

# Episode 69: How Oatly used the Messenger Effect to become the world's most successful milk alternative

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

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

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And today we're diving deep on the behavioral science powering Oatly, part of America's growing trend of non-dairy milk alternatives.

Let's get into it. So Richard, this is not the first time you and I have sat down and talked milk before. Back in episode 22, we covered the very famous Got milk campaign and we looked at some of the behavioral science that the milk industry has used to turn perception and buying around milk. And Oatly is maybe what we could say this generation's effort at introducing non-dairy [00:01:00] milk alternatives to the market.

And this has really become quite big business. Plant-based dairy alternatives are now big business in America. They account for 15% of all retail milk sales. Oatly, the brand we're gonna narrow in on today. Launched in 2016 in America. By 2020 they went public at 421 million in revenue and to, and as of their last filing at the end of 2024, they had almost doubled their revenue to \$825 million a year.

So this is almost a billion dollar brand and really a very interesting marketing case study. Very interesting sector of this industry. And of course, some really cool behavioral science that we'll dive into to talk about. So let's start with the brand, a little bit of the background for those that may not be as familiar with the Oatly brand.

And then and then we'll talk about some [00:02:00] behavioral science that that we were talking about Powering It. Founded in 1994 by two brothers Ricker and

Bjorn Os. They were researching an alternative to cow's milk for people who were lactose intolerant. Their now CEO, Tony Peterson you know, famously said, our founders just figured majority of the world's population is intolerant to milk.

Why don't we make something that's designed for human beings and not for baby cows? I mean, it's got the brand attitude already showing. So when Tony Peterson comes in as CEO, he's asking himself, how can we take advantage of this growing plant-based milk alternative movement that's taking hold across the world, but particularly in America.

So he sets his focus on rebranding Oatley. To introduce to the American market. So we're gonna look at two things. One, some [00:03:00] serious rebrand that he does to the packaging, and two, the way he introduces it to the American market. In the show notes, we'll drop some pictures of the old packaging and branding compared to the new that they launched with in 2016.

And what's really interesting is he removes the Swedish language from the label. He makes the Oatley logo meaningfully bigger, but then he really starts to change the ethos behind the brand. As part of his launch in America. He commissions an environmental study and then he puts the findings all over the launch material.

On average, a liter of Oatley product consumed in place of cow's milk results in 80% less greenhouse emissions, 79% less land usage, and 60% less energy consumption. And compared to almond milk, it's a sixth of the water to grow a pound of oats compared to a pound of almond. [00:04:00] So he's got this idea that he can take on the industry and really, really make oatley an alternative to milk based on the merits of, of the environmental impact. But the brilliance, as you'll see in the packaging design, see really rates category conventions by reusing lines like, it's like milk, but made for humans. Or, Hey, food industry, show us the numbers.

If you look at the packaging, he, he, he uses almost like a newspaper, like treatment. On the label, he says, we made this product look like a newspaper, so you would take it more seriously. There's really a lot going on in the packaging that makes it stand out on the shelf, which we'll talk about. Then number two, as he launches in America, he knows that there's going to be a challenge to get a new, to get [00:05:00] US consumers to try a non-dairy based milk.

So he sets his sight on launching specifically with Fine end coffee shops here in New York City and convincing local baristas that they can recommend oat milk

to customers rather than cow's milk. But as is often the case with marketing, he had to change the product in order to make the promise true. So in 2017, Oatley.

Releases their barista edition. And the barista edition has 3% milk fat versus one and a half percent. So it froths more, it has a more neutral taste, so it tastes less like oat milk. And it works well in both hot and cold beverages. And so he releases a product that really is designed to meet the barista industry.

It hits a lot of [00:06:00] success. We'll talk more about that but pulling numbers today in the third quarter of 2024. Oley reported that 38% of its total revenue came from food service channels. That would include coffee shops and cafes. Just showing how much that original strategy of launching with baristas and coffee shops still carries through to the brands \$825 million in revenue success today.

There's a lot going on here in the, in the lead up to understanding oat. Richard, we, we looked at this as we often do, as what can we learn about the behavioral science powering this brand? And we saw some really interesting things.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah, there's, there's a couple of big things going on here. I think firstly their distinctiveness, when you talked about how they smashed category conventions with this now real attitude that they have, but we've talked about the VREs.

Quite a few times, and I think, you know, there's a great [00:07:00] episode on Liquid Death that, that, that covers that. So the Von Rest effect being this idea that if you behave distinctively like Oly do, then you're much more likely to be noticed. So that's a really interesting strand that they've been undertaking, but one we've covered before.

The other area that I think is super interesting, we've never really discussed is this idea of. Getting recommendations from third parties and launching or getting people's first experience, being in a highend barista coffee shop and getting the baristas to say how amazing this product is. Now, that definitely taps into some payroll science tactics.

So the experiment and idea that most relates to the third party recommendation is an idea called the Messenger Effect, and it's the idea that who says something can be important as what is said. Original study goes back to 1951, a pair of Yale psychologists called Hoveland and Vice, and for their experiment, [00:08:00] they go up to 223 people and they ask their opinion on a topical matter, 1951.

One of those topical matters was, do you think an atomic power submarine can be built in the next year? And the people said yes or no? Psychologists then invite them back to their lab in five days time. And when the participants go to the lab, they are shown a really tightly argued, a four piece of paper that says why they are wrong.

So if someone said, yes, a nuclear powers have ring can be built, there would be a really cogent powerful argument as to why that was just impossible. Psychologists then ask people to say whether they've changed their mind. The twist in the experiment is sometimes that argument that they've read.

Sometimes it's positioned as coming from a credible source, like an expert source like Robert Oppenheimer. [00:09:00] Other times it's positioned as coming from a low credibility source that just PR at the Russia newspaper Ho has. I'm persuade our of the argument. So if the argument comes from a low credibility source, 7% of people change their mind.

If it's come from a high credibility source, it's 23% changing their mind. Wow, this massive three, three and a half fold difference in persuasive power. And remember, everyone is seeing exactly the same logical argument. Everyone's seeing the same fact. All that's changing is supposedly who argument comes from.

So they call this the messenger effect. It's this idea that who communicates a message often be as powerful as the content and the logic of the argument itself.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** It strikes me that that's a lot of marketing understands this kind of naturally, and that's why there's key opinion leader marketing.

That's [00:10:00] why celebrity endorsements can carry a lot of weight. You know, Shaquille O'Neal can go from one category to the next and whatever he focuses on, raise his sales because it is the messenger that's delivering it.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah, a absolutely. I think this is something that is used by Martis. I think there are opportunities to use it more, but maybe where the behavioral science bit gets interesting.

He's not just that you should look for someone else to sing your praises. There's also arguments about what type of messenger worked really well. And there seemed to be three broad areas. You want your messenger to be credible, neutral, or relatable. I mean, ideally all three, but that's quite hard. But if your

messenger can have one of those attributes, it tends to make what they say more persuasive.

So in the holding of voice experiment, it was really about credibility. If you got an expert, someone who had knowledge about a [00:11:00] particular area to make an argument, the same facts would be given more weight. There are other tactics that that can be used to get to get as much input.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Remind everybody again, the three areas. It was

**Richard Shotton:** credibility. So this is, you are an expert in that area. Relatability. The messenger is someone like me and neutrality. You know, in the case of Oatley, it's not only saying they're amazing, it's a barista. It's not only saying that they taste wonderful. It's someone who doesn't have a financial gain.

Be pushing that point.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** So Richard, between those three different areas, is there any one that is more important? Any connection between the, the, those three that we can really learn more about?

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. The, the, the ideal would be to cover off the three attributes, but there is evidence behind each one of the, the attributes.

So there's an amazing academic writer called Steve Martin. And in 2019 he came out with a, a book called [00:12:00] Messengers. It's all about the messenger effect. And in that he talks a lot about neutrality. The, if only say they're amazing, people will discount their argument very strongly

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** because they have a perception that of course they would say they're great. It's to their benefit.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. Yeah. We, they're gonna say, this stuff tastes amazing. It's healthy, it's good for the environment because they're, they're proper. Depends on it. People aren't stupid. I mean, consumers know this and therefore they are, they are skeptical. So Martin looked at neutrality as, as one of the attributes that makes for strong messenger.

So he talks about an experiment he did in Britain with some real estate agents. And what those real estate agents used to do is the receptionist would get a call from a potential customer, the receptionist would put them through to a Salesperson and then the salesperson would say, hi, my name's Peter.

I've got 20 years experience and I'm brilliant. What [00:13:00] Martin suggested they do to tarnish the messenger effect is to get the receptionist to give the initial spiel about the salesperson. So the receptionist would say, okay, I'm gonna put you through to Peter. He's got 20 years experience. He's brilliant for these reasons.

Now, the information that the caller was receiving did not change. It came from someone who was one step removed from self-interest. And what they found is the conversion rate. So people actually going out to see houses wanna buy 20% with this new tactic and actual contracts. And so of houses went up by 15%.

So there I think is a fascinating area. One because it proves this value of neutrality. Maybe secondly. It shows you how low the benchmark is to neutrality. Remember, this was still a receptionist employed by the real estate agency who was giving praise for the [00:14:00] salesperson. They still have a vested interest.

It's just a little bit removed from being completely self-interested, and I think that should give brands a lot of hope because it suggests that. If you get an influencer to sing your praises, even if people kind of know they're probably being paid money, it's still a little bit of distance from the brand, sing its own praises.

Even that small amount of neutrality, even that step towards independence, that gives it more credibility.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** To me what we're showing is that this messenger effect can be coordinated. You give the example of using a influencer. Even in customer service or even in a brand communications, one step removed can be coordinated and can help.

It feels like, to me, this is why social proof is so powerful. Like, to me, this feels very much [00:15:00] like the messenger effect is leveraging some of the same insights as why social proof, works so well.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah, I, I think you're right. So social proof. Argument going back to the 1930s, hundreds of studies showing if a product appears popular, then it becomes more appealing and people are more likely to buy it.

One of the reasons that might be powerful is the neutrality of the crown. You know, if only say there are amazing skepticism, if hundreds of people are buying oatley, well, all those drinkers are trying to get the tastiest best value

thing they can. They are neutral, they're independent, they are in the pre, they're disinterested, and therefore the behavior of the crowd has that neutrality.

So I think you're right. There are reasons why the messenger effect and why social proof. There are similar reasons about why both are powerful

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** and, and in the Steve Martin experiment, the receptionist connects to lots of real estate agents. So [00:16:00] there is a perception that she would likely not say that about every.

Person she connects to. And that's why it's more believable because she's choosing to say it about some and not others. And of course, as a brand we can control that message.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. And, and maybe it's people have a simple rule of thumb of praise from another person is more valuable than someone giving themselves praise.

What they're probably not doing once they've got the rule in Thunderhead is not calibrating that exactly to what is the relationship between the two parties who are, are praising each other. Maybe we've got this rule of thumb of give greater value to praise people and then we don't calibrate that perhaps as accurately as we should.

And therefore, as you say, an organization has a real opportunity here. If you have layers of different staff, make sure they are. Praising each other. You know, if you're an ad agency, make sure the planner is [00:17:00] talking up the creative, the creative is talking up the account manager. The account manager is talking up the, the strategist.

There are real simple applications here, but perhaps we don't do them enough because we think, well, we're not completely neutral. Why would anyone listen to us? But Martin gives experiments, suggest otherwise.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And if it's feeling a little bit like social engineering or maybe if it's edging on dishonesty, I think the rule still applies.

If you view it as a, through a lens of culture, you should say something positive about the person that you are passing off to, and let it be honest. This person is, is more trustworthy. This person's more innovative. That person's a great communicator. You can choose a positive attribute as part of the recommendation that is built in truth.

And so now it's not a force. Talking point. It's a true, it's a truism that you are making sure gets added to [00:18:00] increase the the, the, to increase the effect.

**Richard Shotton:** I, I think that's a very good build. This is not recommending you make stuff up, okay? That is a short term tactic. You can get caught out. You're gonna damage your reputation in the long term.

But presumably if you have a colleague, there's something about them that you can say that's positive. If there isn't, then there are much, much bigger problems than behavioral sites can solve. But you should not have that person working there. You know, maybe it's their experience level, maybe it's their knowledge of the local area.

Maybe it's their friendliness. It's got to be something from all the different characteristics the person has that you could, you can focus on. It's about picking that positive, genuine, truthful insight, not making one up.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Mm.

And as you jump to brand marketing, it seems so often brands make the mistake of we're gonna get 10 influencers and they're all going to feature how great tasting product X is, versus letting the influencer [00:19:00] choose their authentic attribute that really connects with them.

It will be much more believable and much more effective if they choose the positive attribute to call out. Amongst a list of approved brand attributes should you so choose or to give them free reign one way or another? It, I think it would be the studies show. As long as you get that positive attribute, that positive attribute, the messenger effect is working.

But if you can give them that honesty it will only be that much better and more believable. Yeah, I think it's a great idea. Great idea. So what other elements. Exists that would make a really powerful messenger effect.

**Richard Shotton:** It talks about credibility with the Hoffman Study neutrality with the Steve Martin study.

The third one is similarity. So relatability. I am most influenced by people like myself. That's the argument. So born in Essex, now live in South London. [00:20:00] I am more likely to be influenced by seeing what. other South Londoners do or other people from message what they do and the populations

hold. That would be the, the argument here messenger, who I can relate to is gonna be more powerful.

And what's interesting is the relatability of someone is a, a, a kind of malleable attribute. So talk about a study that shows the power of similarity and then how that. What we associate with changes. There's a wonderful 2005 study from Levine who's at the University of Lancaster. And this is a very British study.

It's about soccer or as we we say, football. Yeah. He gets a group of Manu Night fans. So this is not into football, they, or soccer. It's just a massive club. The most famous club in Britain. It's a group of man fans, talks them and says, look. Taking part in [00:21:00] experiment the experiment's gonna be conducted in a whole other side of the campus, and you're gonna be watching Manu United Games and looking for the number of fouls.

With something like that, people then sent on their way towards the, the hall where this supposed experiment's gonna take part take place. And then as they're on their way, a jogger runs past falls over. Key of the experiment is does the Manon United fan go and help that jogger? Now, sometimes the jogger is dressed in a man united soccer shirt.

Sometimes they're wearing a Liverpool shirt, so Liverpool of the art rival Max Knight. And what they find is that if the joggers in a Menonite shirt, 92%, the participants help. If they're in a Liverpool shirt, that number drops to 30%. Shocking. Yeah. They are deeply influenced by whether or [00:22:00] not they think people are in the same ingroup as themselves.

The interesting bit though is they then do a follow-up study. Psychologists, so Levine gets another group of Menonite fans it, but when he's talking to them in his original discussion. He says loads of studies into football are about the negatives, hooliganism, all the problems that come with being a football fan.

But what we wanna do is do a study about the positive aspect. Being a, a football fan, everything he's talking about, it's not club related, it's about this broader identity being a, a soccer fan. So that group that then head off towards the supposed venue where they're gonna take part in the experiment.

They then see this jogger fall over sometimes wearing a man united top, sometimes wearing a Liverpool top. Now we get quite a different pattern of helping. 80% of joggers wearing a man united top are helped. [00:23:00] 70% of Liverpool fans are helped to suddenly the, what people are relating to is no longer this really tiny identity piece of club.

Now it's about, we have a shared sporting interest. So where we see relatability and similarity can be changed, we all have multiple aspects to our identity. And British, I'm also a lover of behavioral science. I fear I'm a lover of running. We all have to have different aspects, and I guess what you need to do, if you want to persuade people, is identify.

If you're in a one-to-one situation where some of those identity attributes overlap, making sure you're focusing on those areas of similarity, not the things that, that divide us.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** This is why in the opening you said it's so malleable because it can change so easily from, from seeing myself [00:24:00] as just a man united fan and not a livable fan to, we are all football fans, soccer fans or, or not.

I. What's, what's impactful to me, Richard, is how recency changes the action. I mean, so quickly. They go from hearing talks about either they're only about Man United versus it's about all of us as football fans. To, to that then changing and action. So quickly. Any thoughts on like, how, how, how that, how the recency of the message changes the action?

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. I think it's this element of. We all contain multitudes and where we choose to what, what aspect of ourselves we choose to pay attention to. That changes. Now, you can't tell me I'm French, right, or 25 or a lover of Russian poetry, but. Of all those things that I said I'm interested in, they're not all [00:25:00] equally salient.

At the same time, you can, you can move where I'm paying attention for to the existing attributes and I think that's the, that's the opportunity. You can't create a new fashion at Thin Air, but you can change where I pay attention.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** It makes you think the application in brand marketing is using a 32nd commercial.

To bring the saliency of that part of your identity and then, and then, and then activating on it or using contextual marketing to have people thinking about being a good parent and then activating the, activating against that. It, it gives you a pretty wide creative birth to say, how can we bring the saliency of that identity to the forefront of the mind, and then how can we get an action?

To get a behavior because of that identity. Saliency.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. The, the, the other one that springed to mind is, I think earlier on in the podcast you talked about some of the pharma [00:26:00] advertising. They will build associations with key opinion leaders. So yeah, a giant pharma company, they will think, well, who is the most influential key opinion leader in, let's say, the world of kidney?

And they'll put money, get that association.

A relatability and similarity would be, well actually there's a different angle you could take. Rather than having one world renowned experts, what you might wanna do is have a roster of 10 less well-known key opinion leaders, but maybe one is from Arizona, one's Washington. They use the Arizona ones talk people in Arizona, the Washington one talk people in Washington or, or they have different sub areas within.

The kind of kidney field of which they are experts, and then you match the opinion leader to the, to the, the, the target that you are talking to. So, so, so it's a, it's a different angle to try and build up that persuasive power for your, for your messenger

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** and, and you, what you [00:27:00] choose to do may be based in what your brand realities are.

You may simply not be able to afford the leading key opinion leader in your field. And so this is a way to use key opinion leaders. For less cost or for different effect if you're targeting. You know, let's say one type of racial group or one type of of interest group and your key pen line leader does not have any relevancy to them other than being an expert in kidney function.

There may be a better way to reach them with more, with, with more connection by using by using a leaders thought leaders that better match your audience that you're going after.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. Yeah. A a, absolutely. And I think often when we are thinking, I. Who could be the messenger for our brand? People gravitate towards credibility.

First of all, what's interesting about how relatability is it gives you yes, this completely different set of tactics to get a very powerful messenger. Absolutely. [00:28:00]

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** So Richard, this gives us a lot to think about in these three areas of how to choose the right messenger. But maybe there's some elements that people are less willing to admit to themselves, and maybe we're less willing to think about as marketers that will affect the effectiveness of the messengers we choose.

**Richard Shotton:** So I think you're absolutely right. There are certain aspects of a messenger people will not admit influences them. So there's a famous study brilliantly, an Arctic study from 1968 by Dubin Gross, and for their study, they drive a car to a traffic light. When that traffic light turns green, they purposely store the car for a few seconds and they wait to see whether or not the car behind them starts honking the horn.

The twist of the experiment is sometimes they're driving a, a super high-end car. I was gonna say a [00:29:00] MW. They probably have BMWs in the 1968, but sometimes it's a super high-end car, other tires. It's a barely road-worthy car. It looks like a real beat up car. Junker.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Yeah.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. And what they find is if they are driving a cheap, low stateless car, they get beat Hal 84% of the time.

Whereas if it's a high status car, they're only bent beat 50% of the time. Now what's then interesting is they go and get a new group of people. They tell them out of the experiment and they say to them, what do you change whether you beat a stall car based on the, the expense of that car? Everyone, virtually everyone denies that status wealth has any effect on them all, but of course we know psychologists and behavioral scientists, what people say influences them.

What actually influences them. Completely different things. And unfortunately, status is an area where people are [00:30:00] loathed to admit it influences them. But studies like Dubin Gross and many others completely sing suggest that can be a big influence as well.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And so as we think about this study, it reveals a few things that we've talked about in multiple episodes.

One thing for sure is we cannot ask. Buyers. We cannot ask customers what it is that they will do and assume that that is what they're actually going to do, because they either don't know or they're loath to admit their real motivation. So

that's kind of number one. But number two, that we can use studies like this to really directly influence the way we do brand marketing.

So we know that people not only. Are going to have something like status affect their actions, but they're also going to not admit that that's what, that's the driver of their actions. And when you and I were talking in the pre-show, we were talking a little bit about how [00:31:00] brands can choose different types of key opinion leaders with different types of famous folks to represent them.

You can almost make the choice of a celebrity or a key opinion leader based on status neutrality and relatability. And you and I were saying, yo, should you choose a musician? Should you choose a sports star, or should you choose an actor? And how do they, how do you make that decision of a celebrity endorsement based on status neutrality and relatability?

Through a lot of Endor celebrity end endorsement deals that I've done, we've found that actors almost always are more effective. And I wonder if it's not because they are eminently more relatable because of their roles as actors. They take on [00:32:00] different personalities to be more relatable and generally they are not a part of a.

Winning team or a losing team, a Manchester United versus a Liverpool. So they just naturally appear more rel more neutral. You know, we would, I wonder w what, what comes to mind as we talk about choosing celebrities and potentially deciding them based on these three factors?

**Richard Shotton:** I think you're right. 'cause there is a real problem of how'd you get status and relatability.

They're kind of in, in, in conviction. If you are a. Super famous musician, you've got status, but it's hard to relate to Jay-Z or Coldplay or whoever. The amazing thing with actor is they have status. Tom Hanks has status because he is one of the world's most famous actors. He's Hollywood success. There's also, I think, relatability because of the parts, the hair docs, and sometimes we conflate Tom Hanks and the [00:33:00] characters that he, he plays.

I think with an actor or actress to get both status and relatability. So I think that absolutely backs up your point about maybe they are the ideal vehicle to be a messenger for brand.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** So kind of two points here. One, if you're choosing a celebrity endorsement or a key opinion leader, think about the how the messenger effect affects relatability, neutrality, and status.

That's number one. And number two. Just as we're riffing, potentially actors are better messengers, are better able to take advantage of the benefits of the messenger effect than let's say musicians or sports stars because they better match those three those three standards.

**Richard Shotton:** Yeah. Yeah, absolutely.

Absolutely.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** So as we come to a close today, Richard, would you mind doing a recap of the big topics we've [00:34:00] discussed?

**Richard Shotton:** Yep. Yeah. So probably three key points. We've talked about the messenger effect in general, this is the idea that who says something can be as important as what is said. Remember that hobbling device study with the questions about the nuclear powered submarine.

So brands should be thinking not just what they say, but who can articulate the argument for why they're amazing. That's the first point. Then the second point is that there are predictable characteristics that make for a persuasive messenger. And actually I think we've covered four neutrality, credibility, relatability, and status.

And then our third and final point was if you are trying to work out which of these attributes is right, view as a brand, be very careful about how you do your research. People will not be open about what genuinely motivates them. Sometimes they lie, sometimes they just don't know. So direct [00:35:00] questioning can send you off in the wrong, wrong direct people will explain their behavior as if they were fully considered rational decision makers.

They will downplay some of these simple shortcuts that we've been discussing, which are actually very influential in decision making.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** Thank you for wrapping on on today's episode. Richard, as we come to a close, we always have a fun question. What is the way Richard Shotton takes his caffeine? Is it coffee, is it tea?

If it is one of those, how do you make it? What's your caffeine, caffeinated beverage of choice.

**Richard Shotton:** Definitely preference for a coffee, and there's no way I'm going near oat milk or soy milk. So. Sorry, Oatley. Yeah, yeah, yeah. A little bit of skim milk and a, and a coffee. What about, what about you?

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** I went through, maybe I was just inspired by the British.

I went through a phase of black tea with milk and honey, but I am now back to more American roots. That would be [00:36:00] a skim milk latte. With no sugar and you know, you can really it when it's made well, it can be really be quite delicious.

**Richard Shotton:** Well, I'm very glad that you're doing some tea drink and then of course, as a Brit in the evenings when I don't wanna be having a, a caffeine injection, then I'll, I'll turn to, to tea.

Bit of Earl gray lapse on strong. All very nice. This is of course, what we would expect.

**MichaelAaron Flicker:** And there you have it everyone. If today's episode sparked a new idea for you, do us a favor. Hit the follow button, leave us a review or share this with someone who loves marketing just as much as we all do. And if you have a favorite behavioral science principle or example of something that you see working well in the market, let us know and we might feature it in an upcoming episode.

Until next time, I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

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

**Ad:** Behavioral Science for brands is [00:37:00] 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.