



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 481/06 |
| 2. Advertiser | Greater Building Society |
| 3. Product | Finance/Investment |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 12 December 2006 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement depicts a bank manager in his office on the telephone talking to a client about moving his home loan across to GBS. A young attractive female staff member enters the room bringing in a pot of tea, and as she leaves his eyes follow her until she is out of sight.

THE COMPLAINT

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

We are trying to do so much to stamp out this type of action. I have two granddaughters who will be entering the workforce soon and would hate to think that men like that are in waiting. It is wonderful to receive a nice compliment but not to be leered upon.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

It is difficult to respond in relation to the complaint, as I don't believe that there is anything in this commercial that contravenes anything contained within Section 2 of the AANA Advertiser Code of Ethics, however, I will be guided by the Advertising Standards Board on this.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board viewed the advertisement and considered whether the advertisement breached section 2.1 of the Code concerned with discrimination based on gender.

The Board noted the bank manager leering at his employee and agreed that the advertisement depicted unacceptable behaviour. However the Board agreed that the depiction of the behaviour was deliberate and intended to illustrate the incompetence and unprofessionalism of the bank manager in question. Hence the advertisement by implication condemns rather than endorses the behaviour. The Board agreed, given the context of the behaviour in the advertisement, that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code.

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