



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 439/06 |
| 2. Advertiser | Mitre 10 |
| 3. Product | Hardware/Machinery |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 14 November 2006 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on a young boy playing backyard cricket with an adult male. When the ball hits the garage door, the roller-shutter opens and a man holding a paint tin and brush comes out looking confused as to who the adult male is. The latter explains he's Michael, and points to his orange Dial-A-Dad t-shirt, receiving the reply "But I'm his Dad". As both adults look towards the young boy for further explanation, the boy runs off as if he knows he'll be in trouble. A Mitre 10 employee asks "Spending too much time on your painting projects? Just come to Mitre 10 for expert advice on paint...accessories and project planners. Mitre 10 – all the help you need".

THE COMPLAINT

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

As a full time working dad I do my best to spend time with my kids, but it never feels enough. This ad sends out the wrong signal to kids, if dad can't find the time, there is someone else who will. Dad is portrayed as an over-weight middle aged bloke whilst the Dial a dad is an energetic young bloke happy to play with the kid. As a dad I would be Mitre 10's target audience, well, I'm afraid they have missed the target and lost a customer.

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 commercial is to highlight the point that there are ways for "Dads" to make their time more productive by ensuring they get the best and correct expert advice in painting, so as to avoid time wastage (and be able to spend more time with the family). Accordingly, the commercial is promoting Mitre10's products and services in a way that highlights the importance of family time and family values.

Every Dad knows (as I do as a Dad), that we would love to spend less time doing all the necessary renovating and painting around the home and have more time with the family, and the only way to do this is by doing it right, and doing it smarter. When planning a paint project around the home, there are many hints and tips that customers can pick up from our stores,.... thus leaving more time for Dads to have fun with their children.

We believe our "real Dad" talent to be a realistic selection of typical target-market DIY Dads, and we believe the "Dial-A-Dad" character to be what could be considered typical of such a role if such an organisation as Dial-A-Dad actually existed in Australia for this portrayed purpose. Given that we are promoting the importance of "Dads" spending quality time with their family, we don't believe that the commercial raises any issue of discrimination, or any other matter that would conflict with Section 2 of the AANA Advertiser Code of Ethics.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board viewed the advertisement and considered the complainant’s comments about the representation of fathers.

The Board considered whether the advertisement breached section 2.6 of the Code relating to the vilification or discrimination against sections of the community, in this case, fathers.

The Board considered the depiction of the father in the advertisement to be somewhat sympathetic rather than uncomplimentary. Further, the advertisement is given a theme of fantasy by the depiction of an unlikely ‘dad-for-hire’. The Board felt that although the advertisement was playfully lamenting the lack of time fathers sometimes have for their children (because of the amount that needs to be done around the house) the ad was not criticising all fathers and hence could not be seen as vilification. The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach section 2.1 of the Code.

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