



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	59/06
2. Advertiser	Community First Credit Union Ltd
3. Product	Finance/Investment
4. Type of advertisement	Print
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 March 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement shows two pictures. The first is a picture of a suburban backyard with a clothes line on which are hanging three pairs of large white women's underpants and one white large bra, and the caption "Honeymoon over?" This is accompanied by details of CFCU's "honeymoon" first home loan offer. The second picture is of the same clothes line on which is hanging seven items of women's lingerie, including g-strings, bras and a nightie, and the caption "It doesn't have to be."

THE COMPLAINT

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

...reinforces negative stereotypes about women and implies that women who wear this kind of large white underwear cannot be regarded as exciting or sexy.

...suggests that women are simply there as sex objects who must wear more colourful, brief underwear to be appealing to their partners.

...demeans women who are large and choose not to wear the more colourful titillating underwear.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

We feel that the complainant has made an inaccurate connection between the depiction of underwear and the sexiness of women.

...the wearing of either type of underwear represents a personal choice by the individual.

...the insert uses clothing as a metaphor for phases of life and remarks upon the generally accepted claim that honeymoons represent a time of fun and frolic. This period of life is very different to everyday existence as signified by the plain under garments.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board considered that this was a humorous advertisement which exaggerates and makes fun of well known jokes about differences in men and women's behaviour before and after marriage.

The Board did not consider that the advertisement was offensive to women because of the obvious

humour in the advertisement. The Board did not consider that the advertisement vilified women.

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