



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	175/06
2. Advertiser	Multiplex Living
3. Product	Real Estate
4. Type of advertisement	Print
5. Nature of complaint	Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 9 May 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement features a sepia-toned photograph of a woman (Jodhi Meares) wearing satin underwear and robe, sitting in the sand on a seashore. Smaller colour photos depict the beachfront apartments at Cotton Beach .

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

I find the image degrading to women – why does a woman need to appear in this advertisement not a man? Why has she been scadily (sic) dressed with a bulging cleaving? Why is it an Anglo-Saxon woman? What message does this say for other Anglo-Saxon women?....I read the AFR for business news not for mild pornographic images.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

The woman featured in the advertisement is a prominent swimsuit model whom we have employed as our project ambassador.....We have been using the model for some 2 months.....this is the first complaint we have received to date.

We believe the image suits our target market and represents an aspirational, fresh and youthful image.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”). In particular, the Board considered whether this advertisement discriminated against people on the basis of their sex in breach of section 2.1 of the Code.

The Board did not find the image degrading to women. The Board further considered whether the advertisement portrayed sex, sexuality or nudity with insensitivity to the relevant audience and relevant programme time zone. The Board noted that the woman in the advertisement was on a beach and well covered for someone in that context. The Board did not consider that section 2.3 of the Code had been breached.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.