The Quantum Marketing Audit

A Diagnostic Framework for Measuring Brand Field Strength

Developed by Mark J Evans MBA | 360 Strategy | www.360strategy.co.uk

The quantum marketing framework is intellectually compelling, but boards don't fund philosophy - they fund measurable outcomes. This audit translates quantum principles into a diagnostic tool that identifies where Newtonian thinking is haemorrhaging value and quantifies the opportunity cost of ignoring probability fields.

Time Required: 90-120 minutes with your leadership team

Output: A scored assessment (0-130) across five critical fields, with prioritised action items

ROI Indicator: Companies scoring below 60 typically leave 15-25% of potential revenue unrealised due to friction, misalignment, and classical thinking

How to Use This Audit

Each of the five fields contains 5-7 diagnostic questions. Score each question on a scale of 0-5:

0 = Newtonian Failure (Classical thinking causing active harm)

1 = Poor (Aware of the issue but not addressing it)

2 = Below Average (Some effort, inconsistent execution)

3 = Average (Industry standard, room for improvement)

4 = Strong (Quantum principles partially implemented)

5 = Quantum Mastery (Best-in-class, measurable competitive advantage)

Interpretation:

0-30: Critical. Classical thinking is actively destroying value. Immediate intervention required.

31-50: At Risk. You're operationally competent but strategically vulnerable to quantum-native competitors.

51-70: Transitional. You understand the principles, but execution is inconsistent. Quick wins available.

71-85: Advanced. You're ahead of most competitors. Focus on optimization and edge cases.

86-130: Quantum Native. You're operating in a different dimension from your competitors.

Field 1: Brand Resonance and Constructive Interference

Quantum Principle: Your brand is a frequency, not a feature list. Success comes from resonating with value clusters, not targeting demographics.

Question 1.1: Can you articulate your brand's core frequency in one sentence?

"Our brand exists to [value/belief], which resonates with people who [identity/aspiration]."

0: We have a tagline, but it's generic and interchangeable with competitors

1: We can describe what we sell, but not what we stand for

2: We have brand values, but they're aspirational rather than authentic

3: Our frequency is clear internally but inconsistently expressed externally

4: Our frequency is clear, authentic, and consistently expressed across touchpoints

5: Our frequency is so distinctive that customers can articulate it unprompted

Your Score: ____/5

Question 1.2: Do your marketing touchpoints create constructive or destructive interference?

Test: Review your last 20 pieces of content (ads, social posts, emails, PR). Do they reinforce a single frequency or create noise?

0: Our messaging is chaotic - different channels contradict each other

1: We have brand guidelines, but teams interpret them differently

2: Most touchpoints align, but 30-40% create off-brand noise

3: 70-80% alignment - occasional mixed signals

4: 90%+ alignment - rare exceptions are quickly corrected

5: Every touchpoint amplifies the same frequency - customers describe our brand as consistently authentic

Your Score: ___/5

Question 1.3: Are you resonating with value clusters or targeting demographic segments?

Test: Pull your last campaign brief. Does it say "35-54-year-old professionals" or "people who believe [value]"?

0: We only target by age, income, and location

1: We have psychographic data but still target demographically

2: We've identified value clusters but still default to demographic targeting

3: We target value clusters in strategic campaigns, demographics in tactical ones

4: We primarily target value clusters - demographics are secondary filters

5: We've mapped our entire audience as overlapping value clusters and can identify the resonance zones

Your Score: ___/5

Question 1.4: Do you test for interference patterns?

Test: When you A/B test messaging, do you test "Feature A vs. Feature B" or "Value A + Value B vs. Value A alone"?

0: We don't A/B test messaging systematically

1: We test tactical elements (CTA buttons, subject lines) but not strategic positioning

2: We test different value propositions but don't measure how they interfere with each other

3: We occasionally test combinations of values to find constructive interference

4: We systematically test value combinations and have data on which create amplification

5: We have an interference pattern database showing which value combinations resonate with which clusters

Your Score: ___/5

Question 1.5: When you take a public stance, do you consider the quantum impact?

Test: Think of your last CSR initiative, political statement, or ethical stance. Did you calculate how it would affect your probability field?

0: We avoid taking stances - we try to appeal to everyone

1: We take stances reactively when pressured

2: We have values but don't consistently act on them publicly

3: We take considered stances knowing some customers will disagree

4: We strategically take stances that strengthen resonance with our core cluster, even if they alienate others

5: Our stances create such strong constructive interference that they become the primary reason customers choose us (Patagonia-level)

Your Score: ___/5

Field 1 Total: ___/25

Quick Win: If you scored below 15, conduct a Frequency Audit. Gather your last 20 marketing assets. Have 5 team members independently write down "what this brand stands for" based on each asset. If you get 20 different answers, you have destructive interference.

Field 2: Customer Superposition and Potentia

Quantum Principle: Customers don't have fixed identities. They exist in superposition until context collapses them into a decision.

Question 2.1: Are your personas static descriptions or probabilistic models?

Test: Pull out your persona documents. Do they say, "John is..." or "John is 70% likely to [behaviour] if [context]"?

0: We don't have personas

1: Our personas are demographic sketches with stock photos

2: Our personas include motivations and pain points, but they're static

3: Our personas acknowledge contradictions (e.g., "wants speed AND sustainability")

4: Our personas are probabilistic: "In context X, this person will likely choose Y"

5: We've moved beyond personas to probability profiles that map how likelihood changes across contexts

Your Score: ____/5

Question 2.2: Do your systems allow for customer contradictions?

Test: Can a customer on your platform be simultaneously budget-conscious AND premium-seeking? Or does your segmentation force them into one box?

0: Our systems assume customers fit one segment - they can't exhibit contradictory behaviours

1: We acknowledge contradictions exist but, our systems can't handle them

2: Our systems can track contradictions but don't act on them

3: We design for some contradictions (e.g., sustainable + affordable products)

4: We systematically design for superposition across multiple dimensions

5: Our product/service architecture is built around enabling customers to be contradictory (Airbnb-level: both tourist AND local)

Your Score: ____/5

Question 2.3: Do you measure time to collapse?

Test: How long does it take from first awareness to purchase decision? Do you know which contexts accelerate or delay this?

0: We don't track customer journeys temporally

1: We track time to purchase but treat it as a fixed metric

2: We know average time to purchase but don't segment by context

3: We can identify which contexts shorten/lengthen time to collapse

4: We actively design interventions to either extend superposition (exploration) or accelerate collapse (conversion)

5: We have a dynamic model predicting collapse probability at any given moment based on context variables

Your Score: ____/5

Question 2.4: Do you design for maybe or only for yes?

Test: When someone visits your site but doesn't buy, do you have mechanisms to preserve their superposition state (wish list, reminders, low-commitment options)?

0: No purchase = lost customer - we have no mechanism to preserve potential

1: We retarget with the same message regardless of their state

2: We have basic tools (email capture, cart abandonment) but they're generic

3: We segment maybe states and have differentiated nurture strategies

4: We've designed multiple low collapse options (wish lists, free trials, memberships) that preserve superposition

5: We've built an entire ecosystem that makes staying in superposition with us valuable in itself

Your Score: ___/5

Question 2.5: Do you understand what triggers collapse for different value clusters?

Test: Can you articulate what specific context or signal causes a customer to move from interested to purchased for each major segment?

0: We assume price is the only trigger

1: We know there are multiple triggers but haven't mapped them

2: We have anecdotal understanding but no data

3: We've identified 3-5 major collapse triggers through research

4: We've mapped collapse triggers by value cluster and can predict which will work when

5: We have a real-time system that identifies when a customer is nearing collapse and deploys the optimal trigger

Your Score: ___/5

Field 2 Total: ___/25

Quick Win: If you scored below 15, map the contradictions