From: Greg Shaw (Corp. PR)
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 1998 10:08 PM
To: Mark Murray
Subject: OEM Boot sequence research

This is the research we did that shows consumers don't want the boot sequence interrupted

—Original Message—
From: George Downing
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 1996 10:15 AM
To: Dave Wright (OEM); Greg Shaw (Corp PR;
Subject: FW: OEM PC Shell preferences

so this is the research we did?
thanks

From: Pat Fox
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 1996 9:03 AM
To: Carl Gulledge; George Downing; Dave Wright (OEM)
Cc: Bill Shaughnessy; Laura Scholten
Subject: FW: OEM PC Shell preferences

Here's the final

From: Bob Foulon
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 1996 6:02 PM
To: Pat Fox
Subject: RE: OEM PC Shell preferences

Here you go.
*** ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION ***

Here is the topline for the OEM Positioning Research. If you need additional information, please let me know right away

A copy of the questionnaire and verbatim responses to the open-ended questions are attached.

Methodology
Telephone interviews conducted the week of June 24, 1996. Random sample of registered Windows 95 owners who purchased WINDOWS 95 preinstalled on OEM machines in the past 12 months (N = 244). The interviews were conducted by an outside research firm, Market Decisions Corporation.

Summary
All 244 owners had an OEM shell plus Windows 95 preinstalled on their machines.

Currently
- 72% boot directly into Windows 95
- 13% boot into the shell program, then switch to Windows 95
- 13 % boot into the shell program and operate the PC from there
- 2% don't know

Of those who currently boot directly into Windows 95,
- 23% have deinstalled the shell program from their PCs
- 67% still have the shell program installed, but do not boot into it
- 10% don't know if they deinstalled or deactivated the shell program

Of those who deinstalled the shell, the reason cited for deinstalling the shell program was:
- no need for the shell/the shell was useless

When asked: "When you obtained your computer, which of the following would you have preferred?", respondents said,
- 48% would you have preferred "having it come with WINDOWS 95 only"
- 18% would have preferred "having it come with the shell program, but set up to boot directly into WINDOWS 95"
- 24% would have preferred "having it come as it did, set up to boot directly into the shell program"
- 5% would have preferred "Other" (Windows 3.11 most mentions)
- 5% don't know

The reasons cited when no OEM shell (WINDOWS 95 only) was preferred are:
- No need for shell/shell is useless
- [Windows 95 only is] Faster
- Ease of use
- Used to Windows/Win 95; already use Windows 95

MS98 0204517
CONFIDENTIAL

The reasons cited when "having it come with the shell program, but set up to boot directly into WINDOWS 95" was preferred are:

PENGAD-Bayonne, N. J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
1883

- Flexibility like having the option
- Shell has features I like
- Shell is easier for another user (spouse, children) to use

Of those who said they prefer the shell interface:
- 31% WERE NOT AWARE THAT IT COULD BE DEACTIVATED
- Then, when given the choice in the questionnaire, 38% would deactivate

PC_SHELL Final.doc

Shell Verbatims.doc

From: Pat Fox
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 1996 4:11 PM
To: Bob Foulon
Subject: FW: OEM PC Shell preferences

From: Carl Gulledge
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 1996 3:33 PM
To: Dave Wright (OEM); George Downing; Pat Fox
Cc: Bill Shaughnessy; Laura Scholten
Subject: RE: OEM PC Shell preferences

are there detailed responses to the probing questions?

From: Pat Fox
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 1996 1:44 PM
To: Carl Gulledge; Dave Wright (OEM); George Downing
Cc: Bill Shaughnessy; Laura Scholten
Subject: FW: OEM PC Shell preferences

You should check this out. I've only reviewed topline, but I think it might be a useful tool to apply *proactively* as the AMs introduce their customers to this new way of thinking. Also has OEM mktg implications. Unless legal and PR wanted to keep in back pocket for some reason, which I seriously doubt.
Thx,
Pat

From: Bob Foulon
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 1996 10:19 PM
To: Jonathan Roberts; Nancy McSharry; Pat Fox
Cc: Robert Schoeben
Subject: RE: OEM PC Shell preferences

Got ya. You should not assume that OEM mkt is aware of this. You should drive. Right now, only the PR and legal folks are involved. Here are the final results.
<<File: SHELLTP2.DOC>>

From: Pat Fox
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 1996 4:18 PM
To: Jonathan Roberts; Nancy McSharry; Bob Foulon
Cc: Rob Schoeben
Subject: RE: OEM PC Shell preferences

Thanks, but I understand that part of it and have been privy to some of those discussions. I just wondered if the research was going into OEM marketing to be used proactively with accounts as they begin to discuss the changes in the license. I'll drive this, too.

Thanks,
Pat

MS98 0204518
CONFIDENTIAL

From: Bob Foulon
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 1996 12 26 PM
To: Jonathan Roberts; Nancy McSharry; Pat Fox
Cc Rob Schoeben
Subject: RE: OEM PC Shell preferences

I belive OEM reps are rolling this out (over jochim's protest- he thinks it's a stupid idea)
PR is standing by to deal with flack.

From: Pat Fox
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 1996 12:18 PM
To: Jonathan Roberts; Nancy McSharry; Bob Foulon
Cc: Rob Schoeben
Subject: RE: OEM PC Shell preferences

Where is this going from here? Is OEM involved?
Thx.
Pat

From: Bob Foulon
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 1996 9:38 AM
To: Jonathan Roberts; Nancy McSharry; Pat Fox
Cc: Rob Schoeben
Subject: FW: OEM PC Shell preferences

*** ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED INFORMATION ***
The corporate PC PR group (per billg) felt the need to collect customer survey data to support our decision to not allow oem shells to interupt the win 95 and NT boot cycles. We had done some work on this last january, but decided to launch another over the weekend. Although not final, the results are clear- most customers dislike and don't use the oem shells shipped with their PCs.

<<File: SHELLTOP.DOC>>