INTRODUCTION TO CROSSOVER NOTES — CASSIES 2011

[The Full Set]

Each year I update these Crossover Notes, and it's that time again. 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", 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 "crossed over" from one case to another. Then, as time has 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 (and they don't cover everything), you can read them as a whole. Or you can dip into them selectively, with the headings on the next page helping you choose your topic.

I've tried to be even-handed on the more 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 over 300 published cases. I hope I've helped pass some of the learning on.

David Rutherford

Toronto: January 2011.

These Notes make reference to three publications that are available via the ICA:

- Measuring and Leveraging Brand Equity:
  http://www.icacanada.ca/pdf/publications/MeasuringBrandEquity.pdf
- Excellence in Brand Communications:
  http://www.icacanada.ca/publications-list.cfm#pub14
- Vulcans, Earthlings and Marketing ROI:
  http://www.icacanada.ca/publications-list.cfm#pub27

INDEX OF CROSSOVER NOTES FOR CASSIES 2011

Notes:

1. CASSIES uses “advertising” in its broad sense. It not only stands for advertising through broadcast, print, out of home etc. Where appropriate, it also stands for Direct Marketing, PR, Interactive Marketing, Buzz, Event Marketing, Social Network Marketing etc.
2. Virtually all cases for CASSIES 2011 have a component of social marketing, and it would be repetitive to keep mentioning this. Two cases (Nissan SE-R and Tourism Montreal) warranted further discussion under Crossover Note 28.
3. Starting in 2008/9, the CASSIES show has fallen in January of the year following submission. Originally, we continued to identify cases by the “submission year,” but we are now identifying them by the “award year.” Hence, CASSIES 2011 refers to cases submitted in 2010.

CROSSOVER NOTES FOR CASSIES 2011

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. A few years ago, 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 example 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 markedly. (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
b) Higher price
c) Higher cash flows
d) Higher long-term profitability
e) Facilitating brand extensions
f) Withstanding competitive attack
g) Motivating staff and attracting new talent
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. All the "brand" ideas are there to help (and sometimes confuse) — 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. But whatever the terminology, a brand has to stand for some-thing relevant and different in the consumer's mind. See also *Crossover Note 26.*

[Note: As in previous years, virtually all of the winners talk to this point, and the next one.]

---

[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* referred to on the cover page.

2. **Brand Truths.** Suppose you want people to believe that you have the best-tasting coffee. Simply saying, "I have the best-tasting coffee" will probably not get the result you want because it will get lost in a sea of similar claims. One school of thought believes that the solution is to say the obvious as loudly and even as crassly as you can. We could call it the Bad Boy syndrome. Another involves Brand Truths. These operate on a deeper level than simple claims. One of the top UK agencies described the process of finding these truths as "we interrogate the product until it confesses its strength."

   I was once the Brand Manager on Tide, and it stood for superior cleaning."[3]

   At P&G, superior cleaning was a religion, and Tide delivered. But this was only a glimmer of a 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.*

3. **Core Equity versus Price & Promotion.** From a financial point of view, a brand is not an abstract notion. It has to make good money, and it has to be valuable if you ever want to sell it. This means that you have to make tough decisions when a brand is under price and promotion pressure. If you don't fight fire with fire, you lose business in the short term. But if you don't invest in brand-building, you're likely to lose more over the long term. The North American car market is a classic example.

   This is the choice between a "clear and present danger" and a "worse but less immediate one." We probably succumb more than we should to short-term pressures. Fido in CASSIES 99; Clearnet and KD in 2001; Nautilus and Sidekicks in 2002; Molson's Bubba, Dodge SX 2.0, Manitoba Telecom, MINI, Sola Nero and Toyota Matrix in 2003; Cottonelle, Réno Dépôt and Toyota Sienna in 2004; All Bran, K&G Stores, Energizer Lithium, Hubba Bubba, Moores, Stouffer's Bistro and Familiprix in 2005, Telus and Honda Quebec in 2007, Toyota Trucks in 2009; Lay's, MINI, Ikea Pax Wardrobes, Ford and Hyundai all talk to this issue in CASSIES 2010, and it appears again with Hyundai in CASSIES 2011. All of these cases emphasize brand value, rather than price and promotion.

   > Note: "Core Equity" or "Brand Equity" is a term with more than one meaning. One relates to the "bundle of meanings" in the audience's mind. The other is the equity in financial terms. This is a complicated area, and for more information contact the ICA about the publication *Measuring and Valuing Brand Equity,* and the book *Vulcans, Earthlings and Marketing ROI.* (See the Cover Page for links.)

[3] P&G defined "what the brand stands for" by a document they called the Creative Strategy. In those days, if anyone suggested 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 the recent "Tide Knows Fabrics Best" advertising attests.

4. **Business Strategy dictated by the Brand Positioning.** For some companies the concept of "the brand" goes further than guiding communication effort – it dictates the larger business strategy. Clearnet and i-wireless are examples in 2001. Family Channel and Gaz Metro reflect this in 2004, as does Gee Beauty Store in 2009 and Sunchips in 2010. From the broader business world, Virgin, IBM. Apple and Nike all show aspects of this and Scott Bedbury's book *A New Brand World* is a fascinating read.

5. **The Total Brand Experience.** Brands have always been built at "every point of contact," but the phrase is relatively new. It arrived partly because the explosion of media choice has shifted marketers away from a "mass" mentality, and partly because of the growth of services. The way we are treated by a retailer, restaurant, bank or telco has more effect than an advertisement. So all "points of contact" have to be managed skilfully.

   CASSIES cases used to be about advertising in its traditional sense, but they are now virtually all based on "every point of contact." At the highest level *(Crossover Note 4)* this is more than communication, but most of the time it's another way of looking at Integrated Marketing Communication. This itself is more than making sure everything has the same "look and feel" — for the obvious reason that what works in one medium doesn't necessarily work in another.

   One of the agencies tries to capture the overall experience of a brand under the umbrella of an "organizing idea." All the disciplines then work to achieve their goals in the way that works best in their medium. Of course, if certain words, pictures, icons, slogans etc. work in more than one medium, they will be used. The point is not to force fit. Various cases deal with the total brand experience. They include:

   - CASSIES III: Richmond Savings.
   - CASSIES 99: AGF Funds.
   - CASSIES 2001: Clarica, Clearnet, i-wireless.
   - CASSIES 2002: Bank of Montreal, ED, Lipton Sidekicks, Scotiabank, Sloche.
   - CASSIES 2003: Bubba, Dodge SX 2.0, Irving's Coffee, Manitoba Telecom, MINI, United Way, Univ. de Montréal.
   - CASSIES 2004: Zumanity, Desjardins. Fam Channel, Gaz Metro, Réno Dépôt.
   - CASSIES 2006. WestJet.
   - CASSIES 2007: Cashmere, SickKids,Coors Light, WestJet, TDCanada Trust.
   - CASSIES 2007: Koodo, Gee Beauty Store, Scotiabank
   - CASSIES 2010: Koodo, Doritos, Lexus
   - CASSIES 2011: SAQ and Videotron

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.

---

[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.

This has had a paradoxical effect. Some businesses are obsessed in their desire to keep their product (or service) improving, fearing that they will be left behind. Others go into a slipstream mode—letting others tackle the headwinds first.

John Philip Jones says we do *not* live in a parity world—that imitators may try to match innovators, but they often don't quite succeed. His view (I agree) is that it is dangerously complacent to assume that functional parity is inevitable. Another danger is the belief that "marketing" can compensate for a weak product. This led North America to under-invested in product. The Japanese, and later the Europeans and others, did exactly the opposite—and caused major long-term shifts in any number of markets.

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 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.
- The various Toyota brands in CASSIES 2009.
- Most if not all of the car brands in CASSIES 2010 and 2011.

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.
- Diamond Shreddies – the Grand Prix winner – in 2009, and Lay's in 2010.
- Lay's again in 2011, along with Hellman's, Knorr Sidekicks, Algoma University.

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 the high ground if it is already held by a competitor. This comes from the much-quoted belief that "our positioning has to be unique." So, in the pursuit of uniqueness the brand looks elsewhere. This sounds so logical, but it is flawed.

   Consider Dove in CASSIES III. P&G's Ivory had 100 years of purity and mildness behind it. Dove had decades of "non-drying." With these different positionings they had become joint market leaders in dollar share. Then P&G launched Oil of Olay bar in US test market. It was an excellent product, and a major threat to Dove. Lever Canada decided that they had to blunt any launch of Oil of Olay bar in Canada. To do that, they decided to launch a new ad campaign based on a powerful demo called "the litmus test." Because Dove is not a soap, it does not affect litmus paper, whereas soaps (this includes Ivory) turn it an ugly blue. But "litmus" is a *mildness* story, and Ivory owned mildness. So should Dove go after this high ground? International client/agency management predicted disaster if Dove used the demo. But local management decided to launch it anyway. Four years later Ivory had dropped to half of Dove's dollar share, and Dove's dollar sales were up 73%.

   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's great if it legitimately comes from positioning, but it does *not* have to. Duracell was the first to stake out "lasts longer," and Energizer (afraid to attack this 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 fight for the high ground 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, but they re-defined "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 the high ground. There are many CASSIES successes based on side-stepping or re-defining the problem — Cottonelle, Desjardins, Gaz Metro and Réno Dépôt in 2004. Cruisin' to Win, Crescendo, Whiskas, Twix, Moores and Lotto 6/49 in 2005. Cashmere and Spongetowels in 2009. Gadoua in 2011. Even so, I think the high ground is one of the first places you should look.

8. **Classic Rivalries.** Examples in the CASSIES are as follows:

   - Canadian versus Blue. CASSIES I, III, and 2001.
   - Energizer versus Duracell in CASSIES I, and also CASSIES 2005.
   - Pepsi or Diet Pepsi versus Coke. CASSIES I, 2002, 2005, 2007
   - Dove versus Ivory. Richmond Savings versus the banks. CASSIES III.
   - Sunlight versus Tide. CASSIES 99 and 2001. Lipton versus Campbell. CASSIES 2001.
   - Labatt Bleue vs Molson Dry. CASSIES 2002. Listerine vs Scope. CASSIES II and 2002.
   - Desjardins versus the banks. CASSIES 2004.
   - Cottonelle versus Charmin. CASSIES 2004. And as Cashmere in CASSIES 2007.
   - Dentyne versus Excel in CASSIES 2005. workopolis versus Monster in CASSIES 2006.
   - SpongeTowels versus Bounty in CASSIES 2007 and 2009.
   - Scotiabank versus the other banks in CASSIES 2009.
   - Hellman's versus Kraft in CASSIES 2011.

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 and 2005

- Cottonelle. Gaz Metro. Kit Kat.
- Milk (Quebec and Prairies). Toyota Sienna.
- Crescendo. Energizer Lithium. Toyota Tacoma.
- Eggo French Toast Stix. Twix. Hubba Bubba.
- Coricidin II. Juicy Fruit. Moores. Harvey's.
- Quebec Lotto 6/49.
- Pepsi – Quebec and Quebec Milk.

CASSIES 2006 and 2007

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

CASSIES 2009 , 2010 , 2011

- Spongetowels. Toyota Tundra. Motts.
- Doritos. Lay's. Pres Choice. Philly. Ford. Tylenol. Aviva.
- Reno Depot, Moosehead, Gadoua Moelleux

10. Conventional Wisdom—should it be challenged?

Conventional wisdom will sometimes be right. But it can also be a roadblock. When US Pepsi executives first saw the Pepsi Challenge, they apparently said, "that's not Pepsi." Dove Litmus *(Crossover Note 7)* ran into a fusillade of disapproval at global head offices—and only survived because the Canadian team stuck to their guns. Here are many of the examples that went against the flow:

From CASSIES I, III, 99, 2001:

- Crispy Crunch, making a virtue of greed. Richmond Savings, poking fun at the Humungous banks.
- Sunlight, saying it's OK to get dirty. Fido and Clearnet, using dogs and frogs.
- Various financial accounts—so many that humour has almost become the new conventional wisdom: AGF, Clarica, BMO Quebec (and Scotiabank in 2002).

From CASSIES 2002:

- Bud Light, not going after the young, legal-age, male heavy drinker.
- CFL, against younger viewers, accepting they might alienate the core franchise.
- ED, going high-profile with a taboo topic. Five Alive, switching from Moms to young males.
- Irving Home Furnaces, using age as a plus for attracting attention.
- Labatt Bleue, breaking the Christmas "Happy Holidays" tradition.
- Pine-Sol, breaking the conventions of household cleaner advertising.
- Sleeman in Quebec, embracing the English heritage with "honest frenglish."
- Sloche, rejoicing in being politically and nutritionally incorrect.

From CASSIES 2003:

- Bait Cars, talking directly to criminals. Crown Diamond Paint, advertising that men hate painting.
- Familiprix, using humour to sell health products. Irving Coffee, making a virtue of the caffeine hit.
- Toyota Matrix, breaking the Toyota "rules." Sola Nero, debunking wine snobbery.
- Super 7, revelling in the excesses of the super-rich.
- Université de Montréal, with no smiling students and ivy covered buildings.

From CASSIES 2004:

- Cirque du Soleil, breaking convention as a corporate philosophy.
- Elections Ontario, resisting the temptation to use social responsibility.
- The Miller campaign, throwing out the conventions of political advertising.
- Réno Dépôt, investing in the brand, rather than “price and item.”
- Toyota Sienna, with their “cool minivan” thinking.

From CASSIES 2005:

- Baileys, breaking out of the liqueur cabinet.
- Crescendo, moving away from “delivery/takeout” as the high ground.
- Cruisin’ to Win, thinking small. Energizer Lithium, ignoring the conventions of battery advertising.
- Familiprix, selling health products hilariously.
- Hubba Bubba, using brand thinking in a merchandizing category.
- Moores, redefining the way to look at men shoppers.
- “Stupid.ca” anti-smoking, being hilarious in how it talked to teenagers.

From CASSIES 2006:

- Bloody Zit – need we say more? Chocolate Milk, torturing cute chocolate animals.
- Eterna, choosing an emotional (rather than technical) story to sell film.
- Holiday Inn, moving away from “comfort.”
- Listerine, breaking away from “kills the germs that cause bad breath.”
- MINI and Yaris, breaking car conventions.
- VanCity, challenging the unwritten rules of financial marketing.

From CASSIES 2007:

- Dove, with its campaign for real beauty.
- Reversa, by targeting Cougars
- Cashmere, finding an analogy between fashion and toilet tissue.
- Prairie Milk, appealing to teens in a decidedly un-commercial way.
- The Capital G Bank in Bermuda, with its “We’re Gifferent” campaign.
- Benylin, with “Take a Benylin Day.”
- Coors Light, walking away from the approach that had made it the #1 light beer.
- La Parisienne detergent, with advertising that threw aside the “rules” of the category.

From CASSIES 2009:

- Milk – 5 seconds, with apparently random humour.
- Koodo, by simplifying what had become totally complicated.
- Shreddies, by making something out of nothing.
- Lexus, by redefining what luxury means.
- o.b., by turning “small” from a problem into an opportunity.
- Cashmere, by using fashion to sell toilet tissue.

From CASSIES 2010:

- Sunchips, Doritos, RecycleMe, Impreza, Vespa, Koodo, Women’s World, Gain, MINI, Pres Choice, Ford Groundswell, Suzuki, Subaru Forester, Nissan, Knorr, Aviva.

From CASSIES 2011:

- Nissan SE-R, Molson 67, SAQ, Olan Canada, Videotron, Tourism Montreal, Algoma University, Emergency Room Alternatives.

11. The Eureka Insight. These feature in many cases. Some examples:

- Oh Henry! Gut-fillers had tried to own hunger. CASSIES II and *Crossover Note 7*.
- Buckley's. Rather than side-step their bad taste, Buckley's relished it. CASSIES III.
- Chrysler. Used *emotion* as the key to an immensely successful launch. CASSIES III.
- Philadelphia Cream Cheese. Creating "permission to indulge." CASSIES III.
- Richmond Savings. Creating the "Humungous Bank." CASSIES III.
- Eggs. (See also *12. Changing the Goalposts.*) Farmers brought “natural” to life.
- Sunlight. Getting dirty is fun. This is diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom, dominated by Tide, that clean is good and dirt is bad. CASSIES 99.
- Fido in CASSIES 99. In an echo of Apple vs. IBM, Fido saw that consumers needed the human touch. See also Clearnet and “the future is friendly” in 2001.
- Diet Pepsi and Listerine in 2002 with “forever young” and healthy gums
- Pro•Line in 2002. Appealed to non-experts with “Anyone can win.”
- Aero. Saw the power of “melting” in 2003.
- Super 7. Ignored the political correctness of being tasteful. 2003.
- Quebec Milk. Saw the obvious. Asked people to drink more. 2004 and 2005.
- Toyota Sienna. Realized that the answer lay not in what SUV buyers do. 2004.
- Irving’s Cruisin’ to Win. Saw the power of *small* prizes. 2005.
- Crescendo. Like Oh Henry! saw unoccupied high ground. 2005.
- Butter. Saw a way to use “natural” to connote taste and health. 2005.
- Anti-Smoking. Saw the power of “Stupid.” 2005.
- Jergens Ultra Care. Saw a way to reposition skin. 2005.
- Whiskas. Saw things from the *cat’s* point of view. 2005.
- Moores. Used the fact that their target audience hates shopping. 2005.
- Harvey’s. Realized the significance of The Grill. 2005
- Quebec Lotto 6/49. Realized that 6/49 winners are generous, so be nice to them. 2005.
- United Way. Saw power in the Hand icon. 2005
- CIBC Run for the Cure. Saw the power in the Pinnie idea. 2005
- Juicy Fruit. Saw how to build a new image by destroying the old one. 2005
- Yaris. Realized that you *could* use aspiration in the sub-compact category. 2006.
- WestJet saw the power in the “owners” idea. 2006 and 2007.
- Monster saw the power in the “best boss” idea. 2006.
- Dove. Saw the leverage in the Self-Esteem Fund. 2007.
- Brita. Changed how we think about tap water for ever. 2007.
- Benylin. Realized what we really want to do! 2007.
- Newfoundland. Realized that the problem was the opportunity. 2007.
- SpongeTowels. Brought absorbency to life, almost literally. 2007 and 2009.
- Colon Cancer. Had the “see through” idea. 2009.
- ParticipACTION. Saw that kids are growing old before their time. 2009.
- Shreddies. Their imaginary line extension. 2009.
- Frito Lay. Realized that “junk food” can’t be junk if it comes from the farm. 2009.
- Mott’s. Noticed that Caesars are contagious. 2009.
- Temptations. Understood the tug of war between cats and their owners. 2009.
- James Ready, Yasmin, Impreza, Vespa, Newfoundland Fresh Air, Women’s World, Ikea PAX, i-shares, Never Stop Milk, Knorr, Tylenol, WarChild. 2010.
- Molson 67, SAQ, Locals Know, Hyundai, GGRP, Moosehead, Subaru Outback. 2011.
- Plus virtually all the cases in *Crossover Note 10.*

12. Changing the Goalposts. Some insights see what was always there to be seen. (e.g. Sunlight's Joy of Getting Dirty 1999.) Others re-frame the problem, such as:

- Cow Brand Baking Soda's extended usage.
- Johnson's Baby Shampoo's re-positioning against adults.
- Cereals trying to get eaten as a late night snack.
- Baileys (2005 and 2006) going against wines and beer occasions.

Insights can also spring from what is *not* being said. Eggs in CASSIES 99 is an example. Word-association tests played back benefits, but did *not* identify that eggs are natural. Somehow, this absence caught the agency's eye. They made "natural" into a powerful campaign using real farmers, and turned around a 17-year decline.

Purina is another example. At one time, everyone sold dog food on taste and nutrition. Not surprisingly, consumers played these back as the important benefits, reinforcing conventional wisdom. The team at Scali/Purina then saw the significance of the unspoken (and deeper) truth—that a dog is part of the family. This led to the immensely effective "helping dogs lead longer lives" campaign.

This also points up the need look beyond Canada. PAL in the UK had earlier arrived at similar thinking, leading to their famous "prolongs active life" campaign.

Cases in 2010 that changed the goalposts were Sunchips, James Ready, Doritos, Koodo, Women's World, Philly, i-shares, Hyundai, and Knorr.

In 2011, the cases were Hellman's, Knorr Sidekicks, SAQ, Videotron, and Hyundai.

13. Immediate vs. Long-Term Effect. The effects of advertising in the short and/or long-term have been hotly debated for years. I can't do justice to all the points of view, but here is a fairly lengthy overview:

Einstein proposed the Theory of Relativity about 100 years ago. Then Planck came up with Quantum Theory, and Heisenberg advanced his Uncertainty Principle. Since then, physics has struggled to find the elusive "theory of everything. In a less cosmic way, advertising has followed the same course. A top UK researcher found over a hundred theories of how advertising works. They all capture part of what happens, but none explain the full picture.

This leads to an important point. In the absence of a single agreed theory, we've all pieced together our own notion of what effective advertising is all about. Our mental models (while right some of the time) are not right all of the time. But *we all make the mistaken assumption that our own model is right.*[5]

For example, there used to be a view (diminishing, but still with us) that creativity gets in the way of effectiveness. Some years back, the CEO of one of the big packaged goods companies unrepentantly had this view. I'm sure that in his own mind he was criticizing "irrelevant creativity" or "self-indulgent creativity." But he left the impression that he was only interested in the functional and the predictable.

[5] I think it was Paul Feldwick, a top UK planner, who first made this penetrating observation.

13. Immediate vs. Long-Term Effect (cont'd).

At the other extreme, there's the view that creativity is all that matters. When people advocate this, they don't mean "irrelevant" or "self-indulgent" creativity, but to people at the tried-and-true end of the spectrum, that's what it sounds like.

Between these extremes there's accumulating evidence that creativity (relevant of course) is a *partner* in effectiveness. All the big CASSIES winners bear this out, and an even longer list of examples comes from 20+ years of IPA Effectiveness Awards in the UK. (The CASSIES was modelled on these Awards.)

Many people carry a subconscious version of the 100 year-old AIDA theory in their heads: Attention >> Interest >> Desire >> Action. But there is a lot of evidence that advertising does not work this way, especially for established brands in everyday categories (I dislike the terms "low interest" or "low involvement"). Foote, Cone & Belding, amongst others, have proposed buying sequences based on Learn-Feel-Do, Feel-Learn-Do, and Do-Feel-Learn. In this approach, LFD is similar to AIDA, and applies to high-involvement purchases. FLD applies to categories like cosmetics and perfumes. DFL applies in the so-called low-involvement situations where there is (presumed to be) not much risk attached to the purchase.[6]

Speaking of models, it seems self-evident that advertising has to "cut through the clutter" but even that is being re-examined. It seems that we take in huge amounts of data through the primitive parts of our brain. It doesn't blast its way in. It goes in without our knowledge. This is called Low-Involvement Processing nd it's about as far from AIDA as you can imagine. LIP, in terms of advertising, is unproven, but I think there could be something to it. If you examine all the thoughts, feelings, knowledge and memories you have about brands, a great many seem to have got in by osmosis? For more on this, Robert Heath and Jon Howard-Spink in Admap.

In any event, clients, account people, creative people, and researchers have many different mental models for how advertising works. This explains a lot of the tension when advertising is being developed, discussed and evaluated.

On the issue of immediate versus long-term effect, there is an experience-based view, and an academic/research view. The experience view is captured by the comments of John Pepper, then President of Procter & Gamble, in a 1988 speech:

> I believe in advertising quite simply because I have seen throughout 25 years that the correlation between profitable—let me emphasize profitable—business growth on our brands and great advertising isn't 25 percent, it's not 50 percent, it's not 75 percent. It is 100 percent. And I don't deal in hyperbole here. In 25 years I haven't seen a single P&G brand sustain profitable volume growth for more than a couple of years without having great advertising. Great advertising alone won't do the job. We know that. The product must be right. The pricing must be right. We've got to provide superior satisfaction, superior value to consumers. But great advertising—it's purely and simply a must.

---

[6] This paragraph is touching on the area known as Hierarchy of Effects. Academics and researchers have been trying for over a100 years to pin down what is going on when we buy one thing rather than another. Creative people tend to think more intuitively, but this type of approach can be useful in sorting out where the real points of leverage are. For more (much more) google Hierarchy of Effects,

13. Immediate vs. Long-Term Effect (cont'd).

Within the "experience-based" view, there are basically five advertising scenarios that have to be managed:

1. An established brand is doing well with a well-regarded campaign, and the challenge is to maintain this success. See *14. Refreshing a Continuing Campaign.*
2. An established brand has a good volume/share/ profit level, often with the help of advertising, but now growth is hard to come by. In this scenario, it may be best, from an ROI point of view, to go into "retention" mode—using advertising to maintain the brand at successful levels, rather that trying to make it grow.[7]
3. The brand has launched a new campaign, and shipments/share etc. respond within days/weeks of new advertising.
4. It's clear, based on careful analysis, that the new advertising is not working.
5. The effectiveness of the new advertising is hard to read, either because it is "too early to tell" or there is not enough information to sort out what's happening.

Scenario 1 is relatively straightforward, though it is always a challenge to maintain and refresh a continuing campaign.[8] Scenario 2 may not be red-blooded enough for some, but it needs to be considered in markets with a high cost of aggressively acquiring new customers. Scenario 3 is a delight when it happens, though in most competitive markets it is relatively rare. Scenario 4 happens, and when it does, it's in everyone's interest to fix the problem quickly and learn from it. Scenario 5 is common, and the danger is that decisions get made on anecdotal evidence, rather than by deeper analysis. Angst creeps in, and any of the following could be valid:

- **The advertising is working, but the effect is masked.** Pricing, promotion, in-store activity, distribution etc. almost always have a greater short-term effect than advertising. However, it they are masking an underlying positive trend, then given time, the masking will recede, and all should be well.
- **There is a "slow burn."** This is based on the assumption that (some) advertising needs time to wear in. It has to be said, though, that many people reject wear-in, saying that if a campaign does not have a quick effect, it's unlikely to have one at all. On the other hand, campaigns like "I AM" Canadian in CASSIES III were spectacularly effective, but took time to wear in.
- **There's an "arm wrestler" stand-off.** Two equally matched (and strong) arm wrestlers can hold each other immobile for an agonizing length of time. You may be up against a powerful competitive campaign i.e. you have to assess the strength of that campaign before coming to a conclusion about your own.
- **The advertising is not working.** You may be seeing the early signs of this—in which case you need to be preparing some sort of fix.

[7] Aggressive marketers can find this difficult to accept, particularly given that a passive approach can become a self-fulfilling strategy. However, it does need to be considered.
[8] Boardroom fatigue and "new people wanting change" are big factors here.

13. Immediate vs. Long-Term Effect (cont'd).

From the academic/research side, there's good evidence of advertising's short and long term effect though, as noted above, not all advertising works. Here's a selection of work in this area:

- **John Philip Jones and STAS (Short-Term Advertising Strength).** Jones designed a study to uncover short-term effect, if it exists. He used single-source data to examine "advertised" and "non-advertised" households—and the brands they buy. There are detractors to this work, but the findings seem pretty clear:

  a) There is a definite, short-term effect from advertising. (70% of cases.)

  b) In Jones's words, *a single advertising exposure was shown to be all that was necessary to achieve an immediate sales increase.* (Note that this flies in the face of conventional wisdom about frequency. See *Crossover Note 28*.)

  c) The short-term effect was often followed by a one-year effect (46% of brands) though the sales response at one year was always lower than at one week.

  d) When brands do not show the STAS response, it is likely that the creative is not as strong as it might be, or that it is being out-muscled by more powerful creative from a competitor. [A stronger arm-wrestler.]

- **The IRI on long-term effects.** IRI is a major research company and they run state-of-the-art Behaviorscan split-cable test markets in the US. Consumers are exposed to marketing effort, while a matched control group is not. In the early 90s IRI published the learning from 400 tests that had explored TV creative, media weight, promotion support and so on. They were able to analyze 44 tests for long-term advertising effect. Test areas (A) were measured against control areas (B). Areas "A" got special effort only in Year 1. After that, the test and control plans were identical. In other words, any long-term effect in the test areas was caused entirely by the effort in Year I. Results were:

  a) In Year I, Plan A markets averaged +22% volume over Plan B.
  b) In Year II, Plan A markets held their advantage, at +14%.
  c) In Year III, they still held an advantage, averaging +7%.

  In other words, in these 44 markets, the 3-year effect was, on average, double the one-year effect. The study concludes that payout for one-year effort should be calculated over three years.

- **The Millward Brown Findings.** Millward Brown have immense databases in the UK, USA, Canada, Europe and elsewhere. They see a short-term advertising effect in their continuous tracking, but also a long-term effect. Through sales modeling, they estimate that this long-term effect may, on occasion, be as much as 7 times greater than the short-term effect. (Information provided by Bill Ratcliffe, then President of Millward Brown in Canada.)

13. Immediate vs. Long-Term Effect (cont'd).

- **The Observations of Paul Feldwick**. Paul Feldwick is a top planner in the UK. He has proposed a metaphor for short and long-term effect, based on brand muscle. When we exercise, the result of any individual activity is small and hard to measure. But over time, results can be dramatic. This is more than just a clever analogy. There is a huge amount of evidence that as consumers get more used to buying a brand, it moves into their habitual (and perhaps even loyal) repertoire.

- **Market Mix Modelling.** A few CASSIES winners, and many IPA winners, use econometric modelling to prove the advertising effect. This is a big step forward, though it has to be borne in mind that MMM, at its core, does not measure long-term effects. It uses sophisticated mathematics to examine changes in sales, and relate them to marketing effort. This leads to a theoretical sales curve, which, if the formula is accurate, will be a tight fit to actual. From this it can be assumed that the model is accurately assessing what each tactic is contributing. However (and this is important) MMM does not explain "steady state" or "baseline" volume.

- **The Work of Hess and Ambach.** Hess and Ambach (amongst others) have pointed out that a typical Market Mix model will fail to explain as much as two thirds of a brand's volume. This is usually identified as "baseline volume that the brand would have got anyway." But something must be generating it.

  This"something" is usually identified as the equity that the brand has accumulated as a result of all of its activities over the long term up to that point.

  Hess and Ambach used loyalty programme databases to identify at least some of this "equity" effect. They expressed it as a multiplier applied to the results given by Market Mix modeling, and concluded that advertising's longer term effect "ranges from *1.58 to 3.98* of the market-mix modelling effect, with an average multiplier of 2.32."

For more, see publications by John Philip Jones, Leonard Lodish (IRI), Millward Brown, Paul Feldwick, and Hess & Ambach. For some academic fireworks, see also the disputatious views of Andrew Ehrenberg of the London School of Business.

14. Refreshing a continuing campaign. When I was at P&G and O&M, all the big advertisers and their agencies thought in terms of campaigns. If new advertising got the comment "that's just a one-off," it was the kiss of death.

In those days, a campaign was usually defined by television. There would be one commercial, or a pool, refreshed over time. Nowadays, a campaign is more complicated. But it's fair to say that a number of people (clients and agencies) still believe that campaigns are the right/best way to build a brand.[9]

[9] A young creative colleague once said to me, "where does the belief in campaigns come from? They bore me and my friends. What's wrong with a stream of one-off ideas?" This would have been heresy at one time, and perhaps still is. But in today's increasingly short-attention-span world, it's food for thought.

Recently, the idea of “the brand relationship” has taken hold. This is the notion that we treat brands like friends.

Relationships can be very different, but for most people, the good ones are based on things like trust and consistency. This has led to the idea that brands should present a consistent – though not dull and predictable -- face over time (assuming, of course, that they are standing for the right thing.)

There is still the question, though, of what is a campaign? At one time, packaged goods advertisers (and some agencies) believed in strict pool-outs. But campaigns don’t have to be so formatted. The following list doesn’t pretend to be exhaustive (some types of campaigns are hard to categorize) but it starts at the rigid end of the spectrum, and extends to the holistic. All versions have their successes and failures, but I hope this listing will help free up some of the rigid thinking:

- **Strict Pool-Out.** Famous (or infamous) historical campaigns like "Who wants Gum? I do. I do." They have a repeated format, often with a USP demo or slogan. Some people think this type of advertising is passé. Others remember it fondly.
- **Hall of Fame Pool-Out**. Some think pool outs are dull, predictable and clichéd. Not necessarily. The 20-odd year campaign for Hamlet cigars in the UK was rigidly formatted, but spectacularly creative and effective. Familiprix (CASSIES 2003) is the same.
- **Situational Pool-Out.** These don’t have the format of the strict pool out but still have a clear connection between executions. Diet Pepsi’s “Forever Young” and Pro•Line’s “Anyone Can Win” are examples. Huggies’ “Happy Baby” was extremely long-running. Clearnet/Telus is in this camp. So is “I’m an IBM-er”

  This category also includes campaigns based on spectacular executions like “Manhattan Landing” and “Face” for British Airways, though I’m not sure if there have been many recent examples of this approach.
- **Icons.** These can anchor a campaign (Maytag Man, Marlboro Cowboy) or be a property (Tony the Tiger, Pillsbury Doughboy). Some see icons as yesterday’s idea, but I think that’s a mis-call. Absolut Vodka uses its bottle as an icon, and it’s brilliant. The Familiprix pharmacist is hilariously effective. Will “Salty” become an icon for Knorr SideKicks?
- **Spokes-people, and Spokes-animals.** Dave Thomas and Colonel Sanders, god rest their souls, were examples. The Geico gecko is a current one..
- **Storytelling with continuing character(s).** The Oxo family in the UK was a long-running example. Bartles and Jaymes (now a couple of decades old) was a wonderful success story in the US. Personalities have been very successful in Quebec e.g. the Pepsi and Listerine Grand Prix winners in CASSIES I and II.
- **Music-Based.** Music sometimes goes beyond a supporting role, and becomes part of the brand character. Soft Drinks, Cars, Fast Food, and Beer have all built campaigns this way. In packaged goods, becel’s “young at heart” campaign from a few years ago would be an example.

- **Consistent "Voice and Attitude."** These campaigns are held together by something more subtle. Perhaps the most impressive was Volkswagen in the 60s. Individual executions were different (serious, comical, ironic, dramatic) but they all had the Volkswagen voice and attitude. Brands like Nike are in this category. Benneton is an extreme example.
- **Same core message. Customized execution.** To people with a strict "pool-out" mindset, this hardly qualifies as a campaign at all. But the overall effect can be powerful. The best CASSIES example is the 4-year Dove case from CASSIES III.[10]

  The campaign started in late 91 with "Litmus," a strikingly simple demonstration, with no people or voice over—just haunting music, and some supers. Then came a raucous candid-camera commercial of focus group women doing the litmus test. Then a talking-head commercial with the scientist who invented Dove. Then another demonstration, similar to "Litmus," with the haunting music again.

  The first three executions are so different that some people would not have approved them. Given the subsequent results, that would have been a pity. What holds it all together? The continuing promise of mildness. A scrupulously honest and consistent brand character. And an element of surprise in each execution. Note, though, that there are no continuing slogans or visual icons.

More generally, it's an open question whether today's obsessively short-term attitude is causing us to lose the drive we once had for great campaigns. I hope not.

15. Baby with the Bathwater. Campaigns can run out of steam, and it may be right to throw everything out *(Crossover Notes 14 and 33).* But it's worth checking to see if anything should be kept. "I am Canadian" from the "I AM" campaign in CASSIES III was discarded when the campaign faltered. It came back with "Joe's Rant." The Campbell's Kids re-appeared in CASSIES 2002 after years in oblivion, though I see that they are no longer with us. Cottonelle in CASSIES 2004 knew that they had equity in the cottony soft jingle. But this was also dating the brand. So they found a way to use the jingle in a tongue-in-cheek way.

Quite often, properties get discarded because the people who believe in them leave the brand. This happened more than once on Smarties with "Red Ones Last." Sometimes properties are discarded for a good reason. Dove's "pour shot" had appeared in every commercial since launch. For Litmus (CASSIES III) the Canadian team decided to drop it—to help consumers see Dove in a new way. The global powers-that-be (client and agency) reacted as if Dove was committing suicide, and said so. Their sense of bereavement turned to horror when their advice was ignored. "Litmus" ran without the pour shot, and was immensely successful.

This is an important point about long-running properties. Many believe they should be used in every communication—and in the normal run of things, this is a good idea. But if you have reason to drop a property for a while[11] consumers will not forget it. These images have a tenacious grip on long-term memory.

[10] Other examples are Budweiser in Quebec (2005), and Toyota Trucks in the Prairies (2009).
[11] Prairie Milk in CASSIES 2004 dropped the classic pour shot because it would be a cliché to teenagers.

Put another way, imagine you had to *erase* an entrenched image. Could you do it? I watched Lever try for years to kill "ring around the collar" on Wisk. They couldn't.

That said, I think that we are probably too quick to change things for changes sake. One of the main reasons that brands are valuable —*Crossover Note 1*—is that they accumulate added values over time. The evidence says that this does not happen if a brand keeps changing the face it presents.

I need to stress that I'm not advocating *no* change, but something closer to Paul Feldwick's "exercise" model in *Crossover Note 13*. Let the effort on the brand be part of a coherent program, evolving as needed over time, all building brand muscle.

16. When a campaign stumbles. A loss of momentum might be a momentary stutter and (if we were clairvoyant) we would know that, and make whatever minor fix was needed. But it might be the first clue that something is going seriously off the rails. In that case the pressure can lead to snap (and wrong) judgments. The best answer usually comes from a blend of experience, judgment, intuition, vision, and research. Here are some pointers.

1. **Dig deep into trends and tastes.** You could be on the wrong side of a tectonic shift. "Made in Japan" used to mean a cheap, shlocky, knock-off, and North American business took years to recognize the threat when Japan started to produce quality goods. Then consider Listerine. The famous slogan "Always a bridesmaid, but never a bride" started life in a Listerine advertisement, reflecting a bad breath positioning that had been in place for as long as anyone could remember. But Listerine saw (and helped create) the shift towards the idea of a healthy mouth (see CASSIES 1995 and 2002). Something similar happened in toothpaste. At one time, Pepsodent ("you'll wonder where the yellow went...") was the leader, and whitening was the high ground. Then Crest came with fluoride (and dental association endorsement), and Pepsodent slid into history. Then, over a generation, cavities stopped being the problem they once were.[12] The market shifted towards "mouth health" and Colgate got there first with Colgate Total, knocking Crest off its #1 perch. Crest responded with Crest Complete—and now the market has come full circle with a furious battle for whitening, and many other benefits.

2. **Look at the goalposts**. If they really haven't changed, then it's likely that you just have a short-term stutter. But if they have, try to envisage the new game. See *11. The Eureka Insight*, and *12. Changing the Goalposts.*

3. **Think through the change needed.** See *6. Should the product be improved?* and *14. Refreshing a Continuing Campaign*.

4. **Change for the right reasons.** It's broadly true that long-running campaigns—kept fresh and relevant—are great brand-builders. And it's sadly true that new people, wanting to make their mark, change things for change's sake. But once in a while, major change is needed. Molson Canadian (CASSIES I) was a niche player when it launched "What Beer's all About" in the late 80s. This campaign helped turn Canadian into a mainstream beer, and it displaced Labatt Blue as market leader.

[12] Ironically, Crest helped make this happen by virtue of its sustained "no cavities" marketing.

They kept going with “What Beer’s all About” for a few years. But they also stayed alert to the need for change, in particular watching the appeal ratings with the younger legal-age drinker. This led them to launch the “I AM” campaign (CASSIES III). This was successful, but eventually it too ran out of steam. They re-incarnated with “Joe’s Rant” (CASSIES 2001). But this, in the words of the 2006 Molson case, turned out to be a glorious one-off as Molson—along with other mainstream brands—ran into the onslaught of the “24 for $24” crowd.

Separately, though this time the need for change was more obvious, Juicy Fruit attacked its former squeaky clean image with the guitar-smashing campaign. (CASSIES 2005.) And in CASSIES 2007, Benylin realized that the “trooper” attitude used by all its competitors could be challenged.

17. Turning a liability into a strength.

Usually, advertising strategies are based on obvious strengths, but once in a while there’s an advantage in what looks like a liability. Some examples:

- Buckley’s—Tastes awful but it works. CASSIES III.
- Listerine—Was seen as “Margaret Thatcher” and displaced this image with the Action Hero campaign. 2002 and again in 2006.
- Pine-Sol—Far too strong. Softened this with ‘thorough clean.” 2002.
- Sleeman in Quebec—Took an Anglo-heritage beer in a declining category and re-vitalized it with “honest frenglish.” 2002.
- Pro●Line—Made the un-knowledgeable fan realize that anyone can win. 2002 and 2003.
- Super 7—Made a virtue of excess. 2003.
- Gaz Metro—Made the (feared) gas flame the hero. 2004.
- Short Film Festival—Made a virtue of brevity. 2004.
- Irving’s Cruising to Win—Made a virtue of *small* prizes. 2005.
- Moores—Found a way to appeal to men who hate shopping. 2005.
- Juicy Fruit—Destroyed the oh-so-sweet Juicy Fruit jingle. 2005.
- Chocolate Milk—Tortured little chocolate creatures! 2006.
- Royal Bank. “Bigness and power” could be a liability if positioned wrongly. The “First” campaign made sure it came across as a customer benefit. 2006.
- Newfoundland and Labrador made a virtue of remoteness. 2007 and 2011.
- Shreddies (change without change) and o.b. (the virtue of “small”). 2009.
- Nissan SE-R—dealt with the “no speeding” regulations. 2011.
- Knorr Sidekicks. Made “Salty” a hero and thereby protected the taste image. 2011.
- Algoma University—Made distance from home a virtue. 2011.

Separately, here are some famous examples not from the CASSIES:

- Johnson's Baby Shampoo—They used mildness to reposition the brand against adults who wash their hair every day, and took over as market leader, despite being a blind test loser to adult shampoos.
- Heinz Ketchup—They made a virtue out of the irritating s-l-o-w-n-e-s-s.
- IBM. In the early 90s IBM lost close to $20 billion over a few short years. Apparently, the CEO regarded IBM's size as a problem, and he had tried to decentralize operations into smaller, self-contained units. Then Lou Gerstner, formerly of American Express, took over. He had no computer/tech experience, but one of his first strategic decisions was to declare that IBM's size was its *strength.* The challenge was how to harness this.
- Volkswagen in the 60s with an iconic campaign including "Lemon," "Think Small" etc.

18. Keeping it Simple. We've all been to a presentation that was so complicated that nothing registered. But when it comes time to approve a creative strategy a lot of people get overtaken by the urge to cram everything in. This has to be resisted. P&G said "feel the pain of leaving things out." Trout & Ries give similar advice.

Scott Bedbury (of Nike and Starbucks, and himself a client) blames clients for the habit. He points out that it's hard to see what's wrong with adding another benefit or copy point. I can add from personal experience that the agency advice to leave things out does not have much traction against a client who says, "You may be right, but let's leave it in anyway."

There's a sub-set of this problem when a brand has an emotional benefit *and* a rational claim. Examples are (1) Philly in CASSIES III with "permission to indulge" and "60% less fat." (2) Scotiabank in 2002, wanting to sell individual services while improving overall image (3) Campbell's Soup in 2002, wanting to modernize its image, while getting nutrition facts across. (4) Lay's in 2010 and 2011 which blended emotional and rational benefits extremely well.

This is where expectations have to be realistic. The more points there are, the lower the impact of each. Experienced research companies can help here. They have evidence about the trade-offs involved.

The points so far have been at the Creative Strategy level, but the execution should also be simple—or, said better, *simple for the audience to take in*.[13] The danger is that *we* (the client and agency) know what we are trying to say, and so may not realize that our advertising is unclear. I've also seen directors complicate commercials in an effort to make them more interesting. Overall, virtually all winning CASSIES advertising is simple.

[13] Simplicity is not as simple as it used to be. Direct Marketing, Websites and Social Marketing relish multiple copy points, provided they have selling power. Also, the "visual landscape" has changed, and people raised on music videos and video games can absorb fast-paced images that leave baby boomers bewildered. Finally, the notion of "the brand" is more complex that it was in the days of Volvo = Safety and Tide = Clean.. That said, a piece of communication must still be easy to take in.

19. Great minds think alike. Strong brands always differentiate themselves, but the underlying thinking does not necessarily have to be unique. In 2002, Diet Pepsi, Five Alive and toronto.com all concluded that young men are media savvy, cynical about marketing, feel responsibility looming, but don't want to give up on the best and craziest parts of being young. Fido and Clearnet in the past have identified a confused and intimidated public. The car cases in 2003 (Dodge SX 2.0, MINI, and Toyota Matrix) all talked to the joy of driving. Butter in 2005 and Eggs in CASSIES 99 uncovered similar ideas about "natural." Designer Depot and K&G stores in 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. Chocolate Milk and Wonder bread both pointed out that a nutrition message has to be simple. And the three tourism cases in 2011 all referenced "local" and the idea of the traveller (not the tourist). See also *7. Fighting for the Same High Ground*.

20. Emotional versus Rational. There's a great quote that "a brand is a bundle of meanings." Many of these meanings are rooted in emotion, so if we showed a Vulcan a typical Creative Strategy (especially one from the packaged goods companies in their heyday) he would be puzzled. The key consumer benefit is virtually always rational, and the rationale is rational too. Our Vulcan would say that it is not logical to be so logical, because Earthlings are, well, not logical.[14]

Why have Creative Strategy documents been this way? In part, it traces back *Scientific Advertising* by Claude Hopkins in 1922, and *Reality in Advertising* by Rosser Reeves in 1960. They argued for the unique selling proposition (USP) and the resulting hard-sell advertising had enough successes to perpetuate the thinking.

Meanwhile, others, led by Bill Bernbach, argued for a more intuitive approach, and recently the "emotion" view has gained traction. But even today, there are Creative Strategies that tuck emotional benefits in under Brand Character, or don't mention them at all. I used to make that mistake. When I was Brand Manager on Tide we said implacably that Tide stood for cleaning. We also knew that Tide stood for *trust,* but this did not appear anywhere in writing—and we could easily have overlooked it.

John Bartle of Bartle Bogle Hegarty (the UK agency famous for creativity *and* effectiveness) calls for us to think in terms of the

~Unique Emotional Proposition~

Agencies and clients are factoring this in more than they used to, but it still doesn't get pride of place. Given what we are learning about Emotional Intelligence, this seems illogical, and lord knows what a Vulcan would say. Here are winners that *could* have focused on the rational, but chose emotion:

---

[14] The term "Creative Strategy" can be confusing, because it sets out the *objectives* for creative, and not a strategy for achieving them. A typical structure would be: "(Brand) will convince (target audience) that it is the best choice for (such and such a benefit)" -- but it would *not* say how to do this. So why the term "strategy"? It's because the Creative Strategy was a sub-set of the Marketing Objective. So "Creative Strategy" meant "the strategy by which creative will play its part in achieving the Marketing Objective." If this isn't clear, don't worry. Hardly anyone fusses over these distinctions any more.

CASSIES III

- Chrysler NS Minivan. It had functional improvements, but the campaign was heavily infused with emotional benefits.
- Philadelphia Cream Cheese. The Angel captured "permission to indulge," and the rational benefit of 60% less fat than butter or margarine.
- Richmond Savings. The Humungous Bank campaign.

CASSIES 99

- AGF Funds. The "what are you doing after work" campaign charmed its way into people's pocketbooks.
- becel. With hard-hitting print, and a strong doctors/nutritionist plan, it reached #1. Then they added TV, but regulators forbade hard-hitting claims. This led to the "young at heart" campaign, and spectacular long-term business growth.
- Clearnet MiKe. It appealed to the self-image of its pragmatic, project-driven target audience.
- Fido. It includes rational benefits, but the main pull is user-friendliness.
- St-Hubert tapped into chez-nous.
- Sunlight captured the joy of getting dirty.
- Wonder Bread. They could have sold on taste + nutrition, but instead used the joy of childhood.

CASSIES 2001

- Joe's Rant made us proud.
- Clarica made it all look simple.
- Clearnet gave us the future is friendly.
- Kraft tugged at our heartstrings with KD moments.
- Manitoba Telecom gave us Morty, the talking bison.

CASSIES 2002

- The Bank of Montreal and Scotiabank made us smile.
- Campbell's gave us the less-than-perfect family.
- CFL fanned the flames of rivalry.
- Diet Pepsi (also in 2007) gave us back our youth.
- ED made us think.
- Home Furnaces tickled the fancy of an older audience.
- Nautilus gave us joie de vivre.
- Philly showed us that a less-than-perfect angel was still working.
- Pine-Sol took a quirky look at keeping the house clean.
- Sidekicks gave the family a helper.

CASSIES 2003

- Sloche appealed to teen rebelliousness.
- The SAAQ campaign scared us to death.
- Manitoba Telecom showed that Morty the bison was still working.
- Toyota Matrix went for emotion rather than reason.
- Sola Nero made wine youthful and hip.
- Viagra was, well, Viagra.

CASSIES 2004

- The United Way cast off its "administrative" image.
- Cottonelle talked to women as women.
- Gaz Metro dealt with the fear of Gas.
- Prairie Milk appealed to teens' need for growth.
- Toyota Sienna positioned itself as the cool minivan.

CASSIES 2005

- Smoking is just "Stupid."
- Energizer Lithium found that the rational approach was not working.
- Coricidin II had to find a way to get a blood pressure benefit across.

CASSIES 2006

- Activia had to do the same with the "digestive" benefit.
- Run for the Cure, not surprisingly, found that emotion was appropriate.
- IKEA appealed to the need to feel *smart.*
- Yaris found a way to add aspirational appeal to a sub-compact.
- Eterna did something similar with film and Directors of Photography.
- Pourquoi Commencer used harrowing images to reach drug users.

- Monster appealed to our feelings about our bosses.
- Wonder Plus clearly linked it to the emotional appeal of Wonder Bread.
- Reversa appealed to Cougars in a decidedly non-rational way.

CASSIES 2007

- SpongeTowels sold a rational benefit emotionally.
- Never Stop Milk in the Prairies consciously avoided a rational sell.
- Honda Quebec and La Parisienne did likewise.

CASSIES 2009

- Pillsbury Cookies got at the mother love behind baking.
- Spongetowels exploited the charm of the Spongepocket characters.
- Tetley Green Tea evoked the mysteries of green
- Camp Okutta triggered anger
- Nexium appealed to the gratitude that people rarely show to doctors.
- Frito Lay used the power of "the land."
- Cashmere took just about the most functional product there is, and wrapped it in luxury.

CASSIES 2010

- Temptations helped cat owners deal with cat superiority.
- Lay's connected Americans with rural values.
- Gain used the evocative power its wonderful scent.
- MINI has the "bundle of meanings" that add up to the MINI attitude.
- Subaru Forester, with sumos, made themselves tongue-in-cheek sexy.
- Knorr used the symbolic power of colour.
- Tylenol got back to the emotional pull that had made it an icon brand.

CASSIES 2011

- Knorr found emotion in salt reduction!
- Sunnybrook considered (but rejected) a rational appeal to donors
- Gadoua Moelleux uncovered that amazing affection for white bread.

21. Likeability. Nowadays, it's generally felt that advertising should be likeable, as part of the need to engage people. But there was a time when the opposite school of thought had a strong following. The poster-child was "Ring around the Collar" for Wisk—highly disliked but also highly effective.

The dissonance here reflects different views about creativity and selling power. CASSIES winners almost exclusively demonstrate that *they work together,* and we can hope for the day when this ancient vendetta is put to rest. (See para 4 of *Crossover Note 13.)*

At one time likeability was not on the minds of advertisers—then Alex Biel wrote a paper in the mid 80s. Later, in the early 90s, the Advertising Research Foundation caused another stir with its ARF Copy Research Validity Project.[15] Results showed that the then major copy tests had some modest predictive ability on shipments and share, but no technique did particularly well.[16]

There was also a surprise. Likeability, which until then had been seen as a non-issue, was (apparently) one of the better predictors of in-market success.

[15] They took commercials that had proven their effectiveness – or not -- in split-cable test markets – and submitted them to the major quantitative pre-testing techniques. This "predicted" effectiveness, which was then compared to what had actually happened. The test required pairs of commercials for the same brand (to remove the "brand" effect) and it was hard to find these pairs, but eventually five pairs were validated. The small sample caused some concern, but other than that it was an extremely rigorous test.

[16] Not surprisingly, this caused a blizzard of rebuttal from the research firms.

A bandwagon started. Some people believe that advertising has to *entertain* to do its job. They seized on the “entertaining” meaning of liking. Others—less sure about the entertainment view— pointed out that “liking” is more complex than this.

Alex Biel found that it is closer to “meaningfulness” than “entertainment.” Others say that it is a combination of positives (Entertaining, Relevant, Newsworthy, Empathetic) and/or the absence of negatives (Unfamiliar, Confusing, Alienating). In other words, it’s simplistic to assume that likeability is a synonym for “entertaining.”

In the CASSIES, much of the advertising is likeable in the ordinary sense of the word, but some (Big Brothers Vancouver, Dove Litmus, Ethical Funds, Pfizer’s ED, SAAQ’s anti-speeding, Canadian Blood Services, Motrin, United Way, Leucan, Run for the Cure, President’s Choice, SAQ, Sunnybrook, Plan Canada, Emergency Room) could only be called likeable in the “meaningful” sense.

And then, as with so much in advertising, there are exceptions. Tim Broadbent, in his speech at CASSIES 2004, showed an unsettling UK winner from the 2003 IPA Awards. Lennox Lewis, the former heavyweight boxing champion, talks about wife abuse. He smoulders with repressed rage in a very disturbing (but effective) commercial for police recruitment.

For myself, I’ve found the best approach is to think of liking on the broader lines of meaningfulness, as described above. (For more, see such papers as *Love the ad. Buy the product?* Alexander Biel. Admap 1990, *Do our commercials have to be liked?* Colin McDonald. Admap 1995. *Like it or Not, Liking is not Enough.* Nigel Hollis. Journal of Advertising Research 1995.)

22. Humour in a Serious Category. It doesn’t make sense to trivialize what you are trying to sell, but this does not mean that humour cannot sell in serious categories.

Money is serious stuff, but Richmond Savings (CASSIES III) blew the doors off with its "Humungous Bank" campaign. Other examples include Buckley's, Claritin, and Goodwill in CASSIES III; Fido and AGF in CASSIES 99; Clearnet and Manitoba Telephone in 2001; Familiprix and Université of Montréal in 2003; Miller for Mayor and Elections Ontario in 2004; The “Stupid” campaign, Leucan, and Familiprix in 2005; Listerine in 2006; Colon Cancer and ParticipACTION in 2009; RecycleMe in 2010.

The two financial cases in CASSIES 2002 (Bank of Montreal and Scotiabank) both used humour, and as of CASSIES 2003 I was saying that the financial category had thrown off its “serious” straightjacket. In fact, by CASSIES 2004 the Desjardins case-writer was suggesting that the pendulum had swung too far, pointing out that virtually all the Quebec banks use humour.

Sometimes humour must be avoided, even when there is a temptation to use it. Jokes about erectile dysfunction are an easy laugh, but not to men who have the problem. So the ED campaign in CASSIES 2002 was conspicuously serious. The mood shifted, however, when Viagra introduced branded advertising with “Good Morning” (CASSIES 2003), and this continued with their “gobbledygook” campaign.

23. Problem versus Solution. There's a widespread idea that advertising works better when it is positive—reflecting a mental model that advertising should spend more time on the solution than the problem. But this can be challenged:

- Quebec's "Buckle Up" campaign in CASSIES I.
- The campaign against Quebec's Medical Bill 120 in CASSIES I.
- The Heart and Stroke campaign in CASSIES I.
- Oxfam Canada in CASSIES II.
- Buckley's in CASSIES III.
- Dove Litmus in CASSIES III. (Most of the commercial is showing harshness.)
- Big Brothers Vancouver and Ethical Funds in CASSIES 99.
- Sunlight in CASSIES 99. (Most of the commercial is spent on getting dirty.)
- Erectile Difficulties and SAAQ anti-speeding in 2002.
- Bait Cars, Familiprix and Motrin in CASSIES 2003.
- Elections Ontario in CASSIES 2004.
- The "Stupid" campaign in CASSIES 2005. Also the United Way.
- Moores in CASSIES 2005.
- SAAQ, Gay Lea and Avion in CASSIES 2007.
- Aviva in 2010.

Note: When I tell people that Dove Litmus and Sunlight "Get Dirty" spend most of their time on the problem they often disagree, until they re-look at the commercials.

This is why our thinking needs to be re-examined. The issue shouldn't be the *time* that a piece of advertising spends on this or that, but on the *net impression* created.

24. Tough Topics. The CASSIES don't have a lot of cases about complex social issues. However, we do have the following:

- Quebec's "Buckle Up" campaign in CASSIES I.
- The Heart and Stroke Foundation in CASSIES I.
- Oxfam Canada in CASSIES II.
- Goodwill Industries in CASSIES II and III.
- ABC Literacy in CASSIES III.
- Big Brothers Vancouver in CASSIES 99.
- Erectile Difficulties in 2002, and Viagra in 2003.
- SAAQ anti-speeding in 2002, and again in 2007.
- Bait Cars and United Way in 2003.
- Elections Ontario in 2004.
- The "Stupid" campaign against tobacco in 2005.
- United Way, Leucan and Run for the Cure in 2005.
- The Pourquoi Commencer campaign in 2006.
- Colon Cancer, becel (women's heart disease) and Camp Okutta in 2009.
- RecycleMe and Warchild in 2010.

Note: The British and Australian databases have more cases on tough topics.

25. Brand Linkage (when should the brand name appear). How often do we hear, "I saw this great ad last night…but I can't remember what it was for." This is a brand linkage problem, and it's two-edged. Highly engaging advertising can drown out the brand identity (we used to call this "video vampire"). But advertising that sells crudely runs the risk of being physically or mentally zapped.

When you assess advertising, your mental model will affect your attitude to brand linkage. But there are no simple answers. Some executions with seemingly bullet-proof linkage don't work. Some with seemingly minimal i.d. hook the brand into the consumer's mind. The challenge is to be relevant *and* different at the same time. Relevant, by the way, is *not* the same as familiar. Something can be relevant, but be expressed in a totally new way. If "familiar" is part of your mental model you run the risk that you will only approve advertising that has been seen before.

One of the (supposed) ways to ensure brand linkage is to say/show the brand name "early and often." This idea seems to have taken hold in the 60s.[17] However, a great many CASSIES winners do *not* reflect this, e.g. Chrysler NS Minivan, Dove, Imperial Margarine, Molson Canadian, Budweiser, Claritin, Pontiac Sunfire, Richmond Savings, Metro Toronto Zoo, Goodwill, Sunlight, becel, St-Hubert, Clearnet, Clarica, Manitoba Telecom, Lipton Chicken Noodle, i-wireless, Pro●Line, Pine-Sol, Bank of Montreal, Scotiabank, Aero, Cottonelle, Prairie Milk, Réno Dépôt, Crescendo, Harvey's, K&G Stores, Energizer Lithium, Quebec Lotto 6/49, United Way, Moores, Familiprix, Chocolate Milk, Yaris, Eterna, Monster.ca, and Holiday Inn.

Some very successful advertising puts the brand name front and centre, of course, but it's possible in today's over-hyped world that "early and often" is a turn-off for some consumers. Each situation has to be assessed on its merits. But it's time that an unthinking belief in "early and often" comes to an end.

26. Awareness Alone. It seems like common sense that awareness matters, but it's more complicated than that. First of all, there is the distinction between brand awareness and advertising awareness—and the top of mind, unaided, and aided sub-sets of these. Then there's the fact that awareness figures don't necessarily correlate with business success.[18]

As CASSIES examples, Bud Light had high awareness but a miniscule share. Nautilus had high awareness, but business was suffering. Familiprix, Pro●Line and Viagra had business challenges, but all said that awareness was not their issue.

In a larger sense, marketers, agencies, research houses, and academics have beliefs, models, theories, or approaches that claim to identify what drives success.

[17] This belief came out of Day-After-Recall testing. The technique has since been largely discredited, but debates continue about the role of recall, recognition, and the like. See *Crossover Note 13.*

[18] Some years ago, I worked on Tylenol. It had a long-running campaign that fabulously built the business. Real people with splitting headaches were caught on candid camera. They took Tylenol. The headache disappeared. The premise could hardly be simpler. But no actor could have captured that sense of relief. So what about advertising awareness? It was abysmal. This was one of my first clues that awareness isn't as simple as it seems.

This is where it can get difficult, because while everyone is — in their own way — searching for truth, some are also promoting their own beliefs. So it's a good idea to look at the various views through the filter of objectivity.

One of the simpler models to grasp (in a top-line way) is the Brand Asset Valuator from Young & Rubicam. This comes from a huge and continuing worldwide study of brands that have succeeded and failed. I won't do justice to it here, but Y&R have been able to show that brand success is governed by two forces. One is *Relevant Differentiation*, and the other is *Knowledge & Esteem* (Awareness being part of Knowledge and Esteem.)

In itself, this may not seem so dramatic, but Y&R have been able to show that Relevant Differentiation "leads" Knowledge & Esteem. For example, when new brands grow, they seem to be driven more by Relevant Differentiation than by Knowledge and Esteem. Conversely, mature brands, while enjoying high Knowledge and Esteem, will still go into decline if they lose Relevant Differentiation.

There are other approaches to these questions, but they tend to agree with the broad ideas embodied in the Brand Asset Valuator. The point being, from a brand-building perspective, that awareness alone is often not enough.[19]

27. Share of Mind, Share of Voice, Spending.

> Note: I've been writing these Crossover Notes since 1997 and it would be an understatement to say that the world of Media has changed over that time. A good deal of what people used to think about has been overtaken by events. But I've decided to leave some of the older thinking in, for historical perspective.

When we assess media effort vs. competition we usually measure spending and share of voice. Everything being equal, SOV is important. But there are many times when things are *not* equal.

What do we know about weight versus creative content? Split-cable markets show that extra-spend tests work quite often, but by no means all the time. This means that weight alone is not enough. This is why Share of Mind (what gets through) is a better measure than Share of Voice (what is spent).

A host of studies show that creative effectiveness has more leverage than weight.[20]

This means that if you have effective creative, increased spending *may*[21] work. But without proven creative, there is not much point in spending more on media.

[19] This will vary by category. But even with high impulse brands (I worked for some time in confectionery) pure awareness, if it wasn't relevant, did not seem to work.

[20] I first wrote this in the "traditional media" era. With today's multiple media channels, the notions of "creativity" and "weight" are far more complex.

[21] The reason for the "may" is that most models of media effort show diminishing returns as weight increases past a hard-to-find optimal level.

This field is more than these Crossover Notes can cover. The WARC (World Advertising Research Centre) website has papers by Lodish, Jones, Blair, Ehrenberg, McDonald, Feldwick, Hollis and others. You'll find guarded agreement and withering attacks cloaked in academic politeness.

A good place to start is the paper that summarizes the split-cable results: *General truths? Nine key findings from IRI test data,* by Lodish and Lubetkin, Admap 1992.

[This study will now seem out of date. Current thinking is in flux – and Brian Fitzpatrick of Mindshare directed me to http://adage.com/digitalnext/article?article_id=138023) and especially the kaleidoscope of comments that it provoked.]

28. Media Learning.

See the note at the start of Crossover Note 27.

Many years ago, studies (mainly in packaged goods, and mainly for television) led to the idea of "effective frequency." It was based on two broad notions:

a) That advertising had its best effect after 2-3 exposures in a purchase cycle.
b) That exposure beyond this led to diminishing returns.

This thinking matched the agreed learning theory i.e. that it takes repetition before a message sticks, but then boredom sets in, and repetition does not increase learning much, if at all.[22] This thinking went on to dominate media planning (particularly in TV) for years. It has gone by names such as effective frequency and 3+ planning. The idea is to try to give the audience 2-3 exposures in a purchase cycle, without wasting excessive frequency on them.[23]

Other models also exist. There are "pulsing" models. There's an "impact" model for making a big splash. And there are markets like beer, with heavy seasonal spending, and their own notions about the best way to schedule effort.

Then, in the mid 90s, John Philip Jones—formerly of JWT UK/Europe and for some time Professor of Communications at Syracuse University—published a study that seemed to say that *just one* TV exposure (in the week before purchase) was enough. See *13. Immediate vs. Long-Term Effect.*

This put the cat among the pigeons. Some have embraced the thinking. Some have attacked it. Jones's findings were in harmony with those of Erwin Ephron (see the Pepsi paper in 2002) and the whole field came to be called Recency Planning.

[22] There are even findings that continued exposure *depresses* learning, though I find that hard to believe. P&G built powerful brands on its soap operas, and those daytime viewers saw the same ads repeatedly.
[23] Nowadays, with high fragmentation, I\m not sure that excessive frequency is a problem, though I do wonder about those incessantly repeated ads on televised sporting events.

For the TV part of a plan it proposes lower weekly weights than have historically been recommended, with longer weekly duration. Programmes are also selected to avoid high frequency on the same shows. This is drip-drip rather than impact, and it flies in the face of some long-held beliefs.

It seems to have worked for Pepsi, but detractors say that it has its failures too. For more on this topic, the WARC (World Advertising Research Centre) website is invaluable. More generally, virtually all CASSIES cases now deal with multiple touchpoints.

We have not yet seen a case that is as explicit as "we used to do X, but now we do Y, and this is what we have learned" but I think we can say the following (and again thanks to Brian Fitzpatrick who looked this over for its general correctness).

- Media neutrality is still a desirable thing (i.e. the notion that we should not pre-suppose that any particular medium is right without objective assessment) but it is no longer the hot topic it once was. It is more or less assumed.

- A shift of money from non-digital to digital is happening. (Even the big packaged goods players like P&G, Unilever and J&J are part of this.[24])

- Ideas such as recency planning (discussed earlier) still have their place, but the focus now is much more on engagement, time spent with media, interactivity, viral sharing, user generated content etc.

- Social media has a huge buzz. Creative is put into the marketplace and has its effect, but what the consumer shares with others can be even a bigger factor.

- All of this, in terms of its ultimate effect on sales, share and profit, is still hard to measure.

The 2010 and 2011 cases talk about these activities in many ways. A quick scan of the Creative and Media Execution sections in the Case Library will give a good idea of what is being done.

29. Pre-emptive Media.

See the note at the start of Crossover Note 27

Quite often budgets are not enough to deliver high SOV by sheer muscle. Budweiser in CASSIES III, Tourism New Brunswick in 2001, and Campbell's in 2002, all started *early* in order to stand out. It was quite a break with conventional wisdom to advertise beer before summer, and to advertise summer vacations to Quebecers in the depth of the Quebec winter—but it worked.

VW did something similar with their Athens Olympic sponsorship case in 2005, and Van City broke the financial conventions in 2006.

[24] Despite the shift, I think I'm right in saying that traditional channels still take up very much the larger part of their media spending

30. Reach and Frequency versus Large-Space Impact.

> See the note at the start of Crossover Note 27. The points here largely refer to television.

There's rarely enough budget to build the ideal plan, so there have to be trade-offs. The R/F numbers of a large-space plan will always be lower than for a smaller-space plan, and, although I shouldn't generalize, large-space plans often seem to be rejected because of these lower numbers. At the same time there are advertisers who are willing to invest in high engagement tactics at the expense of reach or frequency, with the social media goal of building a core of brand advocates, who will then influence other consumers, and magnify the impact of the overall investment.

Chrysler in CASSIES III and New Brunswick Tourism in CASSIES 2001 opted for impact in the pre-social media days. Chrysler, a Grand Prix winner, is particularly interesting. This was a launch that would make or break the company, so a great deal was riding on the media thinking. To make things worse, the media budget was 18% less than in the previous year. Even so, (and to great success) they decided that they needed long commercials to get their emotional benefits across, and went with a TV plan that was virtually all in :60s. See also *20. Emotional versus Rational.*

When I was at P&G we called this a decision between "depth of sale" and frequency. As far as I know, there are no research techniques that fully assess depth of sale. In fact, they show (on paper) that a :60—though delivering better numbers—does not justify its higher cost. But the same (on paper) logic would say that a :15 is more cost-effective than a :30. But if that were true we would be living in a world of :15s.

I remember when :15s first arrived. Some pundits said that they would take over, and there certainly was an initial flurry of activity. But the results from the marketplace were not so great. This left :15s taking on a more specialized role.[25]

Research (based on recall, recognition etc.) will still show that :15s—relative to :30s—are more cost- efficient. And the reach/frequency numbers will always favour :15s too. But we know these numbers are not giving us the right picture. I wonder if we could be missing something similar in the case of :60s?

[As noted in the box above, these comments are largely based on TV, but the same point applies to the world of multiple-channel media. MINI would be a good example of this. They have used "impact" thinking to great effect.]

31. Transcending Advertising. A number of CASSIES campaigns have moved into popular culture—at least for a while. Generally, advertisers and agencies are pleased when this happens, though there are always nay-sayers. "Where's the Beef?" had a lot more than 15 minutes of fame. But did it build the Wendy's business? I've seen arguments on both sides. Budweiser's "Whassup" faced similar questions, and the last comment I saw was a thumbs down.

---

[25] Sometimes with spectacular success, as with Familiprix.

Cases that mention the effect—all positively—are Richmond Savings (CASSIES III); Molson Canadian, Tourism New Brunswick, Manitoba Telecom (2001); Bank of Montreal and ED (2002); Familiprix, Irving Mainway Coffee and Motrin (2003); Desjardins and Quebec Milk (2004); Crescendo Pizza, Familiprix, Pepsi and Quebec Milk (2005); Chocolate Milk (2006); Dove, Reversa, Energie and Benylin (2007).

Viral marketing is the latest incarnation of effort that transcends advertising as we used to think of it. It was a major factor in the Dove case in CASSIES 2007 and, with a narrower audience, probably also for Doritos in 2010.

32. Internal Marketing. At one time internal marketing, as an idea, hardly existed. Now it's a crucial part of brand-building, and it had an important role in most of the cases listed under *5. The Total Brand Experience*. Laurie Young and Guy Stevenson give a spectacular example in the ICA book *Excellence in Brand Communication:*

> Between 1990 - 1995, British Airways flew every employee from around the world to London, in batches of 100, to explain the idea behind the World's Favourite Airline campaign. The brand idea wasn't just about serving business travelers. It meant treating coach passengers (World Traveler Class) with great respect and dignity, because their once-a-year trip most likely had more emotional impact than any trip a frequent business traveler took. And British Airways was the world's most profitable airline during that era.

Other cases that mention this topic are Harvey's, United Way, Familiprix in 2005. WestJet, Sick Kids, Royal Bank, Purolator in 2006. SickKids, WWF, Capital G Bank, WestJet (again) in 2007. Fromages d'ici, Nexium, Desjardins, Scotiabank in 2009. Suzuki, Nissan, Aviva in 2010. Sunnybrook in 2011.

33. Changing the Target Audience. The most famous example is Marlboro, originally positioned against women, complete with red filter tip so that lipstick didn't show. Leo Burnett changed that with the Marlboro cowboy. This looks so easy, but when decisions like this have to be made there's usually angst about losing current users, leading to the creative brief that says "appeal to X without alienating Y."

I recall two IPA examples where they were prepared to alienate previous users. The advertising for Batchelor's SuperNoodles and Peperami (a chewy, sausagey stick-like snack) had been aimed at Moms for years. They both decided to go after young men. Batchelor's came up with "men behaving badly." Peperami had a riotously sadistic cartoon campaign. This was anything but "Mom" advertising, but both businesses took off. That's not to say we should always crash around in the china shop alienating longstanding audiences. But there may be less risk than we think.

CASSIES examples include CFL and 5 Alive in 2002; Family Channel in 2004; Crescendo, Eggo, Moores, Harvey's, Juicy Fruit in 2005; Yaris, Holiday Inn in 2006. Coors Light in 2007. Impreza, Harlequin (to an extent), Gain, and Never Stop Milk in 2010. Plan Canada and Reno Depot in 2011.

34. Longer and Broader Effects. Early winners tended to be "growth and turnaround" cases, and this is one way, in the words of the CASSIES mandate, that advertising can be a prudent commercial investment. However, such cases don't capture another value of advertising—often a greater one—its role in helping build a powerful and enduring brand that stands the test of time.

Andrex in the UK is a case in point. It is a toilet tissue—a good but not especially great product. It had been supported by a long-running campaign, always featuring a Labrador puppy getting up to high jinks. Over 20 years, through the early 90s, Andrex added 5 share points, going from about 30% of the market to 35%. In itself, that may not seem so spectacular. What *is* spectacular is that those 5 points came in a continuously rising market.

As a result, sales tripled. More spectacular still, it was at a 20% price premium. Econometric modelling showed that this led to £300 million in incremental sales—for an ad investment of £54 million. This is an example of a "longer" effect, and we have similar—though not as long—examples in the CASSIES — Dove (CASSIES III); becel (CASSIES 99); Budweiser Quebec (2005); Diet Pepsi, Telus, Honda Quebec, Coors Light, and TD Canada Trust (2007); Toyota Trucks in the Prairies (2009); Gain, MINI, Never Stop. Milk (2010). Activia and Hyundai (2011).

The "broader" effect can also be massive. Orange was an upstart UK telecom, with many disadvantages vs. established companies. It launched with an extraordinary vision of optimism for the future. It was highly successful in building business. It also had a profound effect on the City. The IPA paper had a calculation by Lehmann Brothers assessing the effect of advertising on subscriber growth, revenue and churn, and hence share price. It showed that Orange's share price was almost double what it would have been without advertising. This made Orange one of the most valuable brands in Europe, and Orange eventually sold for £33 billion.

These broader effects can be hard to isolate, and UK brands often have econometric modelling and other research studies to support their argument. Here, the case has to be more inferential—such as the correlations made by Molson Canadian between the Joe's Rant campaign and Molson's stock price.

A CLOSING THOUGHT

I'm old enough to remember when Gutenberg invented the printing press, and he said to me (remarkably enough in English) "This is going to change everything." I'm not sure what he would have thought about the telephone, radio and television, but I'm pretty sure he would have been interested in the internet. But for all the change, is Maslow up in his attic re-jigging his pyramid? Is McLuhan wishing he'd said that touchpoints are the message? Is fundamental human nature changing? This is all a bit difficult in a world of 100 emails a day and the notion that faster is better than better. But from the CASSIES point of view, one thing has not changed—the value of showing, by a well-analyzed and well-presented case, that advertising (in its broadest sense), has been a prudent investment.

David Rutherford Toronto, January 2011.