Target group analysis of redbull in uk

Business, Marketing



Target group of Red Bull in UK By Red Bull in UK developed new strategies in marketing their products due to the pressure that was put on the company due to stiff competition from companies such a Coca Cola. In the strategies of the company was avoiding mainstream advertising, as this was not reaching the target group for its products. The company however decided to focus on grass root product promotion that would allow the products use targeted group (RED BULL GMBH v POTTERS, 2013).

The consumers that were targeted through the grass root promotion were those that visited trendy nightclubs. The products also targeted the credibility of those that were involved in interaction with the young target audience (RED BULL GMBH v POTTERS LTD, 2013). The young group was the main target through the promotion and sales. Those that were close such as disc jokers were also target as they were able to promote the product more. Education that was carried out on the product-targeted consumers that are thought might need a lift. The places that were much explored with the sales include those that were in building and construction sites and those that were in offices. Those involved in the brand and product marketing use the local knowledge that they have to increase sale of the product. High profile marketing of the company has focused on maintaining a link with extreme sports. The sponsor that the company has given to two Formula one teams has enabled reaching the youthful energetic audience that has been the target (RED BULL GMBH v POTTERS LTD, 2013).

The groups of consumer that have been targeted in all the activities of the company are those that use more energy as the product is an energy drink.

The groups are mainly those in the youthful sage, those that are involve in

sporting activities and also any of those that carry out activities that require more energy.

Reference

RED BULL GMBH v POTTERS LTD (RED KOOGA TRADE MARK). (2013).

Reports of Patent, Design and Trade Mark Cases, 130(5), pp. 385-393.