

# Cassies 2004 Cases

Brand: Prairie Milk

**Winner: Off To a Good Start—Certificate of Excellence**

**Client Credits: Prairie Milk Marketing Partnership**

Colleen Battigelli Smith, Director Product Marketing, Dairy Farmers of Manitoba

Katherine Loughlin, Manager Market Development, Alberta Milk

Wendy Kelly, Executive Director, Dairy Farmers of Saskatchewan

**Agency Credits: Cossette West**

Richard Hadden, President, Creative Director

Blair Dewan, Senior Writer

Scott Schneider, Senior Art Director

John Hall, Vice President, Planning

Carol Shmygol, Vice President, Account Director

Pat Link, Senior Broadcast Producer

Debbie Chabot, Senior Media Planner

Cam MacNeil, Media Planner/Buyer

Jan Fricker, GM Blitz Promotions

Sandy Fleischer, Vice President, Fjord Interactive

Melanie Wong, Interactive Producer

**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 9. Turnarounds.
- Crossover Note 33. Changing the Target Audience.
- Crossover Note 14. Refreshing a continuing campaign.
- Crossover Note 15. Baby with the Bathwater.
- Crossover Note 2. Brand Truths.
- Crossover Note 11. The Eureka Insight.
- Crossover Note 1. What the Brand Stands For.
- Crossover Note 20. Emotional versus Rational.
- Crossover Note 25. Brand Linkage (when should the name appear).

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

## Executive Summary

**Results Period:** September 2003 through May 2004 (the last month for which results are available).

**Start of Advertising/Communication Effort:** September 8, 2003.

**Base Period:** September 2002 through May 2003.

Milk has inherent equity. It is healthy and good for you. It is good for your bones and teeth. It is genuine, honest and real. It is comfort food and it is great with cake. In fact, historically, it was woven into the fabric of every day life:

*The people who have achieved, who have become large, strong, vigorous people, who have reduced their infant mortality, who have the best trades in the world, who have an appreciation for art, literature and music, who are progressive in science and every activity of the human intellect are the people who have used liberal amounts of milk and its products.*

- 1920s U.S. National Dairy Council Publication

Unfortunately, we now have a 10+ year decline in milk volume and consumption across North America. This is evident in the Prairies (Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan) with volume -1.2% from 1999 to 2002 alone.

Launching a brand is always a challenge. Reinventing a brand is that much more difficult, particularly when consumers are rejecting you. When your wholesome *Ivory* image is no longer in vogue. When you have more competitors than ever before, with unprecedented spend levels, innovations and line extensions. And when your target is young people, who view milk as bland, boring, and for babies.

Such was the challenge with Prairie Milk. A challenge that included not just stabilizing volume, but achieving a 1% to 2% increase for September 03 to December 04—equating to an additional 5 to 10 million litres of milk over the 16-month period. While 1%-2% growth may sound marginal, it is not. Not in the context of the long-term decline, the image of milk, and the competitive battlefield. **Crossover Note 9.**

As this case will show, the “Never Stop. Milk.” campaign has helped deliver a 1.4% volume increase in the first 9 months of activity. Meanwhile, the balance of English Canada is -1.4% (despite significant marketing initiatives). We also have statistically significant gains in perceptions of milk and milk advertising. “Never Stop. Milk.” is truly a success story.

## Situation Analysis

### a) Overall Assessment

Across North America there has been a 10+ year decline in sales and consumption of fluid milk. The same trend holds true in the Prairies (Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan) with fluid milk sales declining by -1.2% from 1999 to 2002 alone.

Several factors have contributed to this including:

- *An unbelievably fierce competitive landscape.* In the past few years the beverage category has exploded. Where once there were a few competitors, today there are hundreds. Where once milk was the beverage of choice at the family dinner table, now soft drinks, water and juice have usurped milk—and the dinner table is a distant memory. Where milk once owned the “healthy” position, today that fertile ground for everything from pop, sports drinks, juices, bottled water to soy beverages. Choice and innovation are unprecedented, as are spend levels, with the competition outspending milk an average of at least 3:1.
- *Negative perceptions surrounding milk.* These are causing people to reject milk in favor of other beverages. 47% of Prairie adults claim to limit their consumption of milk for factors such as:
  - Belief they can get their calcium from other sources
  - Attempt to drink 8 glasses of water a day
  - Concern with the purity of milk

Source 2004 Barriers Study

The decline is in all age groups, especially with Prairie youth. While consumption remains relatively strong until age 9, there is a noticeable decline through adolescence. [Following age 17, there is further significant drop off, which intensifies with age.]

Historically, moms were the target, but society has changed so significantly that they can no longer be relied on as gatekeepers of the fridge. Reaching and influencing moms was relatively easy. Reaching and influencing young people (9 – 17) is far more daunting, yet well worth the effort.

Consider the challenge. They see milk as bland, boring, for babies. Many would be ashamed to be seen with it in front of their friends. They are a notoriously hard to reach target from a psychographic point of view. The product is in decline. And competition has unprecedented levels of popularity and spend.

#### **b) Objectives:**

**Business:** This was set at increasing milk volume by 1% to 2% for the sixteen months running from September 2003 to December 2004. This is an extra 5 to 10 million litres, and was unquestionably ambitious, given recent trends. It is the equivalent of having a quarter of Prairie 9-17 year olds drink 2 ¼ to 4 ½ extra glasses *each and every week*.

**Communication:** This was to achieve significant improvements in attitudes towards milk and milk advertising—while exceeding youth norms on key advertising measures such as breakthrough, comprehension and impact. This too was ambitious, because these norms have been established by products far more popular than milk, with far bigger budgets.

## Strategy & Insight

We ran extensive qualitative and quantitative research to get at the physical and emotional barriers to milk with youth and their parents. In summary:

- Milk reminded parents of the “must dos” of their childhood. “Do your homework. Clean your room. Go to church. Drink your milk.” But parents today are fighting bigger battles. It’s not “drink your milk,” but concern with sex, drugs, what their kids are doing online, and what they are doing at the mall.

***As a result, parents can’t be relied upon as gatekeepers of the fridge. To stimulate consumption with youth we must appeal directly to them. Crossover Note 33.***

- Kids today are highly sophisticated. They are getting older, younger. This is true from a media perspective but even more importantly from a message perspective. They are responsible, want and expect to succeed, are socially and brand conscious. They need to be accepted by their peers.

***To influence kids we must do more than entertain and make them laugh. We must appeal to their intellect.***

- The healthy attributes of milk are regurgitated at amazing levels. “It is good for you. It builds strong bones and teeth.” These have become so ingrained that they serve to diss milk’s image. It is often seen as the loser of the beverage category.

***Positioning milk as “healthy, good for you, builds strong bones and teeth” is wallpaper. Regardless of how innovative the delivery, it is the same old message, and will not change attitudes or behavior. Crossover Notes 14 and 15.***

- Milk owns physical growth. It is inherent and unique to the product.

***In reality, growth is physical, emotional and intellectual. It is endemic to the youth target. They live it. They aspire to it. They thrive on it. Crossover Notes 2 and 11.***

The above insights were translated into the following brand strategy:

1. Develop a new positioning based on this expanded meaning of growth—as physical, emotional and intellectual. **Crossover Notes 1 and 20.** Hence:

***Milk celebrates all teens who are confident in who they are and have the determination to make the most of themselves. Milk celebrates growing.***

2. Develop an advertising platform against the elusive youth target that would resonate and change behavior in the fiercest competitive landscape in history.
3. Invest a relatively lean budget, where milk is outspent an average of at least 3:1, and break through against the Coke, Pepsi, Nike and Nintendos of the world. In essence, outsmart, versus outspend, the competition.

## Execution

### **Creative Platform:**

We decided that we would never be successful with a :30 pour shot, with smiley, happy kids with great teeth, nor with high tech gimmickry that told the same old health story, albeit in a contemporary way.

Instead “Never Stop. Milk.” is a true depiction of all aspects of growth for our target. The physical, the emotional and the intellectual. The good, the bad and the ugly. Because hey, it’s all real to them.

It is kids talking to kids about growth. From first loves, to first break ups. From challenging yourself physically to standing up for what you believe in, having the fortitude and confidence to be the person you want to be.

There is no pour shot. In fact the only reference to milk is at the end of the commercial with the signature “Never Stop. Milk.” The approach rewards kids’ intelligence. They understand the message. Never stop growing, and never stop drinking milk. **Crossover Note 25.**

### **Implementation:**

“Never Stop. Milk.” launched in September 03 with highly targeted television and cinema advertising. We extended our dollars through editing our launch :60 “Anthem” into 2 x :30s, and through selecting the best, not the most, of the media available. We also drove people to the [www.neverstopmilk.ca](http://www.neverstopmilk.ca) website to further bring the milk brand to life, and initiate data collection so we could speak with our target, one on one, in the future. Please visit <http://www.neverstopmilk.ca/grow-online> to view launch site.



Still from “Anthem” launch television

We also developed a unique promotion in April/May 2004 that ran on television, radio, in store and on the web. “Experience of a Lifetime” offered kids a life enhancing experience (space camp in Alabama, film school, a stint with the CFL, Global TV, Fashion 18 Magazine etc.). Please visit <http://www.neverstopmilk.ca/experience-online> to view the online portion.



Still from “Experience of a Lifetime- Sam” promotion spot

All of this was achieved with a 9-month media budget of \$2.4 million dollars.

	2003				2004					
ACTIVITY	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	Cumulative
<b>Phase I - Brand Launch</b>	<i>Television, Cinema, Web</i>									
"Anthem, Courage, Imagination"										
<b>Phase II - Promotion</b>								<i>Television, Radio, Web</i>		
"Experience of a Lifetime - Sam"										
<b>Media Budget</b>		\$1,192,019			\$536,100			\$645,000		\$2,373,119

## Business Results

After only month 9 in a 16-month campaign we have turned the decline around. We have stimulated consumption of over 5 million additional litres. As explained later, we have changed perceptions *and* behavior for a product that was almost the loser of the category.

**Volume Objective:** 1-2% increase in volume from September 2003 until December 2004 versus year ago.

**Volume Achieved:** 1.4% increase in volume from September 2003 until May 2004 (the last month results are currently available) versus year ago.

Extreme diligence has gone into ensuring that we provide the most accurate results available. As a demonstration:

- 1) We have used the Western Milk Pool (measures volume from producer to processor) as the source of volume. Using ACNielsen would unfairly skew results, given that Nielsen has growing coverage of milk distribution channels versus year ago.
- 2) Feb 29 04 has been factored out.
- 3) We have used total milk volume versus “youth oriented” sizes. There have been some recent product launches aimed at young people (e.g. smaller sizes), and to focus on them would unfairly skew results.

**Image Objective:** Significant improvements in attitudes to milk and milk advertising.

**Image Achieved:** Significant gains in perceptions of milk and milk advertising since pre-launch. The following summarizes gains in the percentage of our target who have given positive ratings to key image attributes since before the campaign launch.

Attribute	Percentage Gain (January '04 vs August '03)
	Gains in percentage of 12-17 year olds giving positive ratings to the attribute
<b>Milk Advertising</b>	
Youthful	12
Surprising	10
Modern	9
Leader	7
Confident	6
<b>Milk</b>	
Leader	8
Youthful	5
Genuine	5

**Source: IPSOS ASI Tracking Studies**

Note: the figures in the table are *percentage points*. Youthful went from 36% to 48%, Surprising from 15% to 25%, Modern from 38% to 47%, Leader from 32% to 39%, Confident from 39% to 45%, Leader from 35% to 43%, Youthful from 36% to 41%, Genuine from 59% to 64%.

**Advertising Tracking Objective:** Exceed youth norms on key advertising measures such as breakthrough, comprehension and impact.

**Advertising Tracking Achieved:** We have significantly exceeded youth norms on all key measures. Kids can prove they remember our ads, they understand what we are saying, and the message is resonating (as demonstrated by the fact that we have achieved an impact rating from 8 to 14 points higher than the norm).

	Launch Campaign "Anthem, Courage, Imagination"	Promotion Campaign "Experience of a Lifetime - Sam"	Ipsos ASI Teen Norms
Measurement Month	Jan 04	June 04	
Proven Recall	37%	39%	21%
Message Communication	68%	77%	60%
Advertising Impact	42	36	28
<i>Source Ipsos ASI Tracking Studies</i>			

## Showing Cause and Effect between Advertising and Results

The "Never Stop. Milk." marketing initiatives have directly resulted in the 1.4% volume gains. This is the evidence:

### 1. Results outside of the Prairies.

During the same 9-month period, sales in the balance of English Canada were -1.4%. This is despite significant marketing initiatives in other regions.

### 2. "Never Stop. Milk." has been the sole marketing initiative.

During the past 9 months the entire Prairie marketing focus has been on youth. There have been NO other advertising or promotional tactics typically used to promote milk to moms (from either the milk boards or the individual dairies).

### 3. Significant improvements in the image of milk, and milk advertising.

There has been nothing but the campaign to cause the image enhancements described under Results. A benchmark study prior to launch indicated that milk was bland, boring, a follower, expected, traditional, conservative. This is obviously shifting.

### 4. The degree to which we have surpassed IPSOS ASI youth norms.

These norms are based on ALL youth advertising, including the coolest of brands. For milk to exceed them to such degrees indicates the impact of the effort.

### 5. Unsolicited Response.

We have received a number of unsolicited emails from our target audience. Nine months ago emails such as this were a pipe dream for milk. [Examples were supplied.]

End of Case. Crossover Notes follow.

## INTRODUCTION TO CROSSOVER NOTES — CASSIES 2004

[Prairie Milk 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

<b>All Cases</b>	<b>Prairie Milk</b>
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)

## PRAIRIE MILK. 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)

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

I was once Brand Manager on Tide, and when asked what Tide stood for we said, “Superior cleaning. Not whitening. Not Brightening. Not Fabric Care. *Cleaning*.”<sup>3</sup> Superior performance was a religion on Tide, and Tide delivered, despite the cliché that all detergents are alike. But this was only the 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 detergent in exchange. They adamantly refused, delivering off-the-cuff endorsements that no copywriter could ever have come up with. 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](#).

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

**Cassies I**

- Crispy Crunch.
- Molson Canadian.
- Pepsi. Quebec.

**Cassies II**

- Listerine. Quebec.
- Oh Hungry? Oh Henry.

**Cassies III**

- Dove. “Litmus.”
- Molson Canadian. “I AM.”
- Philadelphia Cream Cheese.

**Cassies 99**

- becel. “Young at Heart”
- Eggs.
- Sunlight. “Go Ahead. Get Dirty.”
- Wonder Bread

**Cassies 2001**

- Kraft Dinner.
- Lipton Chicken Noodle.

**Cassies 2002**

- BMO Quebec.
- Campbell’s Soup.
- CFL.
- Sleeman Quebec.
- Listerine.

**Cassies 2003**

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

**Cassies 2004**

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

<sup>3</sup> P&G defined this by the Creative Strategy. In those days, if anyone even dreamt that the Tide Creative Strategy should include whitening, brightening etc. it was an offence against all that was holy.

**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*.

**14. Refreshing a continuing campaign.** When I was at P&G, and later at O&M, all the big advertisers and their agencies thought in terms of campaigns. If we were developing new advertising, the comment “that’s just a one-off” was a kiss of death.

In those days, a campaign was usually defined by what a brand did on television. There would be one commercial, or a pool, and they would be refreshed over time. Nowadays, influenced by the ideas of “media neutrality” and “every point of contact,” a campaign is more complicated. But it’s fair to say that we (clients and agencies) still believe that campaigns are the right/best way to build a brand.<sup>4</sup>

The belief in campaigns evolved intuitively. But more recently, the idea of “the brand relationship” has taken hold. This is the notion that (in a way) we treat brands like friends. Brand Truths can come out of this type of thinking, as can other insights. I know of one researcher who says, “I want to know what you think of the brand, but I also want to know what the brand thinks of you.”

Relationships themselves can be very different, but for most people, they are based on things like trust and consistency, without being boring or predictable. This has led to the idea that brands should present a consistent face over time (assuming, of course, that they are standing for the right thing in the first place.)

So the intuitive belief is in line with the “relationship” view. 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 do not have to be this tightly formatted. The following list starts at the most rigid and extends to the most holistic. All the examples have successes and failures, and the list is not a comprehensive one because some campaigns don’t lend themselves to being categorized. It will give an idea of the possibilities, however and (I hope) free up what can be rigid thinking:

- **Strict Pool-Out.** Campaigns like “Who wants Gum? I do. I do.” A similar situation is pooled out time after time, in a repeated format, often with a USP demo or slogan. Some people think this type of advertising is passé. Others remember it fondly, and wonder what happened to the way it used to be.
- **Hall of Fame Pool-Out.** Some think pool outs are dull, boring, predictable and clichéd. Not necessarily. The 20-odd year campaign for Hamlet cigars in the UK is rigidly formatted, but is spectacularly creative and effective.
- **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. So are Fido (dogs) and Clearnet/ Telus (flora and fauna). Huggies “Happy Baby” is one of the longest-running.

This category includes spectacular executions like “Manhattan Landing” and “Face” for British Airways, though it can be hard to keep coming up with ideas this big. Kit Kat is a different example, where the idea of “break” continues, and the challenge is to keep it up to date.

---

<sup>4</sup> A 30-something creative friend said to me, “where does this belief in campaigns come from? Young people today want constant change. What’s so wrong with a stream of one-off ideas?” This would have been seen as heresy at one time, and perhaps still is. But it’s food for thought.

- **Icons.** These can anchor a campaign (Maytag Man, Marlboro Cowboy) or be a property (Tony the Tiger, Pillsbury Doughboy). As I write this Michelin is trying to make more of the Michelin Man. Some see icons as a yesterday idea, but I think that's a mis-call—it depends how it's done. Absolut Vodka uses its bottle as an icon, and it's brilliant. The Familiprix pharmacist is hilariously effective, and could become an icon (the creative is in the case history section at [www.cassies.ca](http://www.cassies.ca))
- **Spokes-people, and Spokes-animals.** Dave Thomas and Colonel Sanders, god rest their souls, are examples, as is Morty the Bison for Manitoba Telecom.
- **Storytelling with continuing character(s).** The Oxo family in the UK is one of the longest-running examples. Bartles and Jaymes 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 would be an example.
- **Consistent "Voice and Attitude."** These campaigns are held together by something more subtle than anthems, slogans, structure, and icons. Perhaps the most impressive was Volkswagen in the 60s. Individual executions were very different (some serious, some comical, some ironic, some dramatic) but they all had the Volkswagen voice and attitude. Brands like Nike are in this category. Benneton is an extreme example. As I write this, I'm remembering some Fedex ads that would fit this category ("I have an MBA" and "You're a heck of a man doing a heck of a job, Lewis.")
- **Same core message. Customized execution.** To people with a "pool-out" mindset, this hardly qualifies as a campaign at all, because individual executions are totally different. But the overall effect can be very powerful.

The best Cassies example is the 4-year Dove case, which has been used to illustrate a number of points in these notes. The campaign started in late 91 with "Litmus," a scrupulously simple demonstration, with a haunting music track, no voice over, no people, and the story in supers. Then came the exact opposite: a raucous candid-camera commercial of women in a focus group doing the litmus test for themselves. Then another shift—to a talking-head message from the scientist who invented Dove. Finally, back to another demonstration—this one like "Litmus" in tonality, repeating the haunting music.

Someone with a strict pool-out mental model What held the campaign together was a continuing promise (mildness), an element of surprise, and a straightforward & honest brand character. The format varied completely, with no continuing slogans or visual icons.

Note: It is usually not a good idea to pre-set the type of campaign you need. Best practice is (1) define the issue (2) create the best solution (3) let the type of campaign fall out of this.

It's an open question whether today's obsessively short-term attitude is causing us to lose the drive we once had for creating great campaigns. I hope it isn't.

**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 later faltered. It came back with "Joe's Rant," with a twist. The Campbell's Kids re-appeared in Cassies 2002 after years in oblivion. It will be interesting to see how this plays out. Cottonelle in Cassies 2004 knew that they had properties in the cottony soft jingle etc. But these were also dating the brand. So they found a way to use the jingle in a tongue in cheek way.

Quite often, long-running properties get discarded because the people who believe in them move off the brand. On Smarties, this happened with "Red Ones Last," though I see that it has come back, in a back-handed way. (I'm referring to the ad with two nerdy guys in the office who—in their own minds at least—get the girl.) Sometimes they 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. Despite this logic, the international powers-that-be (at client and agency) reacted as if Dove was at risk of imminent death, and said so in no uncertain terms. Their sense of bereavement turned to horror when their advice was ignored. The "Litmus" commercial ran without the pour shot, and was immensely successful. Interestingly enough, when people were asked if the commercial had the pour shot in it, a goodly number said yes.

This is an important point about long-running properties. Many people believe they should be used in every piece of 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<sup>5</sup> consumers will not forget it. These images have a grip on long-term memory. Think about it this way. Imagine you want to *erase* an image that has got its hooks into the consumer's mind. Could you do it? I watched Lever try for years to erase Wisk's "ring around the collar" image. It wouldn't budge. That said, my view is that (in general) we are too quick to change things—probably because we want to leave our imprint on the brands we are entrusted with.

One of the main reasons brands are valuable, as covered in *Crossover Note 1*, is that they accumulate added values over time. There is no formula for doing this, but the evidence says it does not happen if a brand keeps changing the face it presents.

I need to stress that I am *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.

---

<sup>5</sup> On Prairie Milk in Cassies 2004 they dropped the classic pour shot because it is a cliché to teenagers.

**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 rather than reason, 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 always rational, and the rationale is, well, rational too. Our Vulcan would say that it is not logical to be so logical, because Earthlings are, well, not logical.

It's worth asking why Creative Strategies are this way. First, there is the tendency of many clients to assess issues analytically rather than intuitively. This was fertile ground for the rationalist ideas of Claude Hopkins, who wrote *Scientific Advertising* in 1922, and Rosser Reeves, who wrote *Reality in Advertising* in 1960. The resulting hard-sell advertising appealed to the aggressive mentality of many North American advertisers. It had enough successes to make these beliefs self-fulfilling, and selective perception expunged the failures.

Others, led most notably by Bill Bernbach, argued for a more intuitive approach, and recently emotional appeals have shone more brightly on the radar screen. But even today, there are Creative Strategies that just tuck them in under Brand Character, or do not 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. At an unwritten level, we knew that Tide also stood for *trust*, but this crucial emotional benefit did not appear anywhere in the Creative Strategy—and we could easily have overlooked it.

If you examine your "mental model" of advertising, make sure it rings true with what people are really like. Often, we in marketing are too rational, and that could be tragic. John Bartle (of Bartle Bogle Hegarty, the UK agency famous for creativity that works) has called for us to think in terms of the:

**~Unique Emotional Proposition~**

I think it's fair to say that agencies and clients are trying to factor this into their thinking more than they used to, but it still doesn't get pride of place. Given what we are learning about Emotional Intelligence, this strikes me as illogical, and lord knows what a Vulcan would say.

Here are winners that *could* have focused on the rational, but chose emotion:

- Cassies III
- Chrysler NS Minivan. It had a number of functional improvements, but the campaign was heavily infused with emotional benefits.
  - Philadelphia Cream Cheese. The Angel campaign captured the emotional benefit of "permission to indulge," along with the rational benefit of 60% less fat than butter or margarine.
- Cassies 99
- Richmond Savings. The Humungous Bank campaign.
  - 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, becel reached #1. They then wanted to get on TV, but regulators forbade their hard-hitting claims on TV. 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. The campaign includes rational benefits, but its 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 and Five Alive 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.
  - Sloche appealed to teen rebelliousness.
  - The SAAQ campaign scared us to death.
- Cassies 2003
- 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.

**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 (what we used to call a "video vampire"). But advertising that sells crudely runs the risk of being zapped.

In assessing advertising, your mental model will affect your attitude to brand linkage. But there are no paint-by-numbers 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 still be expressed in a totally new way. If "familiar" is part of your mental model (knowingly or not) 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.<sup>6</sup> 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, Familiprix, Cottonelle, Prairie Milk, Réno Dépôt.

Some very successful advertising puts the brand name front and centre, but it's also possible in today's over-hyped world that "early and often" is a turn-off to consumers. My view is that each situation has to be assessed on its merits. But it's clear that an unthinking belief in "early and often" should come to an end.

**33. Changing the Target Audience.** Many brands aim at the same target for years. It's not necessarily wrong, though it's always worth zero-basing conventional wisdom.

From time to time, a brand keeps the same target, but someone sees a new way to think about them. This is fertile ground for insights—see *Crossover Notes 11 and 12*.

Occasionally, the target is radically changed. The most famous is probably Marlboro. Marlboro was originally positioned against women, complete with red filter tip so that lipstick didn't show. I have an extraordinary B&W commercial, featuring a night-club vamp, fluttering her false eyelashes and crooning, "wouldn't a Marlboro be good right now...." The Leo Burnett people changed all that with the Marlboro cowboy. This type of shift looks easy with hindsight, but when the decision has to be made in real time, it can be tough. There's usually a fair amount of angst about losing current users, leading to the sort of creative brief that says "appeal to X without alienating Y."

---

<sup>6</sup> This belief came largely out of Day-After-Recall testing. It has since been largely discredited as a way of predicting advertising effectiveness in-market—but debates continue about the role of recall, recognition, low involvement processing and the like. See *Crossover Note 13*.

I recall two spectacular IPA examples where, to get maximum impact on the new target, they were prepared to alienate the previous one. The brands were Batchelor's SuperNoodles and Peperami meat snacks (chewy, spicy sausagey things that look a bit like liquorice sticks). The advertising for each brand had been aimed at Moms for years. They decided to aim at young men, a smaller group, but heavy users. Batchelors came up with hilariously unseemly ads in the "men behaving badly" school. Peperami came up with a riotously sadistic cartoon campaign—bringing Peperami sticks came to life, and subjecting them to dreadful indignities. These couldn't be further from "Mom" advertising, but in both cases the business took off.

That's not to say we should always crash around in the china shop, wilfully alienating longstanding audiences. But there may be less risk than we think.

Cassies winners who switched targets, and successfully took the risk of alienation, include the CFL and 5 Alive in Cassies 2002, and Family Channel in Cassies 2004. I think that Pizza Pops—the campaign with the filling splatting all over the place—is also in this camp.<sup>7</sup>

### 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.]

---

<sup>7</sup> Not a Cassies case, but I've been told anecdotally that it was very effective.

**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.

**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.

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

In physics, the search continues for a theory called the theory of everything. Einstein came across the Theory of Relativity about 100 years ago. It explained a lot, but not everything. Twenty or so years later, Planck and others came up with Quantum Theory, and Hiesenberg advanced his Uncertainty Principle. They did not explain everything either. Since then, physics has been a hotbed of enquiry, but there's still nothing that explains it all. In a less cosmic way, advertising has followed the same course. A top UK researcher identified over a hundred theories of how advertising works, all capturing part of what happens, but none explaining the full picture.

This may seem academic, but it's not. 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<sup>8</sup> (while right some of the time) are not right all of the time. But (a key point) *we all make the mistaken assumption that our own model is right.*

For example, there used to be a view (diminishing, but still there) that creativity gets in the way of effectiveness. Some years back, the CEO of one of the big packaged goods companies unrepentantly took this line. I'm sure that in his own mind he was criticizing "irrelevant creativity" or "self-indulgent creativity." But to others this was the mental model that is suspicious of anything that isn't tried and true.

---

<sup>8</sup> I'm not sure who coined this term, but I first saw it in a Paul Feldwick paper.

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

At the other extreme, there is the mental model that creativity is all that matters. When people say this, they don't mean "outstandingly irrelevant" or "outstandingly self-indulgent creativity" though there are people at the other end of the spectrum who suspect that they do.

Between these extremes is a view with accumulating evidence in its favour—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 the IPA Effectiveness Awards in the UK. (Cassies was modelled on these Awards.)

In terms of the theories of how advertising works, many of us carry a subconscious version of the 100 year-old AIDA model in our 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 term "low interest" or "low involvement"). Many campaigns act by positive reinforcement.

It seems self-evident that advertising has to "cut through the clutter" but even that is being re-examined. In neuroscience, there is something called "Low-Involvement Processing." It seems that we, as a species, take in huge amounts of data through the primitive parts of our brain. It does not blast its way in. It goes in without our knowledge. To people with an AIDA mental model, this is about as whacky as it gets. LIP is unproven, but I think there could be something to it, based on a common sense test. If you examine all the thoughts, feelings, knowledge and memories you have, isn't it true that a great many of them have somehow got in by osmosis? (For more, see papers by Robert Heath and Jon Howard-Spink in Admap.)

In any event, there is no "theory of everything," and hence there are scores of different mental models. 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" view, and an "academic/research" view. The experience-based view has four scenarios, based on the different degrees of visible success:

1. Shipments/share etc. respond within days/weeks of new advertising.<sup>9</sup>
2. Advertising has helped an established brand deliver good volume/share/profit. But it is no longer causing growth—it has more of a "retention" role.<sup>10</sup>
3. The advertising is not working, confirmed by careful analysis.
4. The situation is hard to read, either because it is "too early to tell" or there is not enough information to sort out what's happening.

---

<sup>9</sup> And hopefully a long-running business-building campaign—See *14. Refreshing a Continuing Campaign*.

<sup>10</sup> This is a big topic in itself. See *Crossover Note 34*.

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

Scenarios 1 and 3 (when assessed correctly) are relatively straightforward. Scenario 2 can be more difficult, because some decision-makers are not satisfied with a “retention” role for advertising—even though this is sometimes more cost-effective than trying to make a brand grow.

Scenario 4 needs great care. Imagine a new campaign, a couple of months in-market. Media weight has been sufficient, but the business has not taken off. Angst creeps in as you face the question, “Is it working?” The following could all be valid:

- **The advertising is working, but the effect is masked.** Pricing, promotion, in-store activity, distribution etc. can all have a greater short-term effect than advertising. If they are masking the underlying trend, then given time, the masking effect will recede, and all should be well.
- **The “slow burn” situation.** This accepts that the advertising needs time to wear in, and when this has happened, all will be well. Some researchers reject wear-in, saying that if a campaign does not have a quick effect, it is unlikely to have one at all. On the other hand, campaigns like “I AM” for Canadian were spectacularly effective, but only after a slow burn.
- **The “arm wrestler” stand-off.** Two equally matched arm wrestlers can hold each other immobile for an agonizing length of time. This can happen with offsetting ad campaigns i.e. you have to assess the strength of the competition’s campaign before coming to a conclusion about your own.
- **The advertising is not working.** It may be too early to know for sure, but this may be the early sign—in which case you need to be preparing some sort of fix.

From the academic side, one question has been, “If advertising works in the short-term, why is this so hard to see?” And, “If advertising has a long-term effect, is it just the accumulation of short-term effects, or a different long-term process?” These issues are still debated, but the following have been influential:

- **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 within a week of exposure to advertising. The study needs to be read in detail [there are detractors] 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.* (This flies in the face of conventional wisdom about frequency. *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: see above.]

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

- **The IRI on long-term effects.** IRI run state-of-the-art split-cable test markets in the US. Test 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. From this, they were able to analyze 44 tests for long-term advertising effect. Test areas (A) were measured against control areas (B). A only got special effort in Year 1. After that, the test and control plans were identical. In other words, the long-term effect was caused entirely by the effort that occurred 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%.

The momentum in Year I held up, with the 3-year effect double the one-year effect. The study concluded that payout for one-year effort should be calculated over three years. (See the reference at the end of *Crossover Note 27.*)

- **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.
- **The Observations of Paul Feldwick.** Paul Feldwick is a top researcher/planner in the UK with impeccable credentials. He has proposed a fascinating 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.

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

### 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*