

COMPLAINT NUMBER	18/309 Appeal 18/014
COMPLAINANT	M Smith
ADVERTISER	ANZ NZ LTD
ADVERTISEMENT	ANZ NZ LTD, Television
DATE OF MEETING	30 October 2018
OUTCOME	Not Upheld

SUMMARY

The two ANZ television advertisements show the interaction between a couple. The first advertisement shows the couple walking along the street with the woman saying: “Don’t you think it’s time the two of us had a little chat with someone who knows about money?” She directs him into an office and directs him forward to meet a Financial Advisor.

In the second advertisement the man is using different voices saying “My voice confirms my identity” to try and activate a mobile application. The woman enters and says: “Just say it – My voice confirms my identity.” The man stops and tosses his phone aside.

The Chair of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board ruled the complaint made by M Smith had no grounds to proceed. The Complainant appealed the Ruling.

The appeal application was considered by the Chairperson of the Appeal Board. The Complainant was of the view the Chair of the Complaints Board had not given sufficient consideration to the definition of domestic violence and the type of contact between the male and female actors in the advertisements.

The Chairperson held that on balance the appeal application had met the threshold to establish grounds for appeal under Ground (v), it was in the interests of natural justice that the matter be heard by the Complaints Board.

The Complaints Board noted the concerns raised in the Complainant’s appeal application, that the advertisement is demeaning to men and shows a woman having a controlling manipulative attitude towards her partner.

The Complaints Board then considered the response from the Advertiser, which said the interactions between the couple in the advertisements were playful and affectionate and highly unlikely to be construed as demeaning or abusive.

The majority of the Complaints Board said the first advertisement used humour to get its message across, and the interaction between the couple was typical for some relationships. The majority said the woman was not ‘manhandling’ her partner and the advertisement did not lend support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

A minority disagreed and said if roles were reversed the man would come across as pushy and his behaviour would not be acceptable. The minority said the way the woman grabs the man’s arm is quite forceful and the man looks apprehensive.

In accordance with the majority, the Complaints Board agreed the first advertisement had been prepared with the required high standard of social responsibility and was not in breach of Rules 4,5 or 7 of the Code of Ethics or Principle 1 of the Code for Financial Advertising.

The Complaints Board was unanimous in its view that the second advertisement had been prepared with the required high standard of social responsibility and was not in breach of Rules 4,5 or 7 of the Code of Ethics or Principle 1 of the Code for Financial Advertising.

The Complaints Board ruled the complaint was Not Upheld and the appeal was Dismissed.

[No further action required]

Please note this headnote does not form part of the Decision.

APPEAL REFERRED TO COMPLAINTS BOARD

On 17 September 2018, the Chair of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board ruled the complaint made by M Smith had no grounds to proceed. The Complainant appealed the Ruling.

The appeal application was considered by the Chairperson of the Appeal Board. The Complainant was of the view the Chair of the Complaints Board had not given sufficient consideration to the definition of domestic violence and the type of contact between the male and female actors in the advertisements.

After reviewing all the relevant correspondence, the Chairperson held that on balance the appeal application had met the threshold to establish grounds for appeal under Ground (v), it was in the interests of natural justice that the matter be heard by the Complaints Board.

Accordingly, the Chairperson ruled that the appeal application be accepted, parties be provided the opportunity to comment and the matter be referred to the Complaints Board to be considered.

COMPLAINTS BOARD DECISION

The Chair directed the Complaints Board to consider the complaint with reference to Rules 4,5 and 7 of the Code of Ethics and Principle 1 of the Code for Financial Advertising.

Rule 4 Decency required the Complaints Board consider whether the advertisements contained anything which clearly offends against generally prevailing community standards taking into account the context, medium, audience and product (including services).

Rule 5 Offensiveness required the Complaints Board to consider whether the advertisements were likely to cause serious or widespread offence.

Rule 7 Violence required the Complaints Board to consider whether the advertisements contained anything which lends support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

Principle 1 required the Complaints Board to consider whether the advertisements had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility.

Precedent

In considering the issues raised by the Complainant, the Chair referred to a precedent decision, Decision 09/156. That decision concerned a television advertisement for Tower Insurance which shows a heterosexual couple undergoing relationship counselling. A therapist listens to the couple's complaints and tries to mediate a disagreement over car insurance.

The Complainant said the man was being interrupted, misunderstood and talked down to by two women (the therapist and his partner). The complaint was Not Upheld by the Complaints Board.

The Complaints Board was unanimously of the view that the interaction between the characters as shown, was exaggerated and hyperbolic, and the scenario contained an element of satirical humour in the use of the stereotypical behaviour.

First advertisement

The Complaints Board then turned to consider the complaint before it and decided to consider each advertisement separately. First it looked at the advertisement where the couple visit the bank. The Complaints Board said the likely consumer takeout of the advertisement is that the woman appears to be the organiser in the partnership and she was saying "let's get our act together financially". The advertisement appeared to show how easy it was to get assistance from the bank to achieve this.

The Complaints Board noted the concerns of the Complainant that there is a double standard in operation here and if the roles were reversed, and the woman was being controlled or "put in her place" by the man, the man would be seen as "controlling and manipulative".

The Complaints Board noted the Chair said in her initial "No Grounds to Proceed" Ruling that the advertisement showed a woman "taking the lead in the organisation of the couple's finances and the man was being somewhat reluctantly encouraged to meet a financial advisor". In the Chair's view the man did not appear to be being portrayed as a victim of power and control and the advertisement did not lend support to unacceptable violent behavior.

The Complaints Board noted the concerns raised in the Complainant's appeal application, that the advertisement is demeaning to men and shows a woman having a controlling manipulative attitude towards her partner.

The Complaints Board then considered the response from the Advertiser, which said the interactions between the couple in the advertisements were playful and affectionate and highly unlikely to be construed as demeaning or abusive.

The majority of the Complaints Board said the first advertisement used humour to get its message across, and the interaction between the couple was typical for some relationships. The majority said the woman was not 'manhandling' her partner and the advertisement did not lend support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

A minority disagreed and said if roles were reversed the man would come across as pushy and his behaviour would not be acceptable. The minority said the way the woman grabs the man's arm is quite forceful and the man looks frightened.

However, in accordance with the majority, the Complaints Board ruled the first advertisement had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility and was not in

breach of Rules 4,5 or 7 of the Code of Ethics or Principle 1 of the Code for Financial Advertising.

Second advertisement

The Complaints Board then considered the second advertisement where the woman demonstrates to the man the correct way to use the voice recognition service.

The Complaints Board noted the Complainant's view that the way the woman spoke to the man when she pointed out how to use the voice recognition service caused him emotional distress and led to him throwing the phone down in annoyance.

The Complaints Board noted the way the woman tells the man to use his normal voice could be considered a bit sarcastic. The Complaints Board also noted the consumer takeout of the advertisement is likely to be that the advertisement shows how simple it is to use the voice recognition software by just using your normal voice.

However, the Complaints Board agreed the second advertisement was not likely to cause serious or widespread offence and did not lend support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

Summary

In accordance with the majority, the Complaints Board agreed the first advertisement had been prepared with the required high standard of social responsibility and was not in breach of Rules 4,5 or 7 of the Code of Ethics or Principle 1 of the Code for Financial Advertising.

The Complaints Board was unanimous in its view that the second advertisement had been prepared with the required high standard of social responsibility and was not in breach of Rules 4,5 or 7 of the Code of Ethics or Principle 1 of the Code for Financial Advertising.

Accordingly, the Complaints Board ruled the complaint was Not Upheld and the appeal was dismissed.

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

The two ANZ television advertisements show the interaction between a couple. The first advertisement shows the couple walking along the street with the woman saying: "Don't you think it's time the two of us had a little chat with someone who knows about money?" She directs him into an office and directs him forward to meet a Financial Advisor.

In the second advertisement the man is using different voices saying "My voice confirms my identity" to try and activate a mobile application. The woman enters and says: "Just say it – My voice confirms my identity." The man stops and tosses his phone aside.

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FROM M SMITH

The ANZ TV commercials which feature a couple are disgusting in the sense that if you reverse the rolls i.e the male plays the part of the female and vice versa there would be an outpouring of anger from females about a male "manhandling" a woman on one (where the lady says to the guy "we need to talk about the future" her hand clearly gripping the mans r and forcing him to follow her regards of what he wants to do and then basically throwing him into An appointment he had no idea he was being forced into!! Seriously, other way around he would be called a controlling manipulate man committing and forcing her into something she had no knowledge of!!) in this one though he is sitting on the couch minding his own business say "my voice is my identity" in various ways just enjoy his own company when his

partner walks in and snaps at him, saying "just say it! My voice is my identity " doing it herself acting all like that and you watch the emotional distress it causes the guy, he get annoy, lost of his self, depressed, and throws his phone down.

These ads depict a very controlling relationship and just because it is a woman doing it to a man doesn't mean it is ok. It is disgusting that this is considered ok when time and time again men hear things like "it's not ok to control her behaviour with threats" "it's not ok to control who she sees or when she see them"

Both these ads show that the very things the domestic violence groups in NZ have been battling against men to understand are now being used in ads where woman are doing the exact same thing.

Yes I agree it's meant to be a couple of 'fun' ads by ANZ but it's disgusting they think men can be treated in such a way when there is no way in hell that they would EVER think of making the dames ads but changing the roles around!!!

Honestly imagine it. There would be complaints lighting up all over the country.

There should be a law where if you wouldn't do it to a female, you can't do it to a male!!!! Equality..??? It goes both ways, we all deserve respect and to be respected by those we love. This relationship ANZ chooses to show as "the way things are" is disgusting and if we allow it to keep being played it will be considered normal and fine for woman to treat men like this and it simply isn't fine, correct, or even half way decent.

Simply put, any jokes, any situation or conversation, if reversed between the males and females in any given ad would cause offence to woman because it would be demeaning to them have to be upheld when it is woman being demeaning to men!!!

This is a worrying sign that advertisers seem to think men are fair game now as I have seen a few but these two by ANZ are the worst and have finally made me crack and put in this complaint...

I'm going to start complaint about any and all I see or hear so you guys are going to get a lot of these from now on unless you make it right and tell all advertising companies men are not fair game for being demeaned by woman. That simple is a double standard that I will not allow to happen!!!

Men and woman both deserve to be treated with respect and no ad should EVER shows signs of domestic violence and controlling manipulate behaviour to be ok

And that is exactly what ANZ have shown to be ok...as long as it's a woman treating a man like her possession

It's disgusting

Pull these ads and get ANZ to apologise for showing these two ads for so long when we all know for a fact neither of these ads would of made it passed the discussion in the board room if it showed a man with his hand on a lady arm gripping it strongly controlling her and where she goes then throwing her towards a meeting he had made for her without her knowledge and look at her like "get the f in there or else" like she does

Or a man walking into a room where a lady is sitting down enjoying herself playing around saying "my voice is my identity " and he walks in and scolds her "put her in her place" changing the person she is and her free will, just look at how the guy reacts in that ad after the girl says it to him, reverse the rolls and seriously every single woman's right group, the woman's refuge, all of them would be jumping up and down about it

So is it right to treat men like this when we are told and show it isn't right to do it to woman?

No, obviously it is not

So don't ever let these kinds of scenes be shown again where a woman does it to a man when you wouldn't allow a man to do it to a woman!!!

Fairs bloody fair!!! Get these ads pulled now!!

CODES OF PRACTICE

CODE FOR FINANCIAL ADVERTISING

Principal 1: Financial advertisements should observe a high standard of social responsibility particularly as consumers often rely on such products and services for their financial security.

CODE OF ETHICS

Rule 4: Decency - Advertisements should not contain anything which clearly offends against generally prevailing community standards taking into account the context, medium, audience and product (including services).

Rule 5: Offensiveness - Advertisements should not contain anything which in the light of generally prevailing community standards is likely to cause serious or widespread offence taking into account the context, medium, audience and product (including services).

Rule 7: Violence - Advertisements should not contain anything which lends support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

ORIGINAL RULING ISSUED BY CHAIR OF THE COMPLAINTS BOARD: NO GROUNDS TO PROCEED

“The Chair noted the Complainant’s concerns the advertisements show a woman controlling a man in a relationship which would not be acceptable if the gender roles were reversed.

The Chair said she agreed that depictions of violence would be unacceptable, irrespective of gender. However, having carefully watched both advertisements, she said there were no actions shown which reached the threshold to breach Rule 5 or Rule 7 of the Code of Ethics.

The Chair said the likely consumer take-out for both advertisements was that the woman was taking the lead in the organisation of the couple’s finances and the man was being somewhat reluctantly encouraged to meet a financial advisor in one advertisement and being helped with new technology in the another.

In the Chair’s view, the man did not appear to be being portrayed as a victim of power and control or domestic violence. The Chair said the advertisement was not likely to cause serious or widespread offence and did not lend support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

The Chair confirmed the advertisement had been prepared with the required high standard of social responsibility under Principle 1 of the Code for Financial Advertising.

Therefore, the Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.”

APPEAL APPLICATION FROM COMPLAINANT M SMITH

"I am appealing the decision that was made on my complaint in relation to the ANZ advertising campaign on all the ground you have available for objections.... from a to e...

I also want to make it very clear that the person who chaired my original complaint should not be allowed to chair any further complaints what so ever as she has made it very clear from her description of the events of the ads that she perceived what occurred instead of what actually occurred. It is plainly clear to all to see what occurs in the adverts and if you read her versions of events, well, it make your eyebrows raise that's for sure. ...

She has stated that in one of the ads the lady 'nudges' the man forward...when if you actually watch the ad the woman has a firm controlling grip on the mans upper arm the whole time and basically throws him pushes him into an appointment that she has made for him. She NEVER nudges him.

A nudge would be a gentle touch, briefly directing someone or an intimate connection like people do when they gently 'bounce/knock' into each other. That isn't the case in the advert what so ever. I'm pretty sure ANZ realise this as that ad has not resurfaced again yet but the other one has.

The fact that her brain has transformed the lady's behaviour into a nudge instead of what is clearly a tight grip on the males upper arm speaks volumes about how this woman perceives and sees things in our world today. She is in fact a major part of the problem we have of how males are treated and portrayed in advertising media today and her personal views of how woman can act to men and men to woman have no place on a board/organisation such as yours. You are there to make sure general decency is upheld and you have not done that at all. She also has absolutely no knowledge of what domestic violence encompasses and the many forms it takes. ...

In the other ad she has said that the male was being "helped" with technology. Well simply put he was not being helped at all. That would mean being shown how to use an app or computer or log on. The male was in fact having fun mucking around and enjoying himself. He obviously knew how to use the technology so again your chairs perceived view is very different to what we can all clearly see. If you sat 100 people in a room and asked them to view the ad and then asked "do you think the male knew how to set up his voice recognition feature but was just having fun with it to kill time" which is EXACTLY what he was doing I would suggest 100% would agree.... and then if you asked a further question of "do you think the female just wanted him to do it and shut up" again I would suggest 100% of the people would agree with that too.

...

At this point I'm going to give you something I've copied and pasted directly from teara.govt.nz and I will give you the fully address so you can read it in full if you like. The part that I find absolutely appalling is that we have surveys done that show that domestic violence in NZ is truly a two way street. Woman abuse their partners just as much as men do woman but they have done their best to dismiss this. In fact they state that because female abuse causes less harm than males it's basically ok. So a female hits a male and doesn't leave a mark it isn't assault..??!!!! Are you for real!!!! This in it self shows how appalling we as a society act towards females abusing males. The truth is woman use other means to abuse men. They attack the behaviours and systematically cut out people from their partners lives they don't like and play mind games with them. These are the worst kinds of things to do to any human being as the on going damage takes years to overcome if the victim is ever able to at all. It truly is disgusting that the government agency knows females abuse males however it's all a one way street and they act like domestic violence is only men abusing

woman!! This show how deep this worrying trend is and how everyone now has to fight against this view point!!! MENS LIVES MATTER AS WELL, men's well being is just as important as woman's!! Look at the wording they use when they talk about woman's abuse to men... suggest.... they have done surveys and found out facts that woman abuse men but then they say it suggests this...honestly this is a huge issue for men, and generally speaking men don't speak out about it because we are scared to...we worry about how we will be perceived...you will realise this from the comment section of the articles I'm going to ask you to read from stuff.co.nz

This is all evident you have to consider for my appeal so I truly hope you do read everything I give to you here today, all links, all articles and all comments from the articles as well.

Anyway from Teara.govt.nz

Different types of violence

A growing number of studies have categorised different kinds of domestic violence:

- * coercively controlling violence involves psychological abuse, often accompanied by physical and sexual abuse. This is mostly perpetrated by men on women and children, and is the most damaging in its effects
- * resistive violence is when a victim of power and control violence – usually a woman – retaliates, often in self-defence
- * situational partner violence is when couples use physical force to deal with problems in their relationship. Although it typically involves minor forms of violence (for example, pushing, shoving and throwing things), it sometimes involves serious forms of violence.

Gender issues

Police, courts and social services deal mainly with cases of men assaulting women and children. However community surveys suggest women assault their partners as much as men do. This apparent contradiction is explained by the fact that people responding to surveys tend to report low-level situational partner violence and focus on particular incidents of conflict rather than patterns of control or threats of violence. Also, women assaulting men are less likely to cause serious harm, whereas men may inflict significant physical injuries on women.

Features of domestic violence

Domestic violence is different from other violent behaviour because it is seldom a one-off act but a pattern of repeated behaviour towards intimate partners or former partners that has wide-ranging negative effects. Because it occurs in private, other people, even family and close friends, may not be aware that it is happening, or may choose to ignore it. This makes it particularly difficult to assess and overcome.

Domestic violence crosses ethnic and class boundaries, and occurs in both heterosexual and increasingly a distinction is made between one-off acts of violence – situational couple violence – and coercively controlling violence, which are a systematic pattern of assaults and intimidation that creates a climate of fear and self-regulation.

Link:

<https://teara.govt.nz/en/domestic-violence/page-1>

Before I go further I want everyone at your organisation to read the following articles, but more importantly I also want you to read the comment section in full of each article and I would suggest you use these as references anytime you have a complaint about how a male is being treated in an ad or where it is complained that the ad would be considered sexist if the roles were reversed. Please read them because as the major part of the reason your chair has used as to say my complaint wasn't worthily of being looked at is society is ok with this sort of behaviour and it's ok with our values from memory of what was said when in fact

if you look at how the people of New Zealand are speaking out over these issues you are completely wrong.

Read these in full and the comment sections:

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/sport/opinion/107265035/mark-reason-serenas-sexism-reflects-americas-culture-of-misandry?rm=m>

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/103376720/advertising-authority-dismisses-complaint-richie-mccaw-ad-derogatory-to-men>

...

These two ads I was complaining about are the 2nd and 3rd in the series of ads. The first was a fun ad. It showed the two of them trying to get somewhere he was on his bike and she took a bus. All smiles and fun and an enjoyable air no offence to anyone at all. Second ad to air is her setting up an appointment for him (which I don't even think you would be able to do under NZ law without his permission or you are a signature on his accounts) she says "we need to talk about our future" not what your chair said (again perceived view not what actually happened!!)and he gets excited thinking she is meaning take our relationship further emotional or commitment wise as they walk along a street but he ends up being manhandled dragged or pulled by the upper arm lead to where she wants him to be...no nudge NO NUDGE AT ALL as your chair described!!! And then forcefully directed by her strong grip on his arm into a meeting she wants him to have but obviously has never been disguised with him!!

...

The double standards that exist in NZ to how we treat woman to men is there for everyone to see....we just choose not to talk about it when it's from the female side for some reason and that is wrong!

...

Why aren't the media and people who the ability to show these things doing so?

Why do organisations such as yours choose to close your eyes and ears to the chorus of people like me saying enough is enough!!

The third ad of ANZ shows the worst form of domestic violence there is. The kind that changes a person from whom they were to whom the other person in the relationship wants them to be.

Make no mistake, we have all heard woman say in movies, tv shows and in real life "but I can change him"

What the hell!!!! Change him???? How dare any person ever think they are allowed to mess with someone's head and change the person they are!!!!

You will never hear in any tv show a man saying "I'll change her" look at the Simpson's as an example. I recall one episode where Marg is saying to Lisa "and I've changed him" talking about homers behaviours and Lisa was like uhh mum and then marg says "I did I did" and Lisa walks off ok mum knowing she hadn't but the fact that it is somehow ok for woman to think they are allowed to try and change a man from who he is to what they want to be blunt is completely wrong. Our own identity should never be under attack especially from those that supposedly love us.

This is coercively controlling violence which involves psychological abuse. Whether you like it or not that is exactly what she is doing in the 3rd advert that ANZ has produced. And unfortunately as a male that has had this done to me I can recognise it straight away! ANZ may not of been intending it to be so...in fact I doubt they did, but I recognise it straight away and if this guy in the ad was a friend of mine I would be urging him to leave her. From the first advert to the third in this series of advertising the way she treats her partner has a worrying trend and I would be worried about him as a friend if he was my mate. That's no lie, this woman has a very bad influence over him and is undertaking controlling and manipulating behaviour over him to get what she wants with no regard to him as a human being.

I know how long it takes to come back form this kind of abusive where your actual identity has been under attack....the very person you are is being attacked and changed to suit the other person in the relationship.

Now I appealing the decision you have made on all grounds :

- * The proper procedures have not been followed.
- * There is new evidence of sufficient substance to affect the decision.
- * Evidence provided to the Complaints Board has been misinterpreted to the extent it has affected the decision.
- * The decision is against the weight of evidence.
- * It is in the interests of natural justice that the matter be reheard.

Further more your board or organisation should never publish its findings until the 14 day window of appeal has past. Until that point the complaint is still actually in play and you may have to actually review it and your original decision maybe over turned. So to publish it before the 14 day window of appeal is over is wrong I feel. Something you may want to consider moving forward with any further complaints

Sorry for the "all over the place" appeal to this decision but the truth is we are actually talking about an issue significantly larger than these ads....however you shape how we as a society see these issues. By allowing ANZ to continue using these adverts you are saying you are ok with woman having a controlling manipulative attitude towards men. I truly hope that isn't the case.

We either say we are happy to keep demeaning men.... or we do what's right and say we are in fact wanting equality for all.

I'm no feminist, because to me that is now a sexist word. Never does a so called feminist ever speak out about the injustices to men. I want equality for both men and woman...but to many sexist woman hide behind the word feminism so that word has lost its original meaning to me....which is a shame because I do believe in the original concept of it, just not where it is today in our society.”

...

APPEAL ACCEPTED BY CHAIRPERSON OF THE APPEAL BOARD

The Chairperson noted that in the appeal application, the Complainant considered the Chair of the Complaints Board had not given sufficient consideration to the definition of domestic violence and the type of contact between the male and female actors in the advertisements.

After reviewing all the relevant correspondence, the Chairperson held that on balance the appeal application had met the threshold to establish grounds for appeal under Ground (v), it was in the interests of natural justice that the matter be heard by the Complaints Board.

Accordingly, the Chairperson ruled that the appeal application be accepted, parties be provided the opportunity to comment and the matter be referred to the Complaints Board to be considered.

RESPONSE TO APPEAL FROM ADVERTISER, ANZ NZ LTD

Contact person for advertising complaints	Matthew Pickering, Head of Consumer Marketing, ANZ New Zealand
Name and contact at creative agency	Thomas Penn, Business and Strategy Director, TBWA
Name and contact at media agency	Chantelle Hurndell, Business Director, PHD
A basic, neutral description of the advertisement	ANZ 3067153 – “A-Z Review” A couple walking down the street. Women suggests it’s time they ‘had a little chat’, at which point she directs him into an ANZ branch to speak with a Personal Banker. ANZ 3067154 – “Voice ID” Man relaxed on couch attempting to use ANZ’s voice recognition service by putting on different, funny accents. Woman enters room and says “You just say it... My voice confirms my identity” in a normal voice to demonstrate correct use.
Date advertisement began	ANZ 3067153 – “A-Z Review” Week commencing 25 March 2018. ANZ 3067154 – “Voice ID” Week commencing 22 April 2018.
Where the advertisement appeared (all locations e.g. TV, Billboard, Newspaper Website)	TV AV (video extension of TV i.e. OD platforms, YouTube, Spotify) Social media (ANZ 3067153 – “A-Z Review” only)
Is the advertisement still accessible – where and until when?	The advertisements are part of a suite of ads which have been rotated over the past 12 months. These two particular ads were on air during March – September 2018 (see Appendix 1 for past media schedule). Neither are currently live, but are likely to air again over the next 12 months (media schedule is unconfirmed).
A copy of digital media file(s) of the advertisement – if the complaint relates to on-screen graphic, please send a broadcast quality version.	
Who is the product / brand target audience? Please provide a copy of the media schedule.	TV buy is AP18-54, with a subset demo target of 18-34 for video extension of TV and social media.
Pre-vetting Approval number if applicable	n/a

<p>Clear substantiation on claims that are challenged by the complainant. Please see the Guidance Note.</p>	<p>It is ANZ's firm view that the interaction depicted between the couple in the ads is playful and affectionate and reflects acceptable social behaviour. It is highly unlikely to be construed as demeaning or physically abusive towards men by any reasonable person.</p> <p>We believe the ad is a plausible representative of a relationship between 2 young people, with a bit of creative license taken for advertising.</p> <p>We object strongly to the complainant's accusations of gender in-equality and domestic abuse. We think this is a gross mis-interpretation of these advertisements.</p> <p>The interactions between the main characters – Dotti and Leon – are intended to be light-hearted and affectionate representations of a young, modern couple.</p> <p>The banter and physical touch is playful, and Leon is not distressed or harmed by Dotti's actions in any way. In regard to the 'arm tug', it's a gentle tug to direct Leon into the branch, and not malicious or violent in any way.</p> <p>Dotti is providing guidance to Leon to help him stay on top of his money with ease in a fun and light-hearted manner, for example helping him master the new Voice ID technology, or proactively suggesting they both speak to a Personal Banker about their banking needs.</p> <p>The Voice ID advert uses humour to help demonstrate to viewers that you simply speak normally to use the voice recognition service offered by ANZ.</p> <p>We do not think that the female character corrects the male character in a way that is aggressive or demeaning. She is slightly more serious as she is in the process of contacting the bank, whereas he is clearly playing around.</p> <p>In regard to A-Z Reviews, there's no cost and no obligation - and you don't need to be an existing ANZ customer. There is no reason why someone can't set up an appointment on behalf of another person, but of course that person is under no obligation to partake.</p> <p>ANZ takes a very serious stance against domestic violence. The ANZ Staff Foundation provides support to organisations focused on domestic violence prevention and victim support. ANZ also offers domestic violence leave and support to staff.</p>
---	--

APPEAL INFORMATION

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on