



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	64/08
2. Advertiser	iSelect Pty Ltd (Wrestling Rhinos)
3. Product	Insurance
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Wednesday, 13 February 2008
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on a young woman jumping into a backyard swimming pool as young men cook on a barbecue. Another young woman (Cass) seems to be eyeing off the backsides of the men and thinking "Decisions decisions. They're all so good. Too much to choose from." Her friend (Mill - the iSelect campaign girl) joins her and asks "What's up?" and Cass explains "I just can't decide." Cass agrees, looking across at the men around the barbecue "Ooh yes - tell me about it. They're all pretty tasty." Cass explains she was thinking about the choice of health insurance and the tax surcharge she received last year because she did not have private health insurance. Her friend recommends iSelect and points out a family group who had chosen their health insurance by using iSelect. Cass comments that that must be how the wife could afford the new red dress shoes she is wearing, and adds "Now onto an equally important decision..." and looks across at the men again. After information is given about iSelect Mill begins iSelect's punchline "You'd have to be.." and Cass finishes "...wrestling rhinos to buy health insurance any other way", to which Mill responds "Hey, don't cut my lunch!"

THE COMPLAINT

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

This ad used crass sexualisation of a non-sexual issue at a time when children are watching. I don't want my five year old daughter to be encouraged to check out various male bums.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

iSelect view that the premise of the ad is typical of a social barbeque gathering and relates to general social interaction. The ad centers on dialogue between two central female characters discussing how to choose health insurance options and one character's confusion choosing private health. The ad initially uses the parody of choosing what's on the barbecue for dinner confused with the young men at the barbecue. The creative is not designed to be sexist or demeaning to any gender, rather it is aligned to comical situation and we believe reflects generalist contemporary human behavior.

The ads are currently on air and began screening on January 6 2008.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board noted the complainant's concern about the reference to looking at men's bottoms.

The Board noted that advertisers will often include sexual innuendo or references in an advertisement about many products (not sex related). The Board noted that this is acceptable provided that the advertisement complies with Section 2.3 of the Code which requires sex, sexuality and nudity to be treated with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant timezone.

The Board considered that the advertisement depicts two women admiring men at a party, which is then turned into a discussion about health insurance. The Board considered that the advertisement is a realistic depiction of two women's conversation and that the reference to admiring the men is mild. The reference to the men is intended to be a humorous misunderstanding as the woman accused of looking at the men is actually thinking about health insurance. The Board considered that the sexual reference was very mild and was not inappropriate to the likely audience. On this basis the Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.3 of the Code.

The Board also considered the reference to 'wrestling rhinos' and noted that some members of the community might consider that this reference was inappropriate or violent. The Board considered that most people in the community would consider this a nonsense reference with no particular meaning and not as strong or obscene language or suggestive of violence. The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Sections 2.2 or 2.4 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.