

# Cassies 2004 Cases

Brand: Elections Ontario

Winner: Events and Seasonal—Certificate of Excellence

**Client Credits: Elections Ontario**

John Hollins, Chief Elections Officer  
Drew Westwater, Director of Communications  
Heidi Palmer, Communications Coordinator

**Agency Credits: DDB Canada**

Ben Weinberg, Writer  
Marketa Krivy, Art Director  
Neil McOstrich, Art Director  
Catherine Frank, Director of Global Business  
Linda Mansillo-Kear, Senior Account Manager  
Russ Stedman, Account Director

**Crossover Notes:** All winning cases contain lessons that cross over from one case to another. David Rutherford has been extracting these lessons (he calls them Crossover Notes) since Cassies 1997. The notes for this case are as follows, and are attached. The full set can be downloaded from the Case Library section at [www.cassies.ca](http://www.cassies.ca)

- Crossover Note 1. What a Brand Stands For.
- Crossover Note 10. Conventional Wisdom—should it be challenged?
- Crossover Note 11. The Eureka Insight.
- Crossover Note 18. Keeping it Simple.
- Crossover Note 22. Humour in a Serious Category.
- Crossover Note 23. Share of Mind. Share of Voice. Spending.

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

## Executive Summary

**Results Period:** September 11 – October 2, 2003.

**Start of Advertising/Communication Effort:** September 11, 2003.

**Base Period:** Historical comparisons.

You would be hard pressed to find a country more committed to democracy than Canada. And yet, one in three of us does not vote—a number that tumbles to one in two for voters under the age of 25. This problem pervades most western democracies. Many have tried to reverse it—none successfully.

For Ontario’s Fall 2003 provincial election, the job was to stop the hemorrhaging.

Time was not our friend. In a world where products have months, even years, to influence behaviour, this campaign would have only 21 days from launch of advertising to voting day. This paper describes how the ‘Engage’ campaign helped reverse years of voter apathy and cynicism, and stop the decline.

## Situation Analysis

Whether you’re talking about Paris, Ontario or Paris, France, declining voter turnout is reaching epidemic proportions in just about every western democracy. In Canada this has been true for generations. Nationally, the highest number of voters (80%) went to the polls in 1958. Since then, there has been a consistent decline:

| <b>% Voter Turnout</b> | <b>Year</b> |
|------------------------|-------------|
| 78                     | 1962        |
| 75                     | 1965        |
| 70                     | 1974        |
| 66                     | 1993        |
| 61                     | 2000        |

The lack of voter turnout was driven by apathy and cynicism:

*When non-voters are asked in an open-ended question why they did not vote, a small majority (52%) cite reasons like “the election didn’t matter to me” or “I don’t think my vote makes a difference.*

*Voter turnout for Canadian elections will likely continue to decline if steps are not taken to ensure that more Canadians feel that it is valuable for them to vote and be an active part of the political process.*

Source: IPSOS Survey of Electors 2001 Study

People had forgotten that every vote matters. It would be our challenge to convince them that it did. There were several objectives:

1. Stop the hemorrhaging—keep voter turnout flat.<sup>1</sup>
2. Encourage debate about the importance of participating in democracy.
3. Extend the existing media budget through incremental PR added value.
4. Increase voter registration.
5. Drive voters to the Elections Ontario website for information on how to register and vote.

## Strategy & Insight

Research suggested that a traditional approach, appealing to a sense of civic duty, simply wasn't powerful enough. **Crossover Notes 1 and 10**. You'd think that if Ontario non-voters were reminded of the privileges they had, privileges denied so many other nations in the world, they'd be guilted into registering and voting. But they simply didn't *care* enough to vote. Whether it was the process, the parties or the candidates, these folks felt a disconnect with the system. The key was to find a new way to motivate them.

Through research we discovered that even though people didn't vote, they still had passionate opinions. But these opinions were not being heard. This makes it easy for them to disengage from the issues facing their communities by blaming the system. It was here **Crossover Note 11** that we realized an opportunity to reposition this thing called a vote to:

### *Your Opinion Expressed*

## Execution

This insight led to the provocative creative idea of showing the frustration of not having any say at all. **Crossover Note 18**.

In three darkly humorous television spots, we depicted everyday situations—in an office, a hair salon and a restaurant—where people's opinions were ignored, and expressed for them by someone else. **Crossover Note 22**. While funny, the scenarios conjure up feelings of resentment and anger at not having your opinion considered and acted upon. The idea was to turn non-voter apathy into action. **Crossover Note 23**.

In print, we juxtaposed the mouths of certain individuals over the faces of others. This created a series of powerful and disturbing images that evoked an uncomfortable tension in the viewer and solicited a strong reaction. We also broke precedent and used wild postings for the first time. We took the direct mail piece, traditionally required to inform, and turned it into a piece of communication that integrated with the campaign.

---

<sup>1</sup> It was recognized that anything more aggressive (for example, make voter turnout grow) was unrealistic.

Elections Ontario had never run an ‘Engage-the-Vote’ campaign before. Given the limited duration and the tough objectives, we focused on blitzing awareness over the 21-day election period. The television spots ran in English and French on every station in every Ontario market. English and French newspaper ads ran in all 43 daily newspapers and 7 weekly papers. Wild-postings blanketed all Ontario urban centers, targeting the 18-24 youth target. To create a sense of urgency, we tweaked the last frame of the message depending on the week—changing it from “The provincial election is October 2” to “The provincial election is this Thursday” to “The provincial election is tomorrow.”

In addition, we overhauled the Elections Ontario website, to integrate the concept and improve navigation.

## Business Results

### Objective 1: Stop the Decline

The voter turnout (%) decline was stemmed, with 2003 results basically flat (-1%). This is significant compared to the historical trend, and even more so when compared to the results in other Canadian jurisdictions, where the number of people voting was down an average of 10%. In addition, we had an incremental hurdle to overcome when the media began predicting a Liberal landslide two weeks before the election. History shows that few things drive down voter turnout more than a belief that the outcome is pre-determined and their vote won’t matter.

### Objectives 2 & 3: Encourage the debate. Extend the budget by creating PR added value.

In just three weeks, the campaign was a catalyst for a spirited dialogue in editorials throughout Ontario, with media uptake and debate in broadcast never before seen in this category. The startling amount of feedback, letters and media attention was an early indicator that we were accomplishing our goal. In total, the campaign triggered over 31 articles and letters. These print articles alone yielded impressive numbers:

Incremental circulation: 3,411,711  
 Incremental impressions: 8,529,278  
 Incremental PR value: \$276,569

### Objective 4: Increase number of voters

In 1999, voter registration was 7,598,407 and voters casting at 4,430,611. In the 2003 election, voter registration increased 4.7% to 7,962,607 and voters casting increased 2.2% to 4,528,167. In addition, the 2003 election had the lowest number of people who declined to exercise their vote since 1977.

### Objective 5: Drive to the web

Finally, weekly visits to the website jumped to over 200,000 (vs. a previous average of 15,000-20,000) with almost 55,000 unique visitors per week (compared to 7000/week previously). In fact, the Elections Ontario website ranked in the Top 10 Websites Gaining Queries on Google, North America wide after the first few weeks of the campaign. The other nine websites included *Siegfried & Roy (after the accident)*, *Rush Limbaugh*, *Rugby World Cup*, and *Halle Berry*.

## Showing Cause and Effect between Advertising and Results

Independent IPSOS REID Research was done across the country to measure campaign impact and voter responses. Based on an analysis of this research<sup>2</sup> IPSOS Reid attributed the Ontario success specifically to the 'Engage' campaign. It further recommended that it become a permanent mandate of future election campaigns.

Interest in this approach was recognized by other constituencies and is now being adopted in various jurisdictions across the nation—municipally, provincially and federally. Since this was the first time this type of campaign had been tried in Ontario, the electoral community is associating the campaign with this positive impact and is looking to extend that learning to other constituencies.

Also, the campaign received a Silver Lion award at the International Cannes Advertising Festival, ranking it in the top 1% of 5,082 television entries submitted. It also garnered several top awards in Canadian and U.S. industry competitions.

End of Case. Crossover Notes follow.

---

<sup>2</sup> Specific analysis must be kept confidential

## INTRODUCTION TO CROSSOVER NOTES — CASSIES 2004

[Elections Ontario Version]

Crossover Notes have been going for several years, and now run to 30 pages.

We used to attach the full set to each case, but to save a few trees, we are now customizing each attachment. It can still be quite long, but not 30 pages.

The idea of Crossover Notes occurred to me while I was editing Cassies 1997.

I was a consultant by then. But before that I had clambered up to the group product manager level at P&G, and been President and Vice Chairman at O&M—both in Toronto. These companies were passionate about “lessons learned,” and so was I. It’s hard to believe now, but we felt rushed off our feet even then. Compared to today, though, we had time to study if campaigns were working or not, and come to conclusions about why.

There are lessons, like gold dust, in all the Cassies cases. So in 1997 I decided to extract them. This started with bite-sized footnotes about lessons that “cross over” from one case to another. And the idea kept growing. It is still anchored to the winning cases, but I also draw on other thinking for more complex issues.

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

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

We now have over 120 published cases. They’re an immense and growing body of experience. I hope I’ve helped pass some of this on.

*David Rutherford*

Toronto: November 2004.

For comprehensive advice on brand-building, see *Excellence in Brand Communication*—authored by leading Canadians from across the marketing and advertising spectrum.

It is published by the ICA. See [www.ica.adbeast.com](http://www.ica.adbeast.com).

## INDEX OF CROSSOVER NOTES FOR CASSIES 2004

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

The Notes for this case are marked ✓ and are attached. Some of these refer to others—marked (✓) and also attached. This then starts a chain reaction—because some of the (✓) Notes *themselves* refer to others—but we decided to stop at this point. The full set can be downloaded from the Case Library section of [www.cassies.ca](http://www.cassies.ca)

## ELECTIONS ONTARIO. CROSSOVER NOTES. CASSIES 2004.

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 what is the *essence* of this, or the *abiding truth* of that.

But 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 on soldiers, boy scouts and Supreme Court judges, to the plumage on peacocks (human and otherwise), is a form of branding. Business had an early example in the 1800s when Harley Procter of P&G heard a pastor quote a biblical text about ivory palaces. Goodbye Procter & Gamble White Soap. Hello Ivory. More recently, Tom Peters published *A Brand Called You*. And Tony Blair tried to re-brand the UK as "Cool Britannia."

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

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

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

This doesn't, of course, answer the question, "how do you build these beliefs?" There are widely varying notions, but most 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.<sup>2</sup>

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

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

<sup>2</sup> How do you do this, and evolve? See *Excellence in Brand Communication* : [www.ica.adbeast.com](http://www.ica.adbeast.com)

**10. Conventional Wisdom—should it be challenged?** Conventional wisdom will sometimes be right. But it can also be a roadblock. When US Pepsi executives saw the Pepsi Challenge, they apparently said, "that's not Pepsi," and rejected it. The Dove Litmus campaign (*Crossover Note 7*) ran into a fusillade of disapproval at client/agency global head offices—and only survived because the Canadian team stuck to their guns. Here are others that went against the tried and true:

- Crispy Crunch in Cassies I, making a virtue of greed—a taboo in confectionery.
- Richmond Savings in Cassies III, poking fun at the Humungous banks.
- Sunlight in Cassies 99, saying it's OK to get dirty.
- Fido and Clearnet, using dogs and frogs. Cassies 99 and 2001.
- Various financial accounts—so many that humour, wit and charm have almost become the new conventional wisdom for the category: AGF in Cassies 99, Clarica in Cassies 2001. BMO Quebec and Scotiabank in Cassies 2002.

***Others 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 Mainway Coffee, making a virtue of the caffeine hit.
- Toyota Matrix, breaking all the Toyota “rules.”
- Sola Nero, could not be further away from wine snobbery.
- Super 7, reveling in the excesses of the super-rich.
- Université de Montréal, with no smiling students and ivy covered buildings.

***From Cassies 2004:***

- Cirque du Soleil—as a corporate philosophy.
- Elections Ontario, resisting the temptation to use social responsibility.
- 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.

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

- Oh Henry! None of the gut-fillers had tried to own hunger, even though it was the high ground for the category. Cassies II. See also *Crossover Note 7*.
- Buckley's. Rather than side-step their bad taste, Buckley's relished it. Cassies III.
- Chrysler. Minivans were "my most expensive household appliance." Even so, *emotion* was the key to an immensely successful launch. Cassies III.
- Philadelphia Cream Cheese. In research, people often do not own up to what they really want, which in this case was "permission to indulge." Cassies III.
- Richmond Savings. Almost everyone hated banks, but it still took insight to turn this into the "Humungous Bank." Cassies III.
- Eggs are natural, but in word-association tests, consumers did not say so. (See *12. Changing the Goalposts* next.) The farmer campaign 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. Competitors were fighting on promotion/price. In an echo of Apple vs. IBM, Fido saw that consumers needed the human touch. See also Clearnet and "the future is friendly" in Cassies 2001.
- Diet Pepsi found a way to be youthful without being too young in the "forever young" campaign. Cassies 2002.
- Listerine in Cassies 2002: healthy gums, after a century talking about bad breath.
- Pro•Line in Cassies 2002: Appealed to non-experts with "Anyone can win."
- Aero. Saw the power of "melting" in Cassies 2003.
- Crown Diamond. Used the fact that men hate to paint in Cassies 2003.
- Super 7. Ignored the political correctness of being tasteful. Cassies 2003.
- Cottonelle. Talked to women as women, not as "family." Cassies 2004.
- Quebec Milk. Saw the blindingly obvious. That just asking people to drink more milk might cause it. Cassies 2004.
- Toyota Sienna. Realized that the answer lay not in what minivan buyers do, but in what SUV buyers do. Cassies 2004.
- Virtually all the cases in *Crossover Note 10*.

**18. Keeping it Simple.** We know that complicated things go over our heads. But when it comes time to approve a creative strategy there's an urge to cram things in. This has to be resisted. Procter & Gamble called it "the pain of leaving things out."

Scott Bedbury ("the client" at Nike and Starbucks) blames clients for wanting too much in. Given what's at stake, it's easy to see why a client doesn't want to leave things out. But Bedbury has a point. It's hard for an agency to say no when the client says, "why not leave it in."

There's a sub-set of this when a brand has an emotional benefit *and* a rational claim. Examples would be (1) Philly in Cassies III with "permission to indulge" and "60% less fat." (2) Scotiabank in Cassies 2002, selling individual services and creating an overall image (3) Campbell's Soup in Cassies 2002, wanting to modernize its image, and get nutrition facts across. Something has to give i.e. the more points you want to make, the lower the impact of each. Agencies may try to point this out, or may stay silent. This is where experienced research companies can help. They have evidence-based answers as to the trade-offs involved.

The points so far have been at the strategic level, but the execution should also be simple—or, said better, *simple for the audience to take in*.<sup>3</sup> Here, we have to watch for the fact that we know what we are trying to say, and so an ad may not be as simple or clear as we think it is. A director can also complicate or simplify a commercial in ways that evolve after a script is approved.

Overall, though, it's noticeable that virtually all Cassies advertising is simple.

**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 Cassies 2001; Familiprix and Université of Montréal in 2003; Miller for Mayor and Elections Ontario in Cassies 2004.

The two financial cases in Cassies 2002 (Bank of Montreal and Scotiabank) both use humour. As of Cassies 2003, I was saying that the financial category has thrown off its "serious" straightjacket. And in Cassies 2004 the Desjardins case-writer suggests that the pendulum has swung too far, pointing out that virtually all the Quebec banks are on a humour tack.

Sometimes humour must be avoided, even when the temptation to use it is strong. Jokes about erectile dysfunction are an easy laugh, but not to men who have ED. So the ED campaign in Cassies 2002 was conspicuously serious. By the time we get to Viagra, though, the mood has become distinctly jaunty. See "Good Morning" in Cassies 2003.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is an "eye of the beholder" issue. My kids have no problem processing ads that I find very busy. They don't "get" some ads that I understand perfectly—and so on.

**23. Problem versus Solution.** There is a widespread idea that advertising works better when it is positive—this being part of the “mental model” that advertising should spend more time on the solution than the problem. But there is a fair amount of evidence that this conventional wisdom 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. (Advertising spends most of its time on the awful taste.)
- Dove Litmus in Cassies III. (Most of the commercial is showing harshness.)
- Big Brothers Vancouver in Cassies 99.
- Ethical Funds in Cassies 99.
- Sunlight in Cassies 99. (Most of the commercial is spent on getting dirty.)
- Erectile Difficulties in Cassies 2002.
- SAAQ anti-speeding in Cassies 2002.
- Bait Cars in Cassies 2003.
- Familiprix in Cassies 2003.
- Motrin in Cassies 2003.
- Elections Ontario in Cassies 2004.

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

This is why the conventional wisdom needs to be re-examined. The issue shouldn’t be how much *time* a commercial spends on this or that, but on the *net impression* the consumer takes away.

### ADDITIONAL (✓) CROSSOVER NOTES

**7. Fighting for the Same High Ground.** A brand has to be distinctive. Some take this to mean that you should not fight for high ground already held by a competitor. It comes out as “our positioning has to be unique.” This sounds so right, how can it be wrong? Consider Cassies III. Lever wanted to pre-empt the arrival of Oil of Olay bar from the US, and decided to kick-start Dove sales via new advertising. They had a spectacular demonstration of mildness. When Dove is subjected to a litmus test, the paper does not change. With soaps—including Ivory—the paper turns an ugly blue. But Ivory owned mildness. Those against fighting for the same high ground predicted disaster. But Dove attacked anyway. Four years later Dove was up 73% in dollar sales, and Ivory had dropped to half of Dove’s dollar share. And how do you decide whether to attack or not? On winnability. Ivory held the mildness position, but with “litmus” Dove had a superb claim on that territory.

The key is how you think about distinctiveness. It is certainly essential, *but it does not have to come from positioning*. Consider Duracell and Energizer. Duracell staked out “lasts longer,” and Energizer languished in other territory for years. Eventually they decided to attack, and the Energizer Bunny has been going and going ever since. Both brands have the high ground positioning. They get their distinctiveness from *execution*.

One last case. Sunlight wanted to attack Tide on cleaning, but decided that a frontal assault would almost certainly fail. So they re-defined “clean” as the joy of getting dirty, and won the Grand Prix in Cassies 99.

[I’m not saying you should *always* attack occupied high-ground—just debunking the idea that it has to be a mistake. In Cassies 2004, Cottonelle, Desjardins, Gaz Metro and Réno Dépôt were all successful by sidestepping or redefining the high ground. Even so, the high ground is still one of the first places I look.]

**12. Changing the Goalposts.** Some insights come from suddenly seeing what was always there to be seen. (Sunlight’s Cassies 99 joy of getting dirty would be an example.) Others re-frame the problem, such as:

- Cow Brand Baking Soda’s extended usage.
- Johnson’s Baby Shampoo’s adult re-positioning.
- Cereals trying to get eaten as a late night snack.

Insights can also spring from what is *not* being said. The Eggs case in Cassies 99 is an example. Word-association tests played back any number of benefits, but did *not* identify that eggs are natural. Somehow, this omission caught the agency’s eye, and they turned “natural” into a powerful campaign using real farmers. This 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 back that these were important, reinforcing the conventional wisdom. Suddenly, the team at Scali/Purina 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.

Purina also points up another way to get insights—by looking beyond Canada. Similar thinking had produced the famous “prolongs active life” campaign for PAL dogfood in the UK.

### **A CLOSING THOUGHT**

Throughout my career the unspoken assumption is that advertising has to help make things *grow*—brands, businesses or both. And what could be wrong with that?

But the engines on an airliner not only help it climb, they save it from falling out of the sky. There is inescapable evidence that if a brand is unsupported, it may glide for a while, but eventually it will fall. Or, to use another analogy, a successful brand is like a goose laying golden eggs. If it didn’t lay as many eggs as you wanted it to, would you starve it? I don’t think so. But that is what we seem to do with brands.

*David Rutherford*