metlifecare

PART 7:

How would you know it works?

FED ERA TION

What we would *test* before launch

Recognition	We would put the work in front of people alongside real category advertising and ask: Is this people like me?
Whether the work gives permission	Does it make it easier for prospects to raise a move themselves, rather than with the adult child.
The week after the visit	Look at who toured a Metlifecare village in the last ninety days and didn't proceed. The only genuinely in-market sample available to us before launch, and it sits directly on the largest single opportunity in the next six months.
Memory rather than liking	A cued attribution check forty-eight hours after exposure, with competitor work in the set. This decision has a fuse of 2 to 5 years, so the brand has to survive in memory until the trigger arrives.
The front line	We'd sit down with sales staff across the four catchments and ask each person to state the proposition in their own words. A village manager who can say the proposition and believe it is worth more than an email follow up.
Whether one idea carries four villages	We would show the four village variants together and ask whether they read as one brand doing four different jobs.
Testing real behaviour before launch	We would run a small paid experiment in market ahead of the campaign launch, with enough spend behind two or three variants to produce a meaningful read, looking beyond media metrics to see who actually booked a visit.

What would we *deliberately* not research

Knowing what to ignore matters as much as knowing what to measure. Here is what we would leave out, and why.

- **Whether people who aren't in market like it**. Someone with no trigger will always choose the gentlest ad. Following that preference for seven years is how five operators arrived at the same campaign.
- **How reassuring a message feels.** The most reassuring message is always the least memorable one. This decision needs to survive in memory for years, so memorable wins.
- **A line on its own.** A tagline with no film or imagery around it is being judged as a sentence rather than as advertising. We would test the work as it will actually appear.
- **Whether someone would "consider" a village.** This measures politeness. Seventy-one percent of prospects say they will know when they are ready, and eighty-two per cent of people who moved say they were not.
- **Resident regret.** Our research already ruled this message out. We will not put it in a test where a good score would tempt us to bring it back.
- **How comfortable the language feels.** Comfort is the wrong test. Work that feels awkward in a research room can land perfectly at a kitchen table. We would ask whether it gives People permission to act.
- **Performance against category norms.** Those norms are built from the conventions we are breaking, so the test would mark us down for being different. We would take that risk openly an get our answer from the market instead.

What would make us *change* the idea

WHAT WE WOULD SEE	WHAT WE WOULD DO ABOUT IT
The parent hears it as a judgement on her. The older prospect, watching alone, feels the work is telling her she can no longer cope.	This would be fatal for the idea, because it repeats the effect that adds nearly two years to the journey. We would change who issues the invitation inside the work rather than soften the tone.
The partner is unmoved. The work shifts the prospect but leaves her partner cold.	The idea would be talking past the person who holds the veto. We would rebrief against that person specifically.
Nobody can name Metlifecare. Two days after seeing it, people credit the work to the category or a competitor.	A problem with the assets rather than the idea. We would fix distinctiveness and keep the thought.
They apply but don't settle. Tours convert into applications, and applications stall.	The blockage is the house sale, which advertising cannot solve. We would say so and redirect the work at the resale barrier.
West Auckland stays flat. Three villages move and the fourth stays at seven per cent.	West Auckland's problem is lead source and stock, not creative. We would stop spending against it and move the money to where it converts.
People enquire alone. Enquiry volume rises but bookings are still for one person.	The work is creating interest without moving permission. We would rewrite against the partner holding the decision rather than chase reach.
The sales team can't say it. Village managers cannot state the proposition in their own words.	We would rewrite the proposition. Training people harder against words they do not believe has never worked anywhere.

What *success* would look like to the audience

The real test is whether households talk differently six months from now. Not whether they remember the advertising, but whether the conversation at home has actually changed.

Below are the specific things we would hope to hear people saying.

- A parent says **"I raised it"** instead of "my daughter keeps raising it". That reversal is the whole idea working.
- Someone names **a date, not a condition.** "We'll know when we're ready" becomes "we're looking at after Christmas".
- **A second person comes to the second visit** without the salesperson asking.
- An adult child says **the conversation started without her.**
- A household talks about **timing**, where it used to talk about **giving up the house.**
- A village manager finds **the advertising agrees** with her – with how the best of your front line already describe the job.

.

What we would refuse to call success:

We would also be honest about what does not count. Strong recall with flat bookings is not success. Neither is approval from people who are not in market, or praise from the industry. If the advertising is lovely and nobody books a second visit, it has failed – and we would tell you before you had to.



The *nurture journey* should make decision making easier

Decision making isn’t linear, it’s a path with many branches. Metlifecare’s CX can help start the conversations people find hard.

The database isn't cold
It’s just that 2,200 people have never been offered a reason to engage with Metlifecare that wasn't a sales conversation.

Future need states move suddenly
A near miss on the stairs turns a proactive planner into a reactive mover overnight. A record captured at enquiry is wrong, fast.

Pressure lengthens the decision journey
Households where an adult child pushed too early is one of the largest obstacles in the category.

The step-change is a different shape for nurture.

A lead management system with a branch per situation, updated for where someone is this month rather than where they were fourteen months ago.

Some of the decision journey self-served means increased relevance at the right time, and more settlements.

You can’t win this way by buying more media

Making it personal: the data that builds the picture

	First Contact	Next	Future
First party **Declared by the prospect**	Name(s) & relationship, physical address, email(s)/mobile(s) (with consent), village of interest, source and enquiry date	Lifestyle/independence questions to infer mobility, travel, existing support, interests- e.g. do you have help at home at the moment, etc	Full interaction history by channel · call transcripts coded to CRM fields
Online behaviour **Observed, with consent**	Web sessions, email opens, clicks & forwards, plus replies		
Third party **Matched to address**	**Property data:** distance to nearest village (& competitors), property value, length of ownership, dwelling & land size		

One household record → segment and propensity scores → comms personalised by person, decision stage and village

Area listing activity and days on market

Asked at every interaction, to identify readiness:

1. **Timeframe:**
   When might you move?
2. **Reason:**
   What's prompted you to look
3. Each interaction is compared to prior response to understand changes and feeds a model feature

Every interaction should add to the household record. The richer that record, the more relevant the next conversation — and the sharper the propensity score behind it.