



**Ad Standards** Community Panel  
PO Box 5110, Braddon ACT 2612  
P (02) 6173 1500 | F (02) 6262 9833

**AdStandards.com.au**

Ad Standards Limited  
ACN 084 452 666

## Case Report

<b>1. Case Number :</b>	<b>0130-22</b>
<b>2. Advertiser :</b>	<b>MediPro Capital Finance</b>
<b>3. Product :</b>	<b>Finance/Investment</b>
<b>4. Type of Advertisement/Media :</b>	<b>Mail</b>
<b>5. Date of Determination</b>	<b>22-Jun-2022</b>
<b>6. DETERMINATION :</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

### ISSUES RAISED

AANA Code of Ethics\2.1 Discrimination or Vilification

### DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

This flyer advertisement features an image of four men in an exam room looking at a phone screen. The heading above the image is, "fixed rate for doctors from under 2% P.A." and the flyer includes information on the financial service.

### THE COMPLAINT

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

*There are no women in the photo, either representing the financial advisers or doctors. This presents a completely gender stereotypical and misogynistic approach to advertising and most women in health and finance would find this offensive and archaic.*

### THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

*The feature image on the mailout in dispute shows me & Brad (owners of the business) on either end of the photo. The two doctors in that mailout are clients of MediPro Capital, who just happen to be male. We have not sourced "male talent" to act as doctors of this mailout.*



*Medipro Capital have done numerous print and digital marketing campaigns that have included our female broker and/or female talent, we just happened to choose to use this photo for this mailout. Please see attached flyer we did in 2021 (bigger version of the mailout) which features our female brokers (page 3), plus multiple examples of posts we've made on our social platforms showing females in both broker and doctor roles.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Ad Standards Community Panel (the Panel) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics (the Code).

The Panel noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement is gender stereotypical and misogynistic in the depiction of only men as financial advisors or doctors.

The Panel viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser's response.

**Section 2.1: Advertising or Marketing Communication shall not portray people or depict material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual preference, religion, disability, mental illness or political belief.**

The Panel noted the AANA Practice Note which provides guidance on the meaning of:

- Discrimination - unfair or less favourable treatment
- Vilification - humiliates, intimidates, incites hatred, contempt or ridicule
- Gender – refer to the attributes, roles, behaviours, activities, opportunities or restrictions that society considers appropriate for girls or boys, women or men. Gender is distinct from 'sex', which refers to biological differences

The Panel noted that the Practice Note also includes:

*"Harmful gender stereotypes are unacceptable because they perpetuate unconscious bias and rigid norms of femininity and masculinity that shape what it means to be a girl, woman, boy or man..."*

*Advertisements should take care to avoid suggesting that skills, interests, roles or characteristics are:*

- *always uniquely associated with one gender (eg. family members creating a mess while a woman has sole responsibility for cleaning it up);*
- *the only options available to one gender; or*
- *never carried out or displayed by another gender, as this may amount to discrimination on the basis of gender."*

**Does the advertisement portray material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person on account of gender?**



The Panel noted that the intent of the advertisement is to promote financial services for medical personnel.

The Panel considered that there is a growing desire for diversity in advertisements, and that advertiser should take care that their advertising is reflective of the community which the ad is targeting.

However, the Panel considered that there is nothing in the language or depiction of the advertisement which would suggest that only males can be doctors or work in finance. The Panel considered that the Code provides that in order to breach the Code an advertisement must be discriminatory or vilifying of a person or a group of people.

The Panel considered that by omission the content of the advertisement was exclusive of some segments of the community, but that the advertisement did not depict material which humiliates, intimidates, incites hatred, contempt or ridicule of women or depicts them receiving unfair or less favourable treatment and therefore was not in breach the terms of the Code.

The Panel considered that the advertisement did not depict material in a manner that was discriminatory or vilifying on the basis of gender.

### **Section 2.1 conclusion**

Finding that the advertisement did not portray material in a way which discriminates against or vilifies a person or section of the community on account of gender, the Panel determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

### **Conclusion**

Finding that the advertisement did not breach any other section of the Code the Panel dismissed the complaint.