



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	72/06
2. Advertiser	Australian Health Management
3. Product	Insurance
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 Violence Other – section 2.2
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 March 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

In this television advertisement Steve Waugh is shown to be playing cricket with his mates in the backyard. As a ball is bowled to him, he hits it, and the ball is seen to land on his wife's car, denting the bonnet. As his mates laugh, one asks "Your missus just got that car, didn't she?", and looking amused and nervous Steve replies "Uh-huh" – knowing he will have to smooth-talk his way out of this one. Advertiser's logo is shown with the words "Hospital cover from only \$8.75 a week."

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*...the implication that the wife will hit or PHYSICALLY abuse her husband when she discovers the damage done to her car. This is outrageous. (complainant's emphasis)*

*...attempting to create a new stereotype in the eye of the public, of women being just as guilty of domestic violence as men are.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*The intent of the advertisement was to portray a situation that every married man can identify with; he can see the funny side of what's just happened but he knows he will have to do some "smooth talking" with his wife indoors.*

*It was our intention...that the advertisement be viewed as a comedic execution, as opposed to anything directly or indirectly supporting domestic violence.*

## **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 the reference to potential violence from the man's wife in reaction to her car being hit by a cricket ball was extremely subtle.

The Board considered that the inference of potential violence was very mild and was defused by the humour of the situation and the fact that the man involved is a well known and respected sporting personality.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not portray a threat of violence that was unsuitable or significant and did not consider that the advertisement contravened clause 2.2 of the Code.

The Board also considered whether there was any vilification of women as potential perpetrators of domestic violence. The Board did not consider that the advertisement created any impression that would lead to vilification of women as perpetrators of domestic violence.

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