

Ep89 - How BMW Leveraged the Fresh Start Effect to Win Over New Drivers

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 some of the science of America's most successful brands. I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

Richard Shotton: And I'm Richard Shotton.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And today we're driving in, we're driving into a brand that defines luxury.

BMW. We're excited to talk all about it. Let's get into it. And if you find today's episode interesting. Richard and I have gone even deeper into the behavioral science powering BMW in our new masterclass, hacking The Human Mind, the masterclass based on the book that we launched in September. We also have a training series that we really are excited about.

42 different lectures Richard and I do, covering lots of different [00:01:00] topics, all that you can find at the consumerbehaviorlab.com. So listen to today's episode. Hopefully you'll, you've gotten the chance to grab our book and the masterclass. Just another place to get more details about all the baby earth science that powers some of these amazing brands.

Okay, Richard, we're talking about BMW. It's a luxury brand. It implies history, it implies heritage, and it implies quite a high end feeling when you hear about the brand as we like to do. I thought I might go a little bit back in history. Fascinating history of this brand. Talk a little bit about its prominence today.

And then we're gonna center on one of their campaigns that we just thought was chock full of behavioral science benefit for us. So BMW starts in 1916, but not making cars, actually making airplane engines. And if you can think of that [00:02:00] iconic blue and white logo, it's actually interpreted as the spinning aircraft propeller against the blue sky.

So super cool story of the logo. And actually their first cars don't hit the road until 1929, and it's not until after World War II that they pivot from making

motorcycles, pots and pans, and then start rebuilding their automobile factory and start thinking about positioning themselves as the ultimate driving machine.

And that tagline, ultimate driving Machine, has been their tagline since 1975. Longstanding, actually, as of this year will be the 50 year anniversary of them using this. And BMW has grown into quite the powerhouse. They're sold in 140 countries. About 2.5 [00:03:00] million cars are sold globally each year. And so when we thought about.

All the different aspects that we could go deep on in BMW. We really got excited about a campaign they did called Stage Your Driveway. So let me, let me paint the picture for everybody a little bit about stage your driveway, the campaign, and then we can dive into some of the behavioral science behind it.

So. They partnered with local real estate agents to take pictures of the homes that were going to be set up for sale. And when they were staging the pictures, they also staged the BMWs in the driveways of homes that they were, that were going for sale. And then during open houses. Not only did the real estate agents put flowers on the tables and fresh linens in the [00:04:00] bathroom, they also had a BMW parked in the driveway when people actually came by.

And the idea was to help people imagine not just their new home, but that new life with A BMW in the driveway. And for us, you know, there's a lot more details to the campaign, but a super interesting idea that they're. Bringing the BMW into the home buying experience. A little unconventional, wouldn't you say?

Richard Shotton: Unconventional, I think. So it's a danger of having a good idea afterwards. It looks obvious, but I think this was very unconventional at the time.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. And they're leaning on some pretty interesting behavioral science that's driving why this worked. So maybe can you take us through a little bit more of the details and and talk about the campaign,

Richard Shotton: all, all sorts of different biases at play, maybe the most obvious one is about the timing of the the intervention. [00:05:00] So there's a. A lot of work around an idea called life events, which is essentially the idea that if we undergo a big life event, and, and by life event, I mean, you know, having a baby, getting divorced changing jobs or more, most appropriately for this discussion, moving house.

All sorts of unrelated behaviors become destabilized. Now that's important because most of the time people are creatures of habit. They're not thinking about alternative ways of behaving. They just do the same thing again and again and again. So buy the same toothpaste, drink the same, lag a pub buy the same car when you.

You are in market again, we are creatures of habit, but when people undergo these disruptive life events, there's a rare situation in which these habits are destabilize and people become open to change now as ever. That sounds like a pretty plausible story that Well, [00:06:00] yeah, it sounds plausible. But.

Behavioral scientists never just rely on you know, rationale and, and reason. Everything has to be proved. EE experimentally. So there are some studies that support this argument. There's a great practical behavioral scientist called Elsworth Kirkman who works with the British Behavioral Insights team, and she did a project in 2019 in Portland, Oregon, and they are launching a new bike sharing scheme.

And they monitor the proportion of people who use those bikes. And what they find is that if people have been living. In the area for a long time, and they were close to the bike sharing docking stations. 0.3% of people used them if they were new residents and they live close to the docking schemes.

1.1400000000000001% of people used the, [00:07:00] the, the cycle scheme. Now, a couple of things you can take from those numbers. First is. It is really hard to get people to do things differently. You know, we're still talking about the vast majority of people in both situations ignoring the new opportunity.

But the second point is people were four times more likely to try the scheme if they were new to the area, if their transport habits weren't fully

MichaelAaron Flicker: Disrupted.

Richard Shotton: Oh, so Well, yeah, I said they weren't fully formed yet. They were easier to disrupt. Yeah. Yeah.

MichaelAaron Flicker: There you go.

Richard Shotton: So that, that's the key point here.

BMW wanted people to consider their car for the first time. Reaching people when they are in market for house, when they are disrupting their life in a major

way, meant they were much more likely to consider alternative cars. Much what, what they previously had.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. And, you know, changing homes in America often comes with.

A ton of [00:08:00] mailings. Junk mail comes to your home. Here's new thick magazines with with new furniture to buy. Here's new broadband offers. You know, there's lots of there's lots of insight already that, that certain categories have that where you're in a new home, so you have a new. Practical need for new furniture or for new broadband.

BMW innovatively says, well, you're more open to buying and trying new things. So what about a new car as well?

Richard Shotton: Yeah. That, that, that's, that's a really important distinction to make. I think everyone knows if you, if you move into a new area, well, you're gonna have to buy new furniture. You're gonna have to get your broadband sorted out again.

But the experiment from Kirkman and others, like it shows something else and it's the A disruptive. Occurrence, like a life event doesn't just increase the probability of trying new brands in relevant car [00:09:00] categories, even completely irrelevant categories. People are still more likely to change their, the brands they use because.

They are no longer on this habitual path of, of behaving the, the, the shock of a house move radically destabilizes all sorts of other behaviors. So I think it was BMW's insight that you could go beyond the, the, the categories that are relevant to home moving to look. Broader. That's so interesting.

MichaelAaron Flicker: So it opens an opportunity and they take advantage of it.

Richard Shotton: Absolutely.

MichaelAaron Flicker: This feels close to a bias we've spoke about before called the Fresh Start Effect, episode 49. We used it to, to really understand how New Year's is this Very Every year, new Year new you, there's a, a change. That people are more willing to take at the beginning of a time [00:10:00] period. I think we also talked about it in Spotify where their new music Mondays takes advantage of a start of a new week.

We got the fresh start effect at the start of a new year. This feels related, doesn't it?

Richard Shotton: Absolutely. They, they're definitely related. So the fresh start effect is essentially an argument from Catherine Milkman that when people enter new time periods, their behavior is destabilized and they're more open to change.

So she looks at smaller. Calendar changes than than life events. So she looks at things like start of the year, start of the month, start of a week when people come back from holidays after a birthday. And the findings aren't as dramatic as the kind of fourfold increase in behavior change that we talked about with Kirkman study, but they're still meaningful.

And we, in those previous episodes, talked about the experiments milkman did around exercise and, and, and savings. [00:11:00] But actually since we did that episode, I've, I've come across an, an even better study I wish we talked about at the time which shows even the most. Difficult to change audiences and more open to changing their behavior at fresh starts.

Oh, tell, tell us the study was run across 20 17 20 18 by the West Midlands Police. So outside of London, the biggest kind of conation in, in England is Birmingham and the West Midlands covers that and a few cities. That's essentially blend. And they wanted to get well-known criminals away from their life of crime.

So the police force come up with a new offering. Essentially they're gonna help criminals move out of the area break out of their kind of social circles, get accommodation elsewhere, get a new job in a different environment to try and start a fresh life. Now they send out this offer. To 2077 [00:12:00] criminals who are known to them, and they essentially say, look, we know who you are.

We have got you on our radar, but if you are open to changing, here's a confidential helpline that you could ring and we'll sort out all these other areas like accommodation and new employment. Now, what they found is that if they sent that message out at random time, they got a very low level. Of uptake as you might expect.

But if they sent out these messages after the criminal's birthday, there was a 56% improvement in response rate. So it went from, I think 2.6% to 4.5%. What they're showing here is. Even in a behavior that is as hardwired difficult to

change as crime, if you communicate at these fresh start moments, you have a better chance of success, a much better chance of success.

Doesn't mean everyone's gonna change. You know, life isn't that easy, but you [00:13:00] are, you know, stacking the odds a bit more in your favor. So whatever audience. People who are listening have, my argument today is I bet they're not as hard to change as criminals, so don't dismiss life events and the fresh start effects.

'cause it feels too trivial, shaped, tri too trivial, an intervention. And even these very, very hard to influence audiences have been affected.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. And it, it, it's so lovely the way you put that because we often think as brand marketers, our job is to. Find the interest in audiences and get them to act.

And this is saying, well, humans have moments in their life where they are more open to change. And there, there, there are things that happen in their life completely separate from your agenda as a brand marketer. That would make them, you know, in the example with BMW and the Kirkman study [00:14:00] you know, life events or in this example with the West Midlands police the fresh start effect, both times the actual people have things happening in their life that makes them more receptive to doing something new.

And it's about finding a way to insert your brand in those moments rather than just telling them to consume your product.

Richard Shotton: I, I like the way that you, you put that because it's an argument for a bit more humility on the marketers part. It's not all about what we say, it's reaching people at these receptive moments.

Most of the time, people are deaf to our pleas, even if those pleas are very eloquent and very powerful, most of the time people are ignoring them. But you have these rare windows of opportunity to make sure you are focusing on messages on those, and BMW did that brilliantly because they reach people. At a time of this major change in their life moving house

MichaelAaron Flicker: and getting third party data to know when [00:15:00] these types of life moments happen is very available.

And of course, first party data. If you have a relationship management program, a loyalty program, knowing somebody's birthday is a very attainable piece of

data. If you structure a program to go and get it, and then it becomes actionable for you.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. And, and once you start talking about your own dataset, you can think about this inside one of two ways.

Maybe you are a big supermarket, you know, someone's birthday. This is the time to suggest new products that ne people have never tried before. Or you could think of it defensively if habits become destabilized at these moments. Be very aware. Your loyal customer or your, your habitual customer, your

MichaelAaron Flicker: repeat buyer

Richard Shotton: might well.

Try a new alternative at these moments. So this is when you wanna probably double down on being maybe a bit more generous or making sure you are emphasizing your [00:16:00] strengths. This is the time that people's behavior might start to stray and look at other brands.

MichaelAaron Flicker: It's a funny conversation because when you think about how marketing has changed over decades.

For those of us that were doing marketing in the two thousands and early 2010s birthday, messages from brands were pretty common actually. And today I think they're very rare. And it's funny, we've talked in other things like how rhyming used to be used a lot and now is fallen outta favor. We've used humor.

You and I have looked at studies where humor has really dropped out of favor amongst many advertisers over decades. And this is another example, at least in my own experience of marketing, where brands used to be very aware of your birthday or, or life moments and now they kind of stay out of it.

Richard Shotton: That's interesting.

'cause I wonder if this might be a, a distinction between the US [00:17:00] and the uk. I don't ever remember brands making much of a birthday, so I think it's always been a missed opportunity. The interesting thing there is maybe. Britain should learn from America and America should learn from its history and try and reinvigorate some of these target opportunities.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah, I mean this is a sample size of just my own experience, but I would say in 2006 I would've gotten six to 10 brand messages on my birthday. And today I'm a little bit older, but I would say I get none. That's a very, yeah, just a interesting thought there. So, to, to summarize this part of the section.

Rather than assuming your brand message should just be blasted to the person that you know is interested. Thinking more about where the buyer is in their life stage, in their life moment, and trying to meet them where there might be an opportunity either to win or to defend against loss. That's kind of the summary of this part.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, I, I, I think that would be fair, and I think the only thing I'd double down on [00:18:00] is. It's not just life stage targeting. It's these kind of be trying to be close to a life transition moment. So rather maybe targeting retired people, it's people who have just retired rather than target people who own a house.

It's who've just bought a house. That, that's the only element that I would emphasize of, of that

MichaelAaron Flicker: because it is that transition that may, that resets their ha habituated activities and opens it up.

Richard Shotton: Yeah.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Lovely, lovely. Okay, so let's get to our next bias that was used in the original BMW campaign we opened the episode with.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, so, so the other bias I think they use is, is, is one of price relativity. So often people think the consumers are calculate machines and they're looking around all the different brands they could buy and thinking, well, how much of a benefit am I gonna get? And does that benefit? Loom larger than the the cost, but that isn't how most people behave [00:19:00] because it's a really complex calculation.

And there's this amazing phrase from Daniel Carman that says, when people face complex calculations, what they tend to do without really realizing is they tend to replace the complex calculation with a simpler one that gives them an almost as good answer. So rather than doing the mental gymnastics of comparing potential value, potential utility with price, what people tend to do is think.

How much have I paid for something similar? And if this item is less than that similar basket of goods, it's good value. If it's worse than it's bad, bad value. That's the principle of price. Relativity. A hundred dollars is neither good nor bad value. It always depends what it's being compared to. Now, if you think about BMW.

They're applying that brilliantly because normally A BMW is an expensive motor car compared to almost everything. Yeah. Yes, compared to everything. Compared to your weekly shop, your [00:20:00] family holiday, your stereo, other cars, it always looks expensive, but if you're comparing it to the house purchase, suddenly it feels like a much, much smaller number, and that's a massive opportunity.

Now that might all feel a bit speculative. But I did, I've done these studies quite a few times, but I did one in 2018 with car brands. And it was coincidentally with BMW, this isn't their data, it's just happened to use them as an example. So recruit a group of people. And I said to them, Ford Moderno costs roughly 20,000 pounds.

A BMW five series costs roughly 30,000 pounds. And then I said to people, how good value is the BMW? And 33% of people thought the BMW was good or great value, then got a completely fresh group of people, gave them the same image of a BMW five series, quoted exactly the same price. Just over 30,000 pounds.

But this time I [00:21:00] compared the BMW to a Bentley Flying Spur, which at the time was 119,000 pounds. And I asked them again, how good value is the BMW. Now that figure goes up to 47%. So it was 33% in the first version. Now it's 47% of people think it's good value. That's a 42% improvement. Now if you think about the core of the study, what it is essentially showing is exactly the same item, exactly the same price will be evaluated very differently dependent on what comparison set is put in front of people.

So if you compare it with a Ford Mon, BMW doesn't look great value. You compare it with a Bentley flying Spur, it looks amazing value. That's an example of people substituting the right question, which is what benefits are you gonna get and does that justify the price? That's the right question from a logical point of view.

They're substituting that, right, but complex question with a simpler one, which is what comparison set can I [00:22:00] quickly grasp onto to compare with this, this BMW cost. So what I think. BMW do so well with the stage your driveway

is by placing the car next to a luxury house. Then they make whatever cost they're asking for feel, and that's the important bit.

The initial emotional reaction. The feeling is it's just that little bit better value.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah, it's it's something that when you hear it explained, it makes sense when you hear your study, if you can have confidence in it. And one of our good friends and supporters of the podcast, Rory Sutherland is, can say that set.

He sometimes has a magical way of just simplifying the idea down as, as cut tight as possible. He talks about Rolls Royce's that are showcasing their cars at Jet and Yacht exhibition. And he said, if you're looking at Lear Jets all afternoon, a 300,000 [00:23:00] car is an impulse buy at that point. I mean, right. I mean, like, and, and it, and it all kind of adds up when you, if, if what we do as humans is.

Look at the relative price between things. It makes sense to make your relative price something much higher than than what you might otherwise compare it to.

Richard Shotton: Yes. 'cause there is, there's no fixed mental comparison set. You as a marketer can change that. So yeah, by putting it on the drive of a, a luxury house.

It's never gonna make a A BMW field inconsequential, but it's enough to change that initial emotional reaction. And what often happens is we have an intuitive reaction to a price or to a situation, and then we use all our powers of logic to justify the intuitive reaction to ourselves. So if our initial reaction is it's reasonable value, we will then use our logic to, you know, remind ourselves of all the benefits maybe that, that, that, that make that.

Initial [00:24:00] feeling are reasonable. But it's the initial impulse, emotional reaction that comes first is the logic that comes afterwards. So do yourself favor as a brand, and by changing comparison there, give yourself the best chance to have the positive emotional reaction.

MichaelAaron Flicker: So we're talking right now about pretty big priced things.

We're talking about houses and BMWs, and these are once in a, you know, multiple year purchase. You and I have talked about in the past when Nespresso first launched their Nespresso machines, they had a tricky challenge if you

compared a cup of Nespresso that it made to drip coffee. It was a very expensive proposition.

And nespresso pod, I forget if it was 25 cents or 50 cents, but compared to drip coffee, that cost a few cents a cup. Too expensive. But if you compare an espresso to going and buying a \$5 Starbucks [00:25:00] or any barista coffee, man, it seems like a great deal. And so by changing the comparison set, when Ne Espresso launched its machine to to barista made coffee houses, you changed the comparison set and changed the relative price that you were comparing it again.

So there's ways to do this not at once in a decade purchase or once in a multi-year purchase. You could do this same approach in everyday items by changing what the relative prices compared to.

Richard Shotton: Absolutely. I, I think it was really interesting is the same principle price relativity can be applied to something that costs \$1 or a hundred thousand dollars.

Now, it, it's the sense of relativity that's important. How you then express that and who you decide to compare against might vary if your roles or BMW or, OR, or Nespresso. But the principle stays the same. Absolutely.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. Yeah. Isn't that interesting? Okay, [00:26:00] so we've got this second idea that pricing is relative and be really thoughtful about what you, what you are, what you're comparing your price to.

We have a third. Idea that we wanted to bring up for everybody.

Richard Shotton: So this is called the mere Proximity Effect, and it's essentially what you are surrounded by the values of those surrounding items rubs off on you as a brand. Now first. Hearing that sounds remarkably similar to price relativity, but this is slightly different.

You know what BMW could have done is, I don't know, park the cars next to a, a lot of a, a plot of land that cost a million pounds an empty derelict garage. You'd have still had the price relativity element, but some of those values would've not been very helpful. By placing it next to placing the BMW next to a luxury house that looks gorgeous as beautifully designed, some of that will [00:27:00] affect people's more qualitative feelings about, about your brand.

So that's the idea of the, the, the mere prox proximity effect. Now, as ever, we always wanna talk about studies, not just. Speculative arguments. And there's a lovely study from Kim at Cornell University, a 2022 study where they, they put this to, to test, so recruit over a thousand participants and they show them a magazine.

And within that magazine, there's an ad for a clothing brand. Now, sometimes this fake clothing brand is surrounded by. Editorial. Other times it's surrounded by ads for luxury brands like Chanel or Dior or Hermes. And the psychologists then ask people to rate the quality of this, this fake fashion brand.

And what they find is, even though the ad is exactly the same amongst both groups, [00:28:00] their rating varies dependent on what that ad is surrounded by. So when it's surrounded by tutorial. Average rating is 3.2 in terms of quality, high number equals, et cetera, high quality, low number, et cetera, of low quality.

When it's surrounded by those luxury brands, that rate goes to 3.75, so 3.2 to 3.75. Now, there is a 17% improvement in perception of quality if the brand is surrounded by high-end luxury goods. Now that's interesting because remember, everyone sees exactly the same product, the same design of the ad, the same argument for why the product's amazing, but the reaction is partly formed by what surrounds the ad, not just what's within the,

MichaelAaron Flicker: and so we're using this example born out of BMW, putting their cars next to luxury homes.

But it strikes me that [00:29:00] brands. For many decades, put their advertising in high-end magazines or high-end newspapers to get that credibility. To rub off of that, you know, high-end magazine, the lifestyle of that magazine. And in our digital age, there's so much talk about targeting the individual fi, the personalization, and the targeting individual.

Sometimes we for, you know, we might put less priority on, well, what are the run of site ads we're running on? What is the programmatic buy across? And no matter how great your brand ad is showing up at the weather channel or showing up at nothing, nothing bad about the weather channel at all, but it may not be the right.

Environment for some brands to be in.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, absolutely. And it might be a trap that we've got ourselves caught in, as you say, in the kind of digital era when immediate [00:30:00] responses and immediate short-term sounds are very easy to measure. And because they're easy to measure, we optimize those. What's trickier to measure is the long-term impact of where you are running on, on brand perception and because it's trickier to measure it often.

Doesn't factor in people's calculations. So the, yeah, the, to me, I think you are absolutely right is a reminder that if you just look at cost per thousands and you just look at immediate metrics, you are going to be led into surroundings that don't rub off positively on your brand. I think that is an absolute fair point.

This is a bigger issue in the digital world than it certainly was 20, 30 years ago.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And when we, if you look at like a, a Bennet and Fields, long and short of it, if we are talking about digital advertising, lower funnel, much more likely to be short form advertising. Okay? But [00:31:00] long advertising meant to generate an emotional response where you show that ad.

Can have a real effect. The Kim study shows where it's shown, not just that it reached the right person that was in your demographic and your targeting, but if it was shown in the middle of a high you know, of a HBO or a Netflix premium viewing experience or if it was on a run of show CTV by somewhere else, it can make a difference to how it's perceived.

Richard Shotton: Absolutely. And it's, I think you, as you are alluding to, it's not that every brand should pay a premium to be amongst those higher end surroundings, but if you're not gonna do it, you've got to be aware that there is some sacrifice. So as long as you are calculating whether or not the premium's worth it, feel free to.

Do it or don't do it. But I think the, the thing that worries me is people aren't making that [00:32:00] calculation and they think that they're costlessly generating efficiencies when actually there is a, a hidden detrimental effect on their brand.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And as you started to speak about, it's about the metrics you track.

And so you know, if you are, if you are trying to have emotional response, if you are trying to do long, long advertising and the long and the short of it, that requires different metrics than short response driven. Click and advertise.

Richard Shotton: Yeah.

Yes, yes, absolutely. It requires different metrics and I think there is a, a mantra of, you know, don't just rely on the metrics that are easy to capture.

Make sure the metrics you are using are ones that reflect what you're trying to achieve. And too often. We get things the wrong way round, and I think over-optimize to what's easy to capture rather than what's effectively an effective measurement.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Well said. You know, and it strikes me that we've talked about you know.

About [00:33:00] how this was maybe more common with magazines and newspaper advertising, but another area that this has been known, this is like basic marketing 1 0 1 is store where you place your physical stores. If you look at any strategy for like where you would put a store in a mall, you're always asking, what are the brands that I can place my brand next to across from, you know, and what's the proximity?

Did they. To the key stores in a, in a shopping area, in a mall, in a, in any area. So some of those like things we've, that have been developed so often by the practitioners on the ground, this proves why that, that, that that's what they found.

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

MichaelAaron Flicker: Lovely. So three different things that we focused on.

Richard, would you remind us of the three big items we're today?

Richard Shotton: So we started by talking about life events and the fresh start [00:34:00] effect, and the experiments here essentially show that for an awful lot of time people are unthinkingly repeated, repeating their behavior from a past similar situation.

However, there are predictable moments when those habits are disrupted, when people enter new time periods at the start of a year or a new. But just after a

birthday or when they undergo a big life event like moving house, their behaviors are destabilized and they're much more open to consider considering alternative ways of behavior.

So what BMW did brilliantly is try and save people to pick their new cars just after people had have moved house or, or very close to the house, moved moment. So that was the first principle, using and targeting life events. The second principle BMW used was price relativity. This is the idea that a hundred dollars is neither good nor bad value.

It always depends what that product for a hundred dollars is being compared against. And by placing their cars on [00:35:00] the driveways it super expensive luxury houses they made the cost that they were asking for their higher vehicle look much more, more palatable. So they changed the mental comparison set and that created a more positive emotional reaction to the price, and that led to people being more comfortable spending money.

And then the third principle they applied was what we've just been discussing, the mere proximity effect, which is essentially the surroundings you are in as a brand or an ad will rub off on people's perception of your brand. So if you're in a magazine, you surround yourself by high-end brands, your company will be treated differently than if you are in a more mass market environment.

BMW applied that brilliantly by placing their cars in luxury houses. So it's not just that this was an expensive environment, it wasn't, you know, \$250,000 sewage factory they were putting their cars outside. These were luxury [00:36:00] houses. And it's that luxury element that kind of bleeds from one item to another.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Lovely, lovely. And as we said in the opening we went deeper on this topic in our masterclass. So for those that are interested in learning even more about this case study and what we took away from it, feel free to go to the consumer behavior lab.com and check out the masterclass. And as we come to today's wrap up, Richard.

Richard Shotton: Yeah,

MichaelAaron Flicker: we're talking cars. We're talking BMW. But the road trip is a very American idea. Getting behind the steering wheel of a car and driving is, at least us Americans would feel ownership over the freedom that that brings. Yeah. Have you done a long road trip? Where'd you go? What you do? What, what, what would you, so

Richard Shotton: I'm not a great fan of driving myself.

So my memories of road trips where I've been [00:37:00] driving are generally quite negative. However, I do have an amazing memory of hitchhiking when I was about 19, maybe 18, from Botswana. All the way straight down through South Africa. I think it was about 1995, like '96 maybe. And then once it got to the coast all the way along from, I think there about roughly central of the coast all the way along to Cape Town.

And that over about three or four days was one of the, the best road trips I've ever done, even though I didn't do a single minute of driving. So that would be my, my best memory in that area.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And 1995, 1996, how hard was it to get a ride from one spot to the next? Su,

Richard Shotton: super easy. I think there was a real culture of, you know, picking people up in the middle of nowhere sometimes asking for little.

Cash payment, but it was, it was, it was much easier. I think if you're trying to do hitchhiking in, in Britain, you're just gonna get people throwing things out of a, the car window at you and insulting your your, your character.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Not as, not as easy. Not as easy. And maybe not as [00:38:00] easy today. Even may, may,

Richard Shotton: may. Well, I mean, yeah. That's 30 years ago now. Yeah. Yeah. That's

MichaelAaron Flicker: funny. That's funny. And for me, I would say before my wife Eric and I got married, we did a road trip. In New Zealand, in the south island, all of it. And we drove all around the south island. Maybe it was eight days every day in the car to a new spot.

And you know, just that sense that you're exploring on your own was yeah, was a pretty freeing and special time for us. So, oh, I've never been case. Not the memories in the cars, right? Yeah.

Richard Shotton: Sounds lovely. Sounds lovely.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. Yeah. Thank you. If you like today's episode, please give us a, like follow us on our social media channels and as we always ask if this was helpful to you, share it with other marketers and other brands.

Our whole mission is to make sure people learn about these principles and improve the effectiveness of their marketing. [00:39:00] Until next time. I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

Richard Shotton: And I'm Richard Shotton.

MichaelAaron Flicker: All of today's transcript and episode show notes are available on our website, the consumer behavior lab.com.

Happy listening.

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.