



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

1. Case Number :	0299-19
2. Advertiser :	Aussie Home Loans
3. Product :	Finance/Investment
4. Type of Advertisement/Media :	Internet - Social - Facebook
5. Date of Determination	25-Sep-2019
6. DETERMINATION :	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

AANA Code of Ethics\2.1 Discrimination or Vilification

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

This advertisement is set in a suburban salon. A conversation is depicted between a customer and a hairdresser mid-sentence where the hairdresser character asks about her client's refinancing plans. The hairdresser gives bad advice. As the hairdresser gives the hair a spray to finish styling her customer's hair, the advertisement transitions to an Aussie broker. The Aussie broker nods empathetically and gives a reassuring smile.

THE COMPLAINT

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

Picking on a trade that is constantly not recognised for the hard work and derivation that people put into their apprenticeship. Slanderous behaviour, and borderline hate speech.

It is clearly giving the impression that hairdressers are stupid and it's demeaning to women, as hairdressing is a female led industry I'm a hairdresser our industry is already difficult and under paid we work hard give 100% train constantly are stylish and work with huge corporations and education facilities,



This advertisement suggests we are dated uneducated and unstylish, not to be trusted with advice or influence, Not only is it demeaning to a female led industry it's demeaning to women it potentially puts off young women from becoming heir dressers and encourages the impression that we are uneducated.

It's very disappointing it's insulting.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Our research indicates Australian consumers find choosing a home loan confusing, difficult and stressful. Further, 50% of customers do not engage the expertise of a broker as their first port of call when looking to purchase a home loan.

Our strategy is to tell Australians to skip the advice of friends, family and colleagues, and to instead ask the professionals – an Aussie Home Loans broker.

The body of work (the campaign) depicts males and females across a range of professions who are not home loan experts, dispensing questionable advice.

Thus, our intent is to dramatize the benefit of speaking to the professional brokers employed by our client, Aussie Home Loans.

The media plan ensures the audience will receive a suite of communications depicting the many sources of confusing advice Aussies encounter, such as websites and comparison platforms, people including friends, family, various professions and colleagues, and competitors such as big banks and local broker.

Creatively, the film component of the campaign depicts;

- A father advising his son to play 'hard ball' like he did in the 70's.*
- A tailor advising a client to purchase an investment property by 'listening to the house say buy me'*
- A hairdresser suggesting a 50-year loan as you want 'a long time to pay it off'*

Creatively, print, social and outdoor components of the campaign, reinforce the strategy through the use of imagery and copy that depict our campaign characters giving home loan advice that is confusing and our campaign line 'Go straight to Aussie' as a clear call to action to avoid the confusion.

In all instances, these are hyperbolic depictions for the purpose of humour. Additionally, no comments, judgements or criticisms are made about the specific genders or occupations we depict. No comment or characterisation is offered of their worth, merit, stature, value, professionalism or general esteem/regard in the



community generally, held by a character in our advertising, or held by the brand itself.

The campaign does, as stated above, offer comment on the quality of the fictional advice these fictional characters offer. Which we view to be of similar quality to the haircuts or tailoring our brokers are able to provide. We respect each profession as the experts in their chosen field.

We believe the work does not intend, or in fact, discriminate or vilify hairdressers, tailors or dads.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Panel noted the complainants’ concerns that the advertisement is denigrating to women and hairdressers.

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

The Panel considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.1 of the Code which requires that ‘advertisements shall not portray 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 complainants’ concerns that the advertisement is offensive towards hairdressers. The Panel noted that occupation was not a category under Section 2.1 of the Code and therefore could not be considered by the Panel.

The Panel noted the complainants’ concerns that the advertisement is denigrating to women.

The Panel noted the Practice Note to Section 2.1 of the Code which provides the following definitions:

“Discrimination – unfair or less favourable treatment

Vilification – humiliates, intimidates, incites hatred, contempt or ridicule”.

The Panel considered that the scenario in the advertisement was highly exaggerated in its use of sets and characters, specifically noting the 50’s style salon and depiction of the woman in overdone makeup and hair. The Panel considered that most members of the community would recognise the large element of humour and would be unlikely to take the specific depiction of the woman’s character as the hairdresser seriously.



The Panel considered that the woman in the advertisement wasn't seen to represent all adult women, rather it was an exaggeration of a cliché of hairdressers being full of advice.

The Panel considered that the humour in the advertisement was from the scenario itself, and was not related to the gender of the person making the comment. The Panel considered that the woman was not shown to receive unfair or less favourable treatment, and while she was shown in a potentially negative light, she was not humiliated or ridiculed because of her gender. The Panel considered that the depiction of the woman would be unlikely to be considered by most members of the community to incite contempt or ridicule of women in general.

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

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Panel dismissed the complaints.