

True earth case essay sample

[Business](#), [Marketing](#)



1. Wheeler's primary choices were between targeting the general audience of all men and women over the age of 34, and specifically targeting the high value 18-34 year old women. The upside of taking a generalist approach is that it would be safe. There was already evidence that the 1.0 neilson rating was coming from an audience of women 34 and up. However, there are many downsides to this strategy. The primary downside is that men only made up 39% of the viewership, yet by targeting marketing at men equally with women, funds are being wasted. This assumption is based on the theory that the 39% male viewership would remain intact if marketing was shifted distinctively away from them. The other strategy is to shift the channel's focus onto women in the 18-34 demographic at the risk of sacrificing the current audience. This would be beneficial, because the value of advertising time on the Fashion channel would increase as the audience would become a more valuable consumer demographic. This positive outlook must be tempered with the consideration that it is a risk, and there is no guarantee that the risk of losing the current audience will be offset by the increase in revenues generated through a higher per capita audience value.

My opinion is that it is worth the risk of advertising to the premium demographic, because the channel is a niche product, and the premium demographic of 18-34 women is already interested in the subject matter the Fashion Channel is presenting. The channel already has more of this demographic than CNN, and if targeted, the channel could likely poach some of the viewers from lifetime, as the fashion channel is a niche venue for the subject matter, and lifetime is a general channel that just happens to have a niche fashion show. The benefit of stability posed by a generalist approach is

offset by the decreasing advertising revenue under the current model. 2. I would recommend that Wheeler not only target women between the ages of 18-34, but also focus on the households with over \$100k in annual income. The fashion channel already attracts this audience just through the inherent nature of the subject matter. The 18% share of the audience with household income over \$100k is 2% higher than the national average, and only 1% lower than Lifetime.

This is a high value demographic, and a small increase in viewership would increase the channel's advertising revenue significantly. Specifically, the demographic referred to as "fashionista" appears to be the ideal target audience for the channel. This recommendation also takes into account that fashion is a luxury afforded primarily to consumers with expendable income. It would only take a slight shift in programming to adjust from a general fashion channel to a high end fashion channel, and attract an audience advertisers would pay a premium for. Alternatively, a shift toward an increased focus on men would have an opposite effect, it would drive away the high value 100k+ women 18-34 demographic, by shifting programming away from luxury women's fashion to men's programming. The luxury women's fashion industry is very dependent on the niche idea in line with the current fashion channel programming. However, shows that attract male viewers would take away from the niche informed insider façade that is important to the premium 18-34 demographic.