

Quick Reference Guide to offensive language

Ipsos UK Research for Ofcom

October 2026

Ipsos UK



Introduction

Warning: this guide contains potentially highly offensive language and discussion of content which may cause offence

How to use this guide

Ofcom commissioned Ipsos UK to conduct research to help them understand public attitudes towards potentially offensive language¹ on television (TV), radio and video-on-demand (VoD) services. This document serves as a Quick Reference Guide for stakeholders in these media and other interested parties. It summarises views on the acceptability of potentially offensive individual words and phrases on TV, with broader application to VoD services and radio. It should be read alongside the full research report, which provides more detailed analysis of the contextual factors that influence acceptability. The research report explores attitudes towards non-English words as well as additional topics relating to potentially offensive content, including Blackface², misgendering³, reclaimed language, mimicking accents, and mimicking disabilities.

The full research was a mixed-method study, comprising a nationally representative survey and qualitative research with a range of audiences. Data in this guide are based on findings from the survey element of this research only. The full report draws on findings from both the qualitative and quantitative strands.

In the 2021 wave of this research, each potentially offensive word was given a single rating of 'mild', 'moderate' or 'strong'. These ratings combined audience views across broadcast contexts and drew on both the quantitative and qualitative research to reflect the perceived strength of individual words. In this 2026 guide, words have been given two acceptability ratings based on the quantitative survey: one for broadcast on TV before the 9pm watershed, and one for broadcast on TV after the 9pm watershed. This reflects the finding across the 2021 and 2026 waves of the research that audience attitudes towards potentially offensive language can vary considerably between these two contexts. There was often a marked divergence, with the same term considered generally unacceptable before the watershed and generally acceptable after the watershed. Providing a single rating would have risked creating a misleading impression by classifying words as moderately acceptable, when they were, in fact, considered less acceptable before the watershed and more acceptable after it. Providing separate ratings enables the guide to capture the nuance of audience attitudes in each context more accurately and gives

¹ In this report, 'offensive language' is sometimes used as a short-hand to refer collectively to the words and phrases tested in the research, which have variable potential to cause offence, as explored with respondents and participants.

² Blackface refers to the act of someone (typically with white skin) painting their face darker to resemble a Black person or someone from an ethnic minority. The practice dates back to the minstrel shows of mid-19th century America, where White performers dressed as caricatured versions of Black slaves as a form of entertainment.

³ Misgendering refers to the practice of using pronouns or other gender-specific words that do not align with a person's gender identity when referring to or addressing that person, especially a transgender or non-binary person.

stakeholders a clearer understanding of how perceptions of individual words differ before and after the watershed.

The categories have also been renamed ‘more acceptable’, ‘moderately acceptable’ and ‘less acceptable’ to make clear that the ratings indicate the contextual acceptability of each word in the specific broadcast setting tested, rather than assigning it a fixed level of offensiveness. This change reflects the qualitative finding that audience views can vary depending on what was broadcast, how and why it was broadcast, and who was using the language. Given that these contextual factors can have a significant impact on the acceptability of offensive language, the ratings in this guide should not be taken in isolation. Readers should interpret the ratings in the light of the accompanying research report, which provides further detail on the contextual factors that influence acceptability.

Although the Quick Reference Guide does not include separate ratings for VoD services, the survey findings suggest that audience attitudes towards offensive language on these services are generally closer to those recorded for post-watershed broadcast on TV. This is consistent with findings from the qualitative research, suggesting that the greater choice and control exercised by audiences using VoD services may result in higher tolerance for offensive language. However, the qualitative research also found that participants often distinguished between different types of VoD service, with offensive language generally considered more acceptable on subscription services than on broadcaster services. In addition, the qualitative research explored the importance of audience protection measures such as warnings, age ratings and child accounts. The post-watershed ratings presented in this guide therefore provide a useful indication of likely audience expectations for content on these services, while language considered unsuitable for broadcast on TV before the watershed may also be regarded as inappropriate on VoD services where suitable audience protection measures are not applied. Readers should consult the accompanying research report for a more detailed exploration of audience attitudes towards offensive language on VoD services.

Qualitative findings suggest that audiences apply similar principles when assessing the acceptability of offensive language on TV and radio, particularly in relation to protecting children from potentially offensive content. The ratings presented in this guide therefore provide a useful indication of audience attitudes towards offensive language on radio. In particular, language considered unsuitable for broadcast on TV before the watershed is also likely to be regarded as inappropriate for broadcast on radio at times when children are particularly likely to be listening. Readers should consult the accompanying research report for a more detailed exploration of audience attitudes towards offensive language on radio.

Survey design

For the quantitative phase of the research, Ipsos carried out an online survey among a nationally representative quota sample of 4,289 UK adults aged 18+. The analysis in this guide is based on 4,214 respondents who reported watching broadcast TV, using VoD services or listening to the radio at least once a month. Fieldwork ran from 2nd March to 17th March 2026.

Respondents were asked a series of questions about their familiarity with various potentially offensive words. For words that respondents reported they had 'seen or heard before today', they were subsequently asked to assess their acceptability for broadcast on TV before and after the watershed, and in a programme available on a VoD service that can be watched at a time you choose.

For analysis, words were grouped into seven categories⁴ of offensive language:

- general swear words,
- references to body parts,
- sexual references,
- references to race, nationality and ethnicity,
- religious references,
- references to mental health and physical health conditions, and
- references to sexual orientation and gender identity.

Respondents were shown 46 or 47 potentially offensive words at random from the seven categories. These were also shown in a randomised order. This approach meant that a minimum of 1,000 respondents assessed each word and helped ensure the sample profile for each word was similar.

Quick Reference Guide Methodology

In contrast to the 2021 Quick Reference Guide, which incorporated findings from both the quantitative and qualitative strands of the research, this 2026 Guide summarises the acceptability of 183 potentially offensive terms using findings from the quantitative survey only. The nationally representative survey of 4,289 UK adults provides a robust basis for assessing attitudes towards offensive language and reporting findings at a population level. While the qualitative research remains an important part of the study, its role in the 2026 wave is to explore the factors that shape attitudes towards offensive language, including the influence of context. The categorisation of individual words is therefore based solely on survey findings, with the qualitative research providing additional insight into how and why audiences make judgements about acceptability.

Respondents were not provided with definitions of the words included in the quantitative data collection. Familiarity with the words was therefore self-reported, and respondents' understanding of how these words can be used offensively is likely to have varied. Respondents rated the acceptability of broadcasting each word on TV before the watershed and after the watershed on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 represented 'totally unacceptable' and 10

⁴ The majority of terms tested in the survey appear in only one category, apart from the following: *jew*, *kike*, *yid*. These words appear in both references to race, nationality and ethnicity, and religious references. All other words appear in a single category.

represented 'totally acceptable'. A mean acceptability score was calculated for each word in each broadcast context and used to assign one of three ratings:

- **More acceptable:** Words in this category are generally considered more acceptable by audiences and require less contextual justification.
- **Moderately acceptable:** These words have a greater potential to cause offence, and careful consideration should be given to context and audience expectations when using them.
- **Less acceptable:** Audiences generally consider these words less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.

Words with a mean score of 6 and above were classified as **More acceptable**, words with a mean score between 5 and 5.99 were classified as **Moderately acceptable**, and words with a mean score below 5 were classified as **Less acceptable**. This system has been used to assign ratings for terms both before and after the watershed.

The 'moderately acceptable' category has been deliberately defined more narrowly than the 'more acceptable' and 'less acceptable' categories because mean acceptability scores tended to cluster around the midpoint of the ten-point scale. A broader 'moderately acceptable' range would have resulted in a disproportionately large number of terms being assigned to this category. The category thresholds were therefore informed by the distribution of mean scores across the words tested, with the narrower middle range helping to ensure that this rating is reserved for terms that audiences generally regard as neither clearly highly acceptable nor unacceptable.

Each word has also been assigned a familiarity rating. Respondents were considered familiar with a term if they had 'seen or heard the term before today'.⁵ Words which were familiar to between 0% and 39.99% of respondents are considered to have a low level of familiarity, words which were familiar to between 40% and 69.99% of respondents are considered to have a medium level of familiarity, and words which were familiar to 70% or more of respondents are considered to have a high level of familiarity.

Many of the words included in this guide can have multiple meanings depending on the context in which they are used, some of which may not be offensive. The ratings presented in this guide should therefore be interpreted as applying to the use of these words in a potentially offensive context. They are not intended to reflect the acceptability of non-offensive uses of the same word.

Respondents were not provided with definitions of the words included in the survey. Familiarity with, and understanding of, the meaning of each word was therefore self-reported and is likely to

⁵ Respondents were given the following answer options to gauge familiarity: 'I've never seen or heard it before today', 'I've seen or heard it before today but don't know what it means in an offensive context' or 'I've seen or heard it before today and I'm familiar with it / know what it means in an offensive context'. Respondents could also respond 'don't know' or 'prefer not to say'.

have varied between respondents. For words with multiple meanings, some respondents may have been thinking about a non-offensive use of the term when assessing its acceptability. The research did not seek to validate respondents' interpretations of the words tested.

The qualitative research found that participants considered a range of factors when determining the acceptability of potentially offensive language. These factors can be grouped into four broad questions:

- **What was broadcast?** The specific words, phrases, or concepts used, along with their baseline level of offensiveness and perceived strength.
- **How was it broadcast?** Expectations based on contextual factors such as the time of broadcast (including the likely presence of children), type of programme (including genre and style of show), channel or station, whether the programme was live or pre-recorded, and any mitigating actions such as warnings or apologies.
- **Who was saying it?** The speaker, their role, authority, identity and relationship to the language used.
- **Why was it being said?** The perceived purpose or intention behind the language used, the tone, target and whether it was seen as malicious, educational or accidental.

As noted above, the qualitative research found that contextual factors can have a significant impact on the acceptability of offensive language. The ratings assigned to each word should therefore be used as a guide only. Readers must consult the accompanying research report for further detail on how audiences determine the acceptability of offensive language and take that information into account when applying the ratings.

In each section, words have been listed in alphabetical order according to their category.

Acceptability ratings by category

Warning: this guide contains highly offensive language and discussion of content which may cause offence

1.1 General swear words

Ratings for all general swear words for broadcast <u>before</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Bloody Chav Cow Crap Damn Git Sod off	Bigger Douchebag Effing Feck Ging-er Pissed Pissed off	Bastard Bellend Bint Bitch Bloodclaat Bumberclat Cuck Dickhead Fuck Minger Motherfucker Shit Shite Son of a bitch Tosser Twat Wanker

Ratings for all general swear words for broadcast <u>after</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Bastard Bellend Bint Bitch Bloodclaat Bloody Bugger Bumberclat Chav Cow Crap Cuck Damn Dickhead Douchebag Effing Feck Fuck Ging-er Git Minger Motherfucker Pissed Pissed off Shit Shite Sod off Son of a bitch Tosser Twat Wanker		

General swear words (in alphabetical order)			
Word	Acceptability <u>before</u> the watershed	Acceptability <u>after</u> the watershed	Familiarity
Bastard	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Bellend	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Bint	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Bitch	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Bloodclaat	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
Bloody	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Bugger	Moderately acceptable . Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Bumberclat	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Chav	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Cow	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Crap	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Cuck	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Damn	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Dickhead	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

Douchebag	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Effing	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Feck	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Fuck	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Ging-er	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Git	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Minger	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Motherfucker	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Pissed	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Pissed off	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Shit	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Shite	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Sod off	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

Son of a bitch	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Tosser	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Twat	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Wanker	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

1.2 References to body parts

Ratings for all references to body parts for broadcast <u>before</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
	Arse Balls	Arsehole Bawbag Beaver Bollocks Choad Clunge Cock Cunt Dick Fanny Gash Japs eye Knob Minge Prick Punani Pussy Pussy hole Snatch Tits

Ratings for all references to body parts for broadcast <u>after</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Arse Arsehole Balls Bawbag Beaver Bollocks Choad Clunge Cock Dick Fanny Gash Japs eye Knob Minge Prick	Cunt Pussy hole	

Punani Pussy Snatch Tits		
-----------------------------------	--	--

References to body parts (in alphabetical order)			
Word	Acceptability <u>before</u> the watershed	Acceptability <u>after</u> the watershed	Familiarity
Arse	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Arsehole	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Balls	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Bawbag	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
Beaver	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Bollocks	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Choad	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity

Clunge	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Cock	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Cunt	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Dick	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Fanny	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Gash	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Japs eye	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Knob	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Minge	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Prick	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Punani	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Pussy	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

Pussy hole	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Snatch	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Tits	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

1.3 Sexual references

Ratings for all sexual references for broadcast <u>before</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
	Bang Bonk Frigging Tart	Cocksucker Cum Ho Jizz MILF Nonce Prickteaser Shag Skank Slag Slapper Slut Spunk Whore

Ratings for all sexual references for broadcast <u>after</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Bang Bonk Cum Frigging Ho Jizz MILF Nonce Prickteaser Shag Skank Slag Slapper Slut Spunk Tart Whore	Cocksucker	

Sexual references (in alphabetical order)			
Word	Acceptability <u>before</u> the watershed	Acceptability <u>after</u> the watershed	Familiarity
Bang	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Bonk	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Cocksucker	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity

Cum	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Frigging	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Ho	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Jizz	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
MILF	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Nonce	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Prickteaser	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Shag	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Skank	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Slag	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Slapper	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Slut	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

Spunk	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Tart	Moderately acceptable . Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Whore	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

1.4 References to mental health and physical health conditions

Ratings for all references to mental health and physical health conditions for broadcast <u>before</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Invalid Looney Nutter Wheelchair bound	Cretin Deaf and dumb Div Dwarf Handicapped Imbecile Mental Mentally challenged Moron Psycho Special	Cripple Downs Flid Midget Mong Retard Schizo Spastic Window licker

Ratings for all references to mental health and physical health conditions for broadcast <u>after</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Cretin Deaf and dumb Div Dwarf Handicapped Imbecile Invalid Looney Mental Mentally challenged Midget Moron Nutter Psycho Schizo Special Wheelchair bound	Cripple Downs Flid Mong Window licker	Retard Spastic

References to mental health and physical health conditions (in alphabetical order)			
Word	Acceptability before the watershed	Acceptability after the watershed	Familiarity
Cretin	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Cripple	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Deaf and dumb	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Div	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

	based on what an audience would reasonably expect.		
Downs	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Dwarf	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Flid	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity
Handicapped	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Imbecile	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Invalid	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Looney	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Mental	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Mentally challenged	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Midget	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Mong	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity

Moron	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Nutter	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Psycho	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Retard	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Schizo	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Spastic	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Special	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Wheelchair bound	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Window licker	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity

1.5 References to race, nationality and ethnicity

Ratings for all references to race, nationality and ethnicity for broadcast <u>before</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Jock Oriental Uppity	Cracker Freshy Jew Mick Paddy Taff Tinker	Bud Bud Chinaman Ching Chong Chinky Coconut Coloured Coon Curry Muncher Darky Gippo Golliwog Golly Half-caste Honky Jap Jungle bunny Kike Kraut Monkey Nazi Negro Nigger Nig-nog Nip Pajeet Paki Pikey Raghead Sambo Sheep shagger Slope Spade Spic Uncle Tom Wog Yid

Ratings for all references to race, nationality and ethnicity for broadcast <u>after</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Bud Bud Chinaman Coconut Coloured Cracker Freshy Gippo Honky Jew Jock Kraut Mick Nazi Nip Oriental Paddy Pikey Sheep shagger Slope Taff Tinker Uncle Tom Uppity	Golly Half-caste Jap Kike Negro Pajeet Raghead Spade Spic Yid	Ching Chong Chinky Coon Curry Muncher Darky Golliwog Jungle bunny Monkey Nigger Nig-nog Paki Sambo Wog

References to race, nationality and ethnicity (in alphabetical order)			
Word	Acceptability before the watershed	Acceptability after the watershed	Familiarity
Bud Bud	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
Chinaman	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Ching Chong	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Medium familiarity

Chinky	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Coconut	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Coloured	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Coon	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Cracker	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Curry Muncher	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Darky	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Freshy	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
Gippo	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Golliwog	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Golly	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Half-caste	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity

Honky	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Jap	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Jew	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Jock	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Jungle bunny	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Kike	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Low familiarity
Kraut	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Mick	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Monkey	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Nazi	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Negro	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Nigger	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity

Nig-nog	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Nip	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Oriental	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Paddy	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Pajeet	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Low familiarity
Paki	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Pikey	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Raghead	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity
Sambo	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Sheep shagger	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Slope	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
Spade	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity

Spic	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity
Taff	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Tinker	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Uncle Tom	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Uppity	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Wog	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	High familiarity
Yid	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity

1.6 References to sexual orientation and gender identity

Ratings for all references to sexual orientation and gender identity for broadcast <u>before</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Cis Queen Transsexual	Bummer TERF	Batty boy Bender Bent Butt bandit Chick with a dick Dyke Fag Faggot Fairy

		Fudge packer Gender bender He-she Homo Lezza Mincing Muff diver Nancy Pansy Ponce Poof Queer Rugmuncher Shemale Shirt lifter That's gay Tranny
--	--	---

Ratings for all references to sexual orientation and gender identity for broadcast after the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Bender Bent Bummer Butt bandit Cis Dyke Fairy Gender bender He-she Lezza Mincing Muff diver Nancy Pansy Ponce Poof Queen Queer Rugmuncher Shemale TERF That's gay Tranny Transsexual	Batty boy Chick with a dick Fag Faggot Fudge packer Homo Shirt lifter	

References to sexual orientation and gender identity (in alphabetical order)			
Word	Acceptability before the watershed	Acceptability after the watershed	Familiarity
Batty boy	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity
Bender	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

Bent	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Bummer	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Butt bandit	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Chick with a dick	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Cis	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Dyke	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Fag	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Faggot	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Fairy	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Fudge packer	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity
Gender bender	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
He-she	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

Homo	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	High familiarity
Lezza	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Mincing	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Muff diver	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Nancy	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Pansy	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Ponce	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Poof	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Queen	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Queer	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Rugmuncher	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Shemale	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Shirt lifter	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered	High familiarity

		based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	
TERF	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
That's gay	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Tranny	Less acceptable , requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Transsexual	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable , requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

1.7 Religious references

Ratings for all religious references for broadcast <u>before</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
God Goddam Hun Jesus Christ	Bible basher Jew Papist Prod Tarrier	Fenian Kike Muzzie Taig Yid

Ratings for all religious references for broadcast <u>after</u> the watershed		
More acceptable Requiring less contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Less acceptable Requiring clear and strong contextual justification.
Bible basher Fenian God Goddam Hun Jesus Christ Jew Papist Prod Taig Tarrier	Kike Muzzie Yid	

Religious references (in alphabetical order)			
Word	Acceptability before the watershed	Acceptability after the watershed	Familiarity
Bible basher	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Fenian	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
God	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Goddam	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Hun	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Jesus Christ	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity

Jew	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	High familiarity
Kike	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Low familiarity
Muzzie	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Low familiarity
Papist	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	Medium familiarity
Prod	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
Taig	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
Tarrier	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	More acceptable, requiring less contextual justification.	Low familiarity
Yid	Less acceptable, requiring clear and strong contextual justification.	Moderately acceptable. Context should be considered based on what an audience would reasonably expect.	Medium familiarity

Our standards and accreditations

Ipsos' standards and accreditations provide our clients with the peace of mind that they can always depend on us to deliver reliable, sustainable findings. Our focus on quality and continuous improvement means we have embedded a "right first time" approach throughout our organisation.



ISO 20252

This is the international specific standard for market, opinion and social research, including insights and data analytics. Ipsos UK was the first company in the world to gain this accreditation.



Market Research Society (MRS) Company Partnership

By being an MRS Company Partner, Ipsos UK endorse and support the core MRS brand values of professionalism, research excellence and business effectiveness, and commit to comply with the MRS Code of Conduct throughout the organisation & we were the first company to sign our organisation up to the requirements & self-regulation of the MRS Code; more than 350 companies have followed our lead.



ISO 9001

International general company standard with a focus on continual improvement through quality management systems. In 1994 we became one of the early adopters of the ISO 9001 business standard.



ISO 27001

International standard for information security designed to ensure the selection of adequate and proportionate security controls. Ipsos UK was the first research company in the UK to be awarded this in August 2008.



The UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR) and the UK Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA)

Ipsos UK is required to comply with the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the UK Data Protection Act (DPA). These cover the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy.



HMG Cyber Essentials

Cyber Essentials defines a set of controls which, when properly implemented, provide organisations with basic protection from the most prevalent forms of threat coming from the internet. This is a government-backed, key deliverable of the UK's National Cyber Security Programme. Ipsos UK was assessed and validated for certification in 2016.



Fair Data

Ipsos UK is signed up as a "Fair Data" company by agreeing to adhere to twelve core principles. The principles support and complement other standards such as ISOs, and the requirements of data protection legislation.

