



Case Report

1	Case Number	0249/10
2	Advertiser	QBE Insurance
3	Product	Insurance
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	22/06/2010
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.1 - Discrimination or Vilification Gender

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The TV Advert in question promotes QBE's 4 Year New Car Replacement product. The 15 second ad begins with a woman taking groceries out of the car as her husband, overloaded with fishing gear, walks past her. Because he is carrying too much, he drops everything, sending his equipment sprawling over the driveway. His wife, frustrated, talks to camera asking if she can replace her husband as easily as can the car.

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

This is a sexist ad..... women fought to stop this kind of ad for women... why is this ok against men????

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

This ad is part of a suite of commercials that positions several real life scenarios that people find themselves in. The underlying take out of the campaign is that QBE will cover most things in life, but some things (e.g. frustrating spouses, burnt dinners) can't be covered by insurance.

The campaign takes a humorous approach to the serious product of insurance. Not uncommon in general advertising, our intent behind this campaign was to use real life frustrations to which people can relate and associate them with insurance. It's not uncommon to communicate product messages that draw upon societal stereotypes in the insurance category.

The complainant has contacted us directly and spoken at length with our Communications Manager, Cath Weatherley on Thursday 27th May. During the conversation, we communicated the intent behind this ad (discussed above) and that it was not to convey sexism. We always listen to and respond to complaints directly and in this case, acknowledged that the ad did not resonate with our complainant. In this instance, we acknowledged the complainant's point of view but did not agree.

We believe this ad demonstrates one person being upset with another's behaviour, but do not agree that this is an example of sexism. The concept would have worked equally had the genders been reversed or had they been of the same sex.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board noted the complainant's concern that this advertisement is inappropriate in its gender bias/stereotypical approach.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser's response that the advertisement is part of a suite of advertisements depicting real life scenarios that people may be faced with and that most, but not all scenarios, would be covered by insurance.

The Board noted that the advertisement is for a New Car Replacement insurance product. The Board considered that it is not uncommon to depict stereotypes in advertising and also considered the woman's comments relating to the ‘old for new’ replacement offer did not imply that she wanted to replace her husband but was intended to be a light-hearted, humorous approach to the woman's frustrating spouse and the product of insurance. The Board considered that most members of the community would find the woman's statement, in the context of her returning home with the groceries while her spouse returns home with his fishing gear, humorous and not a suggestion that all men are lazy.

The Board considered that the advertisement does not depict men in a manner that discriminates against or vilifies them and determined that the advertisement does not breach section 2.1 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.