

# FS-25-2067\_ LuckyYatra

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** [00:00:00] Welcome back to 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 that powers great marketing today. I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

**Richard Shotton:** And I'm Richard Shotton.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And today we're bringing you a new series where we explore effective campaigns, the work that went into market, and why we believe they were so effective.

Let's get into it. So Richard, we are starting this new series because there's so much interest and excitement around all the work in the industry. You and I are very passionate about work that makes a difference about effective campaigns, things that not just put great creative in market, but that have demonstratable results.[00:01:00]

So we said to ourselves. What if we looked at all the effectiveness award shows? What if we looked at all the case studies, if there's white papers available and we find the ones that have demonstrated to have made an impact, and we use that as a source of material for us to talk about it and deconstruct and bring a lens to it.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah, so in a way it's like a micro version of our book. So the book Hacking Human Mind. 17 giant brands, you know, super successful brands. Starbucks, Guinness, Klarna. Well, rather than look at the brand as a whole, what we've done here is look at, you know, smaller. Campaigns, and I think that opens up the discussion to a far broader range of really effective bits of marketing.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** I hadn't thought about this, another connection and separation from the book. In the book, we chose what we were calling [00:02:00] some of the world's best brands. Here we are really looking for the most effective campaigns. So there a lot of the brands we are planning to feature. A lot of the campaigns we're planning to feature in the upcoming weeks might be brands you've never heard of, might be campaigns or markets you don't know the details about.

And we think that's powerful.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. Or, or it could be a brand that hasn't done very well for 10 years, but they had an amazing campaign. The important thing is. Is there an evidence backed idea in there that can be extricated from the actual event and replayed and reused by listeners? So that's, that's gonna unite everything we talk about.

There are transferable learnings that you can apply to your business,

**Michael Aaron Flicker:** and this also opens up the opportunity for listeners to. Write in and let us know about campaigns that were effective that you see in market. We're always [00:03:00] looking for where to get the best ideas, and if we think of ourselves as a hive mind, all of our listeners, together we have access to tons of great campaigns, tons of great marketing effective work.

So you'll listen to these and please by all means, share. For those listening campaigns that, you know, were effective in market and we can see if there's some evidence-based science to support it. So today's episode is entitled Lucky Yara. Indian for the Lucky Journey, and it's really a interesting campaign that was featured this year in the 2025 Cannes Lions Festival.

But let's focus on the campaign. This country is India. The client is Indian [00:04:00] Railways. The agency is FCB India and Indian railways is facing a systemic problem. Millions of Mumbai commuters simply. Do not buy train tickets. They just jump on the train. And they ride for free. With over 24 million railway passengers each day, it's the busiest transit system in the world.

It's so busy, so packed that it was impossible to add turnstiles of any kind. Impossible to create a barrier. To getting that many people on and off the trains. So rather than increasing ticket checkers or coming up with more serious fines or using technology to enforce, getting people to pay for their tickets, they flip the script.

What they [00:05:00] use is something that was already there on the ticket. For almost a hundred years, Indian railways has printed a serial number on every ticket that they sell. And so what FCB India and Indian railways decide to do is they convert that unique number into a lottery number and every person who purchases a rail ticket now.

Has a lottery ticket. The chance is to win a thousand. The chance is to win \$117 every day, or \$585 every week just by taking their ticket number and entering it on a Cipro website. They had a QR code, they had a website. You enter the number and you're entered for a chance to win. The results are astonishing with just \$1.4 million allocated to prizes.

The campaign generated 685 million in ticket revenue, [00:06:00] and that's a big number, but importantly, it increased ticket sales by 34%. So it wins this effectiveness award not only for its creativity, but for proving that rewarding honesty can be as powerful as punishing fraud. It was a more than just a lottery.

It was a behavioral science experiment that they put into market to see what would happen. And now the Mumbai railway. Test is going to extend out to all of India's 7,000 stations. So they try it in Mumbai, it works there, and they're extending it. So really a lot of interesting stuff happening here. And you know what, we'll put in the show notes.

There's a great two and a half minute video that that talks about all the conditions and what they did. So we'll add that to the show notes, Richard, but a lot happening here. Very interesting. Campaign.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah, I, I, I love it as a campaign. It's a great [00:07:00] example of application. Psychological insight and then beautifully, creatively delivered.

So I think when it comes down to the, the psychology, we've talked about this principle before, which is the idea that uncertain rewards. Can be more effective than certain rewards. So what we mean by that is there are, you know, different ways you can financially encourage your behavior. So you could reduce the price of something and everyone gets, say a five or a 10% discount.

The alternative is to add some uncertainty in. Don't guarantee that you're gonna get a price money off. You don't guarantee that you're gonna get a win. You just have a sm a chance of of success. And there's a really, really good study by Nina Mazar, who's at the University of Toronto, and back in 2015, she did this brilliant study that suggests it's that [00:08:00] uncertainty, those variable rewards that tend to be the certain ones.

So she sets up a vending machine, and the snacks inside this vending machine normally cost 75 cents. But for a few weeks she runs a

promotion. So people have the choice. They can either have the 75 cents snack for 50 cents, there is a guaranteed fixed 33% off. That's the certain reward, or they pay 75 cents and there is a one in three chance that they get it completely free.

So two thirds of the time, you pay the total amount for 75 cents, one third, you get it completely free. And what she finds is that there are significantly more people buying the snack in the uncertain condition. So people buy 43% more of the uncertain reward rather than the the certain reward. The [00:09:00] argument that Mazar makes and others are the, some of the benefit that we get excited about is the financial discount, the financial award.

But actually on top of that, there is the uncertainty, the excitement, the intrigue of the gamble. Will we be a a winner? And you get that added benefit if you convert your fixed discount into a more variable reward.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Yeah, it's an interesting study. Yeah. Because one, it would not necessarily be what a classical economist would say would happen.

Yeah. When you give, yeah. They'd

**Richard Shotton:** say they're the same thing. They'd say,

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** correct.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** No, please. It's

**Richard Shotton:** the

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** same thing. Yeah. They'd say, and so

**Richard Shotton:** say third off or one in three chance are free. It's the, it's the same thing. And, and the cost of course the business is, is the same.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And so that's interesting in that it.

Challenges a classical assumption. The other thing that's interesting to me is that when these numbers [00:10:00] are relatively insignificant, this game of chance brings even a little bit of excitement to what otherwise is a pretty low engaged decision. So on top of it, you know, or maybe because. It's an easy choice, 50 cents, 75 cents.

Of course the quarter matters, but really this game of chance brings a little bit of fun and intrigue to the decision. How much do you think that plays into it?

**Richard Shotton:** So a lot of the experiments are around reasonably small items now. This particular study with a vending machine, it was a 75 cent snack. She in the same paper, I think, does things with, you know, pens or mugs.

I mean science's up to like five or \$10, but they're reasonably small. The only thing I would say is what inspired her to do the study [00:11:00] was the case of a furniture shop. So there was a furniture shop in America where they said to people. And apologies I get the, the baseball team wrong. Is it, is it the Boston Red Sox are their baseball team?

It

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** is

**Richard Shotton:** very, they're basketball

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** from London. He gets right? Yes. Very good. Yes. The

**Richard Shotton:** Boston

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Red Sox,

**Richard Shotton:** I think the amusingly for a European named World Series. If the Red Sox won the World Series, people would get their furniture purchase completely free Now. Again, I'm conscious that this is a sport I know nothing about, so I'm scrubbing around a bit here.

But let's say at the beginning of the season, I know a 5% chance of the Red Sox winning. That might be reasonable. You know what?

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** We're gonna have Boston fans up in Arms.

**Richard Shotton:** Arms, okay. Okay.

But

**Richard Shotton:** seven and half percent, the argument would be, and you know, it would be that, yeah, it is more effective. To give people a chance in this, in this manner than just saying, okay, well this week [00:12:00] we are reducing our furniture by 7.5%.

So, so, so, you know, I think that there are, that's an example, not a peer reviewed one, but what inspired the campaign that shows that the it can work on a bigger scale. 'cause that furniture shop in Mazars paper reports a huge amount of excitement and uplift in the sounds because of the, because of the campaign.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Love it. So. F-C-B-C-C-O. Rakesh Menon says by shifting the conversation from penalty to possibility, lucky Yatra is reshaping how passengers view train tickets no longer just a fair, it's a chance to win Pig. So as you're saying, it's a reframing. Of of what's happening here.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. And actually I hadn't quite thought of it that way.

It, so we've got the uncertain versus fixed award. Lots of things that listeners can do with that. The other bit is, as you say, flipping the conversation from negative threats around [00:13:00] penalties and fines and whatever to positive you could win. And there are quite a few studies that suggest that can be effective.

So there's an idea called the Ostrich Effect. George Lowenstein at Carnegie Mellon did the, the, the first kind of research around it. And what he found was often if you scare people, make them feel ashamed, make them feel guilty. Rather than that person resolving to change their behavior, so the criticism no longer applies.

What they tend to do is like the metaphoric gloss reach, they stick their head in the sand. They just completely ignore the messaging, or they go through mental gymnastics to explain to themselves why the messaging

just won't apply to them. And Lowenstein didn't just base this on logic and speculation.

He had access to some amazing data. So the big fund provider, Vanguard, let him look. Anonymized account data so LTE could [00:14:00] see when were Americans checking their stock portfolios. And what he found was when the s and p 500 stock market is going up, people check their, their portfolio regularly when it's going down, and therefore you're likely to have bad news.

People check their stock account less, and it's not, not rational. Yeah, it's not rational. The information about your wealth is equally useful in, in both situations, but when the stock market is rising, it's gonna be good news and you feel good when it's going down, you get an immediate feeling of negativity.

And what Loewenstein said is one of our rules of thumb is if something causes pleasure. In the immediate term, we'll double down on it. If something causes us displeasure in the immediate term, we avoid it So often, the supposedly logical intervention in a situation like fair dodging is to make massive threats and to try and scare people.

But what often happens is people either. Ignore the ads or they [00:15:00] think themselves. Well, other people might get caught, but I'll be all right. So I love this twist to a, a more positive approach to a social problem.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And this is not the first time uncertain rewards have been applied to travel before. No,

**Richard Shotton:** no, there's there's quite the, the, the history of this working well. So you go back, I think it's about 2018, Singapore introduced a lottery style mechanism called the Travel Smart Program. Each time you travel, you get points, and the more points you have, the more entries you get into a lottery.

Now the clever thing they did was, one of the big issues in Singapore was peak time is unpleasantly busy. So they decided, well, let's use these. Points to try and shift people earlier in the day. And now if you travel really early or really late, you get more points per mile travel.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Mm-hmm. Yeah,

**Richard Shotton:** yeah. To the travel provider, you know, to the Singapore transport system.

Doesn't matter how many [00:16:00] points you give away, all that matters is the volume of the, the cash prize. So they were steering people to the right times without actually. Costing the, the metro more money. And what they found was that when they introduced this, there was a 12% increase in people traveling in that morning pre peak period because they boosted the number of points available.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** It's such a it's such a helpful thing to hear because it gives you this, I, it, it, it's fertile to say like, how are you using rewards? How are you incentivizing? And could you use the same dollar impact on your brand's p and I in a more innovative way that's going to improve the ROI on that investment.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. Your point is the one to double down on this. Set of experiments is not give, give people money and they'll buy your product more often and, you know, reduce the price or, or throw cash at the [00:17:00] problem and, and you solve it. It is more subtle than that. It's saying for the same dollar spend, you will get a better change of behavior if you add an element of variability in rather whether, rather than giving people a fixed discount that that's the key point.

We are not saying put more promotional budget down, we're saying introduce more variability where you can.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And it's interesting because in the first example we're talking about a lottery style offer. When we were writing the book together, we said We don't wanna be encouraging tactics that could just be read, is like gambling.

So we are, so, you know, one of the ways that these un uncertain rewards can take. A tactical hold is through like a game of chance. But the Singapore's Travel Smart program is a great example where it wasn't, it was variability, but not through a game of chance. Right. So, you know, [00:18:00] whether folks are for or against gambling the, the insight is more important than the way it comes into practice.

Fair.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. And absolutely. And I always say, you know. It's not for us to tell people what's moral immoral, but everyone of course will have their own code. And I'd never wanna suggest if a experiment makes someone feel uncomfortable and they don't like the implications, there's no necessity to apply it. I mean, there are so many of these studies, just work on the ones that fit with your kind of own standards.

And if people don't like the idea of the kind of gambling or gambling light. Maybe the other learning, as we've discussed from the lucky Yra, is the power of positivity. Now, if you scare people, it often backfires. That could be a completely different learning to take from the same case study.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** I love that.

It reminds me of a study we've talked about before. Maybe you can give everyone the details. Stockholm, Sweden, [00:19:00] and they use. Speed cameras. It's a speed camera lottery. Am I right about

this?

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah, that's, that's right. So Volkswagen a while ago we'll put, there's a very good case studies, we'll put. It's a little two minute video.

We'll put that in the show notes. Okay. They encourage people to come up with ideas and one of the winning ones was what was called the, the speed camera lottery. So. I think you said stock Stockholm, didn't you? Yes. What they did was, previously Stockholm tried to encourage drivers to reduce their speed by not speed cameras.

You drive past, you are going too fast, you get fine. What they tested was a little twist of that. If you drive too fast, you still pay a fine. But the fine money goes into a pot and anyone who drives past the [00:20:00] speed camera and they're obeying the speed limit, they have a chance to win the pot. That's been by the fine

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** entered, you're entered to win because you complied with the rules.

**Richard Shotton:** Yes.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And it's being funded by those that did not

**Richard Shotton:** comply. Yeah. And we'll put the, the link in the show notes and it's got a nice big bump. In the proportion of people who were, who were following

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** the speed limit, speed fell speeds, fell by 22%, is the punchline from 32 kilometers per hour to 25. But it's that, it's it's kind of like a gambling scheme, but not, you know, it's kind, it's, it's using, it's, it's teaching a lesson and it's using.

Social pressures in a unique way. I think it's a lovely, it's a lovely example of being very creative with how you can get people to change their behavior.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah, absolutely. Absolutely. Now we've done the good news about uncertain rewards and lotteries and all sorts. There is a bit of bad news though, which is, you know.[00:21:00]

People are complex. The world is a a noisy, sophisticated place. And just because lotteries generally work doesn't mean they always do. And there is some interesting data around COVID vaccines. So Andrew Freeson. At University of Colorado, 2021 looks at 19 states and he compares the uptake in the vaccine rate with states that have a lottery and states that don't.

Now, what's interesting about a lot of state lotteries is how big they were. So Ohio had a million dollar. Prize or \$5 million prize offered by the Department of Health, California went even bigger and had a 1.5 million dollars prize. And what frees and finds is there is no significant difference in vaccine uptake between the states.

Now, at first, that sounds [00:22:00] surprising. You know, offer people lots of money, surely, or a chance of lots of money. Surely they should all jump at the chance. But Sarah Krepps, who's at Cornell University said, you've got to be a bit careful because you've gotta think about what is the, the body language of the of, of the lottery.

And so she said. If you are offering huge prizes, what people might take out of that is the degree of suspicion. They might think, well, if the government has to incentivize me so much, maybe there is something wrong with this vaccine. Maybe it's not as good as people are saying.

The scale of the prize actually amplified seeds of doubt in some people's minds.

So the argument here would be, I think just be careful and because lotteries generally work, just think about the unique elements [00:23:00] of your situation. I think that would be the key part. And in this particular medical situation, too big a lottery was a problem.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Yeah, I think that's the thing I would underscore is that.

The science and the academics that inform what should work, always have to live in the real world with the, with the culture and the, and the business case around it. There was a lot of vaccine skepticism. Across the United States when this was happening. And so even though a big reward could have worked, it missed the, it missed the setting that it was in, or at least that's what Sarah Crepes is making the argument that that's possibly one of the reasons it didn't work.

**Richard Shotton:** Yes. And you know, someone trying to explain the results afterwards. It is slightly spec, but that to me does, does make a lot of sense. And I think this whole area of [00:24:00] rewards and incentives, you know, is a interesting or complex area and I think one of the best. Interviews that we've ever done was with ESEI.

Oh yes. So, you know, he wrote this amazing book, I think it's called Mixed Signals, all about how to get the most out of incentives and when they can, when they can backfire.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Episode 78. So my quick Googling Yeah. Of our, of our of our article, of our, of our episode. And as you say, he went deeper into the parts of that you might think about when you're setting up these these different uncertain rewards.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah, and, and, and he argued that sometimes if you offer a financial incentive, it can crowd out. The, the social obligation reasons for adopting a behavior. So he says, look, there's two ways of driving [00:25:00] behavior. You can use money to incentivize people or you can appeal to their kind of better selves.

Mm-hmm. You can use, you know, the kind of social norms and expectations of society. And what could be happening is, you know, you

introduce a. Cash incentive, and then that crowds out those existing social motivations to get a vaccine. Some people might have done it even though they were worried about a vaccine, but they thought, well, this is still the, the right thing to do.

Once you en cash enters the equation, now it, it can dampen down some of those. Social reasons for, for donating

**Michael Aaron Flicker:** and, you know, what comes up for me that he, I don't remember him talking about, but you are solving a very emotional challenge with a very rational. Solution. So the vaccine skepticism centered a lot around fear of the unknown, [00:26:00] fear of, you know, what something developed so quickly could do to you, and you're solving it with something very rational, A taxable prize.

Yes. You know, it's a, it's a fascinating Yes. Again, thinking about it after something more emotionally based might have been more successful. Yeah, absolutely. Like that. You go for it.

**Richard Shotton:** Oh, I was gonna say, you know, I'm just thinking the, the flip of what you are saying, which is if the problem had been quite mundane, a lottery and a financial incentive from a government could be brilliant.

So in you Go Britain, the example that strikes me, we have a tax, like a property tax that you pay every year called the council tax and you have to pay it. But lots of people pay by you know, ringing up. A week, they have to, you know, hit the deadline. And that's expensive for the council to run those phone lines to chase the people who forget.

And they, and also just the fact they haven't got money for a couple of months. So what the councils try and do is encourage people to set up a [00:27:00] direct debit. It comes out automatically, it's cheaper. They get the money earlier. And they very, very successfully have used a lottery mechanic to do that. You know, if you set up a direct debit, you are rented into the drawer.

The behavioral insights team in Britain have found that to be a very effective way. Of encouraging behavior change, but there it's much more of a mundane, there you go. Just not getting round to it. It's hassle they have to get over. So maybe, you know, when it comes to these areas, it's picking the right tool for the right challenge.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** So often that's the, that's the fun, the skill, the excitement of what we're talking about week after week. It's one thing to know the business, challenge the business problem deeply. It's another thing to know the marketing academics. Deeply, but the, the art is connecting them and using and, and then creatively presenting that academic insight to solve the business problem.

That's [00:28:00] where, to us, the creative fusion occur. Yes,

**Richard Shotton:** because a lottery isn't, A lottery isn't a lottery. I mean, what's the size, what's the theater around it? You know? Yes, you can have a general finding, but of course if there's variance within what type of lottery you're doing, there's gonna be a a different impact.

And then when it comes to the academic studies, I always think if you are a business owner and you read about the Nina Mazar study, you remember the one with the vending machine, you've gotta think how close is my situation to that? If you literally are a vending machine operator, you are crazy not to at least test that idea.

If you are selling low value items on the internet, yeah, it's probably a good idea to test. If you are selling Rolls-Royces to multimillionaires, then well, I dunno, maybe it's too much for a stretch to apply it. You know, we've got to have an appreciation of. Is our situation similar to the situation that the experiment was running?

If it is. [00:29:00] You got a good chance at working the further away you are, the more uncertainty creeps in ironically. Yeah,

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** yeah, yeah. It, it's, it's great and, you know, you've used the term a lot literal versus lateral applications. It's a great argument for, like, if you are not a vending machine owner, then any literal application is a little bit more of a, a stretch and a little bit more of a test and learn.

But if you can understand what was happening. When consumers, buyers made that decision, your ability to come up with lateral applications inspired by thinking that brings the idea more broadly, I think, is it it becomes much more effective.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. Yeah. So you've got this like thought about how close is my situation to the experiment, but then the second way of thinking about that lateral interpretation is the creative ability.

To execute [00:30:00] the idea is super important. There's a famous phrase, John Hegerty of BBH I think said a great idea is 80% strategy and 80% execution, which I've always liked. And I think thinking about that what you could agree is there's a brilliant insight from the psychological experiments that gives you an opportunity.

But then how you. Express that that is just as important. That is super important. And the one that I keep and think about and we talked about this in Hacking to human Mind is the example of, so this is a curry house a chain of Indian restaurants in Brim, and they introduced a variable. So if you went at certain times they would incentivize you at the end of the meal.

You had a one in six chance of getting the, the bill completely paid for. Now you could do that. And the way it just comes out and says to you, you know, in a [00:31:00] monotone voice, well, you didn't win this time, you've gotta pay. But what they do is they give it a real theater. The whole design ethic of the restaurant is kind of 1920s Irani cafes in Bombay, and they bring out this big wooden board, similar design style a brass jar.

They called the Macca and they get you to roll the dice. And I think it's that level of theater and beautiful creativity that makes it. Such a good idea, not just the idea that you should have an uncertain reward.

**Michael Aaron Flicker:** I love that. I think that's ultimately why we're all to some degree in this industry is because doing the creative around it, bringing.

Creativity, capital C, not just design, not just copywriting, but creativity in its full form to solving the business problem is exciting to all of us.

[00:32:00] So it's a great example of why uncertain rewards by themselves may or may not work, but the theater, the creativity to make it compelling is really a big part of why, of why it works for Daum.

And in these examples here. So Richard, would you. Just help give us a quick roundup of today's topics.

**Richard Shotton:** So we've covered maybe three big themes. The first one was the power of uncertain rewards versus certain or fixed rewards. And what we mean by that is giving someone a one in three chance of getting something for free tends to boost sales more than giving people and everyone a one third off discount.

So that was the first idea. The key point here is if you have a promotional budget, consider shifting how you use it. Not necessarily spending more, but introducing that element of variability. Give one in a hundred [00:33:00] customers a hundred percent off rather than a hundred percent of customers, 1% off. That was the first part we discussed.

We then talked about the ostrich effect a bit more briefly, but that is the idea that campaigns that try and scare people or make them feel guilty or ashamed, they tend to backfire. People will ignore the ads or explain to them. They'll explain themselves why those messages don't apply to them. And then the third and final study we discussed was a real watch out.

And it was that sometimes a very big incentive can backfire. And we talked about how California and Ohio had used very large incentives to encourage people to get vaccinated, but because they were so large, the question they popped into people's mind was, is this thing dangerous? If the government is trying to pay me so much to do it so.

Just because lotteries can work well, in [00:34:00] general, you need to think about the specifics of your situation and if there is a, you know, and I would argue unfounded nervousness and concern about your products. You know, as you said, that kind of emotional, a fear, throwing a large lottery at the problem might not be the best thing to do.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Might make it worse.

**Richard Shotton:** Might make it worse. Yeah.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Yeah. Thank you to everyone who listened to today's episode. As we like to say, please share it with others that are excited about marketing because we hope it will be of service to them as much as you, as much as you liked it, and to help us reach even more people if you would like, comment, or share.

That helps us reach new marketers who would be helped by our conversation today. Until next time. I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

**Richard Shotton:** And I'm Richard Shotton.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Thanks so much for listening.[00:35:00]

**Advertisement:** Behavioral Science for Brands is brought to you by Method One, recognized as one of the fastest growing companies in America for the third year in a row. Featured on Ink's, 5,000 list. Method One is a proudly independent, creative, and media agency grounded in behavioral science. They exist to make brands irresistible, helping people discover products, services, and experiences that bring moments of joy to their lives As behavior change experts Method one creates emotional connections that drive true brand value for their clients.

Focusing primarily with indulgence brands in the CPG space. Find out more@methodone.com.