

PUBLICFIRST 

Campaign Profiling

Part of the R&D Decade project

What Makes a Successful Campaign?

25 Campaign Profiles

Authors: Tom Banks, Luke Tryl

Contents

2% Defence	1
Extinction Rebellion	2
Stronger In	4
Women Against State Pension Inequality	6
Fuel Duty Campaign	8
Stop the FOBTs	10
£350m for the NHS	12
School Cuts Campaign	14
This Girl Can	16
Tackling the Carers' Crisis	17
Campaign Against Modern Slavery	19
Labour's 2017 general election campaign	20
Hugh's Fish Fight	22
Repeal the Porn Laws	24
Tier 2 Cap	26
Rainbow Laces	27
London Living Wage	29
Out of Sight Out of Mind	31
Turn Up, Save Lives	33
Stop Funding Hate	34
Raise the Rate	35
The Opioid Timebomb	36
Missing Type	37
#PacketInWalkers	39
SugarTaxCampaign.....	41

Campaign name	2% Defence
Lead organisation	Multiple, from Daily Telegraph to think tanks such as the Marshall Fund
Campaign topic	Defence Spending
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the government to meet the NATO target for member nations to spend at least 2% of GDP on defence.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A - the campaign was ad hoc and involved a number of different organisations. No clear organisation or structure existed. This is not uncommon for campaigns of this nature.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of pro-NATO think tanks published reports on the 2% commitment, praising countries which met it and criticising countries which didn't or have just fallen short e.g. the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Royal United Services Institute.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No coordinated online campaign on behalf of the organisations campaigning for it - but organisations and politicians discussed the commitment on social media and announced when they decided to support it.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some anti-war groups submitted evidence to the UK House of Commons Defence Select Committee arguing against the target. These groups include the Campaign Against The Arms Trade (submission available here), and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortly after the campaign entered public discourse, a 2015 YouGov poll found that 53% of the public supported the defence target, 27% were against and 20% were not sure.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2015, only UKIP had adopted the pledge. David Cameron, despite not campaigning on it, committed to it once in government. In 2019, the Conservatives, Labour, the Lib Dems and UK Independence Party had all committed to it in their election manifestos.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most major political parties in the UK have committed to the policy. It is now an established government policy. The public support more military spending but they are very divided along political lines (working class Conservative voters most in favour, and London-based Labour voters most against).

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Extinction Rebellion
Lead organisation	Extinction Rebellion
Campaign topic	The Environment
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure the government to declare a climate and ecological emergency. • Halt biodiversity loss and reduce greenhouse emissions to net zero by 2025. • Create a citizen's assembly for "climate justice".
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Founded in May 2018, Extinction Rebellion (XR) aims to have small autonomous groups which are loosely connected under the "Extinction Rebellion" brand. By October 2018, direct action was beginning to take place. • They are grouped into "self-organising circles" which define their own mandate and role. • "External coordinators" then attend meetings of the circles, but as equals. They are recruited online and are often made up of local environmental activists.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main method of messaging was direct action in the form of protests. This started with 1000 people gathering in Parliament Square in October 2018, for a "declaration of rebellion". • Further activity occurred throughout the rest of 2018 – including blockades of Government departments and bridges in London. • In April 2019, XR started 11 days of protests in London, leading to many arrests and the blocking of Oxford Street with a pink boat. • In October 2019 a 60 city-wide international protest took place. • Arrest was used as a tactic. On its website, XR states that "if the courts keep hearing the same message from us (after being arrested), that message will get through". • The campaign used high stakes protests in order to generate wall-to-wall media coverage.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the October Rebellion, XR was mentioned 70,000 times in online media. • While the campaign did not focus online, a lot of the campaign sub-groups had their own Facebook and Twitter pages. The main Twitter account has over 340,000 followers.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The campaign has been criticised for being too white and middle class. • Their strategy of trying to get people arrested was also criticised for not considering the difference between how white activists and BME activists are likely to be treated by law enforcement – with a piece in the Guardian in 2019 stating "the tactic of being purposely arrested strikes an uncomfortable note for many people of colour, given the adverse experiences people in communities have had with the police." • When XR activists shut down trains in Canning Town, they were criticised for targeting a working-class neighbourhood. • There was also wider public discontent with the tactics employed by the campaign.

Extinction Rebellion continued

Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It seemed to largely polarise people. Some of the good-will won by Greta Thunberg and the school strike was lost when public transport was shut down – seen clearly in polling results below. On the other hand, a lot of people were invigorated by it, with hundreds of thousands of activists taking to the streets, phone in shows dominated by the issue and social media awash with commentary of the protests.• In October, when the largest protests were taking place, about 36% of the UK public supported XR and 54% opposed them.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 400 MPs picked up the trees being given out and some committed to accelerating reforestation in the UK – and while this was a secondary objective for the group, it was an important victory.• The Labour party put a net-zero by 2030 pledge in their manifesto.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The UK government launched a citizen's assembly to discuss climate change.• From January to April 2019, around 15% of people considered the environment to be one of the most important issues facing the country. After the April protests, the environment is now considered an important issue by 25% of the population, making it a top 5 issue. It is roughly as important as immigration and the economy.• The group has also shifted the context in which the environment is debated in public. Organisations such as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth now look much more moderate and mainstream compared to the approach and tactics taken by XR.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Stronger In
Lead organisation	Britain Stronger in Europe
Campaign topic	EU Referendum - Remain Campaign
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Win the referendum campaign to keep the UK in the EU. • To raise awareness of the benefits of EU membership to the UK public. • To build a network of volunteers and campaigners across the country to campaign in favour of remaining in the EU. • To generate elite endorsements from high profile individuals in order to convince the public.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All external communications came from 'Stronger In' as the official Remain campaign during the EU referendum. • Messages and campaign literature were delivered through all campaign channels across press, 'election broadcast', social media, and the ground campaign. • HQ was based in London with regional and local directors and campaign staff. • Volunteers across the country were co-ordinated via NationBuilder and other digital organising tools to manage volunteers. • The campaign utilised Cabinet members and dozens of celebrity endorsements. • They maintained close working relationships with affinity groups e.g. 'Students for EU' and 'Scientists for EU'.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Remain campaign attempted to walk a fine line between talking positively about the benefits of EU membership while simultaneously highlighting 'Project Fear' (the risks of leaving the EU). • Having seen a similar strategy work in the Scottish referendum, there was a deliberate attempt to focus on the risks - including from economists, scientists, researchers and more. • The campaign also deployed experts to deliver their message - Mark Carney on the economy, Frances O'Grady on jobs, Megan Dunn (NUS) on opportunities for students. • These messages were delivered across all parts of the campaign. From set piece broadcast news, to street stalls and leaflets delivered by volunteers.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online campaigning was a large part of the campaign - but Vote Leave were much more successful at deploying ads online. • "Twitter definitely matters... it is hugely important in the air war" said James McGrory, chief campaign spokesperson for the Remain Campaign. This proved to be a strategic error - with the use of Facebook by Vote Leave proving much more effective. • In the last 30 days before the referendum, Vote Leave had almost 4 million interactions on social media - Stronger In had just 2 million.

Stronger In continued

Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was a lack of positive agenda. Despite attempting to project the benefits at the start, it quickly became about the risks of leaving.• Distrust in politicians and experts rose during the campaign - with the constant risks and threats of leaving not cutting through to the public.• The campaign lacked a coherent answer on immigration - an issue that became prominent as the campaign went on.• More crucially, a longer-term coherent narrative around the benefits of the EU to the UK never came to fruition. This helped Euroscepticism to slowly increase in popularity and in discourse over the years, and by the time Stronger In attempted to wrestle a positive narrative, it was too late to convince the public - particularly in left behind areas in the North and the Midlands.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The public were ultimately not persuaded by the arguments made by the Remain Campaign (Leave won the referendum campaign).• More importantly, it became increasingly clear that the deployment of large figures (remaining in the EU will create 790,000 jobs / cost of leaving the EU would be £2,900 a year for every family) was not credible. 'Project Fear' became a pertinent attack line and cut through with the public.• Public trust in 'experts' is also low. In a poll taken one year after the referendum, just 25% trusted economists (44% don't trust), 26% trusted civil servants (43% don't trust) and 20% trusted MPs (52% don't trust).
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The failure of the campaign led to serious questions about the broader coalition that was built to support membership of the EU - and how the campaign failed to tap into the emotions of British voters.• The fall-out from the referendum led to court cases, Electoral Commission investigations and three years of deep division.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign hardened support on both sides of the debate.• The campaign unearthed a small but hyper-motivated group of pro-EU activists - who continued to campaign for EU membership in the years after the referendum.• Organisations still exist campaigning for the EU - and more recently for the re-entry of Britain as a member of the EU.• The campaign highlighted flaws in strategic decisions - and in relying on celebrity endorsements and 'big numbers' to win the argument. The lack of a coherent and emotive message undermined the success of the campaign.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Women Against State Pension Inequality
Lead organisation	WASPI
Campaign topic	State Pension Age
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 1995 Conservative government's Pension Act planned to increase women's State Pension Age (SPA) to 65, to equal men's. However, the campaign argues that despite letters being sent to the women who would be affected, the change was made with insufficient notice and was implemented faster than promised (through the 2011 Pension Act). The WASPI campaign, founded in 2015, aims to achieve fair transitional state pension arrangements for all women born in the 1950s affected by changes to the State Pension Age.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-ordinated by WASPI with a central body in London. WASPI has official local groups throughout the UK, as well as a WASPI international group for WASPI women without an address in the UK. WASPI has experienced coordinators to assist in the creation of new local groups and uses Facebook for local groups to keep in touch. WASPI received a grant from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation to support its campaign.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WASPI demonstrations have attracted thousands of activists (7,000 attended March 2017). WASPI sells branded goods on its website, with one local group writing a WASPI anthem, which is available for purchase. WASPI put significant energy into targeting politicians at a national and local level. WASPI's website hosts templates for contacting government on a wide range of levels including: District and County Councils, MPs, Government Departments, General Election Pledge for prospective candidates, FOIs and more. WASPI has been active in securing and monitoring media coverage of its movement, a list of media appearances can be found here, up to date as of July 2019. WASPI has used online petitions as well as crowdfunding to forward its goals (see below). WASPI uses demonstrations in London to target media coverage and attention from Westminster.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The WASPI Facebook page has 112,000 likes and followers. WASPI's Twitter page has 21,500 followers. The disparity in popularity between this and its Facebook page is likely due to the demographics of WASPI supporters. WASPI launched an e-petition on the parliament website, which gained over 117,000 signatures, triggering a parliamentary debate. £100,000 was raised via Crowdfunder in 3 weeks to kickstart funding for WASPI legal campaigns.

Women Against State Pension Inequality continued

Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WASPI has been grouped together in the public eye, and occasionally by the press, with other campaign groups on the issue, such as Backto60, which want to reinstate the women's state pension age at 60. There is less public support for such a policy, as it is seen as unfair. WASPI are currently at pains to distinguish themselves from this campaign. • Labour's WASPI pledge of £58 billion was a big win for the campaign, but faced a hostile media reception, as it had not been costed for, and there were plans to borrow to raise funds.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media coverage and public reception of WASPI women tends to be sympathetic. • WASPI campaign has received a large volume of mainstream media attention, particularly in the 2019 election.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the 2019 election, WASPIs gained unprecedented media coverage, and were mentioned in all the manifestos except the Conservative one, with Labour pledging to "right a historic wrong". • 14 debates were held in parliament on the WASPI issue. • Oct 2016: Over 100 MPs handed in petitions supporting the campaign. • May 2016: APPG on WASPIs formed, with WASPIs attracting 120 MPs to pledge their support. • Over 100 local and county councils support WASPI. • WASPI recorded that they enjoyed a "surge of new memberships prior to the elections, and renewals remain steady," although they do not provide exact numbers of members. • WASPI received a grant from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and support from Unison.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WASPI campaign is still ongoing, as it is yet to achieve its aims. • The WASPI campaign has attracted and retained significant cross-party support. • Other WASPI targets are ongoing. The complaints of maladministration lodged with the Department of Work and Pensions remain on hold, but the Complaints of Maladministration with the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman are underway. • WASPI aims to continue pushing government on their campaign, engaging with many supportive MPs and attempting to build its support base further.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Fuel Duty Campaign
Lead organisation	Fair Fuel UK
Campaign topic	Cutting or freezing fuel duty
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launched in January 2011, the campaign aims to campaign on behalf of hauliers and motorists for lower fuel duty and more transparent pricing of fuel. The campaign aims to highlight the importance of cutting fuel duty, increasing transparency of pricing, and for a 'fairer deal' for motorists. • A secondary objective of the campaign was to give a voice to everyday motorists in the debate on fuel pricing and motoring.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The campaign is funded by industry bodies including the Freight Transport Association and the Road Haulage Association - but was publicly badged as a grassroots, driver-led campaign. • Its public figurehead is TV personality Quentin Wilson. Wilson co-manages the campaign with PR advisor Howard Cox. • The campaign relied on the public signing various petitions and campaign calls-to-action. They have gained the support of over 1.7 million members of the public since inception. • The group's main advocate in Parliament is the Conservative MP Robert Halfon - who also created the APPG for Fair Fuel to give the campaign a base in Parliament. They have 146 registered supporters in Parliament. • The campaign relied on the media predominantly and utilised very little grassroots mobilisation.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The campaign relied on extremely simple messaging, with a tight focus on its 'cut fuel duty by Xp' message and to 'scrap the fuel price escalator'. • The campaign deployed its lead spokesperson - Quentin Wilson - in the media during interviews and debates. • In Parliament, they utilised MP supporters to table questions and debates on the issue. • The group claims to have saved drivers 'over £100bn in planned tax hikes' since 2010.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The campaign has a website and social media, but when it first launched in 2011 the impact of both of those platforms was limited. • However, since 2011 the impact of these platforms has grown and the campaign has managed to get 1.7 million supporters to sign up to campaign.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The campaign was regularly scrutinised in public regarding its funding and backers. • Growing concerns about environmental issues among the public mean that the use of fossil fuels is coming under greater scrutiny. • They have attempted to pivot more recently to encouraging greener fuel initiatives - but this has diluted the specific message on fuel duty.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As mentioned above, 1.7 million people signed up to the campaign - a significant number for a campaign like this. • A Survation poll in 2012 - a year after the campaign launched - showed that 71% of the public backed a fuel duty cut - with just 3% saying it should be increased. Support was highest from C2DE voters.

Fuel Duty Campaign continued

Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign was incredibly effective in shifting the narrative on fuel tax from a necessary tax to one that was unacceptable due to its hit on 'ordinary drivers' - and has stayed as a constant for several years.• Despite other environmental taxes being introduced, fuel duty has remained static.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fuel duty has been frozen in every Budget for almost 10 years - proving the long-term impact of the campaign and the way it harnessed regular drivers and motorists as a single voice in the media.• The government would now face huge public pressure if it increased fuel duty - particularly given the strong backing for lower fuel prices from working class voters.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Stop the FOBTs
Lead organisation	Campaign for Fairer Gambling
Campaign topic	Stakes at fixed odds betting terminals
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main objective was simple and clear - reducing the maximum stake that could be placed on fixed odds betting terminals. The campaign suggested a £2 maximum stake limit - down from the £100 previous limit. The campaign's secondary objective was to raise the broader profile of gambling related harm - and how policy proposals such as the stake limit would be one of the single most effective measures to reduce that harm.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation of the campaign was media-focused. There was very little grassroots or volunteer campaigning. It relied on endorsements and assembling a coalition of supportive organisations - as well as building support in Parliament to pass the legislation needed. That Parliamentary support came in the form of the APPG on FOBTs - and subsequently the APPG on Gambling Related Harm.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The messaging was relentless in the media - and remained single-issue focused. Profile in the media and in parliament led to Tracey Crouch (who would become Minister for Gambling) knowing about the campaign during her time as a backbench MP. When appointed to Government, Crouch decided on a £2 a spin limit, which aligned with the campaign's objective. At this point, the priorities of the campaign shifted towards supporting Crouch to win the argument within government to secure the legislative change needed. During the campaign, the campaign often linked FOBTs to betting shop clustering on high streets, knowing that even when the vast majority of people might not have been aware of FOBTs, they were fed up with the number of betting shops. The campaign commonly called FOBTs the crack cocaine of gambling in local radio interviews in 2012. The campaign used regional media effectively - pushing out national figures on a localised level to regional press and broadcasters, which enabled both national and local journalists to put the issue to MPs, many of whom stated their opposition to FOBTs and support for a £2 cap.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online campaigning was not a large part of this movement - it relied more heavily on traditional media and Parliamentary engagement. The main spokesperson for the campaign - Matt Zarb-Cousin - often used his personal social media accounts to good effect, though. He often shared personal stories - such as these - to highlight the personal impact.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main challenge for the campaign was taking on a large and well-funded industry lobby. In 2018 the gambling lobby successfully convinced the Government to postpone the stake cut by a year after commissioning a report that suggested job losses and store closures would occur because of the stake cut.

Stop the FOBTs continued

Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is difficult to track the public's reception of the campaign specifically - but it helped raise awareness of gambling-related harm in the public's eyes.• Gambling Commission research in 2018 showed that trust in the gambling industry dropped from 48% in 2010 to 30% in 2018.• The maximum amount that can be bet on machines in bookmakers was also the most well-known policy area (41% knowing a little or a lot about the issue) - suggesting 'cut-through' among the public.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign was ultimately successful - in 2018 DCMS recommended a £2 maximum stake, and in 2019 the policy came into effect.• It has raised the profile of problematic gambling in the UK, with several relevant policies introduced over subsequent years such as the credit card gambling ban in 2020.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign successfully shifted the terms of the debate on gambling in the UK. There is now a much greater focus on gambling-related harm and industry regulation.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	£350m for the NHS
Lead organisation	Vote Leave
Campaign topic	More money for the NHS instead of the EU
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the public debate during the EU referendum away from the economy and onto the NHS. • Harness the NHS as an issue by making a link in the public's mind between leaving the EU and more money for the NHS. • Build a broader coalition of support than possible by campaigning just on immigration. • Prevent the Remain campaign from pushing Vote Leave into a defensive position by talking about what type of post-Brexit relationship the UK would have with the EU (Norway/Switzerland model etc).
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicated by Vote Leave as the official Brexit campaign during the EU referendum. • Delivered through all campaign channels across press, 'election broadcast', social media and ground campaign. • Made use of Cabinet members and senior campaign figures.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key part of the campaign's success was brevity and consistency. • "We send the EU £350 million a week. Let's fund our NHS instead" is incredibly concise, even though it is linking two big issues (the UK's financial contributions to the European Union, and funding for key public services). • Despite criticism from within the campaign and the media regarding the repetition from Vote Leave, the campaign understood that most of the time, most people are not paying attention to politics. Message discipline is required to achieve 'cut-through' and Vote Leave ensured it stuck to this and just two other key messages (control of borders and trade). • The message was delivered through several different channels. From the infamous/ iconic red bus with the slogan emblazoned across it, to hand-delivered leaflets to homes across the country, every channel of communication was used to repeat the same message.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vote Leave relied heavily on social media ads, spending £2.7 million on targeted ads during the campaign. The majority of these were deployed very late in the campaign for maximum effect. • 1,433 different messages were sent, which were seen more than 169 million times in total.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of the £350 million figure was aggressively objected to by opponents. The Remain campaign constantly tried to rubbish the claims and accused Vote Leave of "lying." The Office for National Statistics stated that using the gross figure "alongside the suggestion that this could be spent elsewhere, without further explanation, was potentially misleading." • These attacks proved counterproductive during the campaign by keeping the debate focused on an area where Vote Leave were strongest: just how many hundreds of millions of pounds the UK gives the EU every week. • Vote Leave faced 'internal' pressure to move away from the NHS as an issue, with those on the periphery arguing the attacks on the £350m claim were damaging the campaign's credibility, and that focusing more on immigration, EU corruption, "going global" etc was urgently required. This pressure was ignored.

£350m for the NHS continued

Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vote Leave's '£350 million a week' was one of the keys to its victory. Focus on the NHS gave Eurosceptic arguments about sovereignty a resonance that they had never had before.• Criticism of the use of the £350m figure only resonated with strong Remain supporters. For the key parts of the electorate, the campaign successfully linked leaving the EU with public services and living standards.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A study by King's College London of attitudes to Brexit found that even by October 2018, two years after the referendum, 42 per cent of people who had heard of the '£350m' claim still believe it is true, while just 36 per cent thought it was false and 22 per cent were unsure.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The "misleading" claim continued to be disputed long after the referendum. Pro-Remain campaigners cited it when arguing for a second referendum, saying the result was "won with lies".• Its more lasting impact is that it made finding an extra £350m a week for the NHS a political necessity. Tory MP Brexiteers were taken aback by how electorally potent the message was and it left them with a changed view of the politics of the NHS. After the referendum, anti-Brexit politicians on the left successfully framed the '£350m' claim as a Tory promise/lie. In the run up to the 70th anniversary of the NHS, Prime Minister Theresa May announced the NHS was to receive an additional £20 billion a year in real terms funding by 2024 – an extra £384m a week.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	School Cuts Campaign
Lead organisation	School Cuts
Campaign topic	School funding
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign's stated aims were to get the government to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> End the decline in schools funding happening since 2015 Guarantee new money from the Treasury Fund all ages and all needs, including SEND Provide a five-year funding plan Address historic underfunding Fully implement and fund pay rises
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The School Cuts Campaign is run by School Cuts, an organisation made up of 5 teaching unions. The campaign and its events are assisted by several national campaigns, including Save Our Schools and Fair Funding for All Schools.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main message of the campaign was: "4 in 5 schools in England are still in crisis in 2020 after years of Government cuts. Is your school on the list?" Other campaign messaging focused on the inequality of cuts (more cuts for less affluent schools), "ensure no child loses out". The delivery of message was wide ranging: online and in person, through rallies and targeting MPs. Over 2,000 headteachers took part in a march on Downing Street protesting school cuts. School Cuts ran a national training day, attended by parents, teachers and school leaders, which taught participants how to raise awareness of the issue. In the 2019 GE campaign, over 2 million leaflets were delivered to parents and community members, raising awareness of cuts on a community level.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the 2019 election campaign, over 1 million people watched campaign videos. The campaign also provided an election toolkit, which shows volunteers how to: leaflet in their community; ask their candidates to pledge; collect signatures on their election petition; write sample letters to send to press editors and, organise a screening of a short film explaining the details of school cuts. Hundreds of thousands of people used the online interactive map to find local-level data on school spending in their area. The campaign releases regular publications, which range from fact checking government on education stats to opinion pieces, policy suggestions and news articles. The campaign's online presence is limited, with 4,776 twitter followers, and 19,000 likes on its Facebook page. The campaign encourages visitors to its site to share the website with 5 parents they know, follow the campaign on Facebook and take a quiz that provides key facts about school funding.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This campaign did not manage to bridge the partisan divide over issues of funding. In the 2019 general election, only 1% of Conservative parliamentary candidates took the campaign's pledge to reverse school cuts.

School Cuts Campaign continued

Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Public reception to ending school cuts was very positive, with education a high-ranking issue in the general election (3rd most important according to the campaign).
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Prime Minister has talked about “levelling up” school funding and announced an increase in the Conservative manifesto. This included a commitment to increase funding so that every secondary school pupil will receive a minimum of £5,000 next year, and each primary school pupil will receive £4,000 by 2021-22.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Public discourse around education is strongly in favour of funding.In the 2019 election, education was the third biggest issue on the agenda.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	This Girl Can
Lead organisation	Sport England
Campaign topic	Sport participation
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aims to increase physical activity among women of all ages, shapes, sizes and abilities, across the UK.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-ordinated by Sport England, funded by the National Lottery, and delivered online. VICHEALTH is a partner organisation which licensed the This Girl Can campaign from Sport England.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign's message is that no matter their shape/size/ability, women should be able to feel free to exercise however they please and become active. Observing that many women are put off taking part in physical activity due to a fear of judgement, the campaign seeks to tell the real stories of women who get active or play sport in the way that's right for them, using images that show what activity really looks like.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campaign is deliberately designed for online audiences. Participants are encouraged to join the This Girl Can Supporters Hub and help get more women more active. Registered supporters have access to the This Girl Can Supporter's Toolkit, a set of online resources such as free-to-use photos and images, poster templates, This Girl can logo and brand guidelines, and insight to help them shape their activities.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign faced some criticism that the use of the word "girl" could be demeaning to older women, alongside the issue of objectifying female bodies. It is difficult to measure the impact of the campaign in the short term.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The website claims that the campaign has successfully persuaded nearly three million women to get more active since 2015.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hashtag #thisgirlcan was trending at number 3 in the UK on the first day of airing, and the YouTube video of the ad had over 400,000 views since it was aired on 23 January 2015.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women are becoming much more comfortable to be seen exercising regardless of their shape and size, with the campaign stating in January 2020 that over 500,000 women have become more physically active as a result of the campaign.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Tackling the Carers' Crisis
Lead organisation	Macmillan Cancer Support
Campaign topic	Supporting carers for people with cancer
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign aims to raise awareness and the profile of carers – in order to secure legislative changes to get carers additional support. The number of people looking after someone with cancer in the UK has soared from 1.1 million in 2011 to almost 1.5 million. Around 100,000 people in the UK are caring for a parent with cancer while also looking after their own children.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Macmillan led the caring campaigns, which are split to target specific legislative goals in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and England. Macmillan worked with different partners in each region to tailor its approach. These partners are largely from the charitable sector.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carers are carrying out complex tasks, often without receiving help. Without support, many carers struggle to cope, leading to financial, mental health and social issues. “No one should have to cope on their own when caring for someone with cancer”. Macmillan uses case studies of carers, talking about their struggles before they received support. Over 400 carers shared their experiences. In 2016, Macmillan campaigned to make sure the government’s new Carers Strategy for England would give cancer carers the support they needed. Macmillan released a research paper, named “Under pressure: the growing strain on cancer carers”. Macmillan also released a paper entitled “Do you care?”, which identified cancer carers, and called on government to improve identification and support for carers. In Northern Ireland, MacMillan formed a carers coalition with other charities to raise awareness of the contribution made by carers. In Wales, Macmillan worked with the Wales Carers Alliance to influence government. In Scotland, Macmillan worked with other charities to influence government, and works closely with the new Integrated Joint Boards across Scotland.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over 15,000 people signed Macmillan’s petition. Macmillan pushed the public to ask their MP to speak up for cancer carers during the Care Bill debate.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This campaign had to compete for the legislative attention of MPs and civil servants, meaning that it was competing with other high priority national issues. In some regions, such as Northern Ireland, this has meant that no progress has yet been made.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public reception to this campaign was positive, but as a campaign with a reasonably tight focus around targeting MPs to change legislation, it did not have a massive public impact.

Tackling the Carers' Crisis continued

Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• June 2018: the government published their new 2-year Carer Action plan, including the announcement that Health Education England will work with carers and charities to develop training to better support carers.• Macmillan believes that government legislation did not go far enough. They insist the government should also provide details on how to provide welfare support for carers, make it a formal duty for the NHS to identify carers and signpost them to support.• In Scotland, Macmillan influenced the 2016 Carers Act, which helped more carers get a carer's support plan, providing social and financial help.• In Wales, Macmillan influenced the 2014 Social Services and Well Being Act, which meant that carers get an assessment of their needs as carers, regardless of the type or amount of work they do.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The 2-year carers action plan from the government was not seen as enough to create the culture change needed to ensure that carers are seen as part of the team caring for someone with cancer. They believe that the 5-year Carers Strategy they proposed would have brought about this change.• The need to support cancer carers has been permanently brought to further prominence in the public and legislative eye.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Campaign Against Modern Slavery
Lead organisation	Co-operative Party
Campaign topic	Modern day slavery
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To raise awareness of modern-day slavery in the UK and work towards ending it. To change legislation to increase the amount of support provided to slavery survivors from 45 days to 12 months. To hold the Government to account on its enforcement of the Modern Slavery Act, and particularly section 54, which requires businesses to publish a statement on modern slavery.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-op Party coordinated the cross-party effort in Parliament to support The Modern Slavery (Victim Support) bill, which would increase support for victims of modern slavery from 45 days to 12 months. The Co-operative Group and anti-trafficking charity City Hearts are partners. In 2017, they launched the Bright Future programme, which offers the opportunity of a paid work placement and a job in the food business to those who have been rescued from modern slavery.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign is designed for both online and offline audiences, and targets both the general public and politicians/decision-makers. The Co-op Party shared the Charter Against Modern Slavery to councils across the whole of the UK by partnering with Councillors. The key message is that local councils should ensure that none of the £40bn they collectively spend per year for procurement are going to firms that may exploit people down the supply chain. The Co-op Group launched a press ad to coincide with Anti-Slavery Day in 2018 and raise awareness of the Bright Future programme.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Co-op Party initiated an online petition to complement the cross-party efforts in Parliament to call on the Government to increase support for victims of modern slavery from 45 days to 12 months. There was extensive online coverage of the Bright Future programme and of Co-op's efforts to change the Modern Slavery Act in national and local media (e.g. BBC, AboutManchester etc.).
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review into the Bright Future programme found that one of the biggest challenges that came up was the lack of work placements in the right locations across the country (where the survivors were located).
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bright Future programme was very well received by businesses across the country: companies such as John Lewis, the Body Shop, and Dixons Carphone signed up to the scheme.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An independent review of the Bright Future programme published in June 2019 found it to be 'relevant and effective'. Although the number of actual placements remained steady, the number of modern slavery survivors referred to the programme has grown continuously since its launch. The review found there were 95 referrals until June 2019, 26 placements, and 20 permanent job offers to participants of the scheme.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The government has committed to strengthening section 54 (transparency in supply chains requirements) of the Modern Slavery Act and launched a consultation into proposed changes to the Act. The consultation closed in September 2019 and the feedback received is still being analysed. The government published a guide for businesses on how to produce an annual modern slavery statement in March 2019.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Labour's 2017 general election campaign
Lead organisation	Labour Party
Campaign topic	General Election campaign for the Labour Party
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour sought to overturn the Conservative's 20-point opinion poll lead during the 'snap' general election in June 2017. The aim was to adopt a radical manifesto that was "transformational, not transactional", designed to win support among voters who felt ignored by the incumbent Conservative government. This also allowed Labour to avoid campaigning on Brexit, which had divided the Parliamentary party and its support base. While the campaign failed in its ultimate objective - the Conservatives remained in government - the focus on policies set the political agenda on many issues following the election.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign gained traction on social media which, in contrast to paid-for adverts from the Conservatives, favoured a more organic approach, relying on supporters to share content through their own networks. This was combined with a well-resourced ground operation. The campaign was able to draw on a significantly expanded party membership, as well as the activist base supplied by the highly motivated members of Momentum.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour were effective at using a policy-focused approach to grab the agenda, both proactively and reactively. The "For the many, not the few" manifesto made the case that public services were under-funded, especially education. The campaign linked its messages to relevant unfolding events – reinforcing messages about cuts in police numbers in the wake of two terrorist attacks that occurred during the campaign. This message resonated with working class voters and achieved pick up in the media in the absence of anything from the Conservatives, who ran a campaign with few new announcements. Labour made effective use of reactive campaigning too, exploiting the poorly-received Conservative manifesto pledge on adult social care, labelling it a 'dementia tax' which resonated incredibly strongly with those in retirement worried about their future, and with people with parents of retirement age.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour were widely thought to have won the social media battle during the election, according to digital strategists close to both camps. Labour not only outspent the Conservatives but were also more targeted in their advertising and made greater use of organic content shared by supporters. Labour estimates that more than 15 million people watched at least one Jeremy Corbyn video during the campaign.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jeremy Corbyn attracted poor personal ratings in opinion poll. Labour as a party were divided, not just over the key issue of Brexit but also with large parts of the party openly critical of Corbyn. Labour under Corbyn faced a hostile traditional press during the election.

Labour's 2017 general election campaign continued

Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Many voters responded positively to Labour's messages on public services, especially education and crime.• Corbyn's unpopularity was already 'factored into the share price'.• The Conservatives lost their 20-point lead in the polls to emerge from election day without a majority.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The shock result was, in the immediate aftermath of the election, attributed in part to a 'youthquake' of younger voters being motivated by opposition to Brexit and favouring Labour's approach to the economy.• Later research has refuted this, but it played an important part in politicians' reactions to the result.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The shock of failing to win a majority against Corbyn's Labour forced the Conservative party to re-think its position on public spending.• The 2019 general election saw the Conservatives focus on Brexit, but also strongly on crime, hospitals and schools, helping them to secure a substantial majority of 80 seats on election day.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Hugh's Fish Fight
Lead organisation	Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall/River Cottage
Campaign topic	EU rules on fishing discard
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To raise awareness of the amount of wasted fish caused by the EU's common fisheries policy, linked to concern about fish stocks, with a focus on North Sea Cod. To change the Common Fisheries Policy's rules around discard. To encourage more conscious consumer behaviour around fish consumption.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign was led by Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall personally, boosted by his platform of a long-running TV show on Channel 4. The campaign was supported by several celebrities. Additionally, many high-profile, well-funded NGOs like Greenpeace, Fish2Fork, the Marine Conservation Society, and the WWF endorsed the campaign. The campaign was launched online in the UK in 2010. It also launched sister campaigns throughout Europe, including in Poland, Germany, and Spain.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The core of the campaign was nearly 900,000 signatures to the Fish Fight petition from the UK and globally. There was significant, organised, grassroots pressure put on politicians and leading retailers. 225,000 emails were sent to the EU, and 220,000 tweets were aimed at relevant politicians. The campaign tightly focused on reaching the EU Commissioner responsible for fisheries. The campaign received front page coverage on the Independent soon after launch. The campaign was based on fishfight.net (now defunct), where resources for campaigners were published. The campaign was launched in Autumn 2010. In January 2011, it launched on Channel 4 with Hugh's Fish Fight TV programme, which led to over 2 million unique views of the website over three days.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign was deliberately designed for online audiences. Resources, like graphics and stats, were provided on fishfight.net. Online campaigning was complemented by TV and on the street efforts.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign had to raise awareness about an issue which had previously no public awareness beyond specific fishing communities. This made it difficult to build sustained public pressure. They struggled to spread the campaign beyond the UK, meaning it could be perceived as a specific Eurosceptic British project.

Hugh's Fish Fight continued

Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was significant public and political support for a niche issue. The campaign was supported by the relevant UK government minister at the time (Richard Benyon).• Consumer awareness of fish sustainability increased following the campaign. In 2012, a year after the launch, the amount of certified-sustainable fish and seafood sold by UK supermarkets had increased by over 40%.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign achieved its stated aim, which was to get a ban on fish discard in the revised Common Fisheries Policy.• This was achieved in 2013, after Members of the European Parliament voted against allowing discard of caught fish. This was recognised in the revised Common Fisheries Policy.• The campaign also succeeded in persuading all major UK supermarkets to switch to buying pole-and-line caught tuna.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign achieved its primary legislative ambition, and it has embedded discussions about discarding fish into future fisheries policy discussions.• The campaign has formally finished, with other relevant actors continuing their own work.• There are concerns about how effectively the new policy can be enforced, however, and whether public habits remain sustainable (North Sea cod and mackerel both lost their sustainable status in 2019).

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Repeal the Porn Laws
Lead organisation	Adam Smith Institute
Campaign topic	Age-verification checks for online pornography
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End the UK government's plan to introduce age-verification checks for online pornography.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spearheaded by the Adam Smith Institute (ASI), a libertarian think tank based in Westminster. The ASI think tank teamed up with a range of organisations and privacy campaigners such as the Open Right Group, porn stars, and sex workers to campaign against the law. Tabloid newspapers, especially the Daily Star, were interested and played an important role in amplifying the campaign message in its early days.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much of the messaging repeated the arguments used against the government's 2015 ban on 'extreme' pornography – mainly on free speech, the need for wider policy solutions to reduce violence or prejudice against women through justice and education, and the wider 'freedom to express oneself' arguments. It began with op-eds in print and online media; it was quite easy to get exposure due to the salacious nature of the subject. The ASI ran a petition and signed up supporters on their website. A campaign HQ on the ASI's website included their key messages and examples of high-level press coverage. The slogan 'repeal the porn laws' (playing on the Corn Laws) was repeated clearly throughout online and print media in 2019. There were plans for demonstrations in Parliament Square, but they fell through.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This campaign was primarily online, mainly twitter. It activated the majority of libertarian writers and political commentators in the UK. The campaign was boosted by well-connected political sites like Guido Fawkes offering loud support.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign struggled to overcome public distaste and disgust. Even though the flaws of the government's policy were clear and easy to explain, it was very hard to get public supporters of legal pornography who also command mainstream respect and traction. The campaign was opposed by far better funded organisations like the NSPCC, which are much closer to government. The public were actually in favour of the government's policy by a large margin.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This campaign was not focused on mobilising public opinion, as the entire issue has very low public awareness. Not only was awareness low, the public were also in favour of the government's intended policy when asked.

Repeal the Porn Laws continued

Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign achieved its primary aim. The government, under Theresa May, repeatedly delayed the implementation of the law - citing technical difficulties - and it was formally dropped after Boris Johnson became PM.• This campaign derailed and delayed a lot of the government's plans to introduce laws to regulate the Digital Economy.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is too soon to say what the long term impact is, as the government only formally announced that it would not go ahead with the policy in late 2019.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Tier 2 Cap
Lead organisation	CaSE
Campaign topic	Immigration policy reform
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the arbitrary cap be placed on the recruitment of skilled workers to the UK, allowing employers to recruit where there is proof no UK-based individual is capable of filling such role.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organised and led by the Campaign for Science and Engineering (CaSE).
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CaSE published press releases on their website. There was extensive media coverage, including from the BBC, Evening Standard, Financial Times, coverage on BBC's Today Programme, LBC and Talk Radio. A letter to the Prime Minister urging the government to take action in revising immigration policy was published on their website, and supported by over 40 organisation across business, universities, professional institutes and research charities.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This campaign published many relevant documents on their website. Engagement with social media was limited, the campaign had 40,000 followers on Twitter but very small following on Facebook (only 491 likes).
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign was attempting to raise the prominence of arguments in favour of immigration at a time where larger public opinion was in favour of further restrictions on the number of migrants entering the UK.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public hold a nuanced view on immigration. Specifically on this campaign - and the tier 2 issue - the public are largely in favour of immigration by highly-skilled workers. In Spring 2019, for example, 80% told YouGov that immigration by highly qualified workers was good for the UK.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign successfully activated other organisations such as the Institute of Economic Affairs to campaign for the removal of the cap.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government updated the Tier 2 visa system, by exempting all doctors and nurses from the annual cap. This means that doctors and nurses no longer count in the monthly allocation of Certificates of Sponsorship. And as such there should be enough room for employers to recruit engineers, tech specialists and other highly-skilled professionals without risk of refusal due to the cap.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Rainbow Laces
Lead organisation	Stonewall
Campaign topic	Homophobia in Sport
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To raise awareness of and tackle homophobia in sport, with a focus on football. The campaign aims to create an environment where homophobic language in sport is unaccepted and football players feel safe and able to come out (there are no out players in the top four leagues). The vehicle for creating this environment is having one week in December where sports stars wear rainbow laces in their football boots/other shoes.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-ordinated by Stonewall as the national LGBT charity, but delivered through clubs from grassroots to premier league. Premier League and FA are partners and help to host resources. Corporate partners such as Sky Sports, Adidas, Barclays also support the scheme.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key brand is the rainbow laces which can be purchased from Stonewall. Grassroots clubs and schools get them at cost. Resources also available from the FA and Premier League so it isn't necessary to visit Stonewall. Elite endorsement by well-known players is key to spreading the message and wearing the laces at high profile events - for instance England's World Cup matches in Russia. Media partners including the Sun and Mirror feature the campaign in sports sections along with Sky Sports to reach target demographics. Stonewall also provides guides and case studies for sports clubs on how they can be LGBT friendly.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campaign is deliberately designed for online audiences. Participants are encouraged to post pictures of themselves wearing laces. Sharing graphics are provided by Stonewall for the clubs to use. Resources can also be downloaded from the football association.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early partnership with Paddy Power backfired as it was seen by the public as too commercial. Other LGBT groups were offended by Paddy Power's use of innuendo, for instance 'right behind gay footballers'. The campaign was more successful when the collaboration with Paddy Power was dropped. It is difficult to measure impact of the campaign.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 56% of sport fans who saw Rainbow Laces agree that more needs to be done to make LGBT people feel accepted in sport. Between 2018 and 2019 the number of people who believe it's important anti-LGBT language and abuse, like calling someone or something 'gay' in a derogatory way, should be challenged at live sporting events rose from 58% to 65%.

Rainbow Laces continued

Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Over 100,000 pairs of laces were sent out across the UK.• Across the 19 Premier League clubs who rebranded their logos in solidarity with the LGBT campaign, there have been more than 200,000 negative reactions on Facebook. However, positive comments on social sports clubs' social media outweighed negative 4-1. The only clubs to have more negative comments were Burnley and Aston Villa.• This did spur Clubs to better police online chat rooms.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public discourse around homophobia in sport has changed. It is now seen as a problem to be tackled.• Clubs and fans much more comfortable wearing rainbow laces.• There has been growing take up in other sports, for example in rugby, gymnastics, and cricket.• High profile sports people have come out in other sports. But there are still no out footballers in the top leagues.• Despite this progress, 4/10 LGBT people still think public sporting events aren't welcoming for them.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	London Living Wage
Lead organisation	Living Wage Foundation
Campaign topic	Aligning wages with what people need to live
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign aims to get employers, through legislation or voluntarily, to pay the real living wage to their employees. This is calculated according to the cost of living, based on a basket of household goods and services. There is a separate, higher rate for London.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign is coordinated by the Living Wage Foundation. Once a corporate employer starts paying a living wage to its employees, it joins the movement as an accredited employer. The Living Wage Foundation plays three roles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers accreditation to employers that pay the living wage, or those committed to an agreed timetable of implementation. It also offers a service provider recognition scheme for third party contractors who ensure their own staff are earning the living wage rates. Coordinates the announcement of the real living wage each November, based on the best available evidence about living standards. Provides a forum for leading employers and service providers to publicly join the independent movement of organisations, businesses and people campaigning for a living wage. The living wage commission oversees the calculation of the living wage, it is made up of accredited employers, trade unions, civil society and independent experts. The living wage has an advisory council and a funding steering committee to help provide guidance. The Foundation has principal partners, mostly in business, that particularly support its work.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key message is that “the living wage is good for business”. London Living Wage conducted a business benefits study of living wage accredited businesses to utilise in public debate. The Living Wage Foundation also sells a range of merchandise, including corporate event packs. It coordinates a living wage week each November, celebrating the living wage movement throughout the UK. The campaign also uses case studies of employers who have switched over, and how it has benefitted them.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Living Wage Foundation offers press templates, reports and logos to help living wage employers and recognised service providers on their website. They offer other social media support for employees to download and use to encourage their employers to sign up – and also for those that had already signed up – to become champions on their platforms.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst this policy was popular, it became slightly embroiled in the partisan nature of politics after Labour supported increasing minimum wages, particularly from Ed Miliband’s leadership onwards.

London Living Wage continued

Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign has gained prominent backers, including Polly Toynbee, Church Action on Poverty and Bloomsbury Fightback.• This campaign tends to enjoy public and employer popularity, as shown through the findings of their opinion research:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 93% of university students want to work for living wage employers.• 87% of people think companies should voluntarily pay the real living wage.• 90% of consumers agreed that pay should reflect living costs.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In London, there are 1,837 accredited employers.• Nationally, there are 6,171 accredited employers (not all London living wage).• Nationally, over 180,000 employees have received a pay rise because of the Living Wage Campaign.• The Living Wage Campaign has contributed to the Green Party suggesting an increase in the minimum wage.• During the 2019 General Election Labour promised to introduce a real living wage, which was calculated differently to the foundation's wage, and was actually higher.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In April 2016, the government introduced a higher minimum wage rate for all staff over 25 years of age, calling it a 'national living wage'.• This campaign has brought the living wage to the centre of public attention, permanently increasing pressure on employers to pay a living wage.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Out of Sight Out of Mind
Lead organisation	Cancer Research UK
Campaign topic	Public Health - Smoking
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While tobacco advertising was banned in 2002, tobacco displays still existed in shops after the ban - often next to sweets and crisps. • The campaign therefore called for politicians to close the perceived loophole in the advertising ban that was allowing tobacco to be displayed at the point of sale and to be sold from vending machines. • The campaign also pushed for plain packaging - but this would morph into its own separate campaign in subsequent years.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The campaign was led by the highly effective Cancer Research team. • It relied on traditional media and Parliamentary activity - there was no real element of grassroots or direct campaigning. • There was light touch mobilisation of the public - the campaign directed supporters of Cancer Research to a petition and to email their local MP. Over 1,300 campaigners wrote to MP and local papers. • The Cancer Research team worked closely (but not formally in an official coalition) with other public health campaigners in order to raise awareness of the research and the campaign itself.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The messaging was heavily focused on young people and the prevention of advertising to that group. • The messaging was often based on statistics - '80 per cent of smokers start before the age of 19' was used over and over in content made by the campaign. • The message was delivered by Cancer Research staff in the media, as well as supporters in Parliament such as David Taylor MP.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online campaigning was not a large part of this campaign - particularly given that the full development of social media had not happened during the time of the campaign. • There was, though, sharing of petitions online and emailing of local MPs from Cancer Research supporters - over 50,000 people signed the petition.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main challenge for the campaign was in taking on the large and well-funded tobacco industry. • The tobacco industry was well connected in government and Parliament - mobilising over 80 MPs to urge decision makers that the ban on displays would 'decimate' the high street.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The campaign was well received by the public. As well as the large number of petition signatures gathered by the campaign, a YouGov survey in 2015 showed that 79 per cent of the British public supported action to stop young people taking up smoking, and 75 per cent support for removing tobacco displays in all UK shops.

Out of Sight Out of Mind continued

Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign was ultimately successful - tobacco display was outlawed in England and in 2015 this included small shops too.• The Government also launched a full tobacco control plan in England.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign helped shift the debate even further on smoking - plain packaging came into force in 2017 and there is now a common acceptance that tobacco should not be advertised or seen in the public eye.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Turn Up, Save Lives
Lead organisation	ONE
Campaign topic	UK spending on aid
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the British Government to spend 0.7% of GDP on overseas development aid. For 100 MPs to support the Private Members Bill needed to secure this.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign was led by ONE but other organisations, such as Save The Children, were also involved.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campaigners from ONE stood outside Parliament, urging MPs to “Turn up, save lives”. They also led a “Say you’ll be there” campaign, asking MPs to turn up on the 12th, (and asking people to ask their MPs to be there) when the bill was being read.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign circulated the hashtag #TurnUpSaveLives and they managed to get it to trend twice on the day of the vote. They created a LifeSavers gallery to thank the MPs who were involved.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The biggest issue to overcome was inertia. It is often difficult to get 100 MPs to back a Private Members Bill and to avoid setting a precedent.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There’s no evidence that the general public has changed their mind on the issue. In 2013, 66% of the public thought we should decrease aid spending. In 2018 80% of Brits thought the foreign aid budget should be diverted towards the NHS.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 0.7% commitment is now law. The Conservatives, Labour and the Lib Dems were all committed to the 0.7% target in their election manifestos.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Stop Funding Hate
Lead organisation	Stop Funding Hate
Campaign topic	Hate speech in the Media
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To tackle hate speech in the media by persuading advertisers to pull their support from publications that spread hate and division.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-ordinated by Stop Funding Hate, a Community Interest Company. Community-driven, grassroots human rights campaign (based on participatory campaigning). The group works with other partner organisations, from unions to faith groups (Citizens UK, NUS, Extinguish Hate).
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key message is “make hate unprofitable”: advertisers have the power to decide which publications to fund, therefore the public should write to the companies that fund newspapers such as The Sun and the Daily Mail and ask them to stop advertising in them. The group sells merchandise branded with #StopFundingHate to raise awareness of the campaign and gather more support.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campaign is deliberately designed for online audiences. Participants are encouraged to tweet or email the companies that advertise in publications which publish hateful articles and ask them to stop supporting them by withdrawing their ads. Resources and guidance on how to contact a company about this issue are easily accessible on the Stop Funding Hate website.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have not been any immediate challenges. The campaign has been widely successful and began sharing the #StopFundingHate campaigning model with other charities and community groups across the UK.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since 2016, when the campaign was launched, there has been a significant rise in the number of companies that Stop Funding Hate calls ‘ethical advertisers’. In 2018, following calls from the Stop Funding hate campaign, 96% of Co-op members voted for an ethical advertising AGM motion, urging the Co-op Group to do a full review of their advertising policy and report this back to members. Unilever also issued a public statement committing to ethical advertising.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Clarkson, Managing Editor of the Sun, apologised publicly for a 2015 article in which a columnist likened migrants to “cockroaches”: “I do not think there is any defence for the language she used. We can cherish freedom of expression but using language like “cockroaches” is certainly not appropriate and I apologise for that.” According to the media monitoring done by Stop Funding Hate, there has been a marked reduction in the number of hateful headlines and articles in 2018.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hateful public discourse used in the media has been declining; more importantly, this is now seen as a real issue which needs addressing.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Raise the Rate
Lead organisation	Sixth Form Colleges Association
Campaign topic	Funding of Sixth Form Colleges
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aims to secure a significant increase in the funding rate for sixth form students in the 2019 spending review.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Launched by the Sixth Form Colleges Association and delivered online, utilising a network of sixth form colleges to deliver the campaign.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign's message is that the government should raise the funding rate for 16, 17 and 18-year olds by at least £760 per student in the 2019 spending review (and then in line with inflation each year after) to ensure that schools and colleges can continue to deliver a high-quality education. The campaign draws attention to the fact that sixth form funding was significantly reduced after 2010 and the national funding rate for 16- and 17-year olds has remained frozen at £4,000 per student, per year since 2013/14. The rate for 18-year olds is set even lower at £3,300 per student.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campaign is designed for both online and offline audiences. Participants are encouraged to: sign a Petition to Raise the Rate addressed to the UK Government and Parliament; tweet in support of the campaign; and, share information on other social media. Participants are encouraged to write to their MP championing the cause.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main difficulty is the policy environment in which this campaign operates, with Brexit and other issues taking up the bandwidth. However, schools funding has risen in importance politically.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On 2 January 2019, following the petition, the Government responded that the requested change will be considered: "We are aware of the pressures in the system and are looking carefully at the funding needs of 16-19 education and wider further education. We will consider this further as part of the Spending Review".
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Twelve associations representing school and college staff and students have written to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to urge him to increase funding for sixth form education.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing the idea that education is one area that is more acceptable to be underfunded than others - with education funding now a hot topic in UK politics.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	The Opioid Timebomb
Lead organisation	Evening Standard
Campaign topic	The overuse of opioid painkillers
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To raise awareness of, and tackle, the growing problem of opioid painkillers in the UK. To get pharmaceutical companies to put addiction warnings on opioid medicine labels.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A complex investigation was carried out by The Evening Standard, consisting of several articles that documented the issue of opioid overdose in the UK. There is a different structure to this campaign compared to others analysed because it is led by a news outlet.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key ask of the campaign was that MHRA imposes an addiction warning rule on pharmaceutical companies that sell opioids to prevent a UK opioid epidemic, as has already happened in the US.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Evening Standard created a dedicated website containing all articles making up this investigation: https://opioids.standard.co.uk/ The investigation demonstrated that drug companies fail to tell the public the full dangers of opioids and criticised the MHRA for failing in their job as regulator and letting big pharma get away with it. People were encouraged to inform themselves better of the addiction risks before requesting opioids from their GP. Also, they are warned using data, that in most cases these medications are not actually effective.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have been no obvious challenges for the campaign. The MHRA responded to the investigation within days and established that the investigation was right to demand action on this issue.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a result of the campaign, the MHRA set up an expert working group, and eventually addiction warnings (“Contains opioid. Can cause addiction.”) have begun to appear on the front of prescription opioid packs dispensed on the high street. Health Secretary Matt Hancock called this “a big step forward in tackling opioid addiction in the UK” and credited the Evening Standard for their work raising awareness of this issue.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign’s merit to make lasting change was recognised by the MHRA. Cathy Stannard, one of the UK’s foremost opioid experts who sat on the MHRA’s expert working group, said: “There has been a lot in newspapers about opioids over the past year, much of it lacking accuracy. The Evening Standard has stood out because it has shown a balanced and long-standing commitment to getting to the bottom of the issues and this has supported them in being effective in bringing about real change for the better.”
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign helped to prevent an opioid crisis in the UK and highlighted the effectiveness of a major UK newspaper campaign.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Missing Type
Lead organisation	NHS Blood and Transplant
Campaign topic	Blood donation
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To encourage those who have never donated blood before to sign up as donors. To reverse a trend in decline of new blood donors over the last decade. To contribute to ensuring 204,000 people attend a donation session for the first time in 2015 to replace people who can't donate anymore, and to make sure there is an appropriate mix of blood groups.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This campaign was coordinated by NHS Blood and Transport, but was delivered through a variety of stakeholders, including NHS trusts, brands and influencers.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NHS asked brands, organisations and influencers to remove A, O and B (the letters that make up the blood groups) from their websites, Twitter names and signage without explaining why. It was then revealed that the letters had mysteriously gone missing to highlight the need for new donors. Once the reason was revealed, the NHS used NHS spokespeople as well as patient case-study families to ensure media coverage. The Daily Mirror ran a full print of 600,000 papers with the letters A and O missing from its masthead, supported by editorials on how people could participate. The campaign was primarily targeted at 17-24 year olds, hence the online nature of the campaign.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign was designed to run online, with outreach conducted through brands and influencers; it received strong support on social media. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 influencers showed their support on Twitter. 1,000 brands showed support on Twitter. 26,121 uses of #NationalBloodWeek and #MissingType across Twitter. 66% increase in Instagram fans in less than a week. 1,700 image likes on its Instagram profile. 478,480 people engaged with the campaign on Facebook.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As an uncontroversial campaign for the public good, this campaign faced few challenges.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public reception to this campaign was positive. The campaign generated a huge amount of media coverage, with 689 pieces of media coverage. The media coverage of this campaign was estimated to reach 347,619,784 people.

Missing Type continued

Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Over 30,000 people registered to donate.• 18,000 17-24 year olds registered.• Gorkana - the media insight agency for this campaign - won 'Grand Prix for the most effective media intelligence, research and insights company campaign' for its work on this campaign.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unclear at this stage, but likely a massive increase in available blood donors.• Also highlighted the power of using brands for social good in this way.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	#PacketInWalkers
Lead organisation	38 Degrees
Campaign topic	The environment, specifically plastic recycling
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To publicly highlight the ongoing issue with plastic packets for Walkers Crisps products, and more widely the issue of plastic waste and the need for quicker action on recycling. To mobilise 38 Degrees' huge army of supporters to engage in extremely direct action: posting empty crisp packets to Walkers HQ.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Led by 38 Degrees, the organisation and structure of this campaign was much looser than other campaigns we have profiled. It relied simply on using 38 Degrees' large network of registered supporters, as well as generating media hits about the campaign to widen the reach.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign relied on the use of simple statistics and impactful and emotive imagery. Pictures of crisp packets dating back as far as 1997 found on British beaches were circulated around social media to highlight the problem with the lack of good quality recycling schemes, and the issue of using plastic in the crisp packet manufacturing process. The campaign used Walkers' own target of 2025 to go plastic free to highlight that in that time, 28 billion more plastic crisp packets would have been produced. 89up – an international communications agency that focuses on third sector campaigns - provided 38 Degrees with PR support throughout the campaign, securing coverage in international news outlets from CNN to Time Magazine. The campaign featured as the day's most read news story on the BBC News website. Ultimately, though, the main message of the campaign was individual crisp packets being delivered to Walkers HQ, which was done by thousands of members of the public.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online campaigning was the key part of this campaign. 38 Degrees gathered over 330,000 signatures on a petition started by a member of the public in Wales to persuade Walkers to act on non-recyclable packaging. 38 Degrees then emailed those supporters encouraging them to post used crisp packets back to Walkers.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign suffered a backlash from the Royal Mail in particular. A Royal Mail spokesperson said at the time: "We strongly encourage customers not to post anything in the postal system which is not properly packaged. Crisp packets can't go through the machines, they are not normal mail items therefore my hardworking colleagues need to manually sort them, which adds to time."
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign was received well by the public - shown most clearly by the number of people signing the petition and posting the packets to Walkers. The environment has also shot up in importance in the eyes of the public - in some part because of campaigns such as this one that highlight the problems with non-recyclable plastics in everyday products.

#PacketInWalkers continued

Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign was a success - Walkers announced a new recycling scheme just two months after the campaign launched.• It allows consumers to send any crisp brand packet to over 8000 collection points across the country.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The campaign was another example of direct action on the environment - and raised the issue of plastic at a time when multiple other campaigns on plastic bottles were ongoing.• It also showed how direct campaign tactics - when utilised in the right way - can be highly effective.

[Back to contents >](#)

Campaign name	Sugar Tax Campaign
Lead organisation	Action on Sugar
Campaign topic	Sugar in drinks
Aims and objectives of campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To decrease obesity by implementing a tax on sugary drinks in the UK.
Organisation and structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Campaign was led by Action on Sugar, but other allied organisations were involved too, such as Food Active, Children's Health Fund, the Children's Food Campaign, and the Obesity Health Alliance.
Messaging (including delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The campaign was endorsed by Jaimie Oliver, who made a documentary on the subject called "Sugar Rush". The Children's food campaign managed to get 150,000 signatures on a petition, triggering a debate. They then wrote to every MP asking them to support the tax.
Online campaigning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The petition was circulated on social media, and supporters were encouraged to tweet their support.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A campaign to counter the tax emerged, calling itself "Face the Facts, Can the Tax." It is backed by several organisations including the NFU, The Association of Licensed Multiple Retailers (ALMR); The Automatic Vending Association; The British Beer & Pub Association (BBPA); The British Soft Drinks Association (BSDA), and others.
Public Reception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2017, after the tax had been implemented 71% of British adults thought the sugar tax worked.
Other Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially in 2015, in response to the petition, the Government announced that they had no plans to introduce a sugar tax.
Long term impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> George Osborne announced the sugar tax as part of the budget in 2016. It is now law, and came into effect in 2019. The tax is popular with the British public and further sin taxes are now in scope thanks to the raising of the general profile of sugar by this campaign.

[Back to contents >](#)

This research was produced by Public First under commission from the Wellcome Trust and the Campaign for Science and Engineering (CaSE) as part of their R&D Decade project ([see website for more information](#)).

These summaries are based on our analysis and profiling of the campaigns. While we have used a common framework and typology to classify these campaigns. Some of these findings are necessarily subjective, they are not in any way endorsed or approved by the campaigns themselves.



Wellcome exists to improve health by helping great ideas to thrive. We support researchers, we take on big health challenges, we campaign for better science, and we help everyone get involved with science and health research. We are a politically and financially independent foundation.



The Campaign for Science and Engineering (CaSE) is the UK's leading independent advocate for science and engineering. Our mission is to ensure that the UK has the skills, funding and policies to enable science and engineering thrive. We represent over 115 scientific organisations including businesses, universities, professional bodies, and research charities as well as individual scientists and engineers. Collectively our members employ over 336,000 people in the UK, and our industry and charity members invest over £32bn a year globally in R&D. We are funded entirely by our members and receive no funding from government

PUBLICFIRST 

11 Tufton Street
London
SW1P 3QB

T: 020 368 72761
E: contact@publicfirst.co.uk

www.publicfirst.co.uk