

Cassies 2005 Cases

Brand: Moores: Dressed for Success

Winner: Retail—Gold

Client Credits: Moores Clothing for Men

Dave Starrett, President, Moores
Richard Bull, Vice President, Merchandising
Jayme Maxwell, Chief Advertising Officer
Charlie Bresler, President

Agency Credits: john st.

Crossover Notes: All winning cases contain lessons that cross over from one case to another. 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

- Crossover Note 1. What a Brand Stands For.
- Crossover Note 3. Core Equity versus Price and Promotion.
- Crossover Note 6. Should the product be improved?
- Crossover Note 7. Fighting for the Same High Ground.
- Crossover Note 9. Turnarounds.
- Crossover Note 10. Conventional Wisdom—should it be challenged?
- Crossover Note 11. The Eureka Insight.
- Crossover Note 17. Turning a liability into a strength.
- Crossover Note 23. Problem versus Solution.
- Crossover Note 25. Brand Linkage (when should the brand name appear).
- Crossover Note 33. Changing the target audience.

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Results Period (Consecutive Months): February 2004 – April 2005 (inclusive).

Start of Advertising/Communication Effort: February 2004.

Base Period for comparison: March 2003 – January 2004 (inclusive).

Retailers often think classical marketers overcomplicate advertising. If it works, they say, the cash register will ring. Immediately.

This simplicity is refreshing, but daunting for an agency.

Fortunately, this is exactly what happened in this case. We will present the simple and direct relationship between a new television and radio campaign for Moores Clothing, and same-store sales over 12+ months, beginning in February 2004.

During this time, Moores made no changes to merchandising strategy, no improvements to stores or staffing, no discounting or promotion above usual efforts, and no increase in marketing investment. In short, they changed ad strategy and execution, and sales that had been going down 4.5% jumped to +6.5%, in a market that saw only modest growth in some segments, declines in others.

The case demonstrates that a retailer need not rely on discounting or tactical news to drive traffic and sales. We identified a simple but powerful insight into males and their attitudes—and executed it in an engaging, unavoidable way. **Crossover Note 3.**

SITUATION ANALYSIS

In 1999 The Mens Wearhouse of Fremont, California bought Moores The Suit People and rebranded it Moores Clothing for Men. At the time, Moores was an entry-level men's retailer with 114 stores across Canada. Consumers saw the clothing to be low priced and mediocre quality. Early advertising efforts behind a campaign that promised, "Well Made. Well Priced. Well Dressed" began to improve the quality perceptions, but some executions looked so high-end that the brand began to suffer from an identity crisis. Was it a discount clothing store or a fashion store?

The fact is, Moores' merchandise and pricing put it in the price-sensitive segment. Like the big chains such as The Bay and Sears, plus independents and smaller chains (e.g. Tip Top), Moores used flyers, promotions and price discounting to woo customers and drive traffic. The department stores also made extensive use of databases from their store credit cards to mine information and drive purchases. And because of their "male friendly" categories (automotive, sporting goods, electronics), they often captured men who had come in to shop for other items. Moores had no such advantages.

Let's face it. Moores was not an attractive place for men – and sales for the base year in this case were at -4.5%

How could Moores carve out a significant position in this cut-throat category?

STRATEGY & INSIGHT

We quickly dismissed trying to out-promote the big guys. We didn't have the advertising or promotion budget (The Bay and Sears outspend Moores more than 2:1) and margins couldn't sustain deep discounting. We also had to go beyond promising great fashion at reasonable prices – this wasn't a long term or ownable proposition. **Crossover Notes 1, 7.**

We needed to get a better handle on our customer. What was important to him (if anything) when it came to clothes shopping? Once we understood this, we could articulate an insightful idea that would differentiate Moores from its competitors.

We used our proprietary Segmentation Model and found that there are several segments of male shoppers. From the behavioural and attitudinal data, we could see the guy that Moores could credibly target. He would sooner spend money at the hardware store or on his kids than on a new suit. The first thing he does after work is rip off his tie and jacket.

This guy doesn't view shopping as entertaining or adventurous. **Crossover Note 17.** To him, it's intimidating—and he'll avoid it as long as possible. He doesn't like his clothes to make a statement, he wants them to be a “suit of armor” that lets him fit in.

One of the things this guy *does* like to do – is fix things. He likes to solve problems. And since Moores has the merchandise and sales people trained to do this with clothes, we chose to talk to guys about their wardrobe *as problems that needed to be fixed.* **Crossover Note 11.**

We could see from our study that these guys accounted for over 35% of Canadian men. They lived in communities where Moores has a significant presence. Most importantly, they shopped at our competition, but only when an event prompted them: a wedding, a new job, or the inevitable creep of the waistline.

We wanted Moores to be the first place this guy would go for clothes.

That would take a personality adjustment for Moores too. Previous creative had tried to give the brand an exclusive, image-conscious persona – exactly the attitude our guy would hate! We would talk to him in a humorous, cheeky and lighthearted way—the perfect way to say that Moores can fix a guy's clothing problems. **Crossover Note 33.**

EXECUTION

In a category that relies heavily on flyers, promotional television and radio, we felt Moores could stand out with a branding campaign in 30 second television. Moores needed to get back to basics, with a consistent, defining campaign that would let guys know exactly what Moores stands for. **Crossover Note 1.**

We produced 12 television and numerous radio executions over the year. We launched 3 executions at a time, on a TV schedule of guy friendly programming including sports, news, prime-time, and movies. Each execution focused on one of the problems that men have with their wardrobes: suits that no longer fit, suits that stain easily, clothes that are way out of style. The campaign shows that Moores understands guys, and can help them out of their clothing problems.

We used problem/solution, with tongue-in-cheek and physical humour. This has proved to be wildly engaging. The less serious tone than in the past has turned an intimidating subject – clothes shopping – into an easily fixable problem. **Crossover Notes 23, 25.**

“Dropped Keys” 30 seconds

				
Office worker enters wearing a tight suit twirling keys with his fingers.	He drops his keys and bends down to pick them up.	The sound of his suit ripping catches co-workers attention.	He continues to try to pick up his keys despite his tight, constrictive suit.	V/O: Moores. Well made. Well priced. Well dressed.

“Nightmare” 30 seconds

				
Wedding music plays to the bride standing at the altar.	Wedding music stops. Bride stares in shock to see the groom enter in a tacky blue suit.	Groom approaches altar with a big smile on his face.	Woman awakes from the nightmare of her husband being dressed so badly.	V/O: Moores. Well made. Well priced. Well dressed.

“Coffee Bump” 30 seconds

				
Man takes a sip of his coffee before starting his car.	Man starts the car with coffee in his hand.	Car starts in gear and comes to a screeching halt.	V/O: Hey accidents happen. Fortunately Moores has a wide selection of stain and wrinkle resistant pants from...	V/O: Moores. Well made. Well priced. Well dressed.

BUSINESS RESULTS

The results from the new campaign were immediate and the growth has been sustained.

Television and radio launched in February of 2004. For the 12 months prior, same-store sales were sliding on average at -4.5% per annum.

Sales 12 Months Ending Jan '04		Sales 12 Months Ending Jan '05
Sales Growth	-4.5%	+6.5%

This trend quickly reversed, resulting in annual growth of 6.5%. And monthly sales continue to grow into the spring of this year (Results were supplied.)

No new stores were opened, nor were merchandise prices increased significantly during the period. Sales increases came from increasing the number of store transactions and to some degree, the value of each transaction.

	Pre TV Launch	Post TV Launch	Percent Change
No. of customer Transactions	1,369,038	\$1,475,259	7.7%
Avg. Transaction Value	\$149.75	\$154.34	+3%

CAUSE & EFFECT BETWEEN ADVERTISING AND RESULTS

The new campaign was the only variable over the time frame covered in this case, and we can be completely confident in advertising's cause and effect.

Moore's had been seen negative sales in each of the 12 months leading up to the new campaign. There were no additional media dollars. There were no changes in the competitive arena. There were no new promotional or pricing programs. The number of stores remained constant, and stores were not renovated or improved in any way.

Furthermore, according to Statistics Canada, the clothing, accessory and department store segments turned in results that ranged between -4.8% and +4% over the same period.

This case has proven to Moore's the power of a meaningful brand idea, executed in a way that's unavoidable.

End of Case. Crossover Notes follow.

INTRODUCTION TO CROSSOVER NOTES — CASSIES 2005

[For Moores]

Crossover Notes have been going for several years, and now run to 28 pages.

We used to attach a full set to all cases, but to save a few trees, we now include only the Notes particular to any case.

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

I was a consultant by then. Before that I had reached the category manager level at P&G (what they quaintly called the Associate Advertising Manager). I had then clambered up the ladder at O&M, eventually becoming President and later Vice Chairman—both in Toronto. P&G and O&M were both passionate about “lessons learned,” and so was I. In those days (it seems hard to believe now) we felt rushed off our feet. But we did have 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 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 150 published cases. They’re a growing body of experience. I hope I’ve helped pass some of the learning on.

David Rutherford

Toronto: December 2005.

For 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.

INDEX OF CROSSOVER NOTES FOR CASSIES 2005

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

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

MOORES. CROSSOVER NOTES. CASSIES 2005.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 3. Core Equity versus Price & Promotion.** From a financial point of view, a brand is not an abstract notion. It has to make good money as long as you hold onto it, and it has to be valuable if you want to sell it. A brand under price and promotion pressure has to make tough decisions. If you don't fight fire with fire, you lose business in the short term. But if you don't invest in brand-building, you're likely to lose much more over the long term.

This is the choice between a "clear and present danger" and a "worse but less immediate one." It's hard to get it right, but we probably succumb more than we should to short-term pressures. Fido in Cassies 99; Clearnet and KD in Cassies 2001; Nautilus and Sidekicks in Cassies 2002; Molson's Bubba, Dodge SX 2.0, Manitoba Telecom, MINI, Sola Nero and Toyota Matrix in Cassies 2003; Cottonelle, Réno Dépôt and Toyota Sienna in Cassies 2004; All Bran, K&G Stores, Energizer Lithium, Hubba Bubba, Moores, Stouffer's Bistro and Familiprix in Cassies 2005 all faced this issue. All emphasized brand value, rather than price and promotion.

Core Equity has more than one meaning. One comes from the "bundle of meanings" in the audience's mind. Another is the equity in financial terms. This is a developing area, and for more information contact the ICA about the publication *Measuring And Valuing Brand Equity*.

- 6. Should the product be improved?** Some years ago it was an axiom that your product, functionally, had to have an advantage over competitors. In packaged goods, it was considered foolish to launch a new brand unless it was a blind test winner over its major competitor—ideally overall, and at least for a desirable benefit.³

That thinking has shifted, and it's commonly said today that it's impossible to sustain a functional advantage; that competition can match you in a matter of weeks or months, or even days with some technological products. This has had a paradoxical effect. Some people are almost frenzied in their desire to keep their product (or service) improving—fearing that if they don't, they will be left behind. Others go into a slipstream mode—letting others face the headwinds, then matching what they do.

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

Another danger is the belief that "marketing" can compensate for a weak product. This led to the debacle a decade or two ago when North America systematically under-invested in product. The Japanese, and later the Europeans and others, did exactly the opposite—and carved out the market shares we see today.

³ There was still the "pre-emptive" possibility i.e. staking out a convincing claim for a parity benefit before anyone else did. But, in general, having a product edge was seen as important

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

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

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

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

Technology cases usually have improvements. Services (e.g. Desjardins, Gaz Metro, Réno Dépôt in 2004) usually improve as part of the "total brand experience." Some cases (e.g. Clearnet in 2001 and Lipton Sidekicks in Cassies 2002) say that if your functional advantage is going to be matched, you'd better develop an advantage through brand personality/character/equity. There is no cookie-cutter answer. Each situation has to be assessed on its merits.

- 7. Fighting for the Same High Ground.** Some people feel that a brand 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 P&G's Oil of Olay bar from the US, and decided to kick-start Dove sales via new advertising. They had a spectacular product demonstration. Dove is not a soap, and when it is subjected to litmus paper, the colour does not change. With soaps—including Ivory—the paper turns an ugly blue. But this is essentially a mildness demonstration, and Ivory owned mildness. Some heavy hitters in international management (at the client and agency) predicted disaster if Dove took on Ivory. But Dove attacked anyway. At the start of the case, Dove and Ivory had the same dollar share. Four years later Dove's dollar sales were up 73%, and Ivory had dropped to half of Dove's dollar share.

And how do you decide whether to attack or not? On winnability. Yes, Ivory held the mildness position, but with “litmus” Dove had a superb claim on that territory.

The key is how you think about distinctiveness. It does *not* have to come from positioning. Consider Duracell and Energizer. Duracell was the first brand to stake out “lasts longer,” and Energizer (believing they could not attack this high ground) 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 variation on this theme. Sunlight wanted to attack Tide on cleaning, but decided that a frontal assault on such a powerful brand would fail. They still attacked, however, but they re-defined “clean” as the joy of getting dirty. This brilliant insight helped them win the Grand Prix in Cassies 99.

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

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

Cassies I

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

Cassies II

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

Cassies II

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

Cassies 99

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

Cassies 2001

- Kraft Dinner.
- Lipton Chicken Noodle.

Cassies 2002

- BMO Quebec.
- Campbell’s Soup. Listerine.
- CFL. Pro•Line.
- Easter Seals Relay.
- Sleeman Quebec.

Cassies 2003

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

Cassies 2004

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

Cassies 2005

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

10. Conventional Wisdom—should it be challenged? Conventional wisdom will sometimes be right. But it can also be a roadblock. When US Pepsi executives first saw the Pepsi Challenge, they apparently said, "that's not Pepsi," 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:

From Cassies I, III, 99, 2001:

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

From Cassies 2002:

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

From Cassies 2003:

- Bait Cars, talking directly to criminals.
- Crown Diamond Paint, advertising that men hate painting.
- Familiprix, using humour to sell health products.
- Irving 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, breaking convention as a corporate philosophy.
- Elections Ontario, resisting the temptation to use social responsibility.
- The Miller campaign, throwing out the conventions of political advertising.
- Réno Dépôt, investing in the brand, rather than "price and item."
- Toyota Sienna, with their "cool minivan" thinking.

From Cassies 2005:

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

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*.) 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. 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 in Cassies 2002. They found a way to be youthful without being too young in the "forever young" campaign.
- 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.
- Irving's Cruisin' to Win. Saw the power of *small* prizes. Cassies 2005.
- Crescendo. Like Oh Henry! saw unoccupied high ground. Cassies 2005.
- Butter. Saw a way to use "natural" to connote taste and health. Cassies 2005.
- Anti-Smoking. Saw the power of "Stupid." Cassies 2005.
- Jergens Ultra Care. Saw a way to reposition skin. Cassies 2005.
- Whiskas saw things from the *cat's* point of view. Cassies 2005.
- Moores used the fact that their target audience hates shopping. Cassies 2005.
- Harvey's realized the significance of The Grill.
- Quebec Lotto 6/49. If 6/49 winners are so generous, be nice to them.
- United Way saw power in the Hand icon.
- Leucan realized that there is still hope, despite childhood cancer.
- CIBC Run for the Cure saw the power in the Pinnie idea.
- Juicy Fruit saw how to build a new image by (almost literally) destroying the old one.
- Quebec Milk saw power in the obvious—if one glass is good, two are better.
- Plus virtually all the cases in *Crossover Note 10*.

17. Turning a liability into a strength. Some examples:

- Buckley's—Tastes awful but it works. Cassies III.
- Irving Home Furnaces—Made a virtue of age. Cassies 2002.
- Listerine—Was seen as “Margaret Thatcher” and displaced this image with the Action Hero campaign. Cassies 2002.
- Pine-Sol—Far too strong. Softened this with “thorough clean.” Cassies 2002.
- Sleeman in Quebec—Took an Anglo-heritage beer in a declining category and re-vitalized it with “honest frenglish.” Cassies 2002.
- Pro•Line—Made the un-knowledgeable sports fan realize that anyone can win. Cassies 2002 and 2003.
- Crown Diamond—Appealed to men who hate painting. Cassies 2003.
- Super 7—Made a virtue of excess. Cassies 2003.
- Cirque du Soleil—showed eroticism without really showing it. Cassies 2004
- Gaz Metro—Made the (feared) gas flame the hero. Cassies 2004.
- Short Film Festival—Made a virtue of brevity. Cassies 2004.
- Irving's Cruising to Win—Made a virtue of *small* prizes. Cassies 2005.
- Moores—Found a way to appeal to men who hate shopping. Cassies 2005.
- Juicy Fruit—Destroyed the oh-so-sweet Juicy Fruit jingle. Cassies 2005.
- Johnson's Baby Shampoo—Used mildness to reposition against adults who wash their hair every day, and took over as market leader, despite being a blind test loser to adult shampoos.
- Heinz ketchup—Made a virtue of s-l-o-w.

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

- Quebec's “Buckle Up” campaign in Cassies I.
- The campaign against Quebec's Medical Bill 120 in Cassies I.
- The Heart and Stroke campaign in Cassies I.
- Oxfam Canada in Cassies II.
- Buckley's in Cassies III.
- Dove Litmus in Cassies III. (Most of the commercial is showing harshness.)
- Big Brothers Vancouver and Ethical Funds in Cassies 99.
- Sunlight in Cassies 99. (Most of the commercial is spent on getting dirty.)
- Erectile Difficulties 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.
- The “Stupid” campaign in Cassies 2005. Also the United Way.
- Moores in Cassies 2005.

Note: When I tell people that the Dove and Sunlight commercials spend most of their time on the problem they 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 the *time* spent on this or that, but on the *net impression* taken away.

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

When you assess advertising, your mental model will affect your attitude to brand linkage. But there are no simple answers. Some executions with seemingly bullet-proof linkage don't work. Some with seemingly minimal i.d. hook the brand into the consumer's mind. The challenge is to be relevant *and* different at the same time. Relevant, by the way, is *not* the same as familiar. Something can be relevant, but be expressed in a totally new way. If "familiar" is part of your mental model (knowingly or not) you run the risk of only approving 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.⁴ A great many Cassies winners do *not* reflect this, e.g. Chrysler NS Minivan, Dove, Imperial Margarine, Molson Canadian, Budweiser, Claritin, Pontiac Sunfire, Richmond Savings, Metro Toronto Zoo, Goodwill, Sunlight, becel, St-Hubert, Clearnet, Clarica, Manitoba Telecom, Lipton Chicken Noodle, i-wireless, Pro•Line, Pine-Sol, Bank of Montreal, Scotiabank, Aero, Cottonelle, Prairie Milk, Réno Dépôt, Crescendo, Harvey's, K&G Stores, Energizer Lithium, Quebec Lotto 6/49, United Way, Moores, Familiprix.

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

33. Changing the Target Audience. The most famous example is Marlboro, originally positioned against women, with red filter tip so that lipstick didn't show. The Leo Burnett people changed all that with the Marlboro cowboy. This looks easy with hindsight, but when the decision has to be made 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."

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

Cassies winners who risked alienation include CFL and 5 Alive in 2002, Family Channel in 2004, Crescendo, Eggo, Moores, Harvey's, Juicy Fruit in 2005.

End of Moores Crossover Notes

⁴ This belief came out of Day-After-Recall testing. The technique has since been largely discredited, but debates continue about the role of recall, recognition, and the like. See *Crossover Note 13*.

