

Ep100 - Interview: MichaelAaron Flicker and Richard Shotton on 100 episodes of behavioral science, brands, and ideas that actually work

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 of some of America's most successful marketing. I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

Richard Shotton: And I'm Richard Shotton.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And today Richard and I are celebrating our hundredth episode.

We're gonna use this as a chance to look back, talk about some of our favorite episodes, and look a little bit forward. Let's get into it. So, Richard, when we started this activity did you ever think we'd hit a hundred episodes together?

Richard Shotton: No, I did not. I, I, I really didn't, I didn't think there would be, and necessarily all the brands that we, we could talk about.

But once you start looking into it, there's an amazing variety of brands that I think have at least on occasion, used some brilliant behavioral science principles,

MichaelAaron Flicker: and I think I've been surprised by [00:01:00] how many guests have been so generous to join us and talk so deeply about their fields? You know, we've had a, a wide variety of guests, but almost universally they've been generous to say, well, this is what I teach in my lectures.

This is what I do in my consulting. This is what I learned. Behind the doors at some of the biggest ad agencies. Really a lot of generosity and willingness to share their experiences when we brought our guests on.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, and from a real mix of backgrounds, as you say, there's some top glass academics, people like Danley, I Fishback tally, and then there's some amazing people from the world of advertising.

We have Roy Sutherland, Les Bonnet, so a real nice mix of guests who've given their time.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And most of all we're gonna go take some of the time today in this episode to give highlights of your and my favorite episodes Yeah. Of the, of [00:02:00] the past 100. And we asked ourselves, is it a little bit like.

Choosing your favorite child should you not pull some to the top. But for the listeners that have joined us along the way, you may not have been along since episode one. And while all the episodes Richard and I wouldn't post them if we didn't feel they were great. Some just had some staying power that we thought felt prescient as we were starting 2026 as we hit a hundred episodes.

And so we were just, we just thought, why, why not take a stroll back through memory lane and pick some of our favorites?

Richard Shotton: Great idea. Great idea.

MichaelAaron Flicker: So Richard, would you like to go first? Would you like to maybe tell us a little bit about one or two that stood out in your mind that you remember fondly from our time?

Richard Shotton: Absolutely. So two of my favorites are I think, first of all the Economist, [00:03:00] and I absolutely love that. Episode. So we, there was a brilliant discussion about how they use the Generation Effect. So the Generation Effect is this idea that if you make the audience put a little bit, and I emphasize the little there, but if the audience had to put a little bit of effort into understanding the message, it tends to be much stickier and much more memorable.

So that idea. Yes, can be applied in a very simplistic way. The original experiment kind of gave people lists of words where there was a letter missing and you see occasional creative responses doing that. But what I loved about the Economist example was this lateral creative application of a behavioral science princip.

So what they essentially did in the, in the ad that we discussed was run posters with this brilliant phrase, I don't read The Economist, and then an attribution to management. Management trainee, age 42, love. That's a lateral application [00:04:00] of the generation of age. You don't tell people you'll be a failure if you don't read The Economist.

You set this little puzzle and the act of solving that puzzle that makes the, the, the audience remember it, that, that, that bit more. So that's actually one of my favorite episodes

MichaelAaron Flicker: and it's it's fun to laugh as you even start to say the line. 'cause you can remember these lines. But to me, one of the critical parts of the Generation Effect is that it requires the reader to participate just a little bit.

They have to do, they have to be a little active in that. Can you just talk for a minute about that? Because it's, in realizing that I never read The Economist Management Trae, still at age 42, it's in realizing that that's a little bit of satire, that the Generation Effect is really cemented. Is that right?

Richard Shotton: That that's right. The idea would be. If you make an easy, so make a message so easy to consume, what tends to happen is you have this reduction in memorability, it just washes over [00:05:00] someone. If you require the audience to actively participate in it in essence to generate the answer themselves, that effort creates memorability.

So management trainee, age 42, say they don't read it. You have to go through the kind of logical process of working out. Well, they don't read it. They are a, you know, not, not progress very far in their, their career. Their lack of readership has meant that they haven't progressed you. You have to do that little bit of work yourself, and it's that effort that embeds it in the, in the long term memory.

MichaelAaron Flicker: That's episode 18, the Economist. I'll remember.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, I,

MichaelAaron Flicker: I I'm gonna bring them to everybody as you go, and that way we have 'em. So episode 18, the Economist will be linked in the show notes. Really great. First example.

Richard Shotton: And then the second one that I really like, and, and this one's for a couple of reasons.

This is the campaign. Don't Mess with Texas. So we discussed a Texan campaign that was trying to stop [00:06:00] people littering, and it was phenomenally successful. And I love this for two reasons. Firstly, it really shone a light on how parochial advertising can be.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Mm-hmm.

Richard Shotton: Mm-hmm. In Britain, if I was to talk about that campaign, I would've to give people lots of details.

No one knows about it. That is insane when you think about it. We have the same problem of littering in Britain, yet we don't know about a campaign in America that really powerfully resolved that problem. So I think bringing Campaigns from other countries to light is, is a very valuable thing.

Now, I know that's of less interest to American listeners, but for me, that was one reason I loved it. And then the second thing about the campaign was there's a wonderful, there's humility at the heart of it.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Mm.

Richard Shotton: The standard thing with advertising is to think, how do I change. In a, in a case of an anti-littering campaign, how would I change the worldview of the audience?

So I [00:07:00] get them to care about littering, to see it as a, as a, you know, damaging thing for the environment. That though is a really tough task.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Mm-hmm.

Richard Shotton: And what I think don't mess with Texas did so brilliantly was they, rather than try and change people's worldview, instead they try to change what. Littering meant, so they aligned littering with a lack of state pride.

The audience already had that state pride, you know, but associating, littering with something that might be done with some intera from Louisiana or Mississippi, that was the genius. Change how people frame the behavior, not change the audience's worldview. If we talk about this principle of make it easy as we so often do, I think sometimes we need to apply it to our tasks a little bit more.

So I think those two are my, my real favorites.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Don't Mess with [00:08:00] Texas. Episode 20. I've got it there for everyone here at home. Teaches us that you can use the principles in the way that you talk to your clients or in the way that you build the campaign,

but it, it also teaches us maybe there's an easier task to be done first, rather than changing the entire worldview.

Is there an easier task of, can we use something that everyone in America knows Texans have a lot of state pride and attach it? It, it, it's about reframing what the actual job to be done is. I think that's, that's one of the things I took away from that episode. Yeah.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. So the, so yeah, those, those are, those are my two favorites.

So over to you. What which ones, which ones did you enjoy most? Which one do you think were most useful for the listener?

MichaelAaron Flicker: The first one I chose was an episode we did a long time ago called 11 Madison Park. And for those that don't know this. Restaurant. It's a restaurant in New York City that at the [00:09:00] height of the restaurant's fame became one of the world's top 50 restaurants.

And they used the behavioral science insight of the peak end rule. And without going through the whole study about the peak end rule, here's what they did at 11 Madison Park. Normally when you would be at a fine dining restaurant and you would choose a wine pairing, let's say for \$115, you would give five equal.

Priced glasses of wine so that you have pretty good wines to go along with each meal. What 11 Madison Park did differently is that they lowered those prices of wines, let's say instead of it being \$20 a piece, they made it \$15 a piece so that they could push the last wine that you got with your dessert to be something truly special and will guera.

Who was in charge of the front of house at times said, this was his quote, if you love wine. It's always [00:10:00] exciting to drink a grand crew burgundy, but the chance to do so almost never happens during an ordinary wine pairing. So imagine how excited our guests were when we did it. Our approach gave us the ability to surprise and delight everyone who ordered those pairings, making it an experience.

They would never. And to me that's the gem of the insight. It's about creating an unforgettable moment, even if you have to sacrifice elsewhere. And so Will just kind of naturally had this instinct of the peak end rule, and he applies it beautifully at 11 Madison Park. Okay.

Richard Shotton: I think that's really nice.

That's really nice. And he's doing both parts of the peak end rule there, isn't he? He's not split. The sommelier is not splitting, splitting the budget evenly. They're choosing one wine to be standout and sacrificing the other four, but also they're putting at the very end. So, you know, these are the two things that carne and Rader.

Are disproportionately likely to be remembered from an, from an experience, the peak [00:11:00] event and the, the final event. So yeah, I love that as an idea. And it was a great episode. I think that's you know, his book, unreasonable Hospitality is a, he is a wonderful book. And lots of,

MichaelAaron Flicker: look, you know what, we should put that, we'll put that in the show notes so that everybody can see his book and now he does a lot of speaking, so you could find clips of him talking online.

That was episode 56, 11 Madison Park.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. Keep

MichaelAaron Flicker: tagging those on at the end. Yeah.

Richard Shotton: How about the next one?

MichaelAaron Flicker: The second? Yeah, the second one I was thinking about, funny that I chose two. I chose two food and beverage drink ones. I'm not sure why, but I chose Aperol and we, when we first started working together, you and I talked about Aperol as one of these amazing examples of social proof.

I love it for a number of reasons. So here's what Aperol did. It has in its nature a very distinct orange color, and you see it in the Aperol bottle when you buy Aperol. But their on-premise [00:12:00] approach when you go to a bar is they provided all the bars, balloon glasses. And so when you make an Aperol spritz, you see this big bubble full of.

Aperol colored liquid. Then they gave the bartenders aall umbrellas, these little drink umbrellas that they pop up and put right into the drink. And then like most alcohol brands, they also gave picnic umbrellas and other accoutrements for the bar all together. You get this kind of. Overwhelming effect of this orange color everywhere you look in the bar.

And that made their popularity. Feel like you're discovering it yourself. So imagine you're walking up to the bar, it's crowded, you're waiting for the bartender to come to you, and now it's time to order. And this bartender said, what do you want? And you just see this orange color everywhere. You're much more likely to order an Aperol [00:13:00] spritz.

And to me, that really creates this idea that it was even more popular than it might be because telling in. Another colored glass, if it was Jack Daniels or Jim Beam, you know, Greg Goose Vodka Kettle One. All of their popularity is hidden, not just by the color of the liquid, but by the glassware and the other things they put in the bar.

Aperol really intentionally focused on making his popularity scene.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, that, that, that's one of my favorite episodes. I think it's a brilliant one because. We talk so often about social proof and directly stating popularity. Now all these ads that might go out and say, you know, we are the nation's favorite bourbon, or the nation's favorite washing powder, I think Apple just pushes it onto another level by rather than just stating explicitly popularity.

They imply popularity by making consumption so distinctive. They looked like they're a massive brand before they were. [00:14:00] So yeah, absolutely. I, I loveable as an example. That's well worth listening to, and the Kaiser study is a really clever one to prove it.

MichaelAaron Flicker: That's the littering in the, that's the littering in the alleyways.

Yeah. So that's episode three. How AOL applies the Power of Lateral Social Proof episode three. My goodness, we were younger men when we, when we recorded episode three. And I, in the show notes of that episode, I believe we have the Google search trends. It's really a very lovely case study to see how they roll out this campaign.

And you could see. Independent proof of the, of the popularity that they were driving and a bunch of other elements to that. So a, a lovely episode and a great case study for anyone trying to see examples of social proof being done well in the market.

Richard Shotton: Nice.

MichaelAaron Flicker: So we talked about some of our favorites.

Let's talk about maybe an episode, not that [00:15:00] we would've done differently, but if we could go back and add something to any one of the episodes, what would the episode be and what would you want to add?

Richard Shotton: So one of the, in fact the earliest episode did was Guinness and it's a great, the history of a brand.

It's got this amazing use of various different biases and we talk a lot about the pratfall effect. So this idea that if you admit to a flaw, you make yourself, it's a person doing it or your brand more appealing. So we talk in that episode about the Elliot Aronson study back in 1966 when he was at Harvard.

That shows admitting a flaw, flaw, generates appeal, but. We did quite short episode for that, and I think if we were doing it again, I would do a longer episode and focus more on what type of flaw should you admit. And there's some amazing work by Gerd Bonner at Bielefeld [00:16:00] University that that looks into this.

So, 2003 study. Bonner recruits 131 people. Randomizes them into one of three groups and he shows them an ad for a restaurant. Now, sometimes the ad just makes a positive claim. It says it has an amazing cozy atmosphere. Other times the ad admits that yes, it's cozy, but there is a, a floor in the restaurant, it doesn't have parking.

And then a third group, they see the same. Positive claim, cozy atmosphere. But this time the negative feature that they admit to is related. It's kind of the mirror image of the strength. It's that they can't accommodate large parties. It's such a small restaurant. Sorry, we can't take bookings over. I know six people say.

Now what happens as the prat four effect suggests is that [00:17:00] the ads that admit a flaw, both of them have the the best scores when people are asked about their attitudes towards them. So on the top line, it supports what Aronson says. In a commercial setting, you admit a flaw, you become more appealing. But the really interesting bit is when you then start comparing the scores for the two types of weaknesses.

And this is all on a a nine point scale. What Bon finds is the, the people who see the ad that has the related flaw, they rate the restaurant best of all. And that, to me, moves us on from just saying Admitter flaw to what you need to do is identify the core strength of your brand and then think what is the.

Mirror weakness. So in the case of the restaurant, if you're saying you're cozy, thatch can't take a big party is a related flaw. If your Guinness [00:18:00] though, it's well, you say you are slow because often people assume slowness is related to putting more time into products and that it'll be higher quality. So, so I think if we were doing it again, I'd really double down on that, that bon experiment because it makes the bias of the practical effect.

I think easier to apply in the real world.

MichaelAaron Flicker: I think that's such a important insight because sometimes when we talk about these academic studies, there's doubt or gaps, and if you, in the Aronson study. The flaw is he just spills water or coffee on himself. It has nothing to do with his actual quiz taking abilities.

So it's really an unrelated flaw. And so the application in commercial settings I've seen people sometimes hesitate about, but the Bonner study really does solve that question for us. So for listeners, one study by itself may [00:19:00] open. An idea for you. Multiple studies can give you an a, a way around solving is this really more applicable?

And then of course, testing for yourself is a, is a way that you can have confidence in the application of the insight for your businesses. Is that fair to say?

Richard Shotton: I, I, I think absolutely. I think you've got multiple studies should create greater believability in insight.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Mm.

Richard Shotton: And let's not. Delude people. If there is a single study that tells you something quite surprising, hang a question mark on the end of it.

You know it, it might not be a genuine insight. It might be a statistical fluke if you see multiple studies showing the same basic point. The believability and credibility of that study increases. And then secondly, absolutely. Rather than just being told, admit a flaw. Now what we are saying is admit a flaw.

That is the mirror image of your strength. So if you are a consultant, maybe a B2B consultant, maybe you [00:20:00] want to convey the strength of being, I don't know, particularly intelligent or particularly insightful. While the mirror flaw, the related flaw might be that you are real expensive. People assume, well those who are expensive are gonna be at a higher, higher, higher quality.

So it's a much more directional experiment, I think.

MichaelAaron Flicker: I think that's well said. Maybe my only final build on this, maybe the in am in American universities. Richard, you have like one-on-one classes are beginner. 2 0 1, yeah. Or intermediate 3 0 1 is like advanced. Maybe like a 2 0 1 or 3 0 1 level recommendation.

Is to look at the actual study itself rather than just the analysis that somebody did on it. I've found that when you first look at academic studies, it's intimidating. It's written in dense language, it's often in a website with no pictures. It's just a lot of text. But when you [00:21:00] read exactly how they set it up and when you read about exactly the questions they asked and the responses they got, it gives you a lot more context to how you might apply it to your brand to your business challenge.

So all of. These podcasts hours included, all of the books give you good way finding, but maybe the, the more advanced application of this is take a, take a read at some of these studies, they're not always so impossible to penetrate and you really get a lot more color and richness.

Richard Shotton: Absolutely. And, and, and Aronson's study is an example of that.

The headline find that often gets repeated is admit a flaw and you get high status. Aon probes that and puts a little bit of a a nuance on it, which is if you have high status and you admit a flaw you become more desirable. He shows that if you are a bit of a buffoon, if you are seen to be a [00:22:00] bit stupid and you spill a cup of coffee down himself, you actually make the situation worse.

So absolutely, there's always these layers within layers.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yeah. And, and isn't that the fun of this field? Is that, isn't that like the joy of it is that it gives you insights into how humans may act, how consumers might buy, but actually there's a lot more to uncover and there's always deeper layers. Is it doky who says there's layers of an onion?

You know, you gotta keep peeling the onion back to get to. The heart of, of humanity and I, that may be my, the only dusty FC quote I remember. Yeah. University, but I believe it was him.

Richard Shotton: You could attribute anything to Dusti. Again, I have no, no clue if you'll making up or not. So just, just pepper it in from now on.

Okay, so we have started with a few of our favorite episodes and well worth going back and listening to those. What we've also done though is interview people so often some. Brilliant. Strategists. Creatives, but also academics. [00:23:00] Have there been any ones that particularly stood out to you in terms of those interviews?

MichaelAaron Flicker: When we planned for this part of the episode, there was just three interviews that I could recall. Moments of them like, like in an instant. And I just, I, I thought I'd share those because they're top of mind and they had lasting impact for me. So they may have lasting impact for others. So the first one is from a Oxford University professor.

Named Charles Spence, and he's the author of Astrophysics and he's his expert on the science of taste appeal. Mm-hmm. At first. I thought to myself, how will we use what he has to talk about? And then he, in his very first experiment that he talked about, he takes his university students, he puts them into a soundproof room and he has [00:24:00] them munch or crunch on Pringles chips, but they're wearing headphones and he alters the sound of the bite that they're making and.

And depending on the sound that he changes, he can get them to rate the freshness and the crispiness of the chip by up to more, 15% more. And so it really speaks to how sound. Changes our perception of taste. And then he talks about how rounder chocolate pieces are assumed to be more sweet, how your visual changes the way you taste.

And you've heard people say you taste with your eyes and your nose before you taste with your mouth, but he added a lot of science and academic rigor around that. So that was number one for me. I really love that one. Y

Richard Shotton: Yeah. And if if you're gonna, I mean, he, he almost invented this subfield of psychology.

How one. The perceptions in one sense, like weight [00:25:00] or sight or smell, affect perceptions in another. So hearing from him directly, all those studies that, that, that was a genuinely amazing interview. I think he's very, very impressive. And you made the mention of astrophysics book. I think that will stick that in the show notes 'cause that's, that's well worth reading.

If anyone enjoyed the episode.

MichaelAaron Flicker: So that's episode 60, just to call it out as we go. I'm just doing a little search on the side as we go. Yeah. Next episode was with Les

Burnett, who, if you are in the field of Marketing or advertising, especially if you have an interest in advertising effectiveness. I would say he is one of the industry's most effective, most most effective leaders.

Most well-regarded leaders. He's the co-author of a number of white papers. The one we focused on was the long and the short of it, the Secrets Behind Advertising Effectiveness, and it was a lovely talk and [00:26:00] Richard, you and I decided to approach that. Interview with Les to get his biggest ideas on the table and teach them to our listeners.

And that was great. And at the very end he raises a concept that he's said, you know, I've been thinking a lot about this. And he says, I wonder how branding reduces price sensitivity. Everybody's looking for brands to. Increase recall, increase intent to purchase, actually increase buying. But he says, I wonder how strong branding reduces your price sensitivity.

And would you be willing to pay more for the same thing if it had a stronger brand? And he kind of left it there, but of. All of the interviews we've done, that thought has returned to me multiple times. And today in the industry, I don't believe there's a lot of literature and a lot of studies specifically around this.

So Les may be advancing that. Now, it [00:27:00] may be a call for somebody, one of our listeners to advance that, but it's a fascinating idea that there may be other benefits that are yet to be explored about the strength of doing great branding and great advertising.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. Pricing I think is one of the most.

Fascinating areas. You say the, you know, I think you get into that area of the brand interaction with pricing. There is a big gap and hole that I'm sure far more could be done. I think when you look at behavioral science experiments on how to get people to pay or, or, or respond to the same price slightly differently, then there's an awful without

MichaelAaron Flicker: doubt

Richard Shotton: You know, removing the.

Currency denominators, the Civil Yang stuff. I think we discussed with Phil Agnew in his episode talking about the daily price of a time-based item rather than the yearly one. This idea of the pen is a day effect. Now, I, I always think

if, if people aren't using behavioral sites in their organization now, one of the best places to [00:28:00] start is on your website.

Trying to apply some of these principles right at that moment of sale around the, the, the display the, the promotion of that price.

MichaelAaron Flicker: The only other one that comes to mind right off the bat is our Red Bull episode where we talk about changing the relativity, pricing relativity. So lots of good options there.

That's episode 46 with ette. Last one from me was. The indomitable, the indisputable Rory Sutherland who was so generous to come and do an extended interview. I think he might've been on set for three and a half hours. We were on camera for two and a half hours, maybe longer. And to say we covered hundreds of interesting ideas may even be an understatement.

But one of the ideas he brought that has stuck with me and I've used in my work [00:29:00] over and over since he said it was this idea of reverse benchmarking. And instead of looking at your competitors and ask what they're doing well. You should ask what they're doing badly because where they're doing something badly, you have a opportunity to improve upon that and do much better.

And actually, he brings up 11 Madison Parks Will Guera and his example of of, of how reverse benchmarking can work. And he says, when Guera was in charge of designing the experience at. 11 Madison Park to become a best restaurant in the world. Him and his team, Will's team visited a lot of other best restaurants, including the then number one spot.

And instead of looking to emulate what they did so well, he had his team write down all the things that they were doing badly. And that gave 11 Madison Park an opportunity to differentiate themselves and exceed their expectations. And so [00:30:00] I think that to me. Was just such a reminder that we are really trying to increase our share of the pie.

Increase the overall share of the pie. Competing where others are great may be a lot harder than competing where they've left white spots.

Richard Shotton: Yes, that that part really did stick in their mind. I think the Wil Gadar example he gave was they go to some amazing restaurants, get inspired. Lots of people come back, say, well, I thought the way they did the pastry was amazing.

Let's copy that. And Wil G Guitar's point as well. The beer was bloody awful, and you couldn't get a decent flat white at the end. And then he goes out and recruits someone just to be the beer sommelier, just to be the, you know, expert barista. And, you know, back in what, probably early two thousands, nineties, yes, the expectation of Michelin Star for coffee and beer was not that high.

So he absolutely smashed those expectations, and that therefore became a very, very memorable part of the [00:31:00] experience. Yeah, that reverse benchmarking idea is lovely. So well worth the lesson,

MichaelAaron Flicker: episode 73 for those keeping track at home.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. Yeah.

MichaelAaron Flicker: How about on your side, Richard? Did you have some standout episodes that really got you thinking?

Richard Shotton: Yeah, so I certainly wouldn't disagree with, with your choices. I think the ones I was gonna draw attention to though, were. Hearing from the academics, talk about their own research. I've always thought that was super interesting. So I've had Dan Arles come on and talks about his work origi, about how often incentives can backfire.

But of all of the episodes, the one that I really, really enjoyed the conversation was with iLet Fishback. Mm. And she talked a lot about her research. Things like the gold dilution effect. But I particularly liked her discussion of her [00:32:00] work with Lucy Sharon around uncertain rewards. So the study she talks about in the episode recruits a load of students and she gets 138 of them together.

They are shown, one of two bags of chocolates. So some people see a transparent bag and there are four chocolate truffles on it, and they bid how much they're prepared to pay, and the average bid is 66 cents. Other people are shown an opaque bag and they're told, look, it might have two truffles in it might have four truffles in.

And this fresh group of people, they are asked how much they're bid to take that back home with them. The average bid is more than double. It's \$1.49. Now you think about that for a second, and suddenly you are selling people a worse. Product or, or a cheaper product for the maker, let's say. Put it that way, you're selling this cheaper [00:33:00] products.

'cause on average it's gonna have three truffles, not four, yet you are able to charge so much more. And the point the Fishback made was the people, especially when it's these kinda smaller purchases, they love this excitement of the uncertain reward. They love the excitement of a gamble. Everyone wants to be a winner.

So you can. Put into your product psychological value that is free to do, rather than trying to create value by giving people more and more expensive products away. So, so that was such a nice study, such a nice area. It's one that when we put Hacking the human Mind together, we talked a lot about uncertain rewards and how they could be used in the, in the Facebook chapter.

So she was brilliant. I love that one.

MichaelAaron Flicker: I, I think it's a great reminder, especially if you are more of an advertiser in advertising or in only one type of marketing. That marketing in its classical form is [00:34:00] not just promotion. It's not just price. It's also product in place. Product means, wow, does it what is the thing we are selling and how does it meet?

Near ael talked about how does it meet a psychological need? How does it, how does it meet that? And I think that what Aelt and her studies were revealing is there's sometimes a satisfaction or an intrigue that has as much to do with the what you think you're getting as what the actual product is.

Richard Shotton: Yeah. And you know, that we've seen some lovely applications of the. I can't remember if we talked about this in the Rory episode, but we've certainly spoke about on, on some of the episodes, which was the English curry chain applying this principle. Mm-hmm. So for those of you. I've never been to Britain.

There's a smallish chain called Deum, like quite a fancy curry house. And if you go at an off peak [00:35:00] time, you can ask them to give you a key ring and they give you this very fancy key ring. And then if you go back at an off peak time, at the end of your meal, you can ask them to bring out the macca. And this is a kind of brass jar that they put a dice in, you shake it, roll it, and if a six comes out.

Everything you've eaten, everything you've drunk whole table completely free, and people absolutely go wild for this. But if you were a, the accountant working at dsu, you'd say, well, we're just giving people a 16, 17% discount. I mean, that is not that steeper discount. There are many other people who give

steeper, fixed or certain discounts to get people in unpleasant times of, of peak times.

But by turning into a game, introducing a bit of theater to the, the situation, you, you create this value, the. Isn't in the mathematics, it's not in the underlying utility of, of what's being offered.

MichaelAaron Flicker: [00:36:00] It's what you would call big capital B brand. It's part of the brand experience at Theum, even if it has nothing to do with the food that you're eating.

Richard Shotton: Yes. Although the, the nice thing they do is they give it an aura of relevance. Yes. So DUM is made out to look like a kind of 1920s Bombay restaurant, and the board that comes out is very war and it's got writing on in and restive languages. The macca they say is a, you know, they, they, they give it this kind of aura of 1920s India.

So, so I think that's. Takes the idea on one step further

MichaelAaron Flicker: mm-hmm.

Richard Shotton: In which you move from just, I know rolling a standard dice on a bit of cardboard, you know, it, it's those theatrical elements, the aesthetics, the design that bring it back to the brand a bit more.

MichaelAaron Flicker: I love that. Yeah. Makes great sense. It makes great sense.

Richard Shotton: And in case people think we've just lost our senses, [00:37:00] we've definitely gotta put a picture of that in the show notes. 'cause my description is is woeful.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Oh, I think it, I think it's lovely. And we've done this together. We've been to, we've been to Deum together and, that's one of our great joys. As co-hosts of this podcast, we did an episode, remind me of the name of the of the restaurant in Britain that has unlimited champagne at the push on button.

Richard Shotton: Oh, Bob. Bob Ricard. Yeah.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yes, Bob, Bob Ricard. We've been to Daum. We have not yet made it till 11 Madison Park together. No, no, no.

Richard Shotton: Yeah.

MichaelAaron Flicker: When we get better way 10

Richard Shotton: million listener, we'll do that.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Yes, exactly. When we continue to grow the listenership. But what better way to enjoy behavioral science than to go out and live it, to, to be a part of it.

Lovely. So we've talked about a lot of our favorite, most memorable parts of the first a hundred episodes. Thinking about the future what are you most excited for, [00:38:00] Richard? What are you thinking about in what's coming up?

Richard Shotton: So there's a couple of things that we've done. So we started some themes, some, some themes of episodes.

So there's behavioral science for agencies and we, we thought, well, what are the various different. Roles or tasks that an agency has. There's pitching, there's copywriting, there's media planning, and we did themed episodes around those. So what are the behavioral science biases that those specialties could use?

And I, I, I, I, I really like those because it gives a different angle and it shows people new ways to play behavioral science. But the new theme that I'm very excited that we're just gonna start recording in the new year is around award-winning campaigns. So we've looked at things like the IP effectiveness papers, the A PG Awards can Lions and see, well, what are some of those amazingly successful campaigns?

And then unpicked, what are the behavioral science principles [00:39:00] behind them? And I think they will make fur some. Very, very good episode. So they should be coming out quite soon.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And so that as we look to the upcoming year, we're gonna continue doing our brand focused episodes that we've started the podcast with.

We're gonna continue doing our interviews with thought leaders in our industry, and now we're gonna look at some of the most effective campaigns, some of the best work in the industry, and look at it through a behavioral science lens.

Richard Shotton: Yeah, and, and I wonder if. It makes it even easier for people to apply.

'cause you could think, oh, well wait a minute, aol, they launched in 1919, they colored their brand this bright, bright orange. Now I am dealing with a hundred year old brand. How do I kind of apply something they did so long ago? Mm-hmm. Now, I think that is a unfair criticism, but I'm slightly worried sometimes people have it with a campaign.

These are constant new ideas, often on a smaller scale. So they're the, the. They're easier, I think, to take and [00:40:00] apply for listeners. They can apply them on their own work much more easily.

MichaelAaron Flicker: And for me, without teasing too much. We have some big interviews coming up. Yeah. In the upcoming year, one that is confirmed.

Mark Ritson of the mini MBA that he has made for marketing. He's a great thought leader in our industry. We're very excited to have him on in Q1 of this upcoming year. And so that plus a bunch of other really great thought leaders, it should be a great year of interviews coming up ahead as well.

Richard Shotton: Happy, good one.

MichaelAaron Flicker: So as we come to a close, Richard, and I wanted to say thank you. To everyone who's helped build behavioral science for brands to what it is today. Getting to a hundred episodes wouldn't have been possible without everyone who's been listening and giving their comments, connecting with us on LinkedIn and really helping make sure that what we're [00:41:00] doing adds value to your work and to your careers.

So thank you. Thanks for the chance to create this content and to build this thing together. We really appreciate it.

Richard Shotton: Fantastic. Likewise.

MichaelAaron Flicker: We're looking forward to 2026 and all the conversations we have ahead and as we'd like to sign off. Until next time, I'm MichaelAaron Flicker.

Richard Shotton: And I'm Richard Shotton.

MichaelAaron Flicker: Thanks so much for 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 [00:42:00] 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.