

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612 Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833

www.adstandards.com.au

CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number 253/03

Advertiser
Product
Ansell Healthcare
 Housegoods/services

4. Type of advertisement TV

5. Nature of complaint Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1

6. Date of determination Tuesday, 12 August 2003

7. DETERMINATION Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features a simulated laboratory test of household rubber gloves, with a technician and visitor providing the commentary, saying: "If you thought all rubber gloves were the same, think again. Ansell Fresh'n'Dry. An ingenious innovation, its foam lining absorbs moisture up to four times better. Comfortable, and so much dryer. Impressive. Now I have to try them at home." As the simulation continues, a male voiceover states: "Ansell Fresh'n'Dry. For superior dryness, even during the most time-consuming jobs. You'll always feel comfortable, whatever you do. Fresh'n'Dry from Ansell."

THE COMPLAINT

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

"The Ansell Company's portrayal of glamorous women in token careers happily and successfully taking on the dual roles of professionals and homemaker is unrealistic and demeaning to all women in modern society...The portrayal of women in a token career, with immaculate homes who smile and positively love to clean in 'gloves that absorb less water' and then seductively greet their executive type husband at the door is reflective of male dominated expectation and attitudes of our patriarchal society."

THE DETERMINATION

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

Noting advice from the advertiser that 'while we acknowledge that an increasing proportion of males undertake domestic cleaning activities, the majority of the household gloves purchasers are females,' the Board determined that depiction did not constitute discrimination and/or vilification as represented in the Code.

Following further determination that the content of this advertisement did not contravene any area of the Code, the Board dismissed the complaint.