

Cassies 2007 Cases

Brand/Case: Wonder Bread – Wonder +

**Winner: Packaged Goods Food—Bronze
Best Launch: Bronze**

Client Credits: Weston Bakeries Limited

Craig Hutchison, Vice President Marketing & Sales
Sheryl Johnson, Senior Director of Marketing
Zaki Jaffer, Brand Manager
Julian Franklin, Marketing Communications Manager

Agency Credits: Round Table Advertising

Sallah Cayer, Partner
Brent Peterson, Creative Director
Julie Cha, Art Director
Doug Ramsey, Account Manager
Angela Carroll, Broadcast Producer
PHD Canada, Media
SV&M, Promotions

Crossover Notes: All winning cases contain lessons that cross over from one case to another. David Rutherford has been identifying these as Crossover Notes since Cassies 1997. The full set for Cassies 2007 can be downloaded from the Case Library section at www.cassies.ca

- Crossover Note 1. What a Brand Stands For.
- Crossover Note 2. Brand Truths.
- Crossover Note 6. Should the product be improved?
- Crossover Note 7. Fighting for the Same High Ground.
- Crossover Note 9. Turnarounds.
- Crossover Note 19. Great Minds Think Alike.

To see creative, go to the Case Library Index and click on the additional links beside the case.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Business Results Period (Consecutive Months): Jan 2006 – Jun 2007 (68 weeks post launch)
Start of Advertising/Communication Effort: w/o Jan 9, 2006
Base Period for Comparison: Aug 2004 – Dec 2005 (68 weeks pre launch)

This is a case about the dramatic evolution of Wonder bread in Canada and demonstrates the continued strength of a powerful idea. The case won a Silver in ‘Off to a Good Start’ in 2006, based on results for January 2006 to June 2006. Since that time, Wonder + has continued to grow, and the total Wonder franchise has been turned around.

It takes years to build a brand with a strong equity and hard work to maintain its unique status in the minds and hearts of consumers. Sometimes factors in the marketplace work against your efforts. White bread and Wonder bread were facing just such a situation - with consumers moving away due to the “anti-white bread” Atkins diet, and the availability of many ‘healthier’ bread options. The owner of the Wonder brand in the US went into bankruptcy, and the relevance of the Wonder brand in Canada was in question.

However, to Weston Bakeries, Wonder bread was their largest brand in sales, and it represented the face of the Canadian company. It drove the spirit and motivation of the employees; it was the lead brand to the trade; and a driving force to shareholders. In many ways, it was the heart of the company.

While consumers still knew and loved Wonder, the tasty ‘squishy’ white bread, they were starting to question what was in it and whether it should be in their pantry. And some were walking away altogether. Quick action was needed.

We will show that an innovative marketing and advertising plan, including a product improvement, brought fresh life to an ailing brand. **Crossover Note 6.** Through the introduction of Wonder + bread as a line extension, we have grown the Wonder bread business, and the Total Wonder Franchise—and we have improved the Wonder nutrition credentials.

We will show how a modest, but competitive investment in advertising spending drove sales of Wonder and Wonder + to record share levels and grew the Total Wonder brand franchise in excess of \$36 million in 18 months – a 20% increase for the company’s largest brand. The marketing support for the first year was paid back in 4 months versus the 2-year payback that was budgeted.

SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) Overall Assessment

The white bread category had been eroding for years as consumers turned to healthier bread options. In 2004, the Atkins ‘carb craze’ hit the streets with overwhelming press about the negative effect of carbohydrates, and white bread frequently cited as a key culprit.

b) Resulting Business Objectives

The objective was +5% unit growth annually for Wonder bread sales – a significant improvement over the 10% decline in the previous year. **Crossover Note 9**. We were also anticipating +10% in dollar sales given the 10 – 20 cent premium price of the new product.

We were expecting the launch of Wonder + to provide a halo effect on the Wonder base white business, as well as the entire Wonder franchise by improving nutrition credentials. And we were hoping to set the stage for additional Wonder + products to further grow share.

Longer-term, we wanted to impact the overall category and see the Weston dominated white bread segment return to some normalcy.

c) Budget Range/Share of Voice

The media budget for Wonder + for 2006 was relatively modest - \$1.5MM National excluding Quebec (Wonder is not marketed in Quebec) spent in January to April. This resulted in a 10% share of voice for Wonder + versus Dempster's at 20%. Competitive spending numbers are not available yet for 2007; however the Wonder + levels have increased in 2007 to support the Wonder + line extensions.

STRATEGY & INSIGHT

a) Analysis and Insight

The target for our efforts was two distinct groups and in each case the mindset was quite different. Through research both qualitative and quantitative we learned:

1. **Existing Wonder and White Bread Loyal Users** – they loved white bread and would not sacrifice taste and texture at any cost. They were open to a healthier white bread, but did not believe it was possible without a compromise in taste.
2. **Eroding or Eroded Wonder and White Bread Users** – they knew and loved the taste and texture of Wonder, but were becoming increasingly concerned about its nutritional value. Nutrition was a growing motivator for them.

Due to the massive size of the brand, Wonder could not sacrifice the first group in order to attract the second.

b) Business Strategy

As noted, and in order to not alienate loyal users, we decided to launch Wonder + as a line extension. We would also reduce cannibalization of the base business, and offset the increased product cost, through a 10-20 cent retail premium price.

Due to the early success of Wonder + bread, we added to the franchise later in 2006 and in 2007 by re-positioning hamburger/hot dogs buns, whole wheat bread and English muffins under the Wonder + name, and by introducing tortillas and square bagels.

c) Communication Strategy

The ‘same great taste’ message would be critical to both audiences. We would also need to balance taste and nutrition, and summarized this as *yell taste, tell nutrition*.

We learned that information on nutrition needed to be simple and manageable. **Crossover Note 19.** (See also the Chocolate Milk case.) Too much detail and we would risk nutrition overload, which would then impact on the credibility of the taste proposition.

We simply needed to say “same great taste, now with the goodness of whole wheat” in a way that rejuvenated our Wonder message – leveraging our unique kids heritage and the cherished Wonder character. That would ensure Wonder would get the benefit for the advertising as measured in brand link.

CREATIVE EXECUTION

Our challenge was to come up with a simple idea that would deliver the proposition “same great taste, now with the goodness of whole wheat.” We did this by using identical twins to replicate the Wonder base brand and the new Wonder + line extension. You couldn’t tell the twins apart...you couldn’t tell the breads apart. A clear product demo with our key user group – kids – as the experts.

We shot the commercials to capture the genuine nature of the twins’ discovery. We tightly guided them, but they helped write the scripts with their spontaneous innocence. We were looking for them to provide the childhood moments so “uniquely kids” and uniquely Wonder. Through a great director and creative editing we ended up with pure enjoyment. You are captured by the kids, but in doing so they walk you through a rational product message, clearly linked to only Wonder.

We integrated the creative idea throughout all communication, always very tight to the proposition – **identical taste + whole wheat goodness.**



TWINS :30




Music throughout



VO: Can experts taste the difference between...



...their favourite Wonder bread...



...and a whole new kind of Wonder?



"Don't put your nose on it..."



"I don't know - it looks the same."



VO: Introducing big news from Wonder ...Wonder Plus.



The famous taste of Wonder white bread with the goodness of whole wheat




Conclusion: the taste is identical.



New Wonder Plus. Identical taste plus the goodness of whole wheat.



Online Banners



Truck Advertising



In Store POS



Competitive Response

As expected, Dempster's was very quick to copy, launching Dempster's SMART only four weeks later – the SMART product is a white bread with the nutritional benefits of whole grains. [Crossover Note 7](#).

Dempster's supported the launch with a ramped up Marketing and Communication program which challenged Wonder's share of voice.

However, we had learned in research that whole wheat was enough of a stretch for white bread users. Whole grain was even further away (due to the gritty nature of current whole grain breads) from their ideal white bread. And, as we will see later, this hampered their success.

MEDIA EXECUTION

2006 Support:

- Television using :30 second and :15 second creative “Twins 1,” w/o Jan. 9 to w/o April 3, 10 weeks in total with a combination of conventional and specialty TV; 795 to 1455 GRPs by region.
- Full page magazine ad.
- Toronto Star ads following the Canadian Election. Not only did adults vote, but so did kids for Wonder +.
- In Store – Challenge. AN online way for kids to vote on the identical taste of new Wonder +.
- Online Banners on magazine partner web sites.
- Truck advertising on Weston trucks.


2007 Support:

- Television using :30 second and :15 second creative “Twins 2,” :30 second bagel launch creative “Kids at Work,” w/o Jan. 1 to w/o April 23, 15 weeks in total with a combination of conventional and specialty TV; 1,800 – 2500 GRPs by region; a layer of ethnic advertising was added with adapted commercials and POS in Hindi, Cantonese and Mandarin.
- Full page magazine ad for Wonder + Square Bagels.
- In store support.
- Truck advertising on Weston trucks.

BUSINESS RESULTS

The business results far surpassed objectives. For Wonder Bread we increased shipments by \$26 million dollars, a 16% increase as indicated in Chart A.


**Chart A. Wonder Bread: Jan 06 – June 07 versus Base
Results: \$164 Million to \$190 Million – a \$26 Million Dollar Increase**



* Wonder WW = Wonder Whole Wheat.

The larger Total Wonder Franchise also grew substantially, showing an increase in shipments of \$36 million dollars—a 20% increase as indicated in Chart B. (Remember this is a low interest category and the bread was at a 10 – 20 cent premium price.) The success of Wonder + has contributed to improved earnings growth for George Weston Foods as described in the 06 Annual Report.

Chart B. Total Wonder Franchise: Jan 06 – June 07 versus Base
Results: \$184 Million to \$220 Million or a \$36 Million Dollar Increase



The ACNielsen market share results were outstanding. Results to June 07 not only showed significant gains for Wonder bread, but the support program has benefited the entire Wonder franchise as set out in the objectives.

Wonder English Canada \$ Share – ACNielsen Retail Market Dollars


	Jan. 06 – June 07 vs Base (Aug. 04 – Dec. 05) 68 weeks each
Total White Bread	27.2% Market Share -0.13 Share Pt Change
Total Wonder Bread	12.1% Market Share +1.41 Share Pt Change or +13% growth vs base
Total Wonder Bakery	17% Market Share +1.54 Share Pt Change or +10% growth vs base

* Wonder + bagels, tortillas, English muffins, hamburger/hotdog buns were launched in the last 2 months.

The increased Marketing support in 2006 was paid back in 4 months versus the financial 2 year payback that was budgeted.

Competitive Results

While the Dempster's Smart launch was an attempt to trump the Wonder + launch, the chart below from ACNielsen will support their short comings in meeting that objective:



Grand Prix Prestigious Award – Consumer Acceptance Award

This award was won by Wonder + in 2007 and is given to the new product that has achieved the highest average score across all product categories (food and non-food, branded and private label) in the overall consumer value category as measured by Nielsen Homescan. It is a coveted award as it measures real consumer behaviour – penetration, trial and repurchase rate of a product in consumer households – the true test of loyalty.

Revitalizing the Category


Not only did Wonder help turn around the sales of the brand, improve key attributes and generate increased margin for our customers – by trading consumers investment from lower priced Private Label white bread to Wonder Plus at a +70 cent increase – we accomplished our goal of revitalizing the white bread category. Through June 07 the white bread category according to ACNielsen is up +4.9% in dollars with Wonder + driving this growth. If you look at the white bread market excluding Wonder +, the white bread category is actually -7.8% in dollars. That's been the + in Wonder +!

CAUSE AND EFFECT BETWEEN ADVERTISING AND RESULTS


2006 Tracking Results – “Twins 1”

Very early into the campaign we knew we had a winning creative concept – we delivered a very single-minded and clear message in a very impactful and motivating manner.

We conducted a benchmark IPSOS/ASI wave and a follow up wave in Ontario after only 990 GRP’s and 5 weeks of support. We had above average ad awareness and proven recall numbers that increased significantly from the benchmark – higher than one would expect for ads receiving similar weight – 34 versus 27.



The true strength of the campaign was brand link, with the total Wonder franchise receiving very high levels of brand credit for the ads – 45% versus Ipsos/ASI norm of 40% - with 39% identifying it as Wonder +. The clarity of the message and use of our kid’s equity delivered the results.



Overall message communication increased significantly during the campaign and respondents were internalizing the messaging with dramatic improvements in core white bread/Wonder attributes of health, taste, quality and kids like it. All ad diagnostic measures have either met norms or exceeded norms. In terms of the key message of “white bread made with the goodness of whole wheat.” key consumer measures included:


Wonder +

	Benchmark	Wonder Plus Campaign
	Jan 2-9 %	Jan 10-Feb 26 %
Aided Brand Awareness		
Ever Tried	34	↗ 48
Base (UW): <u>Total Sample</u>	(457)	(277)
Future Purchase Intent		
Top 2 box Score – (<u>Aware of the brand</u>)	23	↗ 35
Base (UW): Total Sample	(157)	(133)
Top 2 box Score – (<u>Tried the brand</u>)	12	↗ 49
Base (UW): Total Sample	(101)	(57*)

Wonder Base – positive effect on overall franchise as well

	Benchmark	Wonder Plus Campaign
	Jan 2-9 %	Jan 10-Feb 26 %
Top-of-mind awareness	23	↗ 29
Total unaided awareness (Share of mind)	53	↗ 62
Aided awareness	97	99
Past 4 week brand usage	45	51
Base (UW): <u>Total Sample</u>	(457)	(158)
Future purchase intent		
Definitely/probably will buy	49	54
Base (UW): <u>Aware of Brand</u>	(445)	(157)

2007 Tracking Results – “Twins 2”




Lastly

Would these types of positive results have been achieved by the sheer nature of an innovative product like Wonder + or can we prove that it was not just the product alone?

1. We ran significantly higher GRP weight levels in the Ontario market in 2006 versus the West - double the weight levels. We were able to reverse the declines in the West leaving shipments flat versus same period January to June year ago. However in Ontario where we ran double the GRPs, we have seen significant volume gains. A good indication that the advertising did indeed add value to the equation.
2. We launched Wonder + Square Bagels in October of 2006 with advertising support only starting in January. Sales were so much stronger than objectives as a result of the advertising we had to pull the bagel ad off the air on February 14. From the chart below you can see the effect of the advertising support. As a result of the successful advertising campaign. Weston is currently searching for additional production capacity.

Wonder Plus Square Bagels – Weekly Shipments
Ad started Jan. 1 and was pulled off the air Feb. 14 due to capacity issues



We started out to turn around a tarnished brand – Wonder – and what we ended up with was so much more. Wonder + is now a strategic platform for growth that is clearly differentiated versus competition. We have turned the nutritional negatives of the brand around into a great halo effect with the culmination of Wonder + being the official supplier to the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Winter Games.

Go Canada Go, Go Wonder + Go!

INTRODUCTION TO CROSSOVER NOTES — CASSIES 2007

[For Wonder Bread]

Each year I update these Crossover Notes. If you've read this cover note before, you can skip it. If not, it's worth a quick read.

My career started with a seven year sentence in brand management at Procter & Gamble. Then I clambered up the ladder at O&M, becoming President and later Vice Chairman, all of this in Toronto. Then I set up as a consultant.

P&G and O&M were passionate about "lessons learned" from advertising effort, and so was I. All the Cassies cases have great lessons in them, though at the pace we work today these lessons are not necessarily easy to find.

I was thinking about this as I was editing Cassies 1997, and I had the idea for Crossover Notes. They started as bite-sized footnotes pointing out lessons that "cross over" from one case to another. Then, as time had gone by, they've evolved to what we have today.

You can use Crossover Notes in two ways. Although they weren't designed as a crash course in advertising, they are worth reading as a whole. You can also dip into them selectively. The headings on the next page will help you choose.

I've tried to be even-handed on controversial issues, but here and there you will sense my point of view. For this I thank the Cassies for not editing their Editor.

We now have close to 200 published cases. And I hope I've helped pass some of the learning on.

David Rutherford

Toronto: January 2008.

For more on brand-building see *Excellence in Brand Communication*—by leading Canadians from across the marketing and advertising spectrum. See also *Vulcans. Earthlings and Marketing ROI*, commissioned by the ICA, and published by Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

See www.ica.adbeast.com.

INDEX OF CROSSOVER NOTES FOR CASSIES 2007

All Cases	Wonder Bread
1. What a Brand Stands For.	✓
2. Brand Truths.	✓
3. Core Equity versus Price & Promotion.	
4. Business Strategy dictated by the Brand Positioning.	
5. The Total Brand Experience.	
6. Should the product be improved?	✓
7. Fighting for the Same High Ground.	✓
8. Classic Rivalries.	
9. Turnarounds.	✓
10. Conventional Wisdom—should it be challenged?	
11. The Eureka Insight.	
12. Changing the Goalposts.	
13. Immediate vs. Long-Term Effect.	
14. Refreshing a continuing campaign.	
15. Baby with the Bathwater.	
16. When a campaign stumbles.	
17. Turning a liability into a strength.	
18. Keeping it Simple.	
19. Great minds think alike.	✓
20. Emotional versus Rational.	
21. Likeability.	
22. Humour in a Serious Category.	
23. Problem versus Solution.	
24. Tough Topics.	
25. Brand Linkage (when should the brand name appear).	
26. Awareness Alone.	
27. Share of Mind, Share of Voice, Spending.	
28. Media Learning.	
29. Pre-emptive Media.	
30. Reach and Frequency versus Large-Space Impact.	
31. Transcending Advertising.	
32. Internal Marketing.	
33. Changing the Target Audience.	
34. Longer and Broader Effects, and A Closing Thought.	

The Notes for this case are marked ✓ and come next.

Note: Cassies uses “advertising” in its broad sense. It not only stands for advertising through the main media of broadcast, print, out of home etc. Where appropriate, it also stands for Direct Marketing, PR, Interactive Marketing, Buzz Marketing, Event Marketing, Product Placement etc.

WONDER BREAD CROSSOVER NOTES FOR CASSIES 2007

1. **What a Brand Stands For.** People in real life hardly give the deeper meaning of brands a second thought. They know that some appeal more than others. They may have a sense that brands jostle for their attention. But that's about it. They certainly don't agonize over the *essence* of this, or the *brand truth* of that.

That said, branding goes deeper than we in marketing may realize. Before marketing was even thought of, branding was part of life. Everything from national flags, to coinage, to the uniforms of soldiers, boy scouts and Supreme Court judges, to the plumage on peacocks (human and otherwise), is a form of branding. Business had an early example in the 1800s when Harley Procter of P&G heard a pastor quote a biblical text about ivory palaces. Goodbye Procter & Gamble White Soap. Hello Ivory. More recently, Tom Peters published *A Brand Called You*. And Tony Blair tried to re-brand the UK as "Cool Britannia."

A brand, in the fullest sense, is hard to define. Dictionary definitions tend to focus on the trademark aspect, and yes, branding does involve some sort of identifying mark. But this misses the point. What makes a brand valuable?

*The answer is The Advantage of Belief.*¹ Charles Revson of Revlon famously said, "In the factory we make cosmetics. In the store we sell hope." In other words, a brand is not a product; it's what people *believe* about a product. These beliefs can be immensely powerful. The most astonishing is the placebo effect. In clinical trials, many patients respond to the "sugar pill," even when they have serious diseases. We see the same thing with blind and identified product tests. With a strong brand, the preference jumps. (See *What's in a Name* by John Philip Jones.) And when the Advantage of Belief takes hold, it leads to a long list of benefits:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| a) Customer loyalty | e) Facilitating brand extensions |
| b) Higher price | f) Withstanding competitive attack |
| c) Higher cash flows | g) Motivating staff and attracting new talent |
| d) Higher long-term profitability | h) Potentially augmenting the stock price |

This doesn't, of course, answer the question, "how do you build these beliefs?" There are widely varying notions, but most people agree on the basic principles: (1) stake out what the brand can and should stand for (2) stick with this over time (3) evolve to account for lessons learned and market changes.²

This can't be done by empty promises. We have to assess what consumers want against what the product delivers—and tell the story better than competitors do. We have a melting pot of perceptions and reality to work with. All the "brand" ideas are there to help—Brand Image, Equity, Personality, Character, Essence, Relationship, Footprint, Truth, Soul, Identity, and so on—along with old faithfuls like Positioning, Focus of Sale, USP, Features, Attributes, Benefits and Values. Whatever the terminology, though, the brand has to stand for something relevant and different in the consumer's mind. See also *Crossover Note 26*.

¹ This is a phrase of mine, though the idea that a brand is "more" has been described by many authors.

² How do you do this? See *Excellence in Brand Communication*: www.ica.adbeast.com

- 2. Brand Truths.** Successful advertising (in fact all successful communication) resonates with its audience. As a marketer, you may want people to believe that you have the best-tasting coffee, but simply saying, “I have the best-tasting coffee” will not usually get the resonance you need. One school of thought believes in saying the obvious as loudly and even as crassly as you can. We could call it the Bad Boy syndrome. Another has led to the idea of Brand Truths. These operate on a deeper level than simple claims. One of the top UK agencies described the process as “we interrogate the product until it confesses its strength.”

I was once the Brand Manager on Tide, and when we were asked, “What does Tide stand for” we said, “Superior cleaning. Not whitening. Not Brightening. Not Fabric Care. Superior *cleaning*.”³

Superior cleaning was the religion on Tide, and Tide delivered, despite the cliché that all detergents are alike. But this was only a glimmer of the Brand Truth. If you “interrogated” Tide the most startling truth was the *intense belief* of Tide users. This came to life in the immensely successful “Two for One Swap” campaign. Hidden cameras watched as women who had just bought Tide were offered two boxes of another good detergent in exchange. They adamantly refused, delivering off-the-cuff endorsements that no copywriter could ever have written. The campaign ran for years, and only came to an end because of its success—women knew it so well that the “candid camera” interview became impossible. Many Brand Truths are also insights, and for a list see [11. The Eureka Insight](#) and [12. Changing the Goalposts](#).

- 6. Should the product be improved?** Some years ago it was an axiom that your product, functionally, had to have an advantage over competitors. In packaged goods, it was considered foolish to launch a new brand unless it was a blind test winner over its major competitor—ideally overall, and at least for a desirable benefit.⁴

That thinking has shifted, and it’s commonly said today that it’s impossible to sustain a functional advantage for very long; that competition can match you in a matter of weeks or months—or even days with some technological products.

This has had a paradoxical effect. Some people are almost frenzied in their desire to keep their product (or service) improving, fearing that if they don’t, they will be left behind. Others go into a slipstream mode—letting others tackle the headwinds, then matching what they do.

John Philip Jones (the Professor of Communication at Syracuse University) is vocal in saying that we do *not* live in a parity world—that imitators may try to match the innovators, but they often don’t quite succeed. His view (and I share it) is that it is dangerously complacent to assume that functional parity is the way of the world.

Another danger is the belief that “marketing” can compensate for a weak product. This led to the debacle a decade or two ago when North America systematically

³ P&G defined “what the brand stands for” by a document they called the Creative Strategy. In those days, if anyone dreamt that the Tide Creative Strategy should include whitening, brightening etc. it was seen as an offence against all that was holy. Since then, P&G has changed its views, and now takes a broader view—as recent Tide advertising for fabric care and Tide-with-Febreze attest.

⁴ There was always the “pre-emptive” possibility i.e. staking out a convincing claim for a parity benefit before anyone else did. But, in general, having a product edge was seen as important

under-invested in product. The Japanese, and later the Europeans and others, did exactly the opposite—and carved out the market shares we see today.

There's no question that the cost to upgrade can be daunting. Nevertheless, many cases reflect the investment. For example:

- Listerine in Quebec in Cassies II, with an improved taste.
- Chrysler with the NS Minivan, and Pontiac Sunfire in Cassies III.
- St Hubert in Cassies 99, upgrading their entire operation.
- Sunlight in Cassies 99, with improved cleaning.
- Home Furnace and Lipton Sidekicks in Cassies 2002.
- Irving Mainway Coffee, Source Yogurt, MINI and Motrin in Cassies 2003.
- VodKice in Cassies 2003, remodelling the Boomerang portfolio.
- Cirque du Soleil in Cassies 2004, by adding Zumanity to their portfolio.
- Kit Kat in Cassies 2004, keeping Original the same, but launching Chunky.
- Toyota Sienna in Cassies 2004, with multiple upgrades.
- Coricidin II in Cassies 2005. (Re-launching after the original brand had been withdrawn.)
- Penaten, Hubba Bubba, Stouffer's Bistro, & Juicy Fruit line extensions in Cassies 2005.
- Wonderbread and Trident in Cassies 2006.

Still others achieve their gains with no change—though the existing product is in all cases good, and sometimes better than the competition. These cases include:

- Crispy Crunch and Pepsi Quebec in Cassies I.
- Oh Henry! in Cassies II.
- Buckley's, Dove, and Philadelphia Cream Cheese in Cassies III.
- Eggs, becel, and Wonderbread in Cassies 99.
- Kraft Dinner and Lipton Chicken Noodle in Cassies 2001.
- Campbell's, Diet Pepsi, Listerine, and Pro•Line in Cassies 2002.
- All the major beer winners over the years.
- Aero, Dodge SX 2.0, Familiprix, Super 7, in Cassies 2003.
- Cottonelle and Milk in Cassies 2004.
- Crescendo, Jergens Ultra Care, Whiskas, Twix, Energizer Lithium, Moores, and Familiprix in Cassies 2005.
- Chocolate Milk, Gatorade, Listerine, Baileys in 2006.
- Brita in 2007.

Technology cases usually have improvements. Services usually improve as part of the "total brand experience." Some cases (e.g. Clearnet in 2001 and Lipton Sidekicks in Cassies 2002) say that if your functional advantage is going to be matched, you'd better develop an advantage through brand personality/character/equity.

- 7. Fighting for the Same High Ground.** Some people believe that a brand should not fight for high ground already held by a competitor. It comes out as "our positioning has to be unique." How can this be wrong? Consider Dove in Cassies III. Lever wanted to preempt the arrival of P&G's Oil of Olay bar from the US, and decided to kick-start Dove sales via new advertising. Dove had a spectacular, though unused, litmus demonstration. Dove is not a soap, and does not affect the colour of litmus paper. With soaps—including Ivory—the paper turns an ugly blue. But Dove had built its business on "Dove won't dry your skin the way soap can" and the litmus test was essentially a mildness demonstration. Worse, Ivory owned mildness. Heavy hitters in client/agency international management predicted disaster if Dove used the litmus test. But local management did it anyway. At the

start of the case, Dove and Ivory had the same dollar share. Four years later Dove's dollar sales were up 73%, and Ivory had dropped to half of Dove's dollar share.

And how do you decide whether to attack or not? On winnability. Yes, Ivory held the mildness position, but with "litmus" Dove had superb ammunition for attack.

The key is how you think about distinctiveness. It does *not* have to come from functional positioning. Consider Duracell and Energizer. Duracell was the first to stake out "lasts longer," and Energizer (afraid to attack the high ground) languished in other positioning territory for years. Eventually they decided to attack, and the Energizer Bunny has been going and going ever since. Both brands have the high ground positioning of "lasts longer". They get their distinctiveness from execution.

One last variation on this theme. Sunlight wanted to attack Tide on cleaning, but decided that a frontal assault would fail. They still attacked, re-defining "clean" as the joy of getting dirty. This brilliant insight helped them win the Grand Prix in Cassies 99.

I'm not saying you should always attack a competitor on the high ground. There are many Cassies successes based on side-stepping or re-defining the high ground. Cottonelle, Desjardins, Gaz Metro and Réno Dépôt did this in Cassies 2004. Cruisin' to Win, Crescendo, Whiskas, Twix, Moores and Lotto 6/49 did it in Cassies 2005. Even so, I think the high ground is still one of the first places you should look.

9. Turnarounds. There are a number of these in the Cassies:

Cassies I, II, II, 99

- Crispy Crunch. Molson Canadian.
- Pepsi. Quebec. Listerine. Quebec.
- Oh Hungry? Oh Henry. Dove. "Litmus."
- Molson Canadian. "I AM."
- Philadelphia Cream Cheese.
- becel. "Young at Heart" Eggs. Wonder Bread
- Sunlight. "Go Ahead. Get Dirty."

Cassies 2001 and 2002

- Kraft Dinner.
- Lipton Chicken Noodle
- BMO Quebec.
- Campbell's Soup. Listerine.
- CFL. Pro•Line.
- Easter Seals Relay.
- Sleeman Quebec.

Cassies 2003

- Aero. Bait Cars.
- Crown Diamond Paint.
- Dodge SX 2.0. Motrin.
- Pro•Line. Super 7.
- Université de Montréal.
- VodKice.

Cassies 2004

- Cottonelle.
- Gaz Metro.
- Kit Kat.
- Milk (Quebec and Prairies).
- Toyota Sienna.

Cassies 2005

- Crescendo.
- Energizer Lithium.
- Toyota Tacoma.
- Eggo French Toast Stix.
- Twix. Hubba Bubba. Juicy Fruit.
- Coricidin II.
- Moores and Harvey's.
- Quebec Lotto 6/49.
- Pepsi – Quebec and Quebec Milk.

Cassies 2006

- Gatorade. Eterna.
- Wonderbread
- Couche Tard
- Grolsch
- Rickard's
- Trident

19. Great minds think alike. Strong brands always differentiate themselves, but the underlying thinking does not necessarily have to be unique. In Cassies 2002, Diet Pepsi, Five Alive and toronto.com all came to similar conclusions about the young men i.e. they are media savvy, cynical about marketing, feel responsibility looming, and don't want to give up on the best and craziest parts of being young. Fido and Clearnet in earlier Cassies both identified a confused and intimidated public. The car cases in Cassies 2003 (Dodge SX 2.0, MINI, and Toyota Matrix) all had similar conclusions about the joy of driving. Butter in Cassies 2005 and Eggs in Cassies 99 uncovered similar ideas about "natural." Designer Depot and K&G stores in Cassies 2005 came to similar conclusions about the quality/price shopper. Twix, looking at 20-somethings, found attitudes similar to what Diet Pepsi and Five Alive had found. And Chocolate Milk and Wonder bread both came to the same conclusion about getting a nutrition message across — i.e. keep it simple. See also *7. Fighting for the Same High Ground.*