Ep92 - Behavioral Science For Agencies: Copywriting

MichaelAaron Flicker: [00:00:00] Welcome back to this week's episode of Behavioral Science for Brands, a podcast where we bridge the gap between academics and practical marketing. Every week we sit down and go deep behind the science of some of America's most successful brands. I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

Richard Shotton: And I'm Richard Shotton.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And today we're continuing a mini series that we've started called Behavioral Science for Agencies, and specifically we're diving into the topic of copywriting.

Let's get into it. But before we get into today's episode, Richard and I wanted to share something that we've been working on for almost two years.

Richard Shotton: It's our biggest project yet, and it's called Hacking the Human Mind. And this is a book that came out this September.

MichaelAaron Flicker: It's got 17 brands, just like what we cover here on the podcast and over 30 behavioral science principles that we go deep on.

Richard Shotton: We wrote it to be practical, insight and hopeful, enjoyable to read. [00:01:00] And we've had lots of praise so far. So Robert Giulini has said he couldn't put it down

MichaelAaron Flicker: and Rory Sutherland said it was a book for the ages. You could find it on Amazon. Just search Hacking the Human Mind or wherever books are sold.

Thanks for your support. So Richard, we kicked off this miniseries Behavioral Science for Agencies back in episode 72 with media planning. And then a few episodes later we did pitching, and today we're doing something that really is part of almost every marketing project. And that's copywriting. And you know, copywriting great copy.

It shapes perception. It creates a motion. And it can also nudge behavior when it's done in the right way. And for those of us who have spent hours in ad

agencies. You know, debating this word versus that word. What does premium mean? What does superior mean? We, we, we have a [00:02:00] obsession with talking about what do words mean, how will they be perceived?

And so we thought of all the areas where we can help agencies really think more deeply about how behavioral science can help make your copy more persuasive, more memorable. You know, more effective. We thought this would be this would be a great episode. And so we'll go into the biases that helps words, helps words in copywriting get even better.

And then we'll and then we'll, and we'll see where the conversation takes us to today. Excellent. Sounds like a good plan. So Richard, we have a few key biases that we thought we would talk about. And maybe before I go through the bias, you can tell us a little bit about the idea between concreteness and abstract terms.

Richard Shotton: Yes. I think this is a really simple but underused principle that can [00:03:00] help. Brands in whatever category they're in, make their messaging more memorable. And it's essentially the idea that people are very, very good at remembering language. They can visualize. They are very bad at remembering language that they can't visualize.

So psychologists call language can visualize concrete terminology they call language you can't visualize is abstract terminology. And there's an awful lot of research that shows concrete language is much more memorable than abstract language.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And we covered these types of theories in previous episodes.

So if you want to see brand examples of this Geico, episode 65. Apple episode 23, we went into the detail on how brands have used this, but Richard and I thought, let's start with the study that really brings us to life. And it's a study by Ian Bag out of the University of Western Ontario in 1972, and he sets up 25 [00:04:00] students in a room and he reads them a list of 22 word phrases, and some of the phrases are impossible amount.

Better excuse, apparent fact. And others of them are words like Rusty engine, flaming forest, white horse. And he asked the group to remember as many as they could. And what you found was that on average they could recall about 23% of the terms. So that's kind of interesting. And if you had tried to

remember right now the list I just read, you could say, did I get better than one out of five?

But what was really the striking observation that Bagg made? Was that just 9% of the abstract words could be remembered like impossible amount versus 36% of the concrete terms like Whitehorse. And that's a fourfold difference. And so as Richard opened, [00:05:00] beg argued that vision is the most powerful of our senses.

And so when you could see the two word phrase in your head, like white horse or square door. It's much easier for you to hang onto that thought for longer. And so while that's an interesting study that was done 60 years ago, Richard, you've taken that idea and you wanted to bring it into even more modern commercial setting.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. 'cause there's a number of potential issues with the study. So as you say. Done back in 1972. This is a very old study and some people think people change, so maybe it's not so relevant. So you've got this age as an issue. You've also got the facts. You mentioned that the sample size was 25. It's very small.

Can we really base a big brand decision on 25 people? It was run on students maybe not the most representative audiences. Perhaps you're targeting business people or you know, those who weren't over a hundred thousand dollars. And can you extrapolate from what worked with some students to those other audiences?[00:06:00]

And then the other parts of the study that draw questions about its validity are things like the bizarre phrases that Beg decided to use. You know, some of the words were things like flaming forest or muscular gentleman. They're not the normal thing. Most brands are selling. So because of those concerns back in 2021 Mike Rahan and I reran.

With a few little twists. Firstly, we made it up to date, it was 2021. We then got a much, much bigger audience, 400 plus people. We made sure they were nationally representative, and we replaced the, frankly bizarre word choice with more commercial words. Things like fast car, skinny jeans ethical vision, wholesome nutrition, things that you might see occurring in in an ad.

And then the final thing we did to try and make it a bit more robust was rather than ask people straight away what they remembered from our [00:07:00] list, we waited for five minutes and then asked people what they could remember.

Because of course, advertisers aren't just interested in immediate recall. They want, you know, more sustained long-term recall.

And when we did that, not only did we find. Begs results held, yes, concrete terms like fast car were much more likely to be remembered than abstract ones, like wholesome nutrition. Not only did we find the same basic data, we found it was much, much stronger. So we found that people were almost 10 times more likely to remember the concrete than the abstract.

So. If anyone was concerned about applying this principle because of the flaws in beg study, hopefully the study Mike and I did should put their mind at rest. This is such a big impact. It is something that every copywriter out there should be thinking about if they want to increase memorability.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And you know, as an [00:08:00] agency, when you get a brief.

So often the brief is asking for you to bring to life RTBs, you know, unique selling propositions that are really internal language from the client to the strategist or from the strategist to the internal agency. And so part of the copywriter's job is to take that and put it in external facing language, but adding this extra lens of how can we make it concrete so that it's memorable is really an additional.

A layer we're adding to their job.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, absolutely. So it's fine for a client to put on their brief an abstracts objective, you know, high quality, trusted premium. The job of the copywriter is to take those ideas and then translate them into language that is easily visualized for. And it's this visualiz bit that's key.

I think sometimes people conflate concreteness with simplicity and that's not quite right. The [00:09:00] argument is if you make a word easy to picture in someone's mind eye, that's when it becomes sticky. Yeah.

MichaelAaron Flicker: I think that, you know, in begs original study, square door just always sticks with me because you could see a square door when he, when he gives it, but to your point.

It's not, it's that you can visualize it in your mind's eye. And one of the things you and I love to do is say, where in the real world do we see brands that could have taken advantage of this? And there's just a so many brand taglines that do

this m and ms melts in your mouth. Not in your hand. You know, you can see it melting in your mouth.

You can feel it. Maxwell House Coffee, good to the last drop. You can visualize the drop of coffee and you can, you could see it. And so these strap lines, these taglines help take things like the taste of chocolate or the smell of coffee [00:10:00] and makes them much more concrete in your mind.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. Good to the last drop could be consistent quality.

Being able to imagine and visualize a drop makes it memorable. Consistent quality. People can understand it, but 30 seconds after putting the newspaper down where they'd read it, they'd, they'd have forgotten it. The skill of the copywriter is to take those abstracts ideas and make them visualize. It's not.

Easy, but knowing that's a big goal certainly makes it more likely to be achieved.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. And I wonder how much of this is again about helping insert the visual into the mind's eye, and that's giving agency to the consumer, to the buyer. So the buyer hears Skittles taste the rainbow. And they, they complete the thought.

They see the flavorful rainbow. And so in [00:11:00] completing the visualization, they're, they're doing a little bit of effort to think about it, but they're, they're not thinking, what does what does you know, wholesome goodness mean? That's a concept. That's a, there's a lot of brain cycles to figure out wholesome goodness.

But taste the rainbow. I think about a rainbow and all the colors, and that infers the taste to me of how flavorful Skittles will be. We, you and I hadn't talked about that, but there is something about

Richard Shotton: that. I think you're right. I think it's. I think that can explain part of the success. So there are definitely experiments out there that make that exact argument.

So Graf and CCA at the University of Toronto did a famous study into what they call the Generation Effect. And it's just, as you say, if people have to put a little bit of effort into coming up with the answer themselves, that message tends to be. Be stickier so that they did a a study where some [00:12:00] people

would be given synonyms like fast, rapid, others were given the same synonyms, but there would be a, a letter missing fast and then R blank, PID.

And it was the people who had the missing letters in, in their words, they remembered about 15% more. And the argument was because people had to generate the answer, it became. That much more, more memorable. So I think part of Absolutely taste the rainbow or goods. The last drop can be people go into the effort of generating the image, but there's also something else going on, which is this visual.

Sense being the most important because in the graph and CCA one, there's the generation, but not the vision, and we get this 15% bump with beg, when you introduce this visual element into language, then you're getting this four or tenfold increase. So I, I think you're absolutely right. [00:13:00] An element of interaction, an element of generating the answer yourself.

Boosts impact. But then if you also layer on that visual image, then suddenly you're onto something really, really,

MichaelAaron Flicker: and it could be easy to say, well, this is very well and good for consumer brands, that you can visualize candy in your hand. Or you can visualize coffee in a cup. We're saying you can go beyond that good to the last drop.

Taste the rainbow melt in your mouth, not in your hand. You could do more than that. But some may push back and say, but this doesn't really work in B2B. And you know, we went looking for a really clear example in B2B copywriting, which is just more naturally prone to abstractions and talking in business terms and just being a little less visually concrete.

And we found this campaign by IBM called Every Second Counts, and [00:14:00] they designed this campaign specifically to help. Bring attention to their products that help with data security. But the concrete framing was they all the campaigns dramaticized, the actual data breach itself, they have a countdown clock.

Of the, of every second that you're having a data breach and the hundreds of thousands of dollars that are being spent during the data breach, and then they share real stories you know, that, that make the whole thing visceral, but making the second of a data breach concrete by the, out, by the money that's wasted, or the money that's being used.

During that, to me it was an example of making it more visual. They show the clock. What do you think is that an example of, of IBM using visual, you know, some more visualization to make it more concrete in people's minds? And I think [00:15:00] often with these experiments, you've got almost families of, of, of, of studies that are all very interrelated.

Richard Shotton: And the one that reminds me of there is the picture superiority effect. So, oh what's his bloody name? I think it's university. It's, it's either Daniel Marrow or Yaro. I always get it mixed up. I think it's Marrow where he gives some people some very, very simple instructions about how to take medication.

And sometimes they're, you know, they just get it as text. Other times they're given the text with, they then have a simple visual of the times of day they're meant to take these pills. And what he finds is that the proportion of people. Who can't remember the instructions a little bit later, it's 19% of people fail to remember them with the text only version.

It's 10% with the text plus visual. Now to me that is an example essentially of concreteness coming to [00:16:00] action. You know, in, there might be situations in the B2B setting where it's really, really hard to use Visualiz language. Well, if you can't do that, maybe the next best thing is, you know. Direct mail or your email making sure you accompany your instructions or the data you are trying to communicate with a very simple visual.

I, I think that is, is certainly in the, in the, in the same area.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah, that's very helpful to hear. Because again, the purpose of all of this is to help remind, to help be more memorable and more able to be recalled what we were talking about. So the, the whole point is to increase salience and memorability.

Fair to say?

Richard Shotton: Yeah. Yeah, yeah. Absolutely.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Cool. So we've talked about our first big idea here, concreteness, and then we have a second idea for copywriters and agencies when they think about how to use behavioral science in their copywriting. Yeah, so,

Richard Shotton: so this is one that I'm, I'm, I'm fascinated by. [00:17:00] And it's the idea that if you want to convey competence and intelligence, communicate as simple as possible.

Now, I think most copywriters would know that, but that doesn't make the behavioral science experiments worthless. What it suggests. 'cause if anyone's ever picked up a magazine or or red brand content, they know that it often is very, very complex. What it suggests is the copywriter knows this principle, but they struggle to persuade the client.

And here behavioral science fulfills a different role and maybe it's persuading the client to adopt some of our, our, our copywriting recommendations. So the experiment in question comes from 2006. It's from a Princeton psychologist called Daniel Oppenheimer, and Oppenheimer gives this experiment one of the best names ever.

So the paper title is Consequences of Erudite, vernacular Utilized, irrespective of Necessity. [00:18:00] Colon, the problem with Using Long Words Needlessly. Yeah, yeah, yeah, exactly. So he's he's living up to his own mantra and what he does in this study. Really simple. He gets abstracts from academic journals.

So these are the ES of the studies, right at the, the top of the journal article. It's a

MichaelAaron Flicker: one paragraph summary of what the entire academic paper will be.

Richard Shotton: Exactly. He then shows that to readers, and then the readers rate the intelligence of the author. Author. Now, sometimes he shows people the original abstract, which has jargon in their unnecessary, complicated words.

But other times he shows people the same basic abstract, but he is replaced the complex terminology with simpler alternatives. And what Oppenheimer finds is that it's the second group who rate the author as more intelligent than the first group. It's the second group rate the author at 13% more intelligent than the first group.[00:19:00]

Now that contradicts. I think most marketers think, I know copywriters often believe in the power of simplicity, but the people who are signing off the work, they often think the way to signal their expertise, the serious of their product, is to speak in a very, very complex way. They think that signals intelligence, but

what Oppenheimer suggests is if you use complex words, you often confuse the reader.

And then that confusion, they won't blame themselves. They'll blame you as the as the communicator. So the argument here is if you want to convey a powerful positive image, speak simply as possible. Make sure you are using easy to understand terminology. Make sure you're getting that reading age grade down.

And if you do that, it will reflect very well on you.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And so often the job, as you said of the agency is to not just do great work that will work in market, but to make sure [00:20:00] that your clients, the brands, the marketers, have confidence in why you're doing that. So sharing that there could be a 13% increase in the simple version versus the more complex version.

Really gives the client a sense, okay, there's some data backing up. Why we would choose to, to simplify maybe in their terms, overly simplify.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, exactly. 'cause if you don't know if, if you have this study, you can take it to the client. You can run very quickly through the methodology. What did it take us two, three minutes to do?

And what I've tended to find is it switches the conversation from, you know, should we communicate in a simple way to how do we communicate simply because you've taken this. Rigorous, independent, crucially study that supports the argument. That is a very persuasive way of getting towards simple copy.

What doesn't work so well is, you know, [00:21:00] drawing on a quote from George Orwell or relating back to your own level of experience. Because if you talk about Orwell's rules for writing, people are gonna think you are. Otherworldly And

MichaelAaron Flicker: you belong as an English graduate. Yeah, yeah. Yes, exactly.

Richard Shotton: You wanna be writing, you know, poetry and modern verse, not, not sell stuff.

But the other part is it just invites some to say, well, in my experience, that doesn't work. You know, my experience is we need complex terminology. You just get this trapped and this spiral of going round and round and round with

different subjective opinions. But if you take the study itself, suddenly it, it, it, I think unlocks a willingness to to, to listen because of that rigor and that independence of the underlying.

MichaelAaron Flicker: So the first benefit is that. Using simple words boost perception of competence. But this has knock on benefit here, that it also makes it easier for the receiver to take action [00:22:00] and, you know, make it easy, would be at the base level. Behavioral science teaching one oh ones, you know, the E method. The E is easy, right?

Making it easy is of huge importance in a lot of behavioral science insight work.

Richard Shotton: Absolutely. And you've got some of the real giants of the field, Nobel Prize winners like Richard Thaler and Daniel Kahneman talking about this principles. They say it's the single most important principle of all the behavioral science experiments out there.

You've also got amazing figures like Todd Rogers, who we had on the show a while back. Talk about when it comes to language, make it easy, is a very important principle. And actually he's not just a commentator in this area. A lot of Todd Rogers' work proves this point and his argument is, look, you can make something easy by reducing the reading age of the, of the words that you use.

The other way you can make something easy [00:23:00] is to reduce the volume of words you use. And he said, you should be doing both of these things. So he did a lovely study with Jessica Lasky Fink, who's at Harvard. And in 2020, they sent out 7,002 emails to American School Board governors members, and he asked them to fill out a quick survey.

Now, sometimes people received 127 word email, asked 'em to fill out the survey. Other times they received an abbreviated version 49 word email. Now. What Rogers and Lasky, Fink found was the people who received the word email, 2.7% of them filled out the survey. People who received the shorter version, that response rate went up to 4.8%, so it got the 78% improvement in responses.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Massive, massive, yeah. Massive

Richard Shotton: increase. But [00:24:00] then the really interesting bit is they then do a, a follow up. They go and find. Lots of people who did or didn't fill out the survey, they keep on ask them to say why they, they did or didn't. And

one of the questions they ask those people is, how long? Did you think it would take to fill out the survey?

And what's interesting is people who received the word email, 29% of them thought the survey was gonna take more than five minutes. Whereas that figure almost halves with the brief email, it's down to 15%. So the argument here is in a situation of uncertainty. It's like, you know, how long is the survey gonna take?

People use the effort of reading the request as a proxy for the effort that the actual task will take. So if you make a really detailed, wordy argument about all the amazing reasons you should fill out a survey, you might increase motivation a bit. But what you are also doing is increasing [00:25:00] the perceived effort of the task.

And often it's the effort, perceived effort of a task that really affects how many people do it. Reducing the length of the request is one of the best ways to make it feel like a very small

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. You know, my mind immediately as we, as we were talking about this study, my mind immediately went to government forms and how on the, on the instruction of any form in America from the IRS, you might have an entire page of instructions.

For a half page set of fields to fill in. So I was thinking about like how much you could change compliance with government forms through, through this you know, through this, this simple insight that if you can give less instruction even upfront, even if all that information went in an appendix, how much better it might be.

Absolutely.

Richard Shotton: Most people are busy. They've got lots of different things they could be doing. [00:26:00] And a part of us, and I know I'm guilty of this, is, is, is we are often lazy, you know, we have this long to-do list and what we often do is put the easiest things to the top top because we get this great sense of satisfaction from ticking them off.

So if you give people, you know, page of rubric about how to fill in the survey, people are gonna think, oh my Lord, that's my whole afternoon. Go on. I know I've got to do my RS. Forms, but it's gonna take ages. Okay. I'll, I'll, I'll get a

few quick jobs done and then I'll come to the IS. Of course it keeps on getting supplanted.

And there's other stuff that comes at the top of the, the to-do list. So it's not that people say to themselves, oh, I'm never gonna do it, but what ends up happening, it goes to the bottom to list, and then it takes a long time to have ever have surface. So make it simple. Make it a short request, you are more likely to get the top do list.

You're more likely to get acted upon.

MichaelAaron Flicker: So we've shown this lovely study and we've shown, and I raised an idea of how it might affect government forms. [00:27:00] It occurs to me commercially, even when you sit in a restaurant and you get a a, a book as your menu. Rather than a simpler presentation, even if it's the same number of dishes, the idea of multiple pages to flip through and lots of descriptive text on each one.

Versus something shorter may, maybe I'm just, my own experience is it feels more daunting whether or not you flip through every page or not. Still you're, you're in a high intention environment. You're sitting in a restaurant, you're going to spend money on a meal. Maybe you're still gonna get through it, but there does have feel that sense of, oh, this is a daunting task to flip through all these pages.

Richard Shotton: And there are real downsides. Even outside of the ease part. There's a brilliant book. He's called the Paradox of Choice by Barry Schwartz, and he talks a lot about the danger of giving people too many options, and what he essentially says is, if you're [00:28:00] going to a restaurant, you might have. One bottle of wine.

He might have a couple of glasses. So if you give people, let's say you're just gonna have one glass. If you give people a menu with five glasses on that there are four things they're not having, there are four things. Those people might slightly. Miss, you know, through loss aversion. If you give them a booklet with a hundred wine glasses, now there are 99 things they're not having.

And each of those absences, each of those things they're not having, adds a little bit of of pain. So he says there is a downside in terms of perception of effort, but there's also that kind FOMO that comes are giving people too many options.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah, yeah. It's really it's really helpful for. Copywriters and agencies to say, so we know this is happening.

How do we bring this into every piece of work we're bringing to the, to the world? And so making it easy, making it shorter is really a [00:29:00] way to help drive better outcomes for their work. So, so do we have a third and maybe final idea we can bring to copywriters that they, how they can apply behavioral science?

Richard Shotton: Absolutely. And we've talked about some broad principles but there are lots of studies that kind of go down to very specific word choice. And one that I think is fascinating that more people could apply is the idea of, of loss aversion. So this is essentially the idea that the equivalent loss will affect us more than the equivalent gain.

So what I mean by that is if you are walking home tonight. And you realize you have dropped $5, you will feel very bad. Someone else out there will eventually stumble across that $5 and they will feel quite good. The point is, their happiness [00:30:00] is smaller than your sense of loss. Even though it's mathematically the same amount when it's from the loss perspective, it affects us more than from the the game perspective.

Now, that's not just. Speculative argument. There is a lovely 1988 study from Elliot Aronson. He wasn't the first person to experiment on loss aversion, but I think he did the most practical study that I know. And he goes round to 404 houses, knocks on the door and tries to tell, sell people loft insulation.

Now, for half the owner homeowners, he says, if take out locked insulation, you save 75 cents a day.

He says, if you don't take out loft insulation, you'll be wasting 75 cents a day. So both circumstances, it's the same massive tical amount, 75 cents. And if people were completely logical, then the impact of those statements should be roughly the same. Be the

Sound: same, [00:31:00] yeah.

Richard Shotton: But he finds saying quite different.

He finds that when he frames it as a gain, you'll gain 75 cents. If you do this, 39% of people wanna find out more information. Whereas when he frames it as a loss, that number jumps to 61%. So exactly the same sum becomes 56% more

powerful if it's framed as a loss rather than gain. Now that is definitely something that copywriters can apply more and most brands don't use that.

Most brands talk about a game frame rather than a loss frame,

MichaelAaron Flicker: and, and so whether it's don't waste, don't miss out, don't lose in the example you gave where you can frame a message that will make you think about what happens if you don't do this. And that fear of loss is what can motivate people to be much more interested.

Than the same amount if it, if it was just a gain.

Richard Shotton: E Exactly. And, and that is a, a much rarer tactic. You know, most brands say switch to [00:32:00] us and gain a hundred pounds. They don't say, if you don't switch to us, you'll be wasting losing out on a hundred, a hundred pounds or a hundred dollars. So copywriters should think, look.

In my specific circumstance, can I keep it simple, but frame it in that negative lost way? Because if you can, you can still keep the simplicity, then you are on something quite powerful.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah, and I do think that there's a sense generally from clients that we don't want to communicate negative things to the world.

Like that would just generally, we wanna put our brand near happy. Lighthearted positive things 'cause that will shed a positive light on our brand. And I don't think we're really saying that they have to be negative. I think what we're trying to do is, is gain attention and importance by pointing out.

The other side of the coin that there's something, you know, smart people [00:33:00] wouldn't waste this time. Smart people wouldn't waste this money. So it doesn't have to be negative. It's more that we just need to focus on the loss more than the gain. Is it, it, there's a, it feels like they're close, but there, there's a distinction to be made here.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. I, I think that, I think that's absolutely fair. Absolutely fair. Yeah.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. So. We've gone through three key ideas for our copywriters and agencies. You wanna give us a quick summary of what they are?

Richard Shotton: So first thing we talked about was concreteness. This is the idea that vision is the most powerful of our senses.

And if you want people to remember your copy, try and make it as visual as possible. So if people can visualize language you are doing using. It'll be much stickier than if it's too abstract. So that was the first principle. The second principle was this overarching idea of Make it Easy which talked about the Oppenheimer study, which was if you use simple language, it will reflect well on you as a communicator.

[00:34:00] You'll look more intelligent, your brand will look higher quality. And then we also talked about a related idea, which was the shorter your request, the easier people will think that request is gonna be. Lots of text makes people think the task is gonna be rous. So that was the Todd Rogers and Lasky Fink experiment.

And then the final more specific study was the Aronson one about loss aversion. The idea that loss is motivate us more than gains, so. Don't just tell people what they'll gain from taking out your product. Tell them what they'll miss out on. What they'll lose out on if they don't take out your product.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And then a sub-context that we spent a bit of time in the middle of the conversation was thinking about how agencies can use academic studies. To give their clients more confidence that this is not just opinion or shared experience. This has got [00:35:00] independent research that should give you confidence that this approach is more likely to work in the real world.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, absolutely. I think that affects people both in. Copywriting department, but, but beyond, but it's an important, valuable use of payroll site.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah, and if Richard and I were to say an underlying motivation of the podcast overall, you know, we want to help marketers become more effective brands and agencies be more effective in their work and under, underneath that.

Is a belief that we have, that there's really a lot of academic work that can inform that. Like we believe that if we can find the right connective tissue and we can give you all those insights, then make use of that in the world and it will make your agency more successful and it will make your work more effective.

And that can bring us to the end of this week's episode. And as we like to do, Richard, we always like to [00:36:00] do a, you know, a fun question to wrap the episode. Your favorite tagline, strap line of all time. Do you have one?

Richard Shotton: Whittling down to one is hard, but one that I might go for, which features in hacking the human mind is a thousand songs in your pocket.

So in the Apple chapter we talk about the benefit. Of concreteness. And we also talk about some other really nice ideas like optimal newness, but around copywriting, we talk about a thousand songs in your pocket and how that exemplifies this idea of concreteness because you can picture a pocket in a way that you can't picture a claim about 5G five herb gigabytes or a five megabytes.

So that's, that's one of my favorites. I think

MichaelAaron Flicker: you get two gold stars. Two gold stars. Excellent. Two gold stars for an amazing strap line tagline. I

Richard Shotton: didn't come up with it, you know? Yeah, that's true.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And for tying it back to today's episode on concreteness. Excellent. Excellent. Yeah. Brilliant.

Richard Shotton: So what, what would you go [00:37:00] for?

You can't have that one ask a different, I'll take

MichaelAaron Flicker: inspiration from pulling from our book the Guinness chapter. Oh, yeah, yeah. That has good things come to those who wait. Is an example of the Pratt Fall fact. We've covered it as, I think it might've been our first episode we ever did together back in episode one, and we did it as a chapter in the book.

It just, there's so much for great marketers to learn about this and and, and really it's a great bit of copywriting.

Richard Shotton: Yes. I think will stor, who we've got coming on soon calls these atomic statements, you know, statements that have so much packed into them and good things come to those way is certainly an example of that.

MichaelAaron Flicker: It's a great one. It's a great one. Well, thank you everyone for listening to today's episode. We were really excited to get this one done. For those agencies where this can be helpful, as always, we'd ask, leave us a comment. Like the, like the page. And if this was [00:38:00] helpful to you, please share it with others that you think would really find value in the topics of behavioral science and copywriting.

Until next time, I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

Richard Shotton: And I'm Richard Shotton.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Happy listening.