Candidate 1 evidence

3b

Traditional grassroots campaign strategies are the strategies which have been used by political parties for many years in their efforts to convince members of the electorate to vote for them in upcoming elections. However, some commentators have suggested that their influence has dwindled in recent years, particularly in the advent of new technology. Others, however, state that traditional methods still have a much greater impact on the electoral performance of political parties than the use of new technology. There is also, though, the argument to be made that media is an essential part of campaign management strategies.

One traditional grassroots campaign strategy still in use today is the use of door-to-door canvassing. This is perhaps the most popular image of a politician in the lead up to an election - going door knocking and speaking to constituents and

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

members of the public in an effort to talk to them about key issues and convince them that it is in their best interests to vote for that candidate and their party. Canvassing nowadays is more likely to involve large groups of volunteers and party activists rather than just the politician themselves and a small team, but the fact still remains that it is one of the most essential ways to influence the way a person votes - after all, research shows that conversations at the pub are still one of the most important ways of influencing the way that a person will vote, so it is clear that human contact is essential in order to attempt to persuade someone to vote for you. In the run up to the 2015 UK General Election, the then-head of the Labour Party, Ed Miliband, pledged that Labour would have *"four million conversations"* with voters by the time of the election. Jon Ashworth MP and his team were among the most proficient of candidates with their canvassing, and this canvassing is largely considered to be the reason that Jon Ashworth MP received around 60% of the vote in his constituency, increasing Labour's share of the vote by around 14%. However, it is clear that canvassing cannot make-or-break the result of an election, due to the fact that the Labour Party still lost the 2015 election. However, it can still be considered to be extremely important when combined with other factors. In 2017, for instance, a group of Labour-supporting activists known as Momentum launched a campaign called My Nearest Marginal in order to try to canvas in key marginal seats. The campaign centered around an app which Labour supporters and Momentum members could use to see the closest marginal seats to them, and the use of carpools in order to get activists to these places. The campaign also teamed new activists with those who were more experienced at canvassing, and meant that the activists were able to storm marginal seats in their droves. Momentum states that more than 100,000 people accessed their website in the run up to the 2017 election. While Labour still lost the election, their canvassing policy, and the work of Momentum, can be taken into consideration when considering why exactly the party received their biggest change in the share of the vote for a Labour leader since Clement Atlee. Therefore, whilst canvassing on its own cannot win an election, when combined with other factors, it can certainly help to make a difference to the popularity of a party. The combination of the traditional grassroots campaign method of canvassing and the new technology used by Momentum did certainly allow for a massive growth of the Labour Party in the 2017 UK General Election.

Another traditional grassroots campaign strategy still being implemented today is the use of battle buses. Battle buses were a stroke of genius when they were first implemented in the late 20th century - no longer did reporters have to follow politicians around the country, they could instead have unlimited access to them. The battle bus houses reporters, advisors and politicians - usually high ranking members of parties, such as the party leader - and allows them to travel the country to speak at events and spread their campaign. Their use has been so successful that some commentators and reporters have even dubbed them to be *"tour buses"* for politicians. Their benefits certainly apply to all involved - reporters have access to politicians, and politicians have access to reporters in an attempt to spread the message which they want to. The battle buses are also usually decorated in a wide variety of party slogans and insignias in order to try to attract the attention of anyone who sees them on the street, as well as to broadcast key election pledges and campaign strategies. For example, the Conservative campaign in 2017 focussed on Theresa May, so the battle buses utilised by the party during this election were emblazoned with her slogan of

"strong and stable leadership". On the other hand, with Jeremy Corbyn low in the polls, the Labour battle buses made no mention of their leader and instead showcased key policies. While not an election, the use of the Leave campaign's battle bus in the 2016 European Union Referendum was critical in their campaign - in fact, many commentators would state that the declaration on the side of their bus, that we were sending masses of money to the EU which could instead be used to fund the NHS, was what ensured that they would win the referendum. In 2015, the Conservative battle bus campaign - simply titled *Battlebus 2015* - took on a new ground. Instead of simply transporting politicians and reporters, the Conservatives used their battle buses to transport party members and activists around the country to marginal seats in order for them to campaign. This move was widely regarded as effective, and the Conservative added an extra fleet of buses in the last week in the lead up to the election. Therefore, battle buses ensure a talking point for political parties, and give them the opportunity to make a strong and visible political statement. However, on their own, battle buses are generally ineffective in influencing the result of an election. When combined with other factors, such as the Conservatives transporting canvassers on their battle buses, the scheme is significantly more effective.

Parties also utilise new technology during their election campaigns. One new technological campaign strategy used by political parties in order to influence their electoral performance was the use of VoteSource by the Conservative Party in 2015. VoteSource was a database designed to replace the old Merlin voter database. It would contain all of the electoral data researched by the Conservative Party, and be available to canvassers and party members in order to allow them to target voters. The scheme was particularly effective when utilised in combination with canvassing and leaflets, and would assign a *'squeeze'* message to every household on the system - that is, a message which would target them individually and attempt to convince them that it was in their best interests to vote Conservative. For example, if a person was a likely seven-out-of-ten to vote Conservative, but a nine-out-of-ten to vote UKIP, and hated Labour more than either of them, the message would be *'don't vote UKIP or you'll let Labour in'*. The scheme was a massive success, and it can attributed at least in part to VoteSource that the Conservative Party won the 2015 General Election. However, many politicians and party members complained to party co-chair Lord Feldman after they tired of their data being saved incorrectly, and at least one association threatened to go back to a card system in order contain their information due to their disgruntlement at the system. Therefore, this use of modern technology was a huge success for the Conservative Party, and allowed them a great deal of influence and power in the election. However, the system was not fullproof, as VoteSource crashed on polling day. Nevertheless, it could be said that the individual, targeted campaigning in the weeks and months leading up to the election meant that this was not a large issue.

Finally, parties also utilise media as a campaign strategy. One example of this is television. In the run up to the 2015 General Election, David Cameron hired two new advisors to help him run his campaign. During the last election, the live television leaders' debates proved to be much more significant than anyone was epxecting in affecting the outcome of the election and in the opinion polls leading up to polling day. Cameron's new advisors guided him, and it was

probably due to their influence that he insisted on having the leaders of all the major parties together for at least one direct debate - the only direct debate he took part in that year. The result was television chaos, but the advisors and Cameron had successfully prepared for such an eventuality. Cameron was able to insert soundbites into his opening speech and into the first arguments of the evening - small clips of himself repeating key pledges which would be edited down by hurried editors in time for the ten o'clock news. While the polls suggested that there was no clear winner of the shambolic television debate, it was still a success for Cameron and his team, as he was able to get his message out there without embarrassing himself in a direct debate against just a few leaders. Nicola Sturgeon was also considered to have performed well during the television debates, and it was perhaps this, when combined with other factors such as the Independence Referendum, which ensured that the SNP completely dominated in Scotland in the 2015 General Election. On the other hand, television can be shown to have a negative impact on leaders. Theresa May refused to take part in debates in 2017, sending other high-ranking politicians in her stead. Tim Farrow, then-leader of the Liberal Democrats, accused May on live television of *"running scared"*, which completely undermined her campaign of being a strong and stable leader. This also had a large impact on May's campaign, given that *"strong and stable leadership"* was indeed the tagline to the entire Conversative 2017 General Election campaign. Therefore, television can have both a positive and negative impact on a leader's performance, but it is again not a make-or-break part of a campaign. The impact that debates, for instance, have on opinion polls can often be considered to be limited, or short-term. In order for a more long-term impact, the debates must be memorable, such as the chaos of the seven-way leaders' debate in 2015, and include the sort of key messages that canvassers would be giving out, or that would be included in leaflets - or indeed on the side of a battle bus.

In conclusion, it would not be fair to say that traditional grassroots campaign strategies have a much greater impact on the electoral performance of political parties than the use of new media. While traditional grassroots strategies do indeed help to make a statement and impact voters, they alone cannot win an election. The most successful campaigns are those which combine both new and old campaign strategies - such as the combination of canvassing and My Nearest Marginal for Labour 2017, or, perhaps most effectively, the combination of VoteSource, leafleting, battle buses, and media for the Conversatives in 2015. In the future, it is likely that political parties will refrain from leaning too much on traditional grassroots campaign strategies, or at least ot the extent which they had in the past. Instead, it is more likely that they will seek a combination of media, traditional grassroots strategies and new technology in order to be able to most effectively manage their campaigns. The growth of mass media has indeed played a part in strategies, given the fact that the country is now more connected than ever, and it is essential to keep up with the times by implementing new technology and integrating this with the traditional grassroots campaign strategies in order to best influence the nation and have the best chance of winning an election.

Candidate 2 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Section 3. - Question 3b

3b Traditional grassroot campaign methods are still very popular in modern day society. They are normally a more effective way to reach out to the public when trying to get as much attention as possible. Modern day now technology is also used a lot and can be effect too.

Door-to-door canvassing is one example of a type of grassroot campaigning. Going to people doors and trying to get them on your side is seen to have been very popular. It is a good way to

speak to someone in person and try and persuade them to change their minds, or even just educate them. It can be good for people who don't use modern day technology and use use phones / internet etc. On the otherhand, grassroots can also be quite inconveniant to people. Many people are at work during the day and wont be in to answer the door or they might jist be home from a long day at work and you are busy in the house that you cant answer the door.

Another really effective grassroots

campaigning method is poster and leaflets. Posters and leaflets are easy to make and can be really effective. You can stick posters to many different places and just by a glance someones mind could be changed. With leaflets, you can post them through peoples doors and that way they dont exactly have to go very far but can still be educated. However, many people just bin leaflets that get posted through their doors if they already have their mind set on someone, or they dont even bother to

give it a read.

~~Another example of grassroots~~

An example of modern day voting strategies is social media. ~~I~~ Many people use ~~social~~ media everyday and it is very easy accesible. Social media is a ~~poo~~ good way to attract younger voters who are a big part of the voter turnout. The SNP tweeted some mini manifestos and this was really effective as many people saw this and ~~I~~ could see whats their key areas more and

it gave them an insight into their key topics before voting. On the other hand, social media is used by many people yet there is ~~also~~ also the percentage of people who do not use social media that also need to find out about those things.

Another modern method of campaigning is phone centres. This can access anyones number and phone thousands of people at the one time to just get the message across, it is quick and effective. Also, ~~⊙~~ APPS on a mobile

phone can be successful as in recent years the SNP have used an app in which takes all the votes and seperates people into categories of who they need to target in order to get the best turnout. This can be effective because then the party know exactly what type of people to target instead of wasting time and money bergetting current voters.

TV debates and discussions are also really good ways of getting voters. MP's can scrutinise the leaders

of the parties in order for them to let things that they propose to ~~do~~ do out.

Candidate 3 evidence

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

3b) Grassroots campaigns have been used for many decades across the UK as a strategy in gaining party support. However, over the past 5 or so years we have seen an increase in new campaign methods which suggest politics campaigns may have move into a more digital era. Due to the UK becoming less and less loyal to particular parties they have to work much harder in order to encourage people to vote for them. Often it is now single issue and a rational-choice model that people work with and as such campaigning is much more important as people are not guaranteed to vote based on class etc

One of the most effective of the grassroots campaigns is canvasing.. Canvassing involves members and volunteers going door-to-door in an effort to draw support for the party. This can often be an effective method as it allows the party to find out about local issues and change local campaigning accordingly to suit the varying needs. With voting becoming more about issues it is often vital that political parties 'show off' campaigns that are likely to attract local voters. Whilst canvassing can be an effective method the efforts can be hampered by the fact it requires a great deal of resources in order for it to be wholly effective. One example where a lack of resources hampered a grassroots campaign was from the Labour party in 2015 whereby they attempted to spread themselves too thin and did not target resources properly in 'unsafe' seats. This led Labour to lose a number of seats in areas such as Glasgow as they often bussed people around to campaign in areas they knew nothing about and such lost voters. Indeed whilst Labour spread resources, too thin the area where they put most resources, Ilford North, actually swung to vote Labour. As such, grassroots campaigns can work this clear indicator if resources are targeted correctly. In contrast to Labour was the Conservative party who targeted the limited resources in areas they thought they could win. This meant that in areas where they needed the most votes more was being done to gain them. This proved successful with the Tories going from a coalition to majority government with much of this being attributed to them being able to take seats of other parties, mainly the Lib Dems. The Conservatives were, unlike Labour, able to put high-level figures in select areas in order to impress the public with this strategy appearing to prove very effective as they did, as mentioned, gain a majority . Canvassing can have a number of drawbacks with resources being one as well as this people can often become abusive to those out campaigning which leads to less volunteers, this, of course, means that the effectiveness of such methods is deduced. As well as this it can only really take place during the day as people can become frustrated if they are interrupted during dinner etc and this is often when new methods, such as online , prove more effective as they can be 24/7 operations. Canvassing can be seen as an effective grassroots method of gaining voters as it allows parties to truly understand and discuss local needs but with it demanding mass amounts of resources it can be very hard for even the largest political parties to conduct, meaning the extent to which it is effective can be reduced. In regards to Labour this can, perhaps, be seen to show a negative impact that it can have on electoral performance.

The media can be seen to play a large role in grassroots campaigns efectinvess on electoral performance. Newspapers have typically been associated with being able to encourage the electorate to vote for a particular party. Much of this is due to the fact they are much less regulated than TV and as such are able to be clearly bias towards some political parties whilst discrediting others. A core example of this is the Sun who backed Tony Blair in the 1997 election. Labour featured mainly positively in the paper whilst the Tories had negative stories printed about them which, of course, the electorate would see and reduce their faith in them. With readership of newspapers falling rapidly over the past decade it can be argued that whilst the still have influence it is certainly diminished compared to the 'hay day'. It can also be argued, however, that newspapers only played a small part in shaping voting intentions as it has been that the Sun predicts the winner and backs them, e.g. switching to Conservative support in 2010 from Labour, and as such this could suggest that the overall effect of this grassroots methods is limited in having an impact on electoral performance. Older people are still more likely to read newspapers and with them being those most likely to vote it could be said that this can be a more effective way of targeting this group than new technology which older people are less likely to use. As well as newspapers TV forms part of the old grassroots campaigns with party political broadcasts having to be shown on TV. Whilst these brodcasts still form party of the campaign debates are seen as much more relevant due to the fact they provide a platform for leaders to show their true style and grill one another. Indeed Nicola Sturgeon in particular was thought to perform very well at debates and it can be said this attributed to the SNP winning the 2015 GE as people in both Scotland and the rest of the UK thought she performed well. This shows that old campaign methods, such as TV, can be adapted to make them feature more prominently in campaigns, as people would likely take little notice of political broadcasts and just use it to make tea etc whilst waiting for a show to come on. With older people more likely to read a newspaper and watch live TV than younger generations it can be an effective way for parties to effectively impact on voters and improve electoral performance. Of course these can also have a negative impact on electoral performance with much of Ed Milibands downfall also being partly blamed with his poor performance during the leadership debates.

New technology strategies can be seen to be forming a much greater part in political campaigns in the UK. Over the past 5 years, the UK has seen a boom in the amount of social media users with more and more people online. This has been realised by political parties with a much greater focus now going to apps such as Twitter and Facebook. Indeed the 2015 General Election was deemed as being a 'digital' one due to the fact political parties put such great emphasis on targeting voters online. The SNP in particular was very active online with them posting 'mini-manifestos' on Twitter so people could see what policies they would implement if they won without having to go through a whole manifesto. This was clearly an effective way for the SNP to encourage voters as they gained 50 seats and decimated Labour in Scotland so in that sense new technology had a greatly positive impact on their electoral performance. The reach of social-media is far greater than the likes of canvassing as it can be done 24/7 and shared to millions of people at the same time. With over 98% of under 35s having some form of social media it can be a great way for political parties to encourage younger voters to vote for them.

Nicola Sturgeon alone has a following of just under 1 million people meaning that her reach is huge thus the SNP 'message' is reaching much more people than if they were to canvass, for example.

One of the drawbacks of new technology, however, is that older people are less likely to use social media and it is well know they are most likely to vote. This means that political parties may be losing key-voters who may be more used to traditional means such as canvassing. Nevertheless as more and more people become digital it is likely we will see a greater increase in the use of technology as it allows for much greater personalisation and targeting than other methods. Indeed the SNP operated the 'activate' app improving electrical performance for parties which collects information about peoples varying characteristics and targets suitable SNP polices to them. This not only gives the SNP a greater reach it also makes people more likely to vote for them as they seen a policy that resonates with them and as has been mentioned with rational-choice becoming more prominent people want policies that suit them and the use of applications such as Activate is a clear way of improving electoral performance for parties. As well as Activate the SNP also integrated Nationbuilder into their campaign with this allowing for the likes of Twitter and Facebook to be linked with the SNP.org website and target people based on their profiles. This shows the smart of new technology as it allows people to constantly see the SNP message online whereas a typical grassroots method may involve speaking to someone once and forgetting about it. This consistent online targeting can be seen as a key to electoral success and means the message is seen by more people. It is clear then that new technology can be a very effective way to let the messages of parties be seen and encourage more people to vote for theme and as such it can have a positive impact on electoral performance due to the great reach it provides. Of course new technology can also have a negative impact on electoral performance as people can put up fake posts which might deter voters for varying reasons.

Overall it is clear that grassroots campaigns can have a positive impact on electoral performance however this is very much dependent on the resources that parties can implement. As well as this it would be wrong to say that it has a 'much greater' electoral performance impact than new technology as all evidence points to the fact that this is growing. To conclude it can be said that both new technology and traditional grassroots campaigns can impact on electoral performance both positively and negatively but with more and more people moving to online sources it is likely this will be a much greater feature in political campaigns in the future.

Candidate 4 evidence

3(a) Voting behaviour is very important to parties when trying to findout the outcome of an election. They spend alot of money on analysing voting behaviour. Voting behaviour however is categories into various models such as the sociological model, party ID, rational choice and Dominant ideology. This essay will look at all models and come to the conclusion that rational choice will soon become the most important however

the sociological model remains the most popular today.

The sociological model of voting behaviour looks at long term factors such as social class, income, gender and age. This has been seen as the most important factor traditionally however this has began to become affected by class dealignment which has resulted in many taking a more individualist approach when voting. The sociological model is still prominent. For example, the labour party still remains the most popular among the

working class and Conservative the more popular among the middle and upper classes. This shows that social class still affects the way people vote. A survey in 2015 showed that around 40% of people still voted with regards to their social class. Although this percent has began to reduce recently it is still very important today in looking at voting behaviour. Geographical location also plays a part in how people vote. For example, the 2015 general election showed the differences in geographical location as SNP dominated the ~~Scottish~~

Scotland in terms of votes. Also although the differences in the way men and women vote are not significant they do still exist. For example in the 2015 general election 30% of men voted Labour compared to 33% of women. A more significant factor affecting voting behaviour under the sociological model is ethnicity. For example, in the 2015 general election 23% of non white voters voted for the Conservatives compared to 65% who voted Labour. This shows that the sociological model shows clear disparities between

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	~~are~~ long term factors of individuals and how that affects the way they vote. However it can be argued that long term factors of individuals affects their rational choice so the two ideologies should be looked at in relation to each other.	
	The rational choice model takes the view that individuals make informed decisions on what is best for them. It views people as consumers in which they will weigh up the pros and cons of each party and pick the one that suits their own self interests. The	

economy has recently been named the most important things to the public. For example the failure of the Scottish 'Yes' campaign has been blamed on the failure to win the economic debate. This shows that people are thinking about how things will affect themselves before voting. ~~Party~~ Class dealignment has resulted in people changing social class and therefore political party. Party leaders have become increasingly popular in the rational choice model as people now want a party leader who is

relatable and seen as
reliable and able. For
example, Margaret Thatcher
was able to gain a large
following as she was seen
as a strong individual
who would be able to
meet demands and get
things through parliament.
However a party leader
can also lead to the party
losing votes. Some people
dislike leaders as see them
as untrustworthy and
not fitting with the parties
views. For example, Jeremy
Corbyn leader of the labour
party is not a fan of the
EU however the labour

party are pro remain.
This had led to people
dowting the labour partys
ability to show their ideas
on the issue as the leader
is not on the same page.
Overally the radical choice
model is becomming increasinly
popular and will be seen as
the most popular in the
next couple of years.

The party ID model takes the
veiw that a personal
will vote for the same party
that their families did.
This means that regardless
of what the parties campaign
was they will vote the same

party regardless, a party loyalist this is also known as. Political parties want this type of voter as it's a guaranteed vote in an election. It can be argued that this model is extremely outdated as people have started to be more open to moving party in order to do what is best for themselves.

Another model that is looked at when looking at how a person will vote is the Dominant ideology. This is a more radical view of voting behaviour and some view it as more of a conspiracy theory. This is the

idea that TV, newspapers
and the media can all
manipulate the public into
voting a certain way. For
example, the Sun newspaper
favours the Conservative
party and often criticise
labour decisions. This
shows that the news can
be swayed to show parties in
a certain light. This is not
a popular model as people
dont like to believe that
they can be manipulated.
The facts would favour this
however as Conservative
are very successful in elections.
As newspapers are usually
privately owned also this

is not an outrageous
conclusion to come to as
much of ~~their~~ Conservatives
policies would favour them.
However it can be argued
that newspaper companies
such as the Sun are making
a rational choice as to
what is most beneficial
to them this shows all
the models interlink.

In conclusion, although the
rational choice model is
becomming increasingly
popular as a result of
class dealignments affect
on society the sociological
model is still the most

relevant in explaining voting behaviour in the UK today. After elections there are clear comparisons to be made between social class or ethnicity and voting. Also it is very hard to be able to document the rational choice model as it is done by the individual therefore the sociological model will continue to be the most commonly refered to. Political parties do not like the idea of the rational choice model as it is the most unpredictable and therefore they cannot determine the outcome of

a vote. Therefore, overall, the sociological model is the most relevant today although this is starting to become affected by class dealignment, making the class too rational choice model increasingly popular.

Candidate 5 evidence

10(a) Power is the ability to make others do something that they might not otherwise do — which could very well be against their own interests — through the use of coercion of threats, sanctions, rewards and manipulation. Power clearly exists wherever there are social relationships. There are different definitions of power. Max Weber outlined that there was a fixed amount of power in any society and those who held power could use it to further their own interests. Power can therefore be described as a 'zero-sum' game as in order for an individual/group to hold power, another individual/groups must not hold any power. Another view of power is held by 'pluralists' who would argue that power is distributed throughout society with different groups holding the ability to use and influence how power is used and thus would point to examples such as the introduction of the national minimum wage under New Labour as a consensus/compromise between British industry and of course Trade Unions. However, Marxists would argue that the power in

society is held by a 'ruling elite' and the ruling elite will use, the power that they have to further their own interests as they would contend that the previous example was merely a means to keep the 'workers' content and that the power in society continues to be held by them.

Steven Lukes, in 'Power: A radical view' outlines the existence of three faces of power both closed and hidden. The first face of power is 'decision making' which is the power that people who make decisions hold such as MPs and other elected officials as they have the power to introduce bills to parliament, debate, and vote on the proposals before passing them into law, of which citizens will have to follow. This face of power could be described as an 'open' face of power since ordinary citizens can clearly identify who is using decision making power, how they are using it and when it is being used since MP's voting records are easily accessible online. In addition to this, this face of power could also be described as an

more 'democratic' face as ordinary citizens hold the control of the power

Power to remove it from any elected official who either misuses it or abuses it, does by voting in elections. For Example, the smoking Ban in 2006 banned smoking in public areas in Scotland as a result of the MSPs discussing the proposed bill and cigarette companies, as well as healthcare professionals, were able to give evidence and lobby the MPs to influence how this type of power was used and thus was a 'transparent' use of power.

The second face of power identified by Lukes was the non-decision making face which is the power to prevent, certain decisions from being made or particular policies from being discussed. Power is therefore not just about imposing decisions/actions over people, but about setting the political agenda itself, by influencing the option being considered in our decision. For Example, prime minister Theresa May holds the non-decision making power of

Chairing cabinet meetings and thus ultimately setting the cabinet's agenda. Theresa May decided to remove the proposal of a 2nd EU referendum from cabinets discussion, resulting in the resignation of Jo Johnson from the cabinet, who was an advocate for a 2nd EU referendum. Thus, this face of power is not democratic as it essentially involves silencing the views of opposing people to those who hold power and hence suggests that this face of power links to the Marxist definition of power that ultimately the ruling elite will seek to silence views which don't conspire with their political agenda. This face of power could also be described as being a 'closed' face of power as it is performed 'behind closed doors' and can be very difficult for ordinary citizens to determine when it has been deployed as they will only know what matters have been allowed to be discussed by those who held power.

The third face of power advocated by Steven Lukies is 'Shaping desires' which is the power to manipulate the wishes and desires of social groups to accept, or even to desire - particular outcomes /or decisions which will be harmful to them, but align to the wishes of those exercising this type of power. This face of power could be described as closed - or even 'insidious', as it clearly gives the illusion that social groups with a particular outcome, ie. they support it, with very little indication (during the time power is being used) that they have Also had their desires shaped. - Thus, is very difficult to identify exactly when this power is being used. For Example, Former Prime Minister Tony Blair was accused by many of effectively 'Shaping' the desires of Both MPs and public opinion through the false evidence of Iraq, under Saddam Hussein, gaining weapons of mass destruction and thus tried to gain MPs support for military action, eventhough it was against their better judgement.