

Ofcom Broadcast Bulletin

**Issue number 161
5 July 2010**

Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	3
Note to Broadcasters Broadcasting Code Review: Sections Nine and Ten of the Code	4
Standards cases	
<u>In Breach</u>	
Dum Hai Tou Entertain Kar <i>ARY Digital, 31 March 2010, 19:30</i>	5
<u>Not in Breach</u>	
Sky News Leaders' Debate and other programmes <i>Sky News, 22 April 2010, 20:00</i> <i>Sky News, 8 May 2010, 15:15</i> <i>Sky News, 10 May 2010, 15:39</i>	8
The Door <i>ITV1, 2 April 2010 at 20:25 and 3 April 2010 at 21:00</i>	
This Morning <i>ITV1, 31 March 2010 at 10:30</i>	16
Fairness & Privacy cases	
There are no Fairness & Privacy Adjudications in this Bulletin.	
Other programmes not in breach	19

Introduction

The Broadcast Bulletin reports on the outcome of investigations into alleged breaches of those Ofcom codes which broadcasting licensees are required to comply. These include:

- a) Ofcom's Broadcasting Code ("the Code") which took effect on 16 December 2009 and covers all programmes broadcast on or after 16 December 2009. The Broadcasting Code can be found at <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/ifi/codes/bcode/>.

Note: Programmes broadcast prior to 16 December 2009 are covered by the 2005 Code which came into effect on 25 July 2005 (with the exception of Rule 10.17 which came into effect on 1 July 2005). The 2005 Code can be found at http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/ifi/codes/bcode_2005/.

- b) the Code on the Scheduling of Television Advertising ("COSTA") which came into effect on 1 September 2008 and contains rules on how much advertising and teleshopping may be scheduled in programmes, how many breaks are allowed and when they may be taken. COSTA can be found at http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/ifi/codes/code_adv/tacode.pdf.
- c) other codes and requirements that may also apply to broadcasters, depending on their circumstances. These include the Code on Television Access Services (which sets out how much subtitling, signing and audio description relevant licensees must provide), the Code on Electronic Programme Guides, the Code on Listed Events, and the Cross Promotion Code. Links to all these codes can be found at <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/ifi/codes/>

From time to time adjudications relating to advertising content may appear in the Bulletin in relation to areas of advertising regulation which remain with Ofcom (including the application of statutory sanctions by Ofcom).

It is Ofcom's policy to describe fully the content in television and radio programmes that is subject to broadcast investigations. Some of the language and descriptions used in Ofcom's Broadcast Bulletin may therefore cause offence.

Note to Broadcasters

Broadcasting Code Review: Sections Nine and Ten of the Code

On 28 June 2010, Ofcom published its proposals for revising Sections Nine (sponsorship) and Ten (commercial references and other matters) of the Code.

The proposals include new rules to allow product placement on television and liberalisation of the rules on paid-for references to brands and products in radio programmes.

The proposals are set out in two separate consultations which are open until Friday, 17 September 2010.

The consultation for the proposals relating to television programming can be found here: <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/consult/condocs/bcrtv2010/>.

The consultation for the proposals relating to radio programming can be found here: <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/consult/condocs/bcrradio2010/>.

Broadcasters should note that, until Ofcom has issued the revised Code, following the closure of these consultations, they must comply with the current Code rules which remain in force.

Standards cases

In Breach

Dum Hai Tou Entertain Kar

ARY Digital, 31 March 2010, 19:30

Introduction

ARY Digital is a general entertainment channel serving a UK Pakistani audience, and is broadcast on cable and satellite platforms. *Dum Hai Tou Entertain Kar* ("Entertain, If You Dare") is a Pakistani talent show. Ofcom received two complaints that in this particular episode a contestant slit a chicken's throat on air and drank its blood while the chicken was still struggling. The complainants considered this content was inappropriate for broadcast at this time. They said that the programme was offensive, particularly given it was broadcast during school holidays when families might be watching together, and that there was no warning of the impending act of cruelty.

Having reviewed the content, Ofcom asked ARY Digital (UK) Limited ("ARY" or the "Licensee"), which is the licence holder and provides compliance for the channel, for its comments under the following Rules of the Code: Rule 1.3 (children must be protected from unsuitable material by appropriate scheduling); and Rule 2.3 (offensive material must be justified by the context).

Response

ARY apologised for any offence caused by the killing of the chicken on air, and said that it would "try to make sure that in future we do not procure such content".

With regard to Rule 1.3, having reviewed the material, the licensee acknowledged that the programme did not comply with the Code as it was transmitted before the watershed. ARY said that since it had been informed of this act featuring on the show it had taken the whole series off air and the remaining episodes had not been broadcast.

With regard to Rule 2.3, ARY said the killing and drinking the blood of the chicken should be seen in the context of this particular programme with its nature and format. It said the series had mostly included singers, actors, comedians, street performers and dancers but the programme also invited anyone to appear who could "amaze the audience and the judges by doing something extra-ordinary". ARY also stated "we've had a disclaimer on this show, warning the audience of the nature of the show".

ARY said that most of its programmes are produced in Pakistan and that they were broadcast in the UK "*almost simultaneously*". However, it assured Ofcom that it would no longer broadcast programmes so quickly in the UK after their broadcast in Pakistan without a three or four week delay to ensure there was time to comply the content with the Code.

Decision

Ofcom recognises that the talent show format proves highly popular amongst audiences. It is therefore unsurprising that broadcasters should seek to feature this programme format in their schedules, and that broadcasters serving ethnic minorities would seek to provide talent shows focussed towards the communities they serve.

Ofcom further recognises that, at times, some of the contestants performing in talent shows will be displaying performances that may seem bizarre and strange compared to the majority of acts on display. In line with the broadcaster's and audience's right to freedom of expression, broadcasters are free to show any such contestants, provided the content complies with the Code.

In this case, the contestant cut a chicken's throat live on air, held the dying bird above his head, and then drank the blood that dripped from its neck. The contestant took several tries to cut through the chicken's throat and appeared to be almost sawing using a blunt knife as the chicken was still moving and flapping. The whole sequence lasted several minutes and no measures appeared to have been taken to limit the suffering to the bird whilst it was inappropriately killed.

Ofcom first considered the complaints made about this programme under Rule 2.3 of the Code. This states that:

"In applying generally accepted standards broadcasters must ensure that material which may cause offence is justified by context."

Ofcom notes that the images of what some may describe as animal cruelty broadcast during this programme may have caused offence to some viewers because primarily of their explicitness and length. Ofcom therefore went on to consider whether the showing of the images was justified by the context. The Code explains that context includes factors such as: the editorial content of the programme, the service on which it is broadcast, the degree of offence likely to be caused and the effect of the material on viewers who may come across it unawares.

ARY stated that the content complained of should be seen in the context of this programme with its particular format of inviting anyone on to perform who could "amaze the audience and the judges by doing something extra-ordinary." Ofcom noted that the programme was produced in Pakistan and the broadcaster said it was aired "almost simultaneously" in the UK. Even though the programme was entitled "Entertain, If You Dare," the editorial content of this talent show like all others, whether produced in the UK or elsewhere, must comply with the Code when broadcast on a licensed service. In this case Ofcom considered that the images showing the killing of the chicken went beyond the usual editorial content of this programme. In particular this was because: the sequence included a number of close ups; no measures were taken to kill the chicken in a quick and less painful way (indeed it took several attempts by the contestant to pierce the bird's flesh before any blood flowed); and the chicken was seen still struggling after its throat was eventually cut.

It was clear to Ofcom that this material was capable of causing a considerable degree of offence through its graphic nature and also by it being carried out live on air as an "act" in a game show format. The killing of the chicken was done for the purposes of entertainment rather than for any more serious editorial purpose. To this extent, in Ofcom's opinion, the killing of the chicken with the associated cruelty was gratuitous and increased the level of offence likely to be caused.

As regards giving a warning to viewers before the broadcast, we noted ARY's statement that a disclaimer was broadcast warning the audience of the nature of the programme. Ofcom noted that there was a text in English broadcast immediately before the programme which said:

“Disclaimer: The stunts and activities shown in this show have been performed under expert supervision and with necessary safety measures. These stunts could be highly dangerous and even fatal, if not performed with proper training, practice, safety measures and under authorised supervision. Viewers especially children are advised not to attempt them.”

However, the disclaimer related to health and safety matters only and not the strength of content of some of the performers’ acts. Ofcom employed the services of an independent translator who confirmed that no verbal warning was given, either in Urdu or English, at the start of the programme or during the programme so as to give a warning to viewers about the potentially offensive material included in this programme.

In summary, this broadcast of the killing of the chicken in a gratuitously cruel way purely for the purposes of entertainment exceeded generally accepted standards and breached Rule 2.3.

In terms of Rule 1.3 of the Code, Ofcom considered that this material was unsuitable for a pre-watershed audience aimed at a family audience which was clearly likely to include children. This is for the same reasons as Ofcom decided that the material was potentially offensive to viewers in general. In Ofcom's view this material was not appropriately scheduled so as to provide the necessary protection to child viewers, as has been acknowledged by ARY. This content was shown on a weekday early evening at a time when children may have been watching, some unaccompanied, and was broadcast during school holiday time when younger viewers may have been in the audience. ARY is a general entertainment channel and talent shows often attract young viewers.

Ofcom therefore concluded that there was also a breach of Rule 1.3 in broadcasting this programme. It was also brought to Ofcom’s attention by one of the complainants that the programme was repeated twice more, later that evening and at 11:00 the following morning. It was therefore likely that children, including some of the youngest, would have been in the audience the following morning.

We are concerned that this is the second incident of content and scheduling Code breaches by ARY regarding a programme in this series within a relatively short period of time¹. It appears that this broadcaster had failed again to comply a programme prior to broadcast. Instead, on its own admission, it based its compliance decisions for this programme on those taken in Pakistan where the programme originated and broadcast the programme “almost simultaneously” on UK television. However, Ofcom notes the decision that ARY has taken with regard to future broadcasts and welcomes its assurances that it will not from now on broadcast any reality shows “*almost simultaneously*” to them being aired in Pakistan (where they are produced), and that in future it will ensure there is sufficient time to comply the content with the Code. Ofcom reminds all broadcasters of the need to ensure before broadcast that all programmes comply with the Code, whatever their source and whether they are pre-recorded or broadcast live

Breach of Rules 2.3 and 1.3

¹ see Broadcast Bulletin 152 at: http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/obb152/

Not in Breach

Sky News Leaders' Debate and other programmes

Sky News, 22 April 2010, 20:00

Sky News, 8 May 2010, 15:15

Sky News, 10 May 2010, 15:39

Introduction

During the recent 2010 General Election campaign and its aftermath, Ofcom received a substantial number of complaints about three items broadcast on Sky News, as set out below.

The Sky News Leaders' Debate, 22 April 2010

This was the second of three televised debates featuring the party leaders of the three UK-wide main parties: Gordon Brown (Labour), David Cameron (Conservative), and Nick Clegg (Liberal Democrat). The other two televised debates were shown on ITV1 and BBC1.

It was widely reported ahead of the General Election campaign, that a detailed agreement ("the Agreement"¹) had been drawn up between the broadcasters televising the three debates and the political parties involved. The Agreement consisted of 76 rules. It covered, amongst other things, the format of the debate, including the role of the studio moderator and how questions should be put by the moderator to the three party leaders.

During *The Sky News Leaders' Debate*, a member of the studio audience asked the following question:

"Given the scandals of the last year it is hard to find a person in my neighbourhood who believes in the power of their vote. How do you plan to restore faith in this political system?"

The moderator, Sky News' Political Editor, Adam Boulton then asked the three party leaders - Nick Clegg, Gordon Brown and David Cameron - to give their initial response to this question. Following these initial responses, Adam Boulton (AB) asked each of the leaders in turn to give a second response, starting with Nick Clegg (NC), as follows:

AB: *"Mr. Clegg, you're on the front page of the Telegraph today?"*

Nick Clegg responded:

NC: *"I am indeed for a complete nonsense story. But anyway, put that aside – complete, complete rubbish."*

The Daily Telegraph reference was to an article which referred to allegations that Nick Clegg had received payments into his personal bank account from party donors². Following Nick Clegg's second response, Adam Boulton asked each of

¹ http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/theeditors/pm_debates_programme_format.pdf

² Nick Clegg denied any wrongdoing over any such payments made to him.

Gordon Brown and David Cameron to give their second response. Adam Boulton did this by simply stating the politician's name and waiting for his response.

Ofcom received 671 complaints about Adam Boulton's reference to the story in *The Daily Telegraph* about Nick Clegg. Complainants considered that Adam Boulton's comment showed bias against the Liberal Democrats, because he made no such personal references to David Cameron or Gordon Brown. A number of complainants also stated that Adam Boulton had breached Rule 63 of the Agreement, which stated that, "It is not the moderator's role to criticise or comment on the leaders' answers".

Some were also concerned about aspects of the presentation and format of *The Sky News Leaders' Debate* which, in their view, showed that the programme was biased towards the Conservatives. For example, some suggested that the use of a 'jagged' Union flag on the set of the programme was intended to convey a message of 'Broken Britain'.

Ofcom also received 37 complaints about the retransmission of *The Sky Leaders' Debate* at 23:30 on the same evening on BBC2. The BBC Trust, and not Ofcom, has regulatory responsibility for matters relating to impartiality and accuracy in all BBC programming. Therefore Ofcom did not consider these complaints.

Ofcom considered this programme under the following Rules of the Code:

Rule 6.1, which states:

"The rules in Section Five, in particular the rules relating to matters of major political or industrial controversy and major matters relating to current public policy, apply to the coverage of elections and referendums";

Section 5 of the Code, in particular:

Rule 5.11, which states:

"... due impartiality must be preserved on matters of major political and industrial controversy and major matters relating to current public policy by the person providing a service...in each programme or in clearly linked and timely programmes"; and

Rule 5.12, which states:

"In dealing with matters of major political and industrial controversy and major matters relating to current public policy an appropriately wide range of significant views must be included and given due weight in each programme or in clearly linked and timely programmes. Views and facts must not be misrepresented."

Interview conducted by Kay Burley with David Babbs, 8 May 2010

Ofcom received 1,008 complaints about an interview conducted by the Sky News presenter, Kay Burley, with the Executive Director of 38 Degrees³, David Babbs. This organisation had helped to arrange a protest march in favour of proportional representation, which was taking place in Westminster on 8 May 2010 when the

³ 38 Degrees is a political reform lobby group that describes itself as an "organisation which brings you together with other people to take action on the issues that matter to you and bring about real change in the UK".

Conservative and Liberal Democrats were in talks about a possible coalition Government.

Complainants considered that Kay Burley constantly interrupted the interviewee and refused to let him answer the questions being put to him. They also complained that she was aggressive and rude to David Babbs. In addition, viewers complained that Kay Burley was biased against electoral reform, and in favour of the Conservative party.

At the outset of the interview, David Babbs explained the reason for the protest:

“We’re hopeful that the confusing situation we see today could be the beginning of something new where our votes could actually count...all kinds of organisations have come together, and we’re sending a clear message to the politicians: If one thing happens now, that thing must be a change to our voting system”.

However, for a period of about three minutes (in the six minute interview) Kay Burley repeatedly interrupted David Babbs so that he could not finish an answer.

Ofcom considered the content under Section 5 in particular Rules 5.11 and 5.12 of the Code (see above). In addition, we considered the content under the following Rules of the Code:

Rule 2.1, which states:

“Generally accepted standards must be applied to the contents of television and radio services so as to provide adequate protection for members of the public from the inclusion in such services of harmful and/or offensive material”.

Rule 2.3, which states:

“In applying generally accepted standards broadcasters must ensure that material which may cause offence is justified by the context”.

Exchange between Adam Boulton and Alistair Campbell, 10 May 2010

On 10 May 2010, there was an exchange between Sky News’ Political Editor, Adam Boulton, and Alastair Campbell, the former Director of Communications and Strategy for the former Prime Minister, Tony Blair. The presenter Jeremy Thompson was interviewing both men live in the wake of Gordon Brown announcing that he would resign and that the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties were to hold formal talks about possible cooperation in a Government. This followed several days of negotiations between the Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties.

The discussion between Adam Boulton and Alastair Campbell centred on Gordon Brown’s tactics to explore the possibility of forming a coalition Government with the Liberal Democrat party. Alastair Campbell defended Gordon Brown seeking to form a coalition with the Liberal Democrat party, and other minority parties, if need be. Adam Boulton questioned Alastair Campbell as to whether Gordon Brown’s desire to seek to build such a coalition was really in the national interest, given the alternative of a possibly more stable coalition between the Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties.

The discussion became heated and the following remarks were exchanged between Adam Boulton (AB) and Alastair Campbell (AC), with interjections by the presenter Jeremy Thompson (JT):

AC: *“Adam, you’re obviously upset that David Cameron’s not Prime Minister.”*

AB: *“I’m not upset.”*

AC: *“You are. You probably are.”*

JT: *“Oh, come on.”*

AB: *“Don’t keep casting aspersions on what I think!”*

JT: *“Alastair, Alastair.”*

AC: *“Adam, calm down.”*

AB: *“I am commenting. Don’t keep saying what I think!”*

AC: *“This is live on television. Dignity. Dignity.”*

AB: *“Don’t keep telling me what I think... This is what you do. You come on and say no one won the election, and you clearly did worse. You talk to me. I’m fed up with you telling me what I think.”*

AC: *“I don’t care what you’re fed up with. You can say what you like. I can tell you my opinion.”*

AB: *“Don’t tell me what I think.”*

AC: *“I will tell you why you’re reacting...”*

JT: *“Alastair, you are being a bit provocative here, and unnecessarily so.”*

AC: *“ Sometimes, politics is about passionate things.”*

JT: *“I understand that.”*

.....

AB: *“You - totally unelected – have plotted this.”*

AC: *“Me? And you’re elected are you?”*

AB: *“No.”*

JT: *“Gentlemen, gentlemen.”*

AB: *“No, he’s [Gordon Brown] got a Parliamentary party. You’re the one who’s cooked this up. You’re the one who’s cooked this up with Peter Mandelson.”*

AC: *“Unbelievable, calm down, calm down.”*

JT: *“Let this debate carry on later.”*

AB: *"I actually care about this country."*

AC: *"You think I don't? You think I don't?"*

AB: *"I don't think the evidence is there."*

AC: *"Adam, you're pompous."*

JT: *"This is Gordon Brown's Statement"* [cuts to footage of Gordon Brown].

Ofcom received 1,116 complaints about this content, with complainants considering that Adam Boulton was biased towards the Conservative party and against the Labour party, and was confrontational, bullying and aggressive towards Alastair Campbell. Some complainants considered that it was inappropriate for a presenter to lose his temper on television.

Ofcom therefore considered the programme under Section 5, in particular Rules 5.11 and 5.12, as well as Rules 2.1 and 2.3 of the Code (see above).

Decision

It is a key element of the Code that coverage of a General Election campaign is considered a matter of major political or industrial controversy or a matter relating to current public policy. Rule 6.1 therefore has the effect of applying Rules 5.11 and 5.12 to programmes covering General Election issues broadcast before polling, such as *The Sky News Leaders' Debate*.

In addition, we also considered that the interview with David Babbs, and the exchange between Adam Boulton and Alastair Campbell, (both broadcast after the General Election) dealt with matters of major political controversy. Section 5, and in particular Rules 5.11 and 5.12, applied in the case of these two programmes as well.

When setting and applying standards in the Code to provide adequate protection to members of the public from harmful and offensive material, Ofcom must have regard to the need for standards to be applied in a manner that best guarantees an appropriate level of freedom of expression⁴. This is in accordance with Article 10 of the European Convention of Human Rights, as incorporated in the Human Rights Act 1998. This is the right of a broadcaster to impart information and ideas and the right of the audience to receive them. Accordingly, Ofcom must exercise its duties in light of these rights and not interfere with the exercise of these rights in broadcast services unless it is satisfied that the restrictions it seeks to apply are required by law and are necessary to achieve a legitimate aim. We note, in particular, the high level of importance that should be attached to freedom of expression in the context of political debate.

It is also important to note the Code's definition of "due" in relation to "due impartiality":

"Due" is an important qualification to the concept of impartiality. Impartiality itself means not favouring one side over another. "Due" means adequate or appropriate to the subject and nature of the programme. So "due impartiality" does not mean an equal division of time has to be given to every view, or that

⁴ See section.3(4)(g) of the Act.

every argument and every facet of every argument has to be represented. The approach to due impartiality may vary according to the nature of the subject, the type of programme and channel, the likely expectation of the audience as to content, and the extent to which the content and approach is signalled to the audience.

We considered each of the three programmes in turn.

The Sky News Leaders' Debate, 22 April 2010

In this programme, we note that many complainants considered that at one point in the debate the moderator, Adam Boulton, seemed to go beyond what was apparently the agreed format of the debate, as contained in the Agreement. This point was when he briefly referred to an unfavourable newspaper report that had been published about Nick Clegg on the same day. We noted that Adam Boulton did not make similar references, at any time during the programme, when asking the other two participants in the debate to speak. However, whether or not there was a breach of the Agreement is not a matter for Ofcom. Rather, Ofcom's regulatory remit is purely concerned with the Code and, in this case, whether this intervention resulted in a breach of the due impartiality requirements.

The reference to the newspaper story was seen by some as the presenter seeking an answer to a specific question about Nick Clegg's conduct where similar interventions were not made as regards the other participants. However, this one question by Adam Boulton would not - on its own - in Ofcom's view raise issues concerning due impartiality under the Code. Further, this comment by Adam Boulton should be seen in context. His comment was related to a question posed by a member of the audience to which the party leaders were responding: how to restore faith in the British political system after various "scandals". It should also be noted that *The Sky News Leaders' Debate* was a 90-minute programme in which all the three leaders had numerous opportunities for each of them to make their points on a range of subjects, and to cross-examine each other on those subjects. Given this, it is clear that the programme was presented with due impartiality with all the politicians facing questions from each other and the audience. We also considered the programme was a serious and detailed debate on a number of political and policy matters during the General Election campaign. One brief comment by a presenter during a 90-minute programme (to which Nick Clegg had an immediate opportunity to respond) could not in itself reasonably cause the programme to breach the due impartiality requirements of the Code. As such, we considered that the broadcaster had preserved due impartiality and therefore did not breach Section Five or Section Six of the Code.

We also considered that the format and presentation of the programme did not raise issues under the Code. In summary, the manner a broadcaster presents a programme to the audience is an editorial matter for the broadcaster as long as it complies with the Code. In this case, we consider it unreasonable to infer any bias or slant in the programme's approach to due impartiality through, for example, the choice of set for this particular programme. Ofcom concluded that the choice of set for this particular programme, including the presentation of the British flag, was not designed to make a political statement in itself, but simply provided a themed studio backdrop related to the debate

Interview conducted by Kay Burley with David Babbs, 8 May 2010

As this interview was broadcast after the end of the General Election campaign, Section Six (Elections) did not apply.

However, the interview conducted by Kay Burley, with David Babbs, focused on why he and others were marching in protest in favour of proportional representation. This issue was important during the General Election campaign and was clearly an issue dominating the then on-going discussions between the Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties as to whether they could form a coalition government. The issue was therefore a matter of major political controversy and the relevant rules in Section Five (due impartiality) applied.

We understand why some viewers may have objected to the manner in which this interview was conducted. There was a period during the interview when Kay Burley appeared to prevent the interviewee from fully responding and he was interrupted frequently. However, such an approach to an interview does not, on its own result, in a breach of due impartiality. On this occasion, while some complaints may have referred to Kay Burley's interviewing as "aggressive" and "rude," on balance, Ofcom concluded that David Babbs was able to state his and 38 Degrees' position on various issues. For a reasonable period at the beginning, he was able to put forward arguments for electoral reform, why he and his fellow protesters were marching at that particular time, and why the inconclusive result of the General Election presented a chance, in his opinion, for the politicians to agree to electoral reform. Further, there was nothing in Kay Burley's questioning, in itself, which would indicate that she was supporting any political party or policy position. It is, of course, legitimate, and sometimes necessary in maintaining impartiality to put the opposing arguments to interviewees.

Although we appreciate why some viewers might have been frustrated by the presenter's approach we believe that David Babbs was, overall, able to put his point across. In particular, we noted that even during the parts of the interview where Kay Burley was repeatedly interrupting David Babbs, the interviewee was still able to get some points across to a limited degree. As such, we considered that the subject matter at hand was treated with due impartiality in line with the requirements of the Code for major matters of political controversy.

We also considered whether the interview complied with Rules 2.1 and 2.3 of the Code because some viewers complained that the interview was "offensive" and "disgusting". We recognised that Kay Burley's interviewing style, in this case, had the potential to offend some viewers, and her approach to questioning David Babbs would not be to everybody's taste. However, we considered that any offence that might have been caused could be justified by the context. We note, for instance, that the presenter did not use any abusive language and the interviewee did not at any time appear distressed. Further, while it could be argued that Kay Burley was acting in the role of devil's advocate in terms of her interviewing style, it did not result in any personal or gratuitous abuse. Given the nature of the content (a live 24 hour news programme), the likely expectation of the audience and the degree of offence that could be caused by this material we believe it did not breach Rules 2.1 and 2.3 of the Code.

Exchange between Adam Boulton and Alistair Campbell, 10 May 2010

We considered the complaints about this particular exchange under two broad grounds, due impartiality and offence.

Firstly, with regard to due impartiality, as this programme was broadcast after the end of the General Election campaign, Section Six (Elections) did not apply.

However, the programme was dealing with arguments for and against Gordon Brown's attempt to form a coalition administration with the Liberal Democrats. We

considered that discussions around the formation of the UK government was clearly a matter of major political controversy and the relevant rules in Section Five (due impartiality) applied.

We noted that this was a heated exchange by two well-known figures, who would have been used to the cut and thrust of political debate.

First, given that Alastair Campbell had effectively accused Sky News' Political Editor of wanting a Conservative Prime Minister, we consider that it was not unreasonable, and within the requirements of due impartiality, for Adam Boulton to defend his position. Adam Boulton did become visibly angry – but that does not, in itself, impact on the due impartiality of the content.

In terms of the issues under discussion on the programme, Alastair Campbell was able to argue that Gordon Brown was constitutionally able to remain as Prime Minister, in the particular circumstances of the post-election period following 7 May 2010, unless another leader was able to construct a coalition that would command a majority in the House of Commons. Within this context, Alastair Campbell was arguing that, although the Conservative Party had won most votes and seats at the General Election, no party had won an overall majority. Therefore, Gordon Brown could legitimately, in his view, seek to form a coalition.

In contrast, Adam Boulton was able to press Alastair Campbell on whether, given that the Labour Party had come second in terms of votes and seats at the General Election, it was appropriate for Gordon Brown to seek to form a coalition Government and remain in power, taking into account the Parliamentary arithmetic of the numbers of MPs of various parties that would be involved. We considered that it was legitimate for Adam Boulton to question a leading representative of the Labour Party about whether it was appropriate for the Labour Party to try to continue in Government in these circumstances. It was also legitimate for the programme to explore the stability of a potential Labour Government in coalition with a number of other political parties. Further, we considered that Alastair Campbell was able to effectively get his points across. While the conduct and manner of the discussion was certainly unusual, in terms of impartiality we consider that relevant views and issues were aired.

We also considered whether the exchange complied with Rules 2.1 and 2.3 of the Code, since some viewers complained that the exchange was "horrendous" and "offensive". We recognise that the discussion between Alastair Campbell and Adam Boulton may have proved surprising or even to be uncomfortable viewing to some, and we also accept that the exchanges were heated. However, given the nature of the programming (a live 24 hour news service), the important political issues that were being discussed and the overall context of the programme, we concluded that generally accepted standards were applied to this content. Two well-known personalities from the worlds of politics and journalism were taking part in a debate about a matter of topical and serious concern. We considered that although the tone and content of this exchange was unusual, it would not have been beyond the likely expectations of the audience for this channel. It should be noted that the discussion at no time resulted in any abusive language or gratuitous insults. Therefore to find that these heated exchanges could not be transmitted would be an unnecessary interference with the broadcaster's and the viewer's right of freedom of expression. We therefore considered there was no breach of Rules 2.1 and 2.3.

Sky News, 22 April 2010, 20:00: Not in breach of 5.11, 5.12, and 6.1

Sky News, 8 May 2010, 15:15: Not in breach of 2.1, 2.3, 5.11 and 5.12

Sky News, 10 May 2010, 15:39: Not in breach of 2.1, 2.3, 5.11 and 5.12

Not in Breach

The Door

ITV1, 2 April 2010 at 20:25 and 3 April 2010, 21:00

This Morning

ITV1, 31 March 2010, 10:30

Introduction

The Door was a two-part “special”, broadcast on ITV1 and hosted by Chris Tarrant and Amanda Holden. During the programme six celebrities competed against one another in order to win money for their chosen charity. The celebrities competed in a set of challenges - found behind ‘The Door’ - which were designed to test their bravery. One of the challenges required the celebrities, covered in raw meat, to crawl past what the programme described as “a pack of hungry dogs” in cages, which were barking aggressively. Other challenges involved the celebrities putting their hands in glass jars that contained scorpions, spiders and other insects in order to retrieve a key, crawling through dark and claustrophobic tunnels filled with rats, and picking up snakes.

On 31 March 2010 (prior to the broadcast of *The Door* a couple of nights later) *This Morning* included an interview with Chris Tarrant, who discussed the upcoming programme. During the interview some short clips of the programme were broadcast, including the challenges involving the dogs in cages and various insects and animals in jars.

Ofcom received seven complaints about *This Morning* and 199 complaints about *The Door*, as broadcast on 2 and 3 April 2010. In summary, the complainants said they had been offended by the content of the programme, particularly in relation to the welfare of the dogs in cages. Complainants stated for example that the dogs appeared “distressed and anxious” and that the treatment of the dogs in the programme was “completely inappropriate, unnecessary, and cruel”. Some complainants were also concerned about the way the other animals were handled by the celebrities in the programme, in particular the rats and snakes.

Ofcom asked ITV Broadcasting Limited (“ITV” or “the Licensee”), who compiled the programme on behalf of the ITV Network, for its comments on the broadcast in respect of Rule 2.3 of the Code (material that may cause offence must be justified by the context).

Response

The Licensee said that it takes seriously its responsibility for animal welfare. It said that the content and tone of the programme was made clear to the audience at the start and that “the various games were designed to challenge and sometimes terrify the celebrities, but they were for the most part clearly artificial”.

With regard to the challenge involving the dogs, the Licensee said that “the welfare of all the animals was an overriding priority in the planning of this challenge”. It explained that “only specially-trained animals were used in the dog challenge”, as provided by Animal Actors, “a reputable company that the producers had worked with before, and which has been supplying animals to television programmes for 30

years". ITV said that the dogs "were all specially trained to bark following hand signals and verbal commands" and "were not in their cages for more than half an hour at a time". The Licensee explained that "at all times each dog was supervised by its handler to ensure that they were correctly and responsibly treated during the recording... and after filming the handlers were fully satisfied with the way the filming was conducted".

In relation to the other animals included in the programme, ITV said that "similarly, professional animal handlers were employed to look after the other animals... and were on set throughout the filming of the challenges".

With regard to the broadcast of clips from the programme during *This Morning*, the Licensee said that during the programme "reference was made to the fact that the production team was the same one that produced *'I'm a Celebrity Get Me Out of Here'*, and to the purpose of the show". It said that in the context of a morning magazine programme it did not believe the clips broadcast exceeded viewers' expectations.

Decision

Under the Communications Act 2003 ("the Act"), Ofcom has a statutory duty to set standards for the content of broadcast television programmes in a Code with which broadcasters must comply. It is important to note that neither the Act nor other legislation gives Ofcom any specific duties or powers in terms of the treatment of, or cruelty to, animals. Ofcom has no legal powers or duties to consider complaints purely about the treatment of animals.

Ofcom's duties in this area are therefore carried out through the enforcement of the Code and we can only intervene if the Code has been breached. Given the duties set out by the Act, and in view of the fact that Ofcom has no legal powers or duties to consider complaints purely about the treatment of animals, complaints about animal welfare are considered in relation to the obligation to ensure that generally accepted standards are applied to content to provide adequate protection for members of the public from harmful and/or offensive material. In carrying out this duty, we must do so "in the manner that best guarantees an appropriate level of freedom of expression". Freedom of expression is the broadcaster right to impart and the audience's right to receive information.

Ofcom accepts that the images of animals broadcast during the programme may have caused offence to some viewers. It therefore considered the complaints made about this programme under Rule 2.3 of the Code. This states that:

"In applying generally accepted standards broadcasters must ensure that material which may cause offence is justified by context."

The Code explains that context includes factors such as: the editorial content of the programme; the service on which the material is broadcast; the likely expectation of the audience; and the degree of harm or offence likely to be caused.

The Door

Ofcom first considered the broadcast of the programmes, as transmitted on 2 and 3 April 2010. We took into account that the editorial purpose of the programme was a competition between the six celebrities, which tested their bravery by putting them in a variety of 'terrifying and unpleasant' challenges in order to win money for their chosen charity. The celebrities were placed in situations that could scare many

people, for example, in enclosed (and sometimes) dark spaces and very close to insects and spiders and barking dogs. In Ofcom's view, while viewers were shown images of dogs in cages and animals being handled by celebrities, none of the animals appeared distressed during the programme and the images were appropriately limited. Ofcom also took into account that the dogs were specially trained, all the animals were supervised by trained handlers at all times, and both programmes were shown after 20:25. In light of these points and the programme's editorial purpose, Ofcom considered that showing such activities was not likely to cause disproportionate offence to viewers and was editorially justified.

Ofcom also took into account that *The Door* was transmitted on ITV1, which is a channel well known for broadcasting entertainment programmes that use animals in this way, for example *I'm A Celebrity Get Me Out of Here*. Ofcom therefore considered this type of programme to be in keeping with ITV1's familiar style and format of programming and would not have exceeded the likely expectations of the majority of the audience.

Given these factors, Ofcom concluded that the images broadcast were justified by context and were not in breach of Rule 2.3 of the Code.

This Morning

Ofcom then considered the broadcast of clips taken from the programme, as shown on *This Morning*. Ofcom took into account that the images were broadcast as part of an interview with the host of *The Door*, Chris Tarrant, and that during the interview he clearly explained the nature of the programme and its similarities with *I'm A Celebrity Get Me Out of Here*. In Ofcom's view, the clips shown did not show the animals in distress and they were appropriately limited. In light of these factors, Ofcom considered that the images broadcast in this programme were editorially justified and would not have exceeded the likely expectation of the majority of the audience for this particular programme. Ofcom therefore concluded that the images were justified by context and were not in breach of Rule 2.3 of the Code.

The Door, ITV1, 2 April 2010, 20:25 and 3 April 2010 at 21:00: Not in Breach of Rule 2.3

This Morning, ITV1, 31 March 2010, 10:30: Not in Breach of Rule 2.3

Other Programmes Not in Breach

Up to 14 June 2010

Programme	Transmission Date	Broadcaster	Categories	Number of complaints
Advertising	05/05/2010	BET	COSTA	1
Advertising	n/a	Clubland TV	COSTA	1
Advertising	n/a	E!	COSTA	1
Afternoon Live	09/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Afternoon Live	30/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Albino United	08/06/2010	More4	Generally accepted standards	1
Andrew Pierce	11/04/2010	LBC 97.3FM	Elections/Referendums	1
BBC News	03/06/2010	BBC 1	Animal welfare	1
BBC News at Ten	02/06/2010	BBC 1	Generally accepted standards	1
Bengali drama	16/05/2010	Channel S	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Bet365.com's sponsorship of FA Cup coverage on ITV	15/05/2010	ITV1	Sponsorship	1
Big Brother	10/06/2010	Channel 4	Offensive language	1
Big Brother 11	09/06/2010	Channel 4	Disability discrimination/offence	1
Big Brother 11	09/06/2010	Channel 4	Outside of remit / other	2
Big Brother 11 (trailer)	n/a	Channel 4 / E4	Generally accepted standards	7
Bing.com's sponsorship of The Simpsons	03/06/2010	Channel 4	Materially misleading	1
Blue Peter Special	03/06/2010	BBC 1	Violence and dangerous behaviour	2
Bones	31/05/2010	Sky2	Nudity	1
Britain's Got Talent	29/05/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
Britain's Got Talent	31/05/2010	ITV1	Harm	7
Britain's Got Talent	31/05/2010	ITV1	Sexual material	1
Britain's Got Talent	01/06/2010	ITV1	COSTA	1
Britain's Got Talent	01/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
Britain's Got Talent	01/06/2010	ITV1	Race discrimination/offence	2
Britain's Got Talent	03/06/2010	ITV1	COSTA	1
Britain's Got Talent	04/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	2
Britain's Got Talent - The Final	05/06/2010	ITV1	Animal welfare	1
Britain's Got Talent - The Final	05/06/2010	ITV1	Nudity	1
Britain's Got Talent - The Final	05/06/2010	ITV1	Under 18s in programmes	1
Britain's Got Talent - The Final	05/06/2010	ITV1	Violence and dangerous behaviour	2
Britain's Got Talent - The Final	06/06/2010	ITV1	Sexual material	1
Britain's Got Talent - The Results	01/06/2010	ITV1	Premium rate services	2
Britain's Got Talent - The	03/06/2010	ITV1	Nudity	1

Results				
British Academy Television Awards	06/06/2010	BBC 1	Generally accepted standards	6
Byd ar Bedwar	24/05/2010	S4C	Due impartiality/bias	1
Campaign 2010 with Jonathan Dimbleby	20/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	1
Celebrity Four Weddings	31/05/2010	Living	Generally accepted standards	1
Channel 4 News	16/04/2010	Channel 4	Elections/Referendums	1
Channel 4 News	17/04/2010	Channel 4	Elections/Referendums	2
Channel 4 News	18/04/2010	Channel 4	Elections/Referendums	1
Channel 4 News	22/04/2010	Channel 4	Elections/Referendums	1
Channel 4 News	23/04/2010	Channel 4	Elections/Referendums	1
Channel 4 News	05/05/2010	Channel 4	Elections/Referendums	1
Channel 4 News	25/05/2010	Channel 4	Due accuracy	1
Channel 4 News	01/06/2010	Channel 4	Due impartiality/bias	6
Channel 4 News	02/06/2010	Channel 4	Generally accepted standards	7
Channel 4 News	04/06/2010	Channel 4	Under 18s in programmes	3
Channel 4 News	05/06/2010	Channel 4	Due accuracy	1
Channel promotion	06/05/2010	Viva	Elections/Referendums	1
Christina Aguilera - "Not Myself Tonight"	01/06/2010	The Box	Sexual material	1
Classic FM News	05/05/2010	Classic FM	Elections/Referendums	1
Coach Trip	02/06/2010	Channel 4	Animal welfare	1
Come Dine with Me	09/06/2010	Channel 4	Generally accepted standards	1
Continuity announcement	03/06/2010	ITV2	Generally accepted standards	1
Continuity announcement	03/06/2010	Five	Generally accepted standards	1
Coronation Street	27/05/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	4
Coronation Street	28/05/2010	ITV1	Drugs, smoking, solvents or alcohol	1
Coronation Street	28/05/2010	ITV1	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Coronation Street	31/05/2010	ITV1	Drugs, smoking, solvents or alcohol	1
Coronation Street	01/06/2010	ITV1 Central	Generally accepted standards	1
CSI: Crime Scene Investigation	29/04/2010	Five	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
CSI: New York	31/05/2010	Five	Scheduling	1
Death in Cumbria	07/06/2010	BBC 1	Generally accepted standards	1
Decision Time: Sunrise	07/05/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Decision Time: The Result	07/05/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Decision Time: The Sky News Debate	22/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	20
Desperado	03/06/2010	Five	Generally accepted standards	1
Dickinson's Real Deal	08/06/2010	ITV1 London	Premium rate services	1
Diddy Dick and Dom	02/06/2010	BBC 2	Generally accepted standards	1

Dispatches	15/03/2010	Channel 4	Due Impartiality/Bias	3
Dispatches	07/06/2010	Channel 4	Due impartiality/bias	1
Dispatches	07/06/2010	Channel 4	Offensive language	1
Drivetime	12/05/2010	BBC Radio Stoke	Generally accepted standards	1
EastEnders	28/05/2010	BBC 1	Offensive language	1
EastEnders	28/05/2010	BBC 1	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
EastEnders	31/05/2010	BBC 1	Generally accepted standards	1
EastEnders	09/06/2010	BBC 1	Generally accepted standards	3
EastEnders	09/06/2010	BBC 1	Race discrimination/offence	2
EastEnders	09/06/2010	BBC 1	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
EastEnders	09/06/2010	BBC 1	Sexual material	1
EastEnders	09/06/2010	BBC 1	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
EastEnders Omnibus	06/06/2010	BBC 1	Offensive language	1
Emmerdale	01/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
Emmerdale	10/06/2010	ITV1 London	Generally accepted standards	1
Eurovision Song Contest 2010 Semi-Final 2	27/05/2010	BBC 3	Race discrimination/offence	1
Father and Son	07/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	2
Father and Son	08/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
Five News update	07/06/2010	Five	Animal welfare	4
Foxy Bingo's sponsorship of The Jeremy Kyle Show	08/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
Sponsorship of the Friday Night movie	09/04/2010	DM Digital	Sponsorship credits	1
Gavin and Stacey	07/06/2010	BBC 3	Religious/Beliefs discrimination/offence	1
Harry Hill's the Best of TV Burp	04/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	4
Have I Got a Bit More News for You	29/05/2010	BBC 2	Gender, including Transgender discrimination	2
Have I Got News for You	03/06/2010	BBC 1	Generally accepted standards	1
Have I Got News for You	03/06/2010	BBC 1	Sexual orientation discrimination/offence	1
Heresy	09/06/2010	BBC Radio 4	Offensive language	1
Holiday Showdown	15/05/2010	ITV2	Under 18s in programmes	1
Hollyoaks	07/06/2010	Channel 4	Disability discrimination/offence	1
Horrible Histories	31/05/2010	CBBC	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Horrible Histories	01/06/2010	CBBC	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Hyundai's sponsorship of Five Movies	06/06/2010	Five	Sexual material	1
Inside Nature's Giants	08/06/2010	Channel 4	Animal welfare	2

Inside Nature's Giants (trailer)	12/06/2010	Channel 4	Generally accepted standards	1
International Football Highlights	30/05/2010	ITV1	Race discrimination/offence	1
ITV News	09/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	1
ITV News	21/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	2
ITV News	28/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	1
ITV News	30/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	6
ITV News	04/05/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	1
ITV News	29/05/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
ITV News	02/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
ITV News	02/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	4
ITV News	02/06/2010	ITV1	Under 18s in programmes	1
ITV News	03/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	2
ITV News	04/06/2010	ITV1	Under 18s in programmes	10
ITV News and Weather	07/06/2010	ITV1 Central	Generally accepted standards	1
ITV News and Weather	09/06/2010	ITV1 London	Generally accepted standards	1
ITV News at Ten	15/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	2
ITV News at Ten	21/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	3
ITV News at Ten	04/06/2010	ITV1	Under 18s in programmes	24
ITV News at Ten and Weather	16/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	1
ITV News at Ten and Weather	09/06/2010	ITV1 London	Generally accepted standards	1
ITV News at Ten and Weather	10/06/2010	ITV1 London	Due impartiality/bias	1
Johnny Vaughan	03/06/2010	Capital Radio	Generally accepted standards	1
Junior Apprentice	26/05/2010	BBC 1	Generally accepted standards	1
Junior Apprentice	10/06/2010	BBC 1	Race discrimination/offence	1
Ken Livingstone	10/04/2010	LBC 97.3FM	Elections/Referendums	1
Kidulthood	04/06/2010	BBC 3	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Leaders' Debate (trailer)	22/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
London Tonight	03/06/2010	ITV1	Due impartiality/bias	1
Lookaround	26/05/2010	ITV1 Border (English)	Generally accepted standards	1
Luther	01/06/2010	BBC 1	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Man vs Fish (trailer)	09/06/2010	Discovery	Animal welfare	1
Marmite Advert – "Love/Hate" campaign	n/a	Various	Elections/Referendums	134
Meridian News	08/06/2010	ITV1 (Meridian)	Nudity	1
Midsomer Murders	29/05/2010	ITV1	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Morning News	13/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1

Naked Office (trailer)	04/06/2010	Virgin 1	Nudity	1
News	02/06/2010	BBC News Channel / Sky News	Generally accepted standards	1
News	04/06/2010	BBC Radio 4	Under 18s in programmes	5
News Bulletin	14/04/2010	LBC 97.3FM	Elections/Referendums	1
Nick Ferrari	22/04/2010	LBC 97.3FM	Elections/Referendums	2
Nixon in the Den	08/06/2010	BBC 4	Due impartiality/bias	1
North East Tonight	09/06/2010	ITV1 Tyne Tees	Generally accepted standards	1
Party Election Broadcast	26/04/2010	Channel 4	Elections/Referendums	1
Party Election Broadcast by the British National Party	26/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	4
Party Election Broadcast by the British National Party	26/04/2010	BBC1	Generally accepted standards	13
Party Election Broadcast by the British National Party	26/04/2010	BBC1	Offensive Language	2
Party Election Broadcast by the British National Party	26/04/2010	BBC2	Offensive Language	2
Party Election Broadcast by the British National Party	26/04/2010	ITV1	Offensive Language	1
Party Election Broadcast by the Conservative Party	27/04/2010	ITV1	Crime	1
Party Election Broadcast by the Conservative Party	27/04/2010	BBC1	Generally accepted standards	1
Party Election Broadcast by the Labour Party	16/04/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	2
Party Election Broadcast by the Labour Party	16/04/2010	ITV1	Offensive Language	2
Party Election Broadcast on Behalf of the British National Party	26/04/2010	Five	Elections/Referendums	5
Party Election Broadcast on Behalf of the English Democrats	23/04/2010	Five	Due accuracy	2
Party Election Broadcast on Behalf of the Labour Party	28/04/2010	Five	Disability discrimination/offence	1
Press Preview	18/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	2
Press Preview	31/05/2010	Sky News	Due impartiality/bias	1
PTC Punjabi Music Awards	11/04/2010	Music India	Undue prominence	1
Radio 1's Big Weekend	22/05/2010	BBC 3	Race discrimination/offence	1
Richard Hammond's Engineering Connections	06/06/2010	BBC 2	Animal welfare	1
Rihanna "Rude Boy"	11/06/2010	Kiss FM	Offensive language	1
Ross Kemp Middle East	08/06/2010	Sky1	Due impartiality/bias	1
Saturday Live with Chris Roberts	01/05/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Sikhs and Politics	21/04/2010	Sikh Channel	Elections/Referendums	1
Sky News	15/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Sky News	20/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	23
Sky News	22/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Sky News	26/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Sky News	27/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Sky News	01/05/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	2
Sky News	04/05/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1

Sky News	05/05/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Sky News	07/05/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Sky News	01/06/2010	Sky News	Due impartiality/bias	3
Sky News	02/06/2010	Sky News	Generally accepted standards	2
Sky News	04/06/2010	Sky News	Under 18s in programmes	7
Sky News	09/06/2010	Sky News	Gender, including Transgender discrimination	1
Sky News at Six	01/05/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Sky News promo	04/06/2010	Sky News	Materially misleading	1
Sky Sports News	03/06/2010	Sky Sports News	Animal welfare	1
Soccer Aid 2010	06/06/2010	ITV1 London	Generally accepted standards	1
Spartacus: Blood and Sand	25/05/2010	Bravo	Generally accepted standards	3
Steve Allen	21/05/2010	LBC 97.3FM	Gender, including Transgender discrimination	1
Story of Science Power	01/06/2010	BBC 2	Animal welfare	1
STV News at Six	25/05/2010	STV	Due impartiality/bias	1
Sukshinder Shinda & Jazzy B - "Bole So Nihal De Jaikare"	09/05/2010	Brit Asia TV	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
Sunday Live with Adam Boulton	11/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
Terry Pratchett's Going Postal	31/05/2010	Sky1	COSTA	1
Terry Pratchett's Going Postal	01/06/2010	Sky2	Violence and dangerous behaviour	1
The Alan Brazil Sports Breakfast	09/06/2010	Talksport	Generally accepted standards	1
The Dukes of Hazzard	04/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	3
The First Election Debate	15/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	41
The Going Home Show	08/06/2010	Absolute Radio	Generally accepted standards	1
The Jeremy Kyle Show	07/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
The Jeremy Kyle Show	08/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
The Jewel of the Nile	30/05/2010	Channel 4	Offensive language	1
The Leaders' Debate	29/04/2010	Sky News	Elections/Referendums	1
The Naked Office	08/06/2010	Virgin 1	Nudity	1
The Naked Office	12/06/2010	Virgin 1	Nudity	2
The Riot	20/05/2010	Saint FM	Drugs, smoking, solvents or alcohol	1
The Secret Diaries of Miss Anne Lister (trailer)	31/05/2010	BBC 2	Sexual material	1
The Simpsons	03/06/2010	Sky1	Animal welfare	1
The Today Programme	09/06/2010	BBC Radio 4	Offensive language	1
The Trisha Goddard Show	08/06/2010	Five	Generally accepted standards	1
The Who - "Who Are You"	27/05/2010	Jack FM (Oxford)	Offensive language	1
The Whole 19 Yards	05/06/2010	ITV1	Competitions	1
The Wright Stuff	07/06/2010	Five	Generally accepted standards	1

			standards	
This Morning	03/06/2010	ITV1	Generally accepted standards	1
Tonight: Spotlight on the Leaders – Gordon Brown	14/04/2010	ITV1	Elections/Referendums	1
Vets in Action	08/06/2010	Five	Animal welfare	1
Waterloo Road	02/06/2010	BBC 1	Sexual material	1
World Cup promo	03/06/2010	Talksport	Materially misleading	1
World Cup's Most Shocking Moments	01/06/2010	BBC 3	Offensive language	1
World Music Awards	06/06/2010	Channel 4	Nudity	1