To really understand campaign effectiveness we need to understand both the media mix and the creative execution, and how these work together to achieve objectives.

- Does the media plan generate enough exposure?
- What media budget share to allocate to each media?
- Does the campaign stand out from other campaigns?
- How does the ad impact the way consumers think about the brand?
- What is the effect on the short and long term KPIs of the brand?

How effective is the mix?

How effective is the creative execution?

How effective is the campaign overall, and what should be adjusted to improve its effectiveness?
Methodology

Case Study + Timing

The campaign comprised of TV, online and display advertising.
The campaign ran from March to June with bulk of the media spend in April and May.

Budget attribution by channel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear TV</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online video</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online display</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey data collection took place from 13-31 May 2015.

Method + Sample

- Online survey using SmileCity commercial panel
- Sample size of n=802
- 18-54 year olds
- Weighted to be nationally representative on region, gender and age
- Some digital assets were tagged so that we could measure actual respondent exposure, or actual digital opportunity-to-see

Questionnaire

- 20 minute questionnaire
- Questionnaire used TNS's proprietary AdEffect and AdEval methodologies to accurately measure the campaign's media mix and creative effectiveness, respectively
- We continued to measure online media habits to provide a back up for digital opportunity-to-see
Key Messages

1. TV demonstrates its power to achieve broad audience reach - without TV in the mix cut-through would have been dramatically lower than the 50% achieved.

2. TV and online are able to work in synergy to deliver impacts that neither could have achieved alone.

3. The creative execution limits channels to deliver the ability of media on their investment.

4. As a result there is no optimum media spend - i.e., no point at which there is incremental benefit in spending more (or less) on TV or online.
TV demonstrates its power to achieve broad audience reach
Half of 18 to 54 year olds recognised the campaign, when prompted, primarily as a result of the linear TV ad.

Sample size: 802

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear TV</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV OnDemand</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Herald</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuff</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Digital offers very little incremental reach, instead reinforcing recognition achieved by TV

**Marginal reach of channels used (%, 18-54 year olds)**

- **TV Only 88%**
- **TV + Online Display 9%**
- **TV, Online Display & Online Video 3%**

In other words, adding online display to the media mix only contributes 9% share of the total awareness achieved.

Sample size: 802
### Video channels were the most cost effective at delivering awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Linear TV</th>
<th>Online Video</th>
<th>Online Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of awareness</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of spend</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of total media spend</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio / index</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To create a fair and reflective index where both measures (Share of Awareness and Share of Spend) are comparable, we need to standardise them. The campaign awareness figures on Slide 6 add up to more than 100% so they have been converted to allow for a fair comparison - so 85% awareness for Linear TV becomes a 75% share of awareness.
TV and online are able to work in synergy to deliver impacts that neither could have achieved alone.
The two channels work together to maximise awareness and consideration; neither could achieve the same impacts alone.

In other words, TV and Online have worked together to produce a result greater than each channel's contribution in isolation.
The creative execution limits the ability of media channels to deliver on their investment.
The campaign had a short-term motivational impact on only a minority of the audience, limiting its potential...

**Short-term impact - AdEval profile for the campaign** (% aware of the campaign)

- **Motivated**: Both involved, and motivated - 28%
- **Involved**: Involved, but not motivated - 14%
- **No effect**: Neither involved, nor motivated - 52%
- **Bypass**: Motivated, but not involved - 6%

**Ideal Profile**
The motivational profile is derived from respondents answers to six questions and is a measure of the campaign's to activate the audience in the short-term. Three questions are designed to measure Interest / involvement and three measure motivation. An algorithm is used to derive the AdEval motivation segments. Base: Respondents aware of any campaign material when prompted. Sample size: n = 387
There is no optimum media spend - i.e., no point at which there is incremental benefit in spending more (or less) on TV or online
The AdEffect response curve pulls apart the impact of the creative from the media. The shape of the curve helps us determine the optimal contact frequency of an ad.

**Example of curves:**
Curves are built using econometric analysis.

- **High Effectiveness**
  - Effective at a low exposure level
  - Curve flattens at high exposure levels

- **S-Curve**
  - Not effective at low exposure level
  - Builds effect at high exposure
  - Media budget per flight should be high

- **Ineffectiveness**
  - Not effective at any exposure level
Looking at the AdEffect curve for awareness, we can see that it lacks effective impact.

**Impact of video exposure on the brand - KPI = unprompted awareness**

A note on interpretation:
The line does go upwards, so therefore more exposures is associated with more awareness, as we would hope and expect. However, a truly effective ad would have an inflection point at which the incremental benefit of adding more exposures would reduce – this is the optimal level, the level at which there is decreasing returns from more media spend.

In other words, the ad execution is not contributing to the overall effectiveness of the campaign above and beyond media spend. Hence investing in more media space on this version of the ad would be ineffective.
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