



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	60/06
2. Advertiser	Pfizer Pty Ltd (Diflucan One)
3. Product	Health Product
4. Type of advertisement	TV
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 television advertisement shows a woman on a chair in front of a camera, saying "I'm about to do something that's never been done on television before. I'm about to treat myself for vaginal thrush. Here, in the studio. In front of the whole crew. Right guys?" The film crew looks uncomfortable but we then see the woman popping a tablet into her mouth and drinking water. The director calls "Cut! Take two" to which the woman replies "No...you just take *one*".

THE COMPLAINT

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

I am sure I'm not the only woman concerned or embarrassed about this ad.

The ad is disgusting, degrading to women and crudely sexually suggestive.

If the ad is versed in humour then they missed the mark badly...

Thrush is a very personal thing and should not be talked about in public....I find it gross and appalling...

There is a time and place to advertise sensitive issues.

It objectifies women and...is inappropriate as she is discussing a rather personal medical condition.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

We strongly deny that the advertisement is in any way a breach of Section 2 of the Code.

Our advertising aims to de-stigmatise what can be a very uncomfortable condition for women by taking a positive, light-hearted approach.

This scenario would be taken by the majority of viewers to be an entertaining and an optimistic approach....it does not in any way degrade or embarrass women.

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 advertisement was a tasteful manner of advertising the ease of use of the product, compared to other types of treatment for vaginal thrush. The Board did not consider that the advertisement was in any way degrading to women nor did they consider that it was sexually suggestive.

The Board considered that many of the complaints were actually complaints about the product being advertised, with complainants expressing concern that such products should not be advertised, rather than being about any particular part of the advertisement that they found offensive.

The Board did not consider that the advertisement breached the Code on any other grounds and dismissed the complaint.