



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 10/06 |
| 2. Advertiser | Michael Hill Jewellers |
| 3. Product | Retail |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1
Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 14 February 2006 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features an older gentleman in luxury surroundings, sitting in a spa looking sad and lonely. The female voiceover states “You don’t need a sugar daddy with the Michael Hill Jeweller Diamond Sale”. Images of jewellery on sale are then shown.

THE COMPLAINT

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

It implies that women need men to buy jewellery for them and thereby are exploiting men for jewellery. It also implies that women don’t earn enough money to buy luxury items themselves.

It infers an age-related discrimination that cashed up older men buy women jewellery for favours.

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

... (the advertisement) implies not that women rely on men to buy their jewellery, but instead that women are independent, discerning and buying jewellery for themselves.

... (the advertisement) encourages women to spend their own money on luxury items that they can afford without the help of a “sugar daddy”. Hence, we do not see the advertisement to be in any way derogatory to 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 whether the advertisement depicted women in a discriminatory or vilified manner by inferring that women need a man to buy them jewellery. There were no women portrayed in the advertisement and the Board did not consider that a reference to needing a ‘sugar daddy’ was sufficient to result in discrimination towards women.

The Board considered whether the advertisement depicted older men in a discriminatory or vilified manner by inferring that older men can be with younger women if the men have enough money. The Board did not consider that the one reference in the advertisement to a ‘sugar daddy’ was sufficient to result in discrimination towards or vilification of men.

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