



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 423/06 |
| 2. Advertiser | Muir Electrical Company (GoodGuys) |
| 3. Product | Housegoods/services |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Radio |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 14 November 2006 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

There are four executions of this radio advertisement:

1. A father suggests that as tonight is Mum's cooking class they can play indoor footy. During the game glass is heard to break and his son asks "Do we have to tell Mum?" to which the father replies "not if we can get to the Good Guys before they close".
2. A boy tells his Dad that he needs his "stuff" dry for tomorrow, so Dad advises his son to put it in the dryer. When the boy asks "Even the...?", Dad replies "Yep". We then hear the dryer clunking to a halt as the boy asks "Dad, do you think we can get to the Good Guys again before they shut?"
3. A boy tells his father he needs a laptop for an outdoor science project and is advised "Just get an extension cord and take the computer from upstairs outside. We later hear Dad tripping over the extension cord and falling down, then admitting "Actually son, maybe we will get that laptop". The Good Guys theme is heard.
4. A son tells his father "Mum says you have to wash up" to which the father replies "I hate washing up. Get me the electric toothbrush and the hand held blender – I'm going to speed things up a bit." We hear a vibrating sound, splashing, then an electrical short circuit. Dad says "Get my keys son". The son asks "Good Guys?" and Dad replies "Yep".

THE COMPLAINT

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

Like so many ads they portray men and fathers as being bumbling, incompetent, stupid and dangerous.

Fathers have been so heavily demonised, mocked, maligned and ridiculed in the media, and regarded as being of no value.

I would think that the ads are only humorous to those people in society who like to see fathers maligned, demonised, denigrated and negatively portrayed even more than they already are.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

The complainant says that in his opinion we are degrading Fathers and contributing to the breakdown of family structures across the country. We refute this and believe that if anything the commercial portrays a healthy Father-Son relationship. But again this is just our opinion and as

(the complainant's) opinion is different it is of no consequence, because the issue is, does the commercial breach the code?

*We believe the commercial **DOES NOT** discriminate or vilify on account of race, ethnicity, nationality, sex, age, sexual preference, religion, disability or political belief which would cause it to be in breach of the code under 2.1 as stated in your letter. We would not and it would not be in our interests as a company to discriminate against anyone.*

We would hope that upon receipt and review of our correspondence you would agree with us and clear the commercials of any breach. The commercials are currently not on-air as they had already been removed as part of our advertising cycle, prior to receipt of your letter however they will make up part of our ongoing advertising plans for the future.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board listened to the advertisement and considered the complainant's comments that the advertisement portrayed men and fathers as bumbling, incompetent and dangerous.

The Board considered whether the advertisement breached section 2.1 of the Code dealing with vilification and discrimination. The Board felt that while the advertisements implied that the mothers were able to cope with all problems and that some things should be hidden from mum, the advertisements were clearly tongue-in-cheek, and a humorous if somewhat stereotypical presentation of fathers. The Board considered that the advertisement did not vilify men. Hence the Board agreed that the advertisement did not breach section 2.1 of the Code. The Board did note disappointment that advertisers continue to portray men as less capable as women in relation to household matters.

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