IDC Buyer Behavior Practice Case Study
Stretch the Brand

© IDC. Visit us at IDC.com and follow us on Twitter: @IDC
Stretching the Brand

What was the Challenge?

• A computer software and services vendor sought to expand its brand portfolio point solutions to enterprise-wide solutions. Low level awareness among C-level decision makers was a barrier to achieving this goal. The client needed to quantify what the current level of awareness was so they could then track and understand how effective their brand awareness campaign was.

What was the Solution?

• IDC employed its Brand Equity approach which assesses brand strengths and weaknesses and provides a benchmark from which to measure improvements
• 600 interviews with senior IT decision makers in the US and Western Europe to measure the client brand and its competitors for unaided brand awareness, aided brand awareness, loyalty, product set familiarity, and satisfaction.
• Key deliverables included IDC’s Brand Equity Index showing where client stood in comparison to key competitors on key brand equity factors, and key recommendations for enabling the brand transition, successfully.

What were the Measurable Results?

The client was able to:
• Develop a brand awareness campaign designed to improve specific areas of weakness identified in the study
• Establish specific goals and measure results of the brand awareness campaign
IDC’s Brand Equity Index

Steps to calculate index

1. Create indexed scores for each vendor on each factor.
2. Apply weights (total = 100).
3. Combine scores and divide by 100.
4. Result is Brand Equity Index Score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Brand C</th>
<th>Brand M</th>
<th>Brand T</th>
<th>Brand R</th>
<th>Brand H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unaided awareness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided awareness</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDC Brand Equity Index

| IDC Brand Equity Index | 100 | 85.2 | 78.1 | 139.1 | 134.9 | 97.5 |

IDC Custom Solutions
IDC’s Brand Equity Index

Summary: Compare your brand to the competition at a glance
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The Value of Design, Quantified
The Value of Design, Quantified

What was the Challenge?

• Our client's notebook PC strategy was to differentiate itself by its attractive design and advanced display technology. The client needed to know what elements of design were most valued by customers, how to charge for design, and identify which customers would make purchase decisions based on design.

What was the Solution?

The IDC Buyer Behavior team designed a discrete choice and market segmentation analysis that would be driven by custom primary research:
• Four focus groups with consumer notebook PC decision makers to better understand the role of “design” in purchase decisions
• A survey of 500 consumer decision makers that included a discrete choice exercise to measure trade-offs between price, brand, and key features.

Analysis included a market simulator able to isolate and measure the value of “design”. Market segmentation analysis profiled those groups most likely to value design in the purchase decision.

What were the Measurable Results?

The client was able to:
• Provide justification to internal stakeholders and partners for premium pricing of products based on attractive design features.
• Identify and measure customers who place high value on design.
• Go to market with pricing and marketing strategy that resulted in higher margin sales for itself and partners.
Market Segmentation: Importance of Design Elements.

- **Very Design Conscious**
  - Considers design very important overall
  - Likely to consider specific aesthetic factors (style, color) and functional design factors (size, weight) very important
  - 20% of respondents

- **Somewhat Design Conscious**
  - Considers design somewhat important overall
  - More likely to consider specific functional design factors very important
  - Aesthetic factors somewhat important
  - 41% of respondents

- **Not Design Conscious**
  - Considers design not important overall
  - May consider specific functional design factors very important.
  - Aesthetic factors deemed not important
  - 39% of respondents
Going Deeper: Who are the ‘Very Design Conscious?’

- High-income married women
  - Median Income $150K
  - Broad Age Distribution
- Older women, moderate income
  - (married or w/children)
  - Median Income $50K
  - Median Age 45-54
- Single women, no children
  - Median Income $50K-$75K
  - Median Age 24
- Single men, no children
  - Median Income $50K-$75K
  - Median Age 25-34
- Older men, moderate income
  - (married or w/children)
  - Median Income $50K
  - Median Age 45-54
- High-income married men
  - Median Income $100K-$150K
  - Median Age 45-54

Shading represents relative concentration of respondents. Bubble sizes correspond to proportional representation.