

Ofcom Broadcast Bulletin

**Issue number 100
14 January 2008**

Contents

Introduction	3
--------------	---

Standards cases

In Breach

McFly Competition <i>BBC North West Tonight (BBC1), 6, 8, and 9 February 2007</i>	4
Dirty Cows <i>LIVING, 14 October 2007, 17:00</i>	6
UK's Toughest Jobs <i>Discovery+1, 20 October 2007, 16:00</i>	7
Rich Kids' Cattle Drive <i>E! Entertainment, 29 October 2007, 17:20</i>	8
Ryanair.com POP POP POP <i>Bubble Hits, 9 November 2007, 14:00</i>	9
Radio Ramadan (Bristol) <i>11 and 12 October 2007, various times</i>	10

Resolved

F1: Japanese Grand Prix <i>ITV1, 30 September 2007, 04:30</i>	11
---	----

Not in Breach

Hell's Kitchen <i>ITV1: 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10 September 2007, various times</i>	12
Weekend "Nazis" <i>BBC1, 27 August 2007, 20:30</i>	15
Crash Test Dummies <i>Sky One, 7 October 2007, 09:00</i>	17

Fairness & Privacy cases

Partly Upheld

Complaint by Brodies LLP Solicitors on behalf of Parks of Hamilton (Coach Hirers) Limited <i>News Items, Real Radio (Central Scotland), 5 January 2007</i>	19
Other programmes not in breach/outside remit	22

Introduction

Ofcom's Broadcasting Code ("the Code") took effect on 25 July 2005 (with the exception of Rule 10.17 which came into effect on 1 July 2005). This Code is used to assess the compliance of all programmes broadcast on or after 25 July 2005. The Broadcasting Code can be found at <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/ifi/codes/bcode/>

The Rules on the Amount and Distribution of Advertising (RADA) apply to advertising issues within Ofcom's remit from 25 July 2005. The Rules can be found at <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/ifi/codes/advertising/#content>

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 policy to state the full language used on air by broadcasters who are the subject of a complaint. Some of the language used in Ofcom Broadcast Bulletins may therefore cause offence.

Standards cases

In Breach

McFly Competition

BBC North West Tonight (BBC1), 6, 8, and 9 February 2007

Introduction

The BBC was approached by the charity Comic Relief to organise a competition on *North West Tonight*. The prize would be a visit to a primary school in the region by the pop group McFly who were undertaking a promotional tour in the area (the *North West Tonight* region comprises Greater Manchester, Merseyside, Lancashire and parts of Cheshire, the Lake District and the Peak District). Entry to the competition was free, via email.

The competition was trailed on the breakfast and lunchtime bulletins of *North West Tonight* between 6 and 8 February 2007, with the intention of the band visiting the winning school on Friday, 9 February 2007. However, on the 8 February 2007, it became apparent to the BBC that the band would not be able to travel outside Greater Manchester. This meant that some of the schools which had entered the competition were no longer eligible to be considered.

The BBC was asked to comment with regard to Rule 2.11 of the Code (“competitions should be conducted fairly”).

Response

The BBC stated that viewers of *North West Tonight* were misled by a competition that started out fairly but changed part way through due to circumstances beyond its control.

The BBC said that the information provided to it on 8 February 2007 that schools outside of Greater Manchester would not be considered left the programme’s producers with three options all of which were less than ideal. They could have:

- cancelled the competition completely;
- told entrants that the prize could not be won by schools outside of Greater Manchester; or
- simply excluded those schools that were.

The producers chose the third option and the BBC asked that Ofcom consider the following issues:

All entries were solicited in good faith and the programme maker’s original understanding was that the group was prepared to visit any of the primary schools in the *North West Tonight* region.

On 8 February the BBC became aware that competition winners would be limited to Greater Manchester which was contrary to the BBC’s original understanding that anywhere in the region was an option.

On Thursday 8 February, a BBC broadcast journalist reviewed all of the entries and created a shortlist of five for the competition organisers. That shortlist included two schools approximately 35 miles outside of Greater Manchester. It was hoped that the best entrant would be selected by the competition organisers and the BBC did not express any particular preference for the winner. The winning school was chosen from this shortlist and was in Greater Manchester.

The BBC stated that at its conception the competition was fair. The producers of *North West Tonight* understood that the scope for the prize was any primary school in the *North West Tonight* coverage area.

However, on the final day of the competition, it knew that schools outside of the Greater Manchester area would not be considered which it accepted was unfair.

Decision

Having taken into account the BBC's response, Ofcom noted that the original terms and conditions for the competition changed. Only schools within Greater Manchester would be considered and this came to light just before the competition was to be concluded, without viewers being made aware that this was the case. This was unfair to those viewers who entered the competition on the basis that they had a fair and equal chance of winning it, when in fact, due to the location of their school, they had no chance of winning.

Ofcom considers that the BBC should have made it clear to its viewers before the competition was closed that it was not going to be possible to honour the original terms and conditions of the competition.

We note that in this case there was limited harm to viewers as entry was free by way of email and that a genuine local school won the prize. The BBC wished to apologise unreservedly for its mistake.

Ofcom underlines to broadcasters that if a material problem arises with the conduct of a competition, viewers or listeners must be informed as soon as possible. Broadcasters must not proceed with the competition without informing the audience of that problem if it is likely to affect viewers or listeners' decision to participate.

Breach of Rule 2.11

Dirty Cows

LIVING, 14 October 2007, 17:00

Introduction

Dirty Cows is a reality show in which city girls compete to be a young farmer's date. Seven viewers complained about the use of the word "fucking" on a number of occasions in this pre-watershed programme. Some were watching with young children. Ofcom asked Virgin Media Television, which owns and is responsible for compliance at LIVING, for comments in relation to Rule 1.14 (the most offensive language must not be broadcast before the watershed or when children are particularly likely to be listening).

Response

Virgin Media Television apologised for the inclusion of this seriously offensive language before the watershed. A mistake in the scheduling process had unfortunately led to this error. It explained that a fault with the sound had been identified in the edited 'PG' version of the programme, which had all the swearing correctly beeped for pre-watershed transmission. Unfortunately staff had decided to use the post-watershed version at 17:00 without first checking its suitability for an early evening slot.

Virgin Media Television said it had introduced new and tighter procedures and enhanced training as a result of this incident.

Decision

Ofcom recently issued guidance to broadcasters (see Broadcast Bulletin, issue 89 at http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/obb89) to remind them that they are under a clear duty to ensure that robust procedures are in place, supported by a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and trained staff, to ensure full compliance with the Code in respect to the broadcast of unsuitable material pre-watershed. Failure to have adequate compliance procedures in place to ensure compliance is a serious matter and can lead to regulatory action being taken.

Ofcom notes Virgin Media Television's explanation for the error and the apology and acknowledges the steps taken to prevent any similar occurrence. However, the word "fucking" was used on four separate occasions in this programme. Ofcom appreciates the offence this would have caused viewers, especially those watching with children, and therefore records a formal breach of Rule 1.14 of the Code.

Breach of Rule 1.14

UK's Toughest Jobs

Discovery +1, 20 October 2007, 16:00

Introduction

UK's Toughest Jobs is a reality programme that follows unemployed youths who agree to take on demanding jobs in a variety of industries. This episode featured three young people who worked in the airline salvage business. A viewer, who was watching with his young son, objected to the inclusion of offensive language (“fuck”, “fucking”, “shit” and “bollocks”) at a time when he did not expect to encounter such language.

Ofcom asked the broadcaster to comment in respect of Rule 1.14 of the Code (the most offensive language must not be broadcast before the watershed or when children are particularly likely to be listening).

Response

The broadcaster said it very much regretted that there were incidents of swearing in this particular edition and apologised. Discovery traced the error to an outside company who were responsible for dealing with the broadcaster's playout facilities. They had incorrectly transmitted a post watershed episode, *Aircraft Salvage*, instead of the intended pre-watershed episode, *Boat Builders*. The broadcaster said a number of steps had subsequently been put in place to ensure that this would not happen again.

Decision

Ofcom recently issued guidance to broadcasters (see Broadcast Bulletin, issue 89 at http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/obb89) to remind them that they are under a clear duty to ensure that robust procedures are in place, supported by a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and trained staff, to ensure full compliance with the Code in respect to the broadcast of unsuitable material pre-watershed. Failure to have adequate compliance procedures in place to ensure compliance is a serious matter and can lead to regulatory action being taken.

In this case, the language was clearly the most offensive and not suitable for broadcast before the watershed. Ofcom welcomes the improved compliance procedures that the broadcaster has initiated in response to this complaint to ensure there is no recurrence of this problem. However, Ofcom considers it appropriate to record a breach of the Code.

Breach of Rule 1.14

Rich Kids' Cattle Drive

E! Entertainment, 29 October 2007, 17:20

Introduction

Rich Kids' Cattle Drive is a reality programme that features the children of celebrities working on a Colorado cattle ranch. A viewer objected to the repeated broadcast of offensive language ("fuck" and "fucking") at a time that was unsuitable. Ofcom asked the broadcaster to comment in respect of Rule 1.14 of the Code (the most offensive language must not be broadcast before the watershed or when children are particularly likely to be listening).

Response

E! Entertainment said that it takes its obligations under the Code very seriously. With programmes such as *Rich Kids Cattle Drive*, two different versions are prepared: the 'unmasked' version to be broadcast after the watershed and the 'masked' version to be aired before the watershed. In 'masked' versions, bad language is 'bleeped' out. Unfortunately, in the case of this episode, the person in charge of logging the 'masked' version for broadcast at 17:20 mistakenly scheduled the 'unmasked' version and, consequently, the wrong episode version went to air. As a result of this incident, the person responsible had been disciplined.

Decision

Ofcom recently issued guidance to broadcasters (see Broadcast Bulletin, issue 89 at http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/obb89) to remind them that they are under a clear duty to ensure that robust procedures are in place, supported by a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and trained staff, to ensure full compliance with the Code in respect to the broadcast of unsuitable material pre-watershed. Failure to have adequate compliance procedures in place to ensure compliance is a serious matter and can lead to regulatory action being taken.

Rule 1.14 makes clear that the most offensive language – like that broadcast in this instance – is unacceptable before the watershed. Ofcom notes that the present breach of Rule 1.14 is a repeated breach.

In Bulletin 52, a breach of Rule 1.14 was also recorded in relation to the same series. At that time, the broadcaster assured us that it would put in place additional checks to ensure no recurrence of the problem. In the current case, while we acknowledge that the inclusion of the most offensive language was a result of human error, Ofcom is very concerned that the broadcaster still did not have sufficiently robust compliance systems in place in October 2007 to prevent such mistakes. Ofcom therefore puts the broadcaster on notice that it will consider taking further regulatory action in the event of any future Code breach.

Breach of Rule 1.14

Ryanair.com POP POP POP

Bubble Hits, 9 November 2007, 14:00

Introduction

Ryanair.com POP POP POP is a programme featuring music videos. It is broadcast on Bubble Hits, a dedicated music channel. Throughout the programme, an on-screen graphic stating "*Ryanair.com POP POP POP*" was displayed. Ofcom was concerned about this continuous reference throughout the programme to what appeared to be the programme sponsor. We requested comments from Bubble Hits in relation to Rule 9.5 of the Code (no promotional references to the sponsor; non-promotional references are permitted only where they are editorially justified and incidental).

Response

Bubble Hits confirmed that the programme was sponsored by Ryanair.com and the programme title incorporated the sponsor's name. It said that the on-screen graphic displayed throughout the programme, "*Ryanair.com POP POP POP*", was the name of the programme and not Ryanair's logo.

Decision

The Code requires sponsored programmes to be identified clearly. One way broadcasters notify audiences of sponsorship arrangements is by incorporating the sponsor's name into a programme title. While this is a legitimate way to identify sponsored content, broadcasters need to take care over references within the programme to its title to avoid these references becoming promotional through giving undue prominence to the sponsor. While there is no absolute prohibition on references to the sponsor in sponsored programmes, references must not be promotional and must be editorially justified and incidental.

Ofcom considered that, in this case, the continuous reference to the sponsor by way of the on-screen graphic was excessive, not incidental and not justified by the editorial requirements of the programme. It was therefore in breach of Rule 9.5 of the Code.

Breach of Rule 9.5

Radio Ramadan (Bristol)

11 and 12 October 2007, various times

Introduction

Radio Ramadan was granted a Restricted Service Licence for 28 days to celebrate the holy month of Ramadan. We received a complaint from a listener who was offended by comments made by presenters on two separate occasions. We therefore requested recordings for the times and dates specified by the complainant.

Response

The station said that it was unable to provide copies of the material broadcast, due to a technical failure of their recording equipment.

Decision

In the absence of recordings, we were unable to investigate the complainant's concerns further. It is a condition of a radio broadcaster's licence that it has adequate procedures in place to ensure that it retains recordings of its output for 42 days and provides Ofcom with any material on request. Failure to supply the recordings for the 11 and 12 October 2007 is a serious and significant breach of Radio Ramadan's licence. This breach will be held on record.

Breach of Licence Condition 8 (Retention and production of recordings)

Resolved

F1: Japanese Grand Prix

ITV1, 30 September 2007, 04:30

Introduction

Ofcom received two complaints about ITV1's coverage of the Formula 1 Japanese Grand Prix. Both complainants objected to the use of the word "fuck" by Mark Webber, a driver who was interviewed 'live' after the race, at 07:05.

Ofcom asked ITV to comment in relation to Rule 1.3 (children must be protected by appropriate scheduling from material that is unsuitable for them) and Rule 1.14 (the most offensive language must not be broadcast before the watershed) of the Code.

Response

ITV stated that Mark Webber was interviewed after being hit by another car and forced out of the race. During the interview, he said:

"It's kids isn't it? Kids with not enough experience. Doing a good job then they fuck it all up".

The interviewer closed the interview immediately and apologised for the language. The race commentator then also apologised and referred to "a very angry Mark Webber".

ITV said that it was a regrettable and isolated lapse in a live interview with a professional racing driver "coming down" from pressure and feeling intense frustration. ITV said it did not choose to broadcast the offensive word and repeated the apologies already offered on air.

Decision

Research undertaken by Ofcom shows that the word "fuck" is considered to be very offensive. Therefore this language should not be broadcast before the watershed.

Ofcom accepts that 'live' broadcasting poses special compliance challenges for broadcasters. Nonetheless, a broadcaster must do its utmost to ensure compliance with the Code. In deciding what action to take in this case, Ofcom took into account that the broadcaster acted appropriately by ceasing the interview immediately and apologising twice, and that audience figures showed the number of child viewers at the time the offensive language was broadcast was very low. Ofcom therefore considers the matter resolved.

Resolved

Not Upheld

Hell's Kitchen

*ITV1: 4 and 6 September 2007, 21:00; 7 September 2007, 22:00;
8 September 2007, 21:40; 10 September 2007, 21:00*

Introduction

The third series of *Hell's Kitchen* featured the well-known chef Marco Pierre White training ten celebrities how to cook. Among the contestants learning how to become chefs were former *Big Brother* winner Brian Dowling and comedian Jim Davidson. The series was broadcast on consecutive nights over a two week period as the public voted for the celebrity they wished to remain in the kitchen.

Over the period 4-10 September 2007, Ofcom received 197 complaints about the programme. In summary, concern was expressed that Jim Davidson made bullying and homophobic comments, which were largely directed at Brian Dowling. For example, Jim Davidson referred to "shirt-lifters" and "poofs". Some of the complainants also expressed concern that Jim Davidson made these offensive comments without being censured by ITV.

Ofcom asked ITV to comment with reference to Rule 2.3 of the Code which states "in applying generally accepted standards broadcasters must ensure that material which may cause offence is justified by the context."

Ofcom also received a further 31 complaints from viewers about the use of the phrase "pikey's picnic", said by Marco Pierre White during the episode broadcast on 6 September.

Response

ITV stated that the episodes of *Hell's Kitchen* broadcast on 4, 7, 8 and 10 September followed generally accepted standards and complied with Rule 2.3 of the Code. The programmes undoubtedly contained language and terms that were potentially offensive. However, ITV believed that they were justified by the context.

It said that as a reality show it was necessary for *Hell's Kitchen* to reflect fairly and accurately what was unfolding in the kitchen. The antagonism between Brian Dowling and Jim Davidson was central to the developing story. The broadcaster argued that it was editorially important to explore the issues of the perceived generation gap between some of the contestants, and of the acceptability of Jim Davidson's behaviour and views.

ITV stated that viewers were given information about the potentially offensive nature of the content before the programmes broadcast on 7 and 10 September which included the offensive language complained of.

In terms of the degree of likely harm and offence, ITV argued that Jim Davidson's language and behaviour were "forcefully challenged" in the programmes and therefore placed in context: Brian Dowling challenged him during their disagreements broadcast on 7 and 10 September; Jim Davidson was interviewed in the "wine cellar" about his language; and fellow contestants Paul Young and Adele de Silva questioned Jim Davidson's behaviour on 10 September following the final

confrontation with Brian Dowling. ITV said Jim Davidson's language and behaviour were placed against a backdrop that made it clear that the contestants, ITV and society in general did not think it acceptable to use terms such as "shirt-lifter" or to make an issue of a person's sexuality.

ITV added that the programmes on 4, 7, 8 and 10 September 2007 needed to be viewed in the context of the series as a whole. In particular, the broadcaster pointed to the episode broadcast on 11 September, which showed Jim Davidson being asked by the broadcaster to leave the programme and apologise for overstepping acceptable boundaries during the disagreement with Brian Dowling the previous evening.

ITV said that robust compliance procedures were in place and that all contestants were briefed by the producers before the series started as to what language and behaviour was deemed to be unacceptable for broadcast. Events on set were viewed as they went out live by the production team, who had been briefed to look out for and note unacceptable behaviour or language and ensure contestants were challenged when required.

Taking the overall context into account, ITV believed that the material broadcast on 4, 7, 8 and 10 September did not exceed the expectation of the audience of a post-watershed reality show such as *Hell's Kitchen*.

Decision

The Code does not, in itself, prohibit the broadcast of offensive language or behaviour. Such material can be transmitted, provided that members of the public have adequate protection from its inclusion.

In providing adequate protection, Rule 2.3 of the Code requires that broadcasters must apply generally accepted standards and that the inclusion of any offensive material is justified by context. Context includes, but is not limited to:

- the editorial content of the programme or series;
- the extent to which the content can be brought to the attention of the audience;
- the time of broadcast;
- the degree of offence likely to be caused by the inclusion of any particular sort of material; and
- the likely expectation of the audience.

In addition Ofcom must exercise its duties in a way which is compatible with Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. This provides for the right of freedom of expression and the right to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by a public body. Applied to broadcasting, Article 10 protects the broadcaster's right to transmit material as well as the audience's rights to receive material as long as the broadcaster ensures compliance with the Rules of the Code and the requirements of statutory and common law.

Ofcom believes audiences now have a fairly clear awareness of the conventions of 'reality' programming: it is unscripted, places together people with different personalities and opinions and observes how they interact with one another. It is often set in a challenging and confined environment and, as such, one can expect tensions and conflict.

Ofcom therefore accepted that it was an integral part of the context of the programme that viewers could accurately see the contestants' behaviour and beliefs unfolding without the broadcaster's editorial intervention. Indeed, as the audience could vote for their favourite contestant it was a key element of the programme that viewers gained an unedited insight into the contestants' personalities. Further, it would be a disproportionate limitation on freedom of expression to require that the contestants on *Hell's Kitchen* could only express views that met generally accepted standards. Therefore, even if viewers felt that certain behaviour was offensive, this did not mean that ITV was not able to broadcast it *in context*.

In terms of context, Ofcom noted the programmes were all broadcast after the watershed. Further, clear information was given to viewers before the start of the programmes that some of the material they were about to see could cause offence.

In terms of the likely degree of harm and offence, Ofcom further noted that during the episodes broadcast on 4, 7 and 8 September Jim Davidson did not direct offensive comments at Brian Dowling. For example, during the programme broadcast on 7 September, the terms "shirt-lifter" and "poof" were used by Jim Davidson to illustrate words that might be deemed unacceptable, not as personal comments. Further, Ofcom noted that during these three programmes Brian Dowling did not accuse Jim Davidson of directing offensive homophobic comments towards him.

Ofcom also considered the concerns raised by some complainants that ITV condoned or encouraged the offensive comments. We noted that Jim Davidson's comments were restricted by ITV and importantly were challenged by the other contestants. Where Jim Davidson's comments appeared to become more personal and potentially offensive ITV ensured that any offensive material was justified by the context within the programme as broadcast.

Ofcom also noted that there was a consensus view on the programme that Jim Davidson's behaviour towards Brian Dowling was not acceptable and that he was in the minority. As well as the contestants expressing their opinions, presenter Angus Deayton made several observations about the perception of Jim Davidson outside of *Hell's Kitchen* and his popularity "*going up in smoke*".

Taking all these considerations into account, Ofcom reached the view that ITV took appropriate care to ensure adequate context for Jim Davidson's views. Ofcom therefore considers there was no breach of Rule 2.3 on this occasion.

With regard to the comment "pikey's picnic" made by Marco Pierre White during the episode on 6 September 2007, we note that the phrase was used to describe the standard of presentation of food by the contestants. In response, one of the contestants, Lee Ryan, expressed his unhappiness about the phrase and subsequently took this up with Marco Pierre White, explaining that he perceived it as offensive to Travellers.

Ofcom recognises that the word "pikey" is an offensive and pejorative term. However, through a participant, it was clear in the programme that such a term can be offensive and unacceptable for some. We therefore considered that, on balance, and within the specific editorial context of a programme such as *Hell's Kitchen*, the comment did not breach Rule 2.3 of the Code.

Not in Breach

Weekend “Nazis”

BBC1, 27 August 2007, 20:30

Introduction

In the documentary *Weekend “Nazis”*, reporter John Sweeney investigated people who spent their leisure time re-enacting incidents and activities from World War Two. The report focused, in particular, on those who chose to wear Nazi uniforms. Filming took place at a World War Two re-enactment weekend in Kent. Towards the end of the programme, undercover filming revealed that a minority of the people involved had extreme racist views.

Two viewers contacted Ofcom to complain about uncensored offensive language broadcast in the programme, including the words “nigger” and “coons”. This language was also included in on-screen subtitles which accompanied the undercover filming section. The complainants, who were watching with children, objected that these words were not edited from the broadcast when other strong language (for example “fuck”) was masked.

Ofcom asked the BBC to comment with reference to Rules 1.16 (offensive language should not be broadcast before the watershed unless it is justified by the context).

Response

Whilst not disputing the offensive nature of these terms, the BBC replied that their inclusion was justified by the context of the programme and there were editorial reasons behind leaving these terms of racial abuse within the programme whilst bleeping out other forms of offensive language.

The BBC argued that John Sweeney’s revelations as regards a disturbing side to a World War Two re-enactment were made apparent early on and were reinforced in the second half of the programme. Therefore viewers would be aware soon after the commencement of the programme of its potential to “disturb and offend”. The BBC’s view was that to have bleeped out the racially offensive terms “would have risked confusing the audience and obscuring the programme’s findings”.

Decision

Rule 1.16 of the Code states that: “Offensive language must not be broadcast before the watershed...unless it is justified by the context. In any event, frequent use of such language must be avoided before the watershed”.

Recent Ofcom research (Language and Sexual Imagery 2005) confirms that “nigger” and “coon” are considered highly offensive words. They were not broadcast frequently in this programme. The issue is therefore whether their use before the watershed was justified by the context. Ofcom’s conclusion was that, on balance, it was justified for the following reasons.

This documentary was in part a serious investigation of an important issue – extremist views (and in particular racist views) among certain people involved with a World War Two re-enactment. A recent Ofcom finding on the Channel 4 documentary *Dispatches: Undercover Mosques*, published in Broadcast Bulletin 97 (http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/obb/prog_cb/obb97/), underlined Ofcom’s recognition

that: “Investigative journalism plays an essential role in public service broadcasting and is clearly in the public interest. Ofcom considers it of paramount importance that broadcasters...continue to explore controversial subject matter. While such programmes can make for uncomfortable viewing, they are essential to our understanding of the world around us.” Although the use of offensive swear words was masked, the unedited broadcast of the racist terms underlined one of the main purposes of this documentary – to expose racist views among certain people involved in a World War Two re-enactment. If the racist words had been edited out, this section of the programme would have had significantly less impact.

Although the programme began at 20:30, the offensive words were broadcast towards the end of the programme, after a build-up of revelations about the extreme views of some participants. For example, just before the words complained of were broadcast, viewers saw the presenter discover concentration camp memorabilia and anti-Semitic pamphlets openly on sale at the re-enactment event. Viewers were therefore prepared to a great extent for the use of the offensive words.

Also *Weekend “Nazis”*, although broadcast pre-watershed, was aimed at an adult audience. Viewing figures show that under-eighteens comprised only a small minority of the total audience. Given the title of the programme and the information available in listings publications and accompanying publicity, there was likely to be an awareness of the type of material to be included in such a broadcast. This, we believe, shaped the expectations of the audience and helped prepare them for the limited amount of offensive content. Viewers were likely to have recognised that such a documentary may not be suitable for young children. Further, the programme was in the timeslot normally occupied by *Panorama* which is known for its challenging and often hard hitting content.

On balance therefore, Rule 1.16 was not breached.

Not in breach

Crash Test Dummies

Sky One, 7 October 2007, 09:00

Introduction

Crash Test Dummies is an entertainment show featuring two presenters, comedians Dan Wright and Steve Marsh, who carry out bizarre experiments and test objects which are claimed to be “indestructible”. The narrator sets out the premise of the programme at the outset, noting the presenters have a “*mission to destroy the indestructible, to defeat the invincible, living the dream and testing to destruction.*”

One segment in this episode – typical of the irreverent nature of the programme - showed the presenters attempt to discover which sausage is most able to withstand a bullet. The narrator said: “*Using their trusted Glock 17s firing 9mm shells, the lads’ plan is to find out which type of sausage is better in stopping a bullet, a French Toulouse or a German Frankfurter.*”

Ofcom received one complaint which objected to the use of hand guns in a programme felt to be aimed at children, particularly in the present social climate. The complainant also said that to feature guns in a light-hearted way was irresponsible.

We asked for the broadcaster’s comments in relation to Rule 1.13 (dangerous behaviour easily imitable by children must not be broadcast in children’s programmes or shown before the watershed without editorial justification) and 2.4 (programmes must not condone or glamorise violent, dangerous or seriously antisocial behaviour or encourage others to copy such behaviour) of the Code.

Response

Sky said that *Crash Test Dummies* is aimed at a general family audience and not specifically at children (which Ofcom classifies as people under the age of 15 years). It noted that on average over 75 per cent of the programme’s audience is aged 16 or over when broadcast during this timeslot.

Sky argued that it was clear the item with the hand guns was carried out under controlled conditions – the experiment took place in an enclosed concrete room – and as such did not portray the act as occurring in ‘normal’ daily life. It said the paramount importance of safety was emphasised throughout, through the safety equipment worn by the presenters and the controlled environment in which the experiment was carried out. Sky also said a strong warning was given at the start of the programme and before the item to advise viewers not to copy the activities shown.

The broadcaster argued the item did not glamorise or condone violence, or show irresponsible gun use. It was clear these experiments were dangerous and should not be attempted, and were not likely to be easily imitable by children.

Decision

Regarding Rule 1.13, the actions depicted were not easily imitable by children, requiring for example access to a hand gun. The weapons were also used solely to carry out the experiment shown. As such, the gun use was carefully positioned within the context of an experiment under what were clearly controlled conditions. Ofcom

was also mindful that *Crash Test Dummies* is not a children's programme but is intended for a more mixed audience, indicated by its transmission on Sky One, a channel known for appealing to a wide variety of tastes.

Concerning Rule 2.4, given the context of the programme and the reasons for the use of guns in this item, Ofcom did not judge the actions went so far as to condone or glamorise anti-social behaviour. While the experiments in the programme were clearly far-fetched and conducted in a humorous manner, it did not alter the importance placed on safety or advising viewers of the danger in weapon use. Both presenters wore safety equipment during the experiment and the guns were not mishandled.

Viewers were also given information about the nature of the content. An announcement was given at the start of the programme which said: "*Our Crash Test Dummies always use safety equipment and sometimes call in their stunt doubles for the really dangerous stuff*". One of the presenters then said straight to camera: "*So if you feel like trying one of these stunts yourself, don't bother. Not only would you look stupid, you'd probably end up dead*".

This programme was therefore not in breach of either Rule 1.13 or 2.4 of the Code.

Not in breach

Fairness and Privacy Cases

Partly Upheld

Complaint by Brodies LLP Solicitors on behalf of Parks of Hamilton (Coach Hirers) Limited

News Items, Real Radio (Central Scotland), 5 January 2007

Introduction

Parks of Hamilton (Coach Hirers) Limited (“Parks”) is a firm that operates a fleet of coaches. On 3 January 2007 a coach owned by the company was involved in a fatal road accident on the M4 near Heathrow airport. Following the accident, vehicles of the same type were withdrawn from service for checks to be carried out. Real Radio (Central Scotland) (“Real Radio”) reported in news bulletins broadcast at 11:00, 12:00, 13:00 and 14:00 on 5 January 2007 that a member of Parks’ staff had informed them that exactly the same type of vehicle was being operated on Parks’ Citylink service between Glasgow and Edinburgh. He gave an interview in the broadcasts and said that the company had decided not to follow the policy of withdrawing the vehicles for checks. In the last three reports, the presenter said that Parks been contacted by the station but had not provided a comment.

The law firm, Brodies, complained on behalf of Parks that the company was treated unfairly in the broadcast.

The Complaint

Brodies’ case on behalf of Parks

In summary, Brodies complained on behalf of Parks that the company was treated unfairly in the items in that the allegation that the same type of vehicle as that involved in the accident was being operated by Parks was untrue. The day after the accident all vehicles of the same type were taken off the road for detailed examination. Real Radio was informed of this, via its solicitors, the same afternoon as the broadcast. Brodies said that it was unfair to Parks to include the allegation in the item.

Real Radio’s case

In response to the complaint of unfair treatment, Real Radio said in summary that the station believed that the reports on 5 January 2007 were in the public interest and that they emanated from a source that it believed to be credible. Two days after the crash in London, Real Radio took a local editorial decision to broadcast the comments made to the station that day by one of Parks’ employees. This employee was clearly concerned about the lack of information provided by his company together with the potential for further danger to both drivers and passengers. The driver was concerned that, in his opinion, the coaches of the same type had not been withdrawn for safety checks. Everything said in the reports was manifestly in the public interest and was reported in good faith. The reports clearly attributed what was said to the driver and the items were not based on conjecture on the part of Real Radio.

Real Radio contacted Parks on 5 January 2007 and tried to offer an opportunity to respond to the claims made by the driver. It was made clear in the items that this had been done but that no response had been received. All that was received from Parks until 11 January 2007 was a decision not to comment. Because of this lack of a response, it was almost impossible within the currency of the report to establish the authenticity or otherwise of the driver's comments.

Real Radio said that the response that Parks said was faxed on the afternoon of 5 January 2007 was in fact sent to a firm of solicitors who had previously represented Real Radio in a different matter and not to Real Radio. In fact the first Real Radio knew of Parks' complaint about the news items was when the station received a follow-up letter from Brodies on 11 January 2007.

Decision

Ofcom's statutory duties include the application, in the case of all television and radio services, of standards which provide adequate protection to members of the public and all other persons from unfair treatment in programmes included in such services.

In carrying out its duties, Ofcom has regard to the need to secure that the application of these standards is in the manner that best guarantees an appropriate level of freedom of expression. Ofcom is also obliged to have regard in all cases, to the principles under which regulatory activities should be transparent, accountable, proportionate, consistent and targeted only at cases in which action is needed.

Brodies' complaint on behalf of Parks was considered by Ofcom's Executive Fairness Group. Ofcom considered the complaint and the broadcaster's response, together with a recording and transcript of the programme as broadcast.

In the circumstances of this case Ofcom found the following:

In considering Parks' complaint that the story included in the items was untrue and that Real Radio was informed of this on the afternoon of the broadcasts, Ofcom took into account Practices 7.9 and 7.11 of the Code. Practice 7.9 states that broadcasters should take reasonable care to satisfy themselves that material facts have not been presented, disregarded or omitted in a way that is unfair to an individual or organisation. Practice 7.11 states that, if a programme alleges wrongdoing or incompetence or makes other significant allegations, those concerned should normally be given an appropriate and timely opportunity to respond.

In deciding whether there was unfairness to Parks, Ofcom considered the items broadcast during the day on 5 January 2007. It considered the communications between Parks and Real Radio after the broadcast only as background to the complaint.

Ofcom noted that Real Radio did not now dispute that the information provided by the man interviewed for the programme was incorrect. Ofcom also noted that Parks' representatives were attending a board meeting during the morning of 5 January 2007 to discuss the accident.

Ofcom further noted that a number of calls were made to Parks by Real Radio on 5 January 2007. The first of these was at 10:40, following a call to the station at 10:20 from the interviewee who alleged that Parks were still using vehicles of the type involved in the fatal accident. Another call was made by Real Radio to Parks at 12:00

and a further one at 14:00. Real Radio was informed by Parks on each occasion that there was no one available to take the call.

Ofcom took the view that the allegation made by the interviewee, that the situation he reported amounted to "*an accident waiting to happen*", was significant and that Parks were entitled to be given an appropriate and timely opportunity to respond to it. In the particular circumstances of this case, Ofcom did not consider that a telephone call to Parks 20 minutes before broadcast of the first news item, in which the station was informed that no one was available to take the call, allowed Parks an appropriate and timely opportunity to respond. Despite being told that no one was able to take the call, Real Radio proceeded to broadcast the story. In view of the seriousness of the accident near Heathrow airport, the seriousness of the allegation made by the interviewee and the absence of any information from Parks, Ofcom did not consider that Real Radio took reasonable care in the circumstances of this case to satisfy itself that material facts were not presented in a way that was unfair to Parks in relation to the 11:00 news item. On this occasion, this was unfair to Parks.

However, in relation to the news bulletins at 12:00, 13:00 and 14:00, Ofcom considered that the information provided by the interviewee would, had it been true, have been of significant public interest. Having made a first call to Parks at 10:40, allowing Parks well over an hour to comment, and then other attempts to speak to a representative of Parks to verify the story, Real Radio was then justified in making the editorial decision to include the story in the later bulletins. Ofcom noted that it was the decision of Parks and Brodies to send their response to a firm of solicitors previously used by Real Radio, rather than communicate directly with the station to respond to the allegations made by the member of Parks' staff, although Real Radio itself had made contact with Parks direct and not via any solicitors. In these circumstances, Real Radio did take reasonable care to satisfy itself that the material facts were not presented in the later bulletins in a way that was unfair to Parks and did provide the company with an appropriate and timely opportunity to respond to the allegation made by the interviewee.

Ofcom therefore found unfairness to Parks in relation to the first news items, but not in respect of the later broadcasts.

The complaint of unfair treatment was partly upheld.

Other Programmes Not in Breach/Out of Remit

12 December 2007 to 7 January 2008

Programme	Trans Date	Channel	Category	No of complaints
118 118 Sponsor Credits	01/12/2007	ITV1	Animal Welfare	1
118 118 Sponsor Credits	05/12/2007	ITV1	Animal Welfare	1
A Smile and a Shoeshine	11/10/2007	BBC Radio 4	Offensive Language	3
Alan Brazil's Sports Breakfast	07/01/2008	talkSPORT	Inaccuracy/Misleading	2
Alan Carr	24/12/2007	BBC Radio 2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
All Star Family Fortunes	08/12/2007	ITV1	Sex/Nudity	1
All Star Family Fortunes	05/01/2008	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Arrange Me A Marriage	13/12/2007	BBC2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Arrange Me a Marriage	22/11/2007	BBC2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
BBC News	21/12/2007	BBC1	Commercial References	1
BBC News	21/11/2007	BBC1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
BBC News	20/12/2007	BBC1	Due Impartiality/Bias	1
BBC News 24	22/12/2007	BBC News 24	Commercial References	1
BBC News 24	07/12/2007	BBC News 24	Sex/Nudity	1
BBC Radio WM	14/10/2007	BBC Radio WM	Generally Accepted Standards	1
BBC2 Ident	13/11/2007	BBC2	Flashing images	1
Big Brother: Celebrity Hijack	03/01/2008	Channel 4	Other	1
Big Brother: Celebrity Hijack	06/01/2008	E4	Generally Accepted Standards	2
Big Brother: Celebrity Hijack	03/01/2008	Channel 4	Other	1
Bodyshock: Born With Two Heads	25/11/2007	More4	Due Impartiality/Bias	1
Boob Envy (trailer)	-	Virgin 1	Sex/Nudity	1
Borat	07/12/2007	Sky Movies Premier	Sex/Nudity	1
Boston Tea Party	22/10/2007	Kanal 5	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Boy A	26/11/2007	Channel 4	Violence	1
Brighthouse sponsorship of Trisha Goddard	-	Five	Sponsorship	1
Bringing Up Baby	02/10/2007	Channel 4	Commercial References	3
Britain's Most Wanted: This World	25/11/2007	BBC2	Animal Welfare	1
British Sex	10/11/2007	Sky One	Sex/Nudity	1
Can Fat Teens Hunt?	17/12/2007	BBC3	Animal Welfare	1
Can Fat Teens Hunt?	20/11/2007	BBC3	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Can Fat Teens Hunt?	04/12/2007	BBC3	Animal Welfare	2
Casualty	17/11/2007	BBC1	Flashing images	1
Channel 4 +1 promo	05/12/2007	Channel 4	Offensive Language	1
Channel 4 News	28/11/2007	Channel 4	Due Impartiality/Bias	3
Channel 4 News	08/11/2007	Channel 4	Due Impartiality/Bias	1

Channel 4 News	23/11/2007	Channel 4	Other	1
Channel 4 Racing	08/12/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Cold Blood (Trailer)	18/11/2007	ITV1	Flashing images	1
Comedy Showcase: Kevin Bishop	06/12/2007	E4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Comedy Showcase: Kevin Bishop	23/11/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Coronation Street	26/11/2007	ITV1	Other	1
Coronation Street	06/01/2008	ITV1	Other	1
Crash Test Dummies	01/09/2007	Sky One	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Deal or No Deal	10/12/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Dispatches: Britain Under Attack	06/08/2007	Channel 4	Crime (incite/encourage)	1
Don't Take My Baby: Tonight	26/11/2007	ITV1	Due Impartiality/Bias	3
Dragon's Den	26/11/2007	BBC2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Drive	29/11/2007	BBC Radio 5 Live	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Drive with Ian Wright & Adrian Durham	03/12/2007	talkSPORT	Offensive Language	1
Eastenders	01/01/2008	BBC1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Eastenders	25/12/2007	BBC1	Offensive Language	1
Eastenders	10/12/2007	BBC1	Violence	1
Eastenders	17/12/2007	BBC1	Substance Abuse	1
Eastenders	06/12/2007	BBC1	Violence	1
Eastenders	03/01/2008	BBC1	Commercial References	1
Ed Reardon's Week	23/11/2007	BBC Radio 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Eggheads	26/11/2007	BBC2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Emmerdale	21/11/2007	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	4
Emmerdale	04/12/2007	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Emmerdale	12/11/2007	ITV1	Sex/Nudity	1
Fags, Mags and Bags	05/11/2007	BBC Radio 4	Inaccuracy/Misleading	1
Funniest Ever You've Been Framed!	24/11/2007	ITV1	Animal Welfare	2
GMTV	27/11/2007	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
GMTV	12/12/2007	GMTV	Advertising	1
GMTV	11/12/2007	GMTV	Due Impartiality/Bias	1
GMTV - LK Today	06/11/2007	ITV1	Commercial References	1
George Bowie at Breakfast	8/11/2007	Clyde 1	Inaccuracy/Misleading	1
George Galloway	25/11/2007	talkSPORT	Generally Accepted Standards	3
George Galloway	01/12/2007	talkSPORT	Inaccuracy/Misleading	1
Ghosthunting with McFly	31/12/2007	ITV2	Inaccuracy/Misleading	1
Golden Balls	02/01/2008	ITV1	Other	1
Graham Norton Uncut	09/12/2007	BBC2	Sex/Nudity	1

Gremlins	15/12/2007	Five	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Harveys Sponsorship of Coronation Street	30/12/2007	ITV1	Religious Offence	1
Have I Got News For You	07/12/2007	BBC1	Generally Accepted Standards	2
Hitler: The Comedy Years	10/05/2007	Channel 4	Offensive Language	1
Hollyoaks	27/11/2007	Channel 4	Substance Abuse	1
Hollyoaks	12/11/2007	Channel 4	Flashing images	1
How to Dump Your Mates	23/11/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
How to Look Good Naked	05/12/2007	Channel 4	Sex/Nudity	3
I'm a Celebrity...Get Me Out of Here Now!	22/11/2007	ITV2	Animal Welfare	5
I'm a Celebrity...Get Me Out of Here	14/11/2007	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
I'm a Celebrity...Get Me Out of Here Now!	24/11/2007	ITV2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
ITV News	10/12/2007	ITV1	Due Impartiality/Bias	1
ITV News	06/12/2007	ITV1	Inaccuracy/Misleading	1
ITV News	06/12/2007	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	2
ITV News	30/11/2007	ITV1	Inaccuracy/Misleading	1
ITV News	28/11/2007	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Ian Collins	28/11/2007	talkSPORT	Generally Accepted Standards	1
In The Night Garden	30/11/2007	CBeebies	Dangerous Behaviour	1
James Whale	04/11/2007	talkSPORT	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Jane Doe: How to Fire Your Boss	03/12/2007	Five	Violence	1
Jeremy Kyle Show	06/12/2007	ITV1	U18s in Programmes	1
Jimmy Carr: Stand-Up	23/11/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	2
Jon Gaunt	30/11/2007	talkSPORT	Religious Offence	1
Jonathan Ross	15/12/2007	BBC Radio 2	Religious Offence	3
Jools Holland's Hootenanny	31/12/2007	BBC2	Inaccuracy/Misleading	3
Justin Timberlake FutureSex/LoveShow	25/11/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Kill It, Cook It, Eat It	07/01/2008	BBC3	Animal Welfare	1
Listen Against	21/11/2007	BBC Radio 4	Offensive Language	1
Live at the Apollo	03/12/2007	BBC1	Offensive Language	1
Live at the Apollo	10/12/2007	BBC1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Live at the Apollo	26/11/2007	BBC1	Offensive Language	1
Loose Women	07/12/2007	ITV1	Sex/Nudity	1
Loose Women	26/11/2007	ITV1	Sex/Nudity	1
Loose Women	30/11/2007	ITV1	Sex/Nudity	1
Lucio	21/11/2007	Capital 95.8FM	Offensive Language	1
Make Your Play	30/10/2007	ITV1	Competitions	1
Man Stroke Woman	14/11/2007	BBC2	Generally Accepted Standards	3
Meet the Natives	27/09/2007	Channel 4	Animal Welfare	4
Mike Mendoza	06/10/2007	talkSPORT	Religious Issues	1

Monster Cafe	03/11/2007	CBeebies	Generally Accepted Standards	11
Moral Maze	24/10/2007	BBC Radio 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
My Parents Are Aliens	14/12/2007	CITV	Sex/Nudity	1
NCIS	07/12/2007	Five	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Nanny Diaries	-	TV3 Sweden	Generally Accepted Standards	2
Neighbours	12/11/2007	BBC1	Flashing images	1
News	13/11/2007	UTV	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Newsnight	12/12/2007	BBC2	Other	1
Nick Ferrari Show	06/12/2007	LBC	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Paul O'Grady	30/11/2007	Channel 4	Violence	1
Penis Envy (trailer)	27/12/2007	Virgin1	Generally Accepted Standards	2
Penis Envy (trailer)	26/11/2007	Virgin1	Sex/Nudity	4
Penis Envy (trailer)	24/12/2007	Virgin1	Generally Accepted Standards	2
Penis Envy (trailer)	25/12/2007	Virgin1 +1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Penis Envy (trailer)	24/12/2007	Virgin1	Sex/Nudity	1
Poison on Your Plate: Tonight	24/09/2007	ITV1	Inaccuracy/Misleading	2
Quiz Call	09/12/2007	Five	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Radio 1 trailer	15/11/2007	BBC1	Flashing images	1
Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares	18/12/2007	Channel 4	Offensive Language	1
Real Radio	31/10/2007	Real Radio	Competitions	1
Richard Bacon	08/10/2007	BBC Radio 5 Live	Generally Accepted Standards	1
River Cottage: Gone Fishing	22/11/2007	Channel 4	Crime (incite/encourage)	1
Russell Brand	06/10/2007	BBC Radio 2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Saturday Live Again!	01/12/2007	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Scott Mills	18/12/2007	BBC Radio 1	Generally Accepted Standards	2
Scott Mills	11/12/2007	BBC Radio 1	Sex/Nudity	1
Secret Diary of a Call Girl	11/10/2007	ITV2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Sexcetera	13/12/2007	Virgin 1	Sex/Nudity	1
Shameless	01/01/2008	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Simon Mayo	06/12/2007	BBC Radio 5 Live	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Sky Sports News	02/12/2007	Sky Sports	Generally Accepted Standards	2
SmartLive Casino	20/06/2007	SmartLive	Competitions	1
South Park	09/12/2007	MTV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Sports Personality of the Year 2007	09/12/2007	BBC1	Commercial References	4
Strictly Come Dancing	-	BBC1	Trails/Promotions	1

Strictly Come Dancing	01/12/2007	BBC1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Stupid	01/12/2007	BBC2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
T4	28/10/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
T4	02/12/2007	Channel 4	Offensive Language	1
The Alan Titchmarsh Show	19/12/2007	ITV1	Sex/Nudity	2
The Armstrong & Miller Show	07/12/2007	BBC1	Religious Offence	1
The Armstrong & Miller Show	30/11/2007	BBC1	Sex/Nudity	1
The Big Fat Anniversary Quiz	02/11/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Bill	19/12/2007	ITV1	Dangerous Behaviour	1
The Bill	14/11/2007	ITV1	Flashing images	1
The Bridge on the River Kwai	29/12/2007	Channel 4	Other	1
The Gadget Show	26/11/2007	Five	Sex/Nudity	1
The Green Green Grass	07/12/2007	BBC1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Hits Nonstop	29/11/2007	The Hits	Sex/Nudity	1
The Jeremy Kyle Show	13/12/2007	ITV1	Offensive Language	1
The Kylie Show	24/12/2007	ITV2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Kylie Show	24/12/2007	ITV2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Legends	13/09/2007	Century FM	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Man With No Face (trailer)	05/12/2007	Discovery Real Time	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Mighty Boosh	15/11/2007	BBC3	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Morning After with Tim Shaw and Kate Lawler	03/12/2007	Kerrang!	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Omid Djalili Show	01/12/2007	BBC1	Other	1
The Omid Djalili Show (trailer)	24/11/2007	BBC1	Sex/Nudity	1
The Royal Variety Performance	09/12/2007	ITV1	Religious Offence	3
The Royal Variety Performance	09/12/2007	ITV1	Sex/Nudity	1
The Secret Millionaire	12/12/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Secret Millionaire	28/11/2007	Channel 4	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Secret Show	26/11/2007	BBC1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Simpsons	31/12/2007	Sky One	Advertising	1
The Street	13/12/2007	BBC1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Tudors	09/11/2007	BBC2	Flashing images	1
The Tweenies	10/12/2007	CBeebies	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The Wright Stuff	17/10/2007	Five	Generally Accepted Standards	1
The X Factor	01/12/2007	ITV1	Religious Offence	2
The X Factor	08/12/2007	ITV1	Inaccuracy/Misleading	1
The X Factor	08/12/2007	ITV1	Offensive Language	1
The X Factor	01/12/2007	ITV1	Religious Offence	5

The X Factor Final	15/12/2007	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	4
Thinking XXX	09/11/2007	More4	Sex/Nudity	1
This Morning	03/12/2007	ITV1	Competitions	1
Top Gear	25/11/2007	BBC2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Top Gear	14/11/2007	BBC2	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Top Gear	18/11/2007	BBC2	Offensive Language	3
Totally Busted	10/11/2007	Playboy One	Sex/Nudity	1
Trinny and Susannah Undress the Nation	20/11/2007	ITV1	Religious Offence	2
Trisha Goddard	22/11/2007	Five	Substance Abuse	1
Ultimate 20 Sexiest Videos	29/11/2007	TMF	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Vauxhall sponsorship of My Time	-	Dave	Dangerous Behaviour	4
We Love Christmas	18/12/2007	The Hits	Sex/Nudity	1
Weeds	25/07/2007	TV3 Sweden	Generally Accepted Standards	1
When Britain Had Talent	05/01/2008	ITV1	Inaccuracy/Misleading	1
Who Wants to be a Millionaire?	05/01/2008	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Who Wants to be a Millionaire? Celebrity	01/01/2008	ITV1	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Who's Doing Who?	-	Fox FM	Competitions	1
Why Chimps Kill	03/12/2007	National Geographic	Generally Accepted Standards	1
Working Lunch	10/12/2007	BBC2	Crime (incite/encourage)	1
Zoe and Gillies Breakfast Show	27/11/2007	Power FM	Crime (incite/encourage)	1