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Old or new media? Or both?

There was an effervescent media buzz prior to the election about whether it would be the first ‘internet election.’ As it happened, old media was the triumphant winner - the leaders’ debates drove the entire campaign on a national level. Well, at least they did until Gordon Brown met Gillian Duffy. But the internet did have a significant role to play: it was an echo chamber for what was unfurling on broadcast media; the campaign was amplified through new media; and people engaged one another through social media and other means such as discussion boards.

The problem in analysing the role that digital media plays is that the question is too often posed in a binary fashion. Is it traditional campaigning or e-campaigning? Is it old media or new media? Digital media in modern politics is not a replacement of old media and campaigning. There is a mutual dependence and integration between the two.

We live in a world where the internet (and increasingly social media) is a fundamental part of the lives of most Britons. We shop online, we socialise online, we find a date online, we get the news, download music, do business, research and book holidays. And we do it through our TVs, PCs, and mobile devices. So why would politics be any different? The reality is that it’s not different. British people increasingly consume and even participate in politics online. So, as the Liberal Democrat strategist, Mark Pack, recently stated ‘is this the first internet election?’ is the wrong question. Rather, we have to move on to how the internet influenced voters, campaigners, and the media in the election.

There are three ways in which the internet and social media can connect with political change and conversation:

i) You can **hear** it there.
ii) It can be **amplified** there.
iii) It can **drive** political change and conversation.

When many question whether this was ‘an internet election’ they are using (iii) to make that judgement. This election though, was mainly in categories (i) and (ii). We could hear the campaign through new media and, to a degree, it was amplified there. However, this time around it was not driven by new media. Television (leaving newspapers trailing - it was not the Sun wot won it) was the big driver.
In an Orange commissioned poll by YouGov, we found that indeed a majority of voters have engaged in politics online:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text message</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media (e.g. Twitter, Flickr, Facebook, YouTube)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail from local candidates or parties</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers websites / BBC online</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online advertising (e.g. Google or Facebook)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And during the debate Twitter was red hot with comment. Tweetminster reported the following data on the debates:

**Debate 1**
- Total Number of tweets: 184,396
- Average frequency: 29.06 tweets/second
- Number of Tweeters: 36,483

**Debate 2**
- Total Number of tweets: 142,795
- Average frequency: 26.6 tweets/second
- Number of Tweeters: 28,790

What this shows is the integrated nature of modern politics. You can’t divorce what is happening on television or on the doorstep from what then happens in cyberspace. The leaders’ debates were an exercise in direct voter engagement.

Very quickly, the ‘winner’ was established both by the direct reaction of the audience and instant polls released following the debates. Voters then went onto the web to inform themselves further. Meanwhile, activists and influencers were busy using Twitter to spread their own thoughts and gauge the reaction of others. The stimulus was old media - the television debates themselves and polling - but then the reaction was echoed and amplified through new media. And voters have started to engage in a richer political

So 61% are getting their information online. This suggests that much of the digital engagement is still passive rather than active, i.e. it is about obtaining information rather than participating in political conversation. So the campaign could be heard online.

We can see this heightened activity following the debates. Using Google Insight analysis, we can see how interest in the respective party leaders peaks after the television debates (key: yellow is Nick Clegg, blue is David Cameron, red is Gordon Brown):

![Graph showing tweet rates](image)

The debates were on April 15th and 22nd and there is a surge of search interest - especially in Nick Clegg - for the 48 hours or so after the debate. The huge surge of interest in Gordon Brown in late April is, of course, the Gillian Duffy incident.
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conversation online. As this expands, the internet will begin to drive political conversation though it didn’t achieve that in this election, especially if fundraising and supporter mobilisation goes to another level. The Orange/YouGov poll found that the following media were engaged during the election:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text voting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts to or from friends and family</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks (e.g. Twitter, Flickr, Facebook, YouTube)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates’ or commentators’ blogs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums on issues or Party websites</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums on newspaper websites</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other online forums/communities (e.g. mumsnet, myfootballforum)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable (I have not commented on the general election)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So while the predominant mode is broadcast peer-to-peer, interaction is taking a substantial place also. Interestingly, 24% of 18-24 year-olds report engaging with the election via social media.

Interactive media is starting to find its place in the political conversation.
This report covers three different aspects of the campaign:

- **Strategy (“the aerial battle”)**
  How did the main parties campaign using new communication and organisation technologies?

- **Creativity (“lone soldiers”)**
  How did others - including the media, issue campaigns, bloggers, humourists, etc - use new media and who was successful?

- **Engagement (“the ground war”)**
  How did candidates and local campaigners engage directly with voters through new media and who got it right?

### the aerial battle

Each of the parties pursued very different strategies. The Conservatives - able to take advantage of their significant financial firepower - went for a centralised approach that deployed smart targeting. It was an approach akin to online and direct marketing. Labour went for a word of mouth approach designed to empower activists in their one-to-one contacts with voters and each other. And the Liberal Democrats pursued a more quirky and creative approach and often relied on unofficial channels to capture supporters and disseminate their message.

The Conservatives targeted voters directly. Labour targeted activists. And the Liberal Democrats aimed to capture some of the wave that their leader was creating through his debate performances.

**Conservatives - new political marketing**

One big advantage of superior financial muscle is that you can invest heavily not only in your web presence but in promoting it and integrating your campaign infrastructure to directly target individual voters. And this was the Conservative approach in the elections. There were the organisational tools - such as myconservatives.com but these weren’t what really drove the Conservative strategy. The strategy was more akin to the type of very targeted marketing deployed in the corporate world. It’s very expensive, but executed in the right way, it’s effective.

This strategy manifested itself in investment in Google AdWords, direct mailing, through email, and targeted use of advertising through Facebook¹. For example, through the dating site match.com, people in income groups (you give your income when you sign up to the site) most affected by Labour’s national insurance increase were targeted with advertising². This was allied with email and direct marketing using the type of rich data about localities that someone like Tesco would use, allied with the parties’ own data collected by canvassers on the doorstep.

---

¹ James Crabtree, David Cameron’s battle to connect. Wired Magazine, April 2010.
² Gaby Hinsliff, Web 2.0: the new election superweapon. The Observer, April 11th 2010.
Innovations such as WebCameron - a personalised video series featuring David Cameron - helped the party to build up a list of 500,000 email addresses. WebCameron came to notice in the US even before the Obama '08 campaign kicked off. So the Conservatives were early innovators and focused relentlessly on message delivery.

As a result, 58% of voters reported contact from the Conservatives prior to the short campaign compared with 46% for the Liberal Democrats and 35% for the Labour Party. So using an integrated and targeted marketing approach, the Conservatives were able to amplify their campaign messages.

And as the image below shows, the Conservatives had very prominent targeting of Google searches. Here are the sponsored links on a search for ‘Gordon Brown’.

The Conservatives were also able to get their videos viewed by a significant number online. For example, David Cameron’s election launch speech was viewed over 175,000 times and a YouTube video of Samantha Cameron was viewed more than 110,000 times.

And their Facebook page had in excess of 70,000 fans. On the day of the election, the Conservatives sponsored the front page of YouTube at an estimated £100,000 cost. In total, ‘WebCameron’ was viewed almost one million times during the course of the campaign.

It didn’t all go to plan, however. One of their attack campaign sites www.cashgordon.com was beset by mischievous (and, on occasion, offensive) hacking when a number of programmers noticed that computer code could be inserted into the site’s Twitter feed to redirect it to other sites. The site had to be taken offline.

verdict:

Cash goes a long way but there is little doubt digital media amplified and targeted the Conservative message.

Labour - making a virtue out of necessity

Had the retail marketing online strategy been available to the Labour Party it might well have pursued it. However, due to financial constraints it was not and so it had to find another way of using digital media to support its campaign. In what Labour’s campaign strategist Douglas Alexander described as a ‘word of mouth election’, the strategy was to galvanise the Labour party machine to take the campaign directly to voters, doorstep to doorstep. Unlike the Conservative campaign which targeted voters directly, the aim of the Labour campaign was to energise its activist base.

The jewel in the party’s crown was Membersnet. Though launched three years ago to less of a fanfare than www.myconservatives.com it had more time to become accepted and used by party activists. Membersnet helped activists to organise events, disseminated campaign materials, kept them in touch with other activists, and gave all members access to a ‘virtual phone bank’ that was essentially an anywhere/anytime phone canvassing tool. The ‘virtual phone bank’ was also accessible through the party’s iPhone app.

The pop gossip site PopBitch gave the app an 8 out of 10, declaring it to be ‘surprisingly interesting.’ Praise indeed.

Alongside these tools, Labour ran a number of issue campaigns to target specific pools of voters. ‘Ed’s Pledge’ (the Ed in question was the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change) on the environment and the ‘Save our Sure Start’ campaigns were the most prominent examples.

The latter campaign deployed Facebook segmented advertising to get the message across.

The ‘word of mouth’ theme was supported by social media. Virtual phone bank activity was boosted using the #mobmonday hashtag when activists across the country would use the tool to target particular constituencies on every Monday in the run-up to campaign and election. And in the final days of the campaign a splash page appeared on arrival at the party’s site encouraging supporters to spread the word about Labour again using the hashtag #imvotinglabour:

![I'm voting Labour](image)

Labour’s digital campaign had an active and energetic feel to it, and it had an impact. In the short campaign, as well as a million and a half site-views overall, Labour was making 300,000 voter contacts per week compared with 100,000 per week in 2005. There were 60,000 contacts made per week using the virtual phone bank, 60,000 viewed the manifesto online with 50,000 downloading the pdf. 30,000 members used Membersnet, where over 15,000 campaign events were organised. Labour also managed to raise £350,000 online.
Labour had its successes on YouTube. The manifesto was launched with the aid of a viral animated film from Ridley Scott Associates which was viewed over 130,000 times. A party election broadcast featuring the comedian, Eddie Izzard, was viewed over 110,000 times.

The party had mishaps online just as the Tories did. It decided to use its pool of supporters’ creativity in a crowd sourcing exercise to design a campaign poster. The winning idea was to cast David Cameron as a throwback to the 1980s. Cameron was featured as Gene Hunt, the hard-living, Audi Quattro driving, macho 1980s cop from the hit BBC drama series, Ashes to Ashes. Rather than undermining the Tory leader, it made him look rather cool and was met with an immediate ‘fire up the Quattro’ response from the Tories.

Liberal Democrats - trying to catch the wave

The challenge for the Liberal Democrats initially was to be noticed. In order to achieve this they introduced a new leadership candidate to the world - Goveid Camerown. Relaying messages about the deficiencies of both parties, a YouTube animated video morphing disturbingly between images of David Cameron and Gordon Brown was produced by the advertising agency, Iris. This was watched almost 50,000 times. It was accompanied by a micro-site http://www.lbservative.co.uk.

The main party website was devoted almost exclusively to policy and focused very heavily on the manifesto. Clearly sensitive to the charge that they were policy light the strategy was to use the party’s web presence to rebut that. Nick Clegg was the only one of the three main party leaders to tweet.

This was all fine: sturdiness mixed with a degree of creativity. And then came the first leaders’ debate.

Straight away, interest in the party surged. The splash page of the party’s site was devoted to desperately trying to capture visitors’ details and bind them into the party’s databases.

verdict:

Labour’s campaign was definitely more active than in 2005 and that was partly down to its digital campaign. Ultimately though, the digital campaign suffered from lack of funding.
Straight after the first debate, the party’s Facebook fan base went from 13,456 to 46,500 and then to 66,689 after the second debate. By the end of the campaign it was up around the 80,000 mark. Labour’s by contrast was languishing at around 35,000 while the Conservatives who had long been targeting Facebook were only slightly behind the Liberal Democrats. Nick Clegg (@nick_clegg) ended the campaign with in excess of 38,000 Twitter followers.

In response to press attacks on the Liberal Democrat leader, Twitter users established a hashtag #nickcleggsfault to mock the attacks. It ended up as the UK’s number one trending topic and one of the leading trending topics globally.

The TV satirist and writer of The Thick of It, Armando Iannucci (who later endorsed the Liberal Democrats), even pitched in:

“#nickcleggsfault
Nick Clegg lived in the same town as a seriously ill man and never visited him, though he knows he has a spare kidney.”
This unofficial activity was spontaneous, effervescent, and, in many ways, anarchic. It was exactly what a web campaign should be. But from the Liberal Democrats’ perspective there is just one issue with this and this is why it struggled, as a party, to catch the wave.

It’s great having 160,000 Facebook fans on an unofficial fan page but how do you capture that as an organisation? They could have created an entire new party - the numbers in this group were much greater than the number of members of their party. But they were in the databases of Facebook, not the Liberal Democrats.

The Liberal Democrats underperformed their poll rating going into May 6th. Digital media was used to capture the wave of support for the candidacy of Barack Obama in the US presidential election because his digital campaign was ready to capture it. The Liberal Democrats were not similarly prepared - they lacked the organisational and financial muscle to do so.

**verdict:**

With the right digital tools and funding, election 2010 could have created an entire new party for the Liberal Democrats. They (understandably) failed to catch the wave. Labour also managed to raise £350,000 online.
the creativity of lone fighters

Humour

It is in the nature of digital media to capture dispersed creativity in a way that closed organisations fail to do. Creativity comes from open thinking - the very antithesis to party lines and group-think. And there were some spectacular successes in the digital campaign of 2010.

Before the campaign even began, an independent creative media specialist, Clifford Singer, had set about undermining the Conservatives first billboard campaign of the long campaign with mydavidcameron.com which allowed visitors to the site to put their own slogan instead of the official Conservative party slogan. It was an offline and mainstream media hit.

Video was a powerful medium in the election. Viral Video Chart placed a video transposing a refined mock Bullingdon Club version of the Pulp hit ‘Common People’ alongside images of David Cameron. The video was viewed over 300,000 times on YouTube and shared over 18,000 times. The Gordon Brown ‘bigoted woman’ moment generated the most interest, however. The most popular YouTube clip of the moment was viewed over 360,000 times.

Campaigns

The most impressive campaign was the Electoral Commission’s partnership with Facebook which targeted all young UK users of Facebook through the site’s Democracy UK page in order to encourage them to vote. The campaign resulted in a total of 540,000 voter registration forms being downloaded ahead of the UK general election.

Blue State Digital, the Obama ’08 digital strategists, worked with the anti-fascist campaign Hope not Hate to defeat BNP candidates. Building on its email database of over 100,000 people from its anti-BNP European election campaign (when it also mobilised 10,000 activists and raised well in excess of £100,000) the campaign focused on two areas: Barking and Dagenham, and Stoke. Not a single BNP candidate
won in the local or parliamentary elections. It was completely driven by activism and fundraising which was immediately funneled to the frontline (above).

Other successes included Westminster 2010 - a ‘declaration of Christian conscience’ - which attracted almost 50,000 signatories. Power 2010 integrated an online petition to change politics, with on-the-ground campaigners, and Google and Facebook advertising with the objective of translating the opportunity for change into real political and electoral reform. This came in useful after the election when these lists were used to organise demonstrations in favour of ‘fair votes.’

Standing out amongst independent activity was TheStraightChoice.org. This was a crowd-sourcing site providing live election leaflet monitoring. Site visitors were able to upload scanned-in campaign leaflets. Thousands of leaflets from all over the country were uploaded and the site enables viewers to analyse these by party, issue, constituency and constituency groups. The organisers of the group also carried out their own analysis of the leaflets according to whether they were local or national; about the candidate or the party; positive or negative; policy or personality; and single issue or multiple issue.

**Media**

Sky News’ constituency analysis, which combined candidates’ tweets and information about each seat was the strongest from the broadcasters. The FT provided some great online tools such as an interactive manifesto comparison site and a frankly terrifying tool that allowed you to select which public services to cull in order to fill the enormous fiscal black hole - not for the faint hearted! Channel 4 News produced a useful fact check blog which held the parties to account for their factual claims and counter claims. The Institute for Fiscal Studies was also a very useful source of authoritative analysis in this regard.

The Telegraph went for an approach based on providing deeper information about individual candidates and a space for discussion about the issues, and provided access to the Vote Match tool to help voters decide which way they should go.
All in all though, compared to the deep and rich information available from the US networks in the US election - for example, polling data that went beyond the headline numbers - the media election online was faintly disappointing.

**Blogs**

The blogosphere is a permanent fixture in UK politics now - a development since the last election. And the major bloggers and blogs all contributed in their own way to the discussion with most major blogs enjoying a spike in traffic. On the right, Guido Fawkes, Iain Dale, and Tory Bear combine gossip and reflection full of personality. ConservativeHome and their Editor Tim Montgomerie had an outstanding election. They even managed to raise several thousand pounds for Anthony Calvert’s campaign to unseat Ed Balls MP in Morley and Outwood. He was just 1,101 votes short and secured a 9.5% swing.

On the left, Left Foot Forward, Hopi Sen, LabourList, and Sunder Katwala at Next Left, tend to approach things from a more policy, politics, and commentary perspective.

And in the Liberal Democrat blogosphere, LibDem Voice, Mark Reckons, and Giles Wilkes at CentreForum are similar in tone and character to the Labour bloggers. The House of Twits site provided a good RT-ing service of interesting political developments and a forum on its site for grassroots political discussion and analysis from all ends of the political spectrum.

**And Marmite... love or hate**

Finally, advertising executives, PR people, and marketers seemed incapable of resisting publicity campaigns seeking to hook their product to media interest in the election. The vast majority of it was contrived and poorly executed. One glorious exception to this rule was Marmite’s viral marketing campaign which was based on a furious election fight between the ‘Love Party’ and the ‘Hate Party.’ Each party produced an election broadcast (the Love Party’s broadcast was viewed 18,000 times which wasn’t far behind some of the actual election broadcast online viewing figures) and a manifesto. You either love or hate marmite and now there was a chance to vote on it. Who won? The Love Party of course.

**winning the ground war**

Technology has long been incorporated into the tool set of the local activist. Mobile phones are the means by which campaigns are organised. Much political trading and negotiation is no longer done in smoke-filled rooms but via email. And social media is the way that pools of activists are expanded and organised. Sometimes local campaigners just don’t get it, as in the case of Labour...
candidate, Stuart MacLennan, who was fired after using Twitter to make a series of abusive comments about Labour colleagues and even innocent bystanders.

However, there were more successful uses of new media than MacLennan’s unfortunate intervention. Here are some of the best

**Conservative**

Charlie Elphicke didn’t go for super slick design but he went for an approach that attempted to engage voters in the Dover and Deal. His website - www.elphicke.com - featured ‘ChatMap’ which was a chat tool that linked discussion threads to location on a GoogleMap. This enables people to click on the map to see what discussions are going on in their area.

His campaign secured a winning 10.5% swing in his favour against a national swing of 5% in favour of the Conservatives.

Nadhim Zahawi meanwhile launched ‘4Stratford’ - a tool for searching publicly available datasets such as planning applications, crime maps, and local authority expenditure mixed with mapping data to provide rich information about the local area. This is a tool that will be expanded now that Zahawi’s election campaign was successful.

Both Nigel Adams, Conservative candidate for Selby and Ainsty and Nicola Blackwood, the candidate for Oxford West and Abingdon both went for clear and high impact design. Blackwood won the seat on a 7% swing against the popular and renowned Liberal Democrat, Dr Evan Harris. This compared to a national swing of 1.5% from the Liberal Democrats to the Conservatives.
Liberal Democrats

On every level, Lynne Featherstone’s campaign site excelled: design, engagement, relevance, information. It featured a ‘Lifestream’ which was basically a live feed of all of Featherstone’s social media and web engagements - Twitter, Facebook, blog, news, video, Flickr, etc. Beyond the site she used Twitter proactively to engage potential activists, supporters, and voters. For example, she tweeted to gauge reaction to her party’s local pledges. By the end of the campaign Featherstone had over 3,000 Facebook friends and almost 3,000 Twitter followers.

Her campaign secured a swing of almost 4% against Labour against a national swing of 3.5% (though in London the swing from Liberal Democrat to Labour was only 1.25% so it’s an even better performance by that measure.)

Evan Harris was perhaps the most prolific tweeting MP during the election and has over 8,000 followers. He used it to mobilise and recruit volunteers to his campaign. However, his web presence overall was not up to the standards of his direct opponent Nicola Blackwood. His party also tactically moved resources to the neighbouring Oxford East constituency and that, in part, explains why he was unable to hold onto his seat.
Labour

Stella Creasey understands community organising style campaigning and social media. She is active in building relationships with constituents in Walthamstow, often using Twitter (she finds issues of local interest there and engages with people on that basis) and manages an email list of 3,000 or so that focuses on local information and engagement rather than raw politics. And her site is very engaging, active, and proactive with great use of different media. Astonishingly she increased Labour’s support in this safe seat with a miniscule swing (less than 0.1%) to her main opponent, the Liberal Democrats.

Luke Pollard’s site in South West Devon succeeded through the use of video which provides very rich content. He had a great blog also, as well as the range of engagement and social media tools. Despite this, it was always going to be a difficult election as he started a distant third place to the Conservatives.

Stuart King in Putney also produced a stunningly designed and accessible site. It was very action driven: volunteer, get yourself a postal vote, pledge your support, make a donation, join Labour etc. Again, however, it wasn’t enough to prevent a large swing to the Conservatives.
Others

Other local campaigns tended to major on personality over engagement and the two clearest examples of this were the campaign sites of Caroline Lucas in Brighton Pavilion and Nigel Farage in Buckingham. Nigel Farage’s site led with his ‘fighting bull’ slogan but offered very little by way of interaction. Caroline Lucas’s site had much more by way of engagement and included a blog and social media. It was competent and striking and doubtlessly made a contribution to her remarkable 9.4% surge in support.
conclusion

If the standard in campaigning through digital media is the Obama '08 operation, then all the major parties fell short in this election. Obama '08 directly targeted messages at voters, enthused them, got them to sign up, fundraised from them, enabled social networks of support to be built, captured the wave of support for the candidate, and actually motivated people to become active in their local communities. It echoed, amplified, and drove traditional campaigning and media and did so in an integrated fashion.

However, if the aim for the next election is to match what Obama '08 achieved, then the campaigns will again fall short of what could be achieved by seeking to engage in a political conversation with voters through new media. The key thing will be to relinquish control. The future of political parties will be very much about creating new spaces for political dialogue and engagement.

New media inverts the flow of communication between elites and us all. If elites do not relinquish control, then they will be ignored. So the challenge is to find a new political conversation, and digital technologies are a way of enabling this at some point, politicians and parties will have to increasingly ask for permission to engage in political conversations that are already happening, for example, in the case of web communities such as Mumsnet. That requires adapting to the priorities and language of those with whom you engage. Retail politics will increasingly be replaced by conversational politics.

The election was heard and amplified in digital media in this election. Increasingly digital engagement, when meshed, blended and integrated with more traditional forms of political engagement, will come to drive the political conversation. But the nature of that conversation will be different. It will be a conversation between all of us. And politicians will have to find a way in. Consequently, politics will become a more humble pursuit.