

B  
F  
I

Film  
Forever

INSIGHT REPORT

# CARTEL LAND

[bfi.org.uk](http://bfi.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### CHAPTER ONE

# **INTRODUCTION** **3**

---

### CHAPTER TWO

# **PLANNING AND RELEASE** **5**

---

### CHAPTER THREE

# **RESULTS** **7**

---

### CHAPTER FOUR

# **OVERALL CONCLUSIONS** **12**

---

### CHAPTER FIVE

# **FINAL THOUGHTS** **14**

---

# CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

---

The following report analyses the ‘Superticket’ offer and the extras offer via iTunes that were trialled for the UK release of the film *Cartel Land* by Dogwoof on 4 September 2015. This release was supported by the New Models strand of the BFI Distribution Fund.

## **Background to the film and the Superticket offer**

*Cartel Land* is a documentary that looks at the journeys of two modern-day vigilante groups and their shared enemy – the murderous Mexican drug cartels.

One group is in the Mexican state of Michoacán where Dr. Jose Mireles, a small-town physician known as ‘El Doctor’, leads the Autodefensas, a citizen uprising against the violent Knights Templar drug cartel that has wreaked havoc on the region for years. Meanwhile, in Arizona’s Altar Valley – a narrow, 52-mile-long desert corridor known as Cocaine Alley – Tim ‘Nailer’ Foley, an American veteran, heads a small paramilitary group called Arizona Border Recon, whose goal is to stop Mexico’s drug wars from seeping across the border.

The distributor for the UK release of *Cartel Land* was Dogwoof, who are a specialist in distributing documentaries. Dogwoof started in 2004 focusing on the UK, and added an international sales arm in 2011. Dogwoof has consistently been at the forefront of innovation in their distribution strategies. They have often sought to use new digital opportunities to increase the audience reach and profitability of their releases.

For the release of *Cartel Land*, Dogwoof wanted to explore the ‘Superticket’ concept. This can vary a little from one offer to another. However, in essence it is an offer to customers who watch the film in a cinema to obtain a digital copy of the film via a download at a later point. The exact terms and cost of this can and do vary for each offer, and it has been tried a few times in various forms. For example in Canada there is (at time of writing – November 2015) a permanent offer for every film via the Cineplex chain of cinemas who also have an online home entertainment business. In the UK there have been a couple of experiments such as one in April 2015 with the release of the film *Kidnapping Freddy Heineken* in Empire cinemas. Little is known about the results of these experiments. Dogwoof wanted to try a variation of the Superticket offer for the release of *Cartel Land*, to see whether a Superticket offer on a film could increase cinema ticket sales. In particular they wanted to see whether it would increase the younger male demographic of attendees seeing the

film at the cinema – who are one of the hardest demographics for independent film distributors to encourage to see their films theatrically as by choice, if they go to the cinema, they usually prefer to see the bigger US studio films and watch independent films as home entertainment. The experiment was to see whether this demographic – who are the target audience for the film – would choose to see the film at the cinema, if they could get the VoD / download version of the film for free with the purchase of that ticket.

As an added enticement to encourage audiences to get the Superticket, Dogwoof added in unique extra materials and special features for the downloads, which was offered exclusively to iTunes. Extras were standard items for many years on DVDs. They often consisted of a director’s commentary, interviews with the key people in the film, extra material and background from the film etc. In digital downloads however, these have almost always not been included. Recently there has been some thinking to reinstate these extras in downloads, most notably by iTunes. Dogwoof were interested in seeing with this release if this made the download more appealing.

## **1.1 METHODOLOGY**

The study relied on evidence from a number of sources:

**Exit Poll Data:** Audiences in ten UK cinemas were polled before and after seeing *Cartel Land*. There were 456 questionnaires returned. The 10 cinemas were: Phoenix Leicester, Broadway Nottingham, Derby Quad, Home Manchester, Queens Film Theatre Belfast, Glasgow Film Theatre Glasgow, Picturehouse Central London, Curzon Bloomsbury London, Hackney Picturehouse London, Ritzy London. Polling took place in the first week of release.

**Sales data:** The report uses data from a number of sources to provide objective analysis of performance, and to provide useful comparisons. Data includes theatrical box office results and home entertainment sales information, supplied by Dogwoof.

**Unused Superticket vouchers:** Every cinema returned their unused vouchers after the first week of the film’s release back to Dogwoof. These vouchers have been counted and compared to other data for greater insight in to the promotion.

**Other industry data:** Including interviews with key stakeholders and the expectations and perceptions



of performance from the distributor Dogwoof, which were discussed before and after the film.

### **1.2 BFI NEW MODELS AWARD (BFI LOTTERY DISTRIBUTION FUND)**

The release was supported by the New Models strand of the BFI Distribution Fund, with a grant of £65,500.

### **1.3 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- Dogwoof released the film in 27 UK and Eire cinemas on 4 September 2015.
- Every cinema was sent a carefully quantified number of Superticket vouchers. These were to be given to every customer who bought a ticket for *Cartel Land* in the first week of the film's release (4 – 10 September).
- A voucher gave each customer a free download of the film (which included the exclusive extras) upon the digital release of the film on 6 October. There was no increase in the cinema ticket price for this free download.
- Customers had to enter a code and their email into the film's website. On 6 October they received an email for the download link for the film and the extras.
- Only an extremely small number of people were actually aware of the Superticket offer before going to see the film in cinemas.
- Not every customer who was entitled to get a Superticket voucher received one (due to issues at venues) and there were problems with the Superticket offer being applied consistently in cinemas.
- Even after buying a ticket at a participating cinema (and receiving a Superticket) for *Cartel Land*, a significant percentage of customers were not aware of, or did not, understand the Superticket offer.
- When the Superticket was understood, a significant percentage of people said that in general it would make them more likely to see a film at the cinema with a Superticket promotion attached.
- When the Superticket was understood a much lower percentage of people said it would have made them more likely to see *Cartel Land* in the cinema.
- About 10% (462) of the people who saw *Cartel Land* in the first week registered to download the film.
- Around 47% (219) of people who registered for a free download have actually downloaded a copy of the film.
- It is difficult to know how many people actually received vouchers and/or understood the promotion sufficiently to accept or reject the offer. However, it might be that as many as 40% did not receive and/or understand the Superticket.
- The percentage of people who took up the Superticket offer might therefore range from around 9% to 16%.
- The film was very well received by audiences scoring well above norms.
- The London audience was significantly younger than the rest of the UK.
- £65,500 of the P&A budget was supported by the New Models strand of the BFI Distribution Fund. The total P&A budget was £130,398.
- The theatrical gross total was £68,400.
- DVD sales were 753 units after 3 months.
- Total digital on demand sales were £22,000 after 1 month.
- The exclusive extras do not appear to have any influence on people buying the downloads.
- The Superticket offer was progressively more appealing to people the younger they were.
- There is sufficient evidence to suggest this could be an attractive offer. It could also add value to distributors and potentially exhibitors. More research is needed to understand this offer and where and how that value might lie.

## CHAPTER TWO

# PLANNING AND RELEASE

---

### 2.1 THE RELEASE

The film was released on 4 September 2015 in 27 cinemas across the UK and Eire. It was released online as download to rent or own on 6 October, and on physical media on 28 October 2015.

The film only played in independent art house cinemas. This can be explained in part by the fact that it is a documentary and therefore perceived to be of niche interest. More likely however the restricted release was due to home entertainment availability being made four weeks after the cinema release. This breached the 17-week window that most cinemas require before they will play a film. Consequently, even if desired, the vast majority of UK cinemas would not play the film.

It becomes even more important in this environment to be able to maximise revenues for the film – and indeed for stakeholders.

Exploring the concept of the Superticket was a direct result of this need. It was also an opportunity to experiment with what might affect VoD consumption, as the digital download release was close in time to the theatrical release.

### 2.2 THE AUDIENCE

While it is a documentary, the film contains many elements similar to those of a thriller. Dogwoof believed that with this genre skew, the film could appeal to a younger, perhaps more male audience. This audience is also more likely to download films online.

### 2.3. THE SUPERTICKET MECHANIC – HOW IT WORKED.

The Superticket offered anyone buying a cinema ticket in the period 4 – 10 September a free digital download of the film with some free exclusive bonus extras.

Dogwoof printed scratch card vouchers that were sent out before the film opened to all of the 27 cinemas playing the film in its first week.

(In theory) every person who bought a cinema ticket received a scratch card voucher that explained the offer.

The customer scratched the card to reveal a unique code, visited [cartellandmovie.co.uk/superticket](http://cartellandmovie.co.uk/superticket) and entered the code.

Nearer the digital release date of October 6th the customer received an email with the link to download the film and the extras.



## 2.4 MARKETING AND PROMOTION

There was a fairly limited budget for the P&A of the film (as befitting the generally niche appeal of documentaries). The media budget was £85,088 (spent on print, outdoor and online) and the publicity budget was £7,000.

The concept of a Superticket is not immediately known to the cinema going public and the detail is also difficult to succinctly express, not least because there isn't an established standard Superticket offer.

Online advertising and posters on the London Underground carried the Superticket message. Other forms of communication did not or could not carry it, as either it wasn't practical (limited space) or that editorial wasn't within the remit of Dogwoof (e.g. editorial / reviews of the film).

With the limited media spend, and the need to also explain the technicalities of the offer, there was therefore a heavy reliance upon the cinemas, and specifically front of house staff, to ensure the promotion happened.

## 2.5 THE VOD RELEASE

This film was made available digitally one month after the theatrical release, on 6 October 2015.

There was an important partnership with iTunes for the release, as iTunes had exclusive access to the extras. The extras included a director's commentary, the trailer, and a series of extra scenes not in the main feature.

This exclusivity guaranteed the film profile was on iTunes's front page for 2 weeks. Previous insight reports have pointed to how important this is to the success of a film. iTunes is still the most important online retailer for VOD film rental and downloads and the discoverability of the film relies heavily on the consumer being able to find it easily e.g. on the home page.



# CHAPTER THREE

# RESULTS

This section considers the results, revenues and lessons of the release

## 3.1 ADMISSIONS AND SALES FIGURES ACROSS ALL PLATFORMS

### Opening weeks film take in all cinemas

The film played the following cinemas in the first week with the following admissions

CINEMA	OPENING WEEK ADMISSIONS
Aberdeen – Belmont Filmhouse	89
Belfast – Queens Film Theatre	256
Bristol - Watershed	292
Canterbury – Curzon Canterbury	39
Derby – Quad Cinema	44
Dublin – IFI	449
Edinburgh – Filmhouse	141
Glasgow – Glasgow film Theatre	275
Inverness – Eden Court	26
Ipswich – Ipswich Film Theatre	62
Leicester – Phoenix Cinema	103
London – Curzon Bloomsbury	218
London – Curzon Soho	83
London – Curzon Victoria	299
London – Genesis Cinema	89
London – Greenwich Picturehouse	182
London – Hackney Picturehouse	222
London – ICA	216
London – Olympic Cinema	39
London – Picturehouse Central	548
London – Ritzy Picturehouse	292
London – Tricycle Cinema	71
London – Watermans Art Centre	41
Manchester – HOME	284
Nottingham – Broadway	129
Sheffield – Curzon Sheffield	34
Wolverhampton – Light House	83

In total there were 4,606 admissions in the first week. In total the film took £68,407 in the theatrical run.

The VOD release resulted in the following sales figures of circa £22,000 at the end of the first month on release, of which iTunes took 66% or £14,609

The DVD resulted in the following sales figures of 753 units as of mid December 2015.

## 3.2 THE AUDIENCE – ANALYSIS VIA EXIT POLLS

There was a comparatively large sample of questionnaires returned from selected cinemas playing the film in the first week of release. The following cinemas were polled. Phoenix Leicester, Broadway Nottingham, Derby Quad, Home Manchester, Queens Film Theatre Belfast, Glasgow Film Theatre Glasgow, Picturehouse Central London, Curzon Bloomsbury London, Hackney Picturehouse London, Ritzy London. In total 456 questionnaires were returned.

In general, the audience was slightly male biased: 60% male 40% female.

### Ages

16% 16-24  
 40% 25-34  
 19% 35-44  
 11% 45-54  
 10% 55-64  
 4% 65 plus

- Most people came with a partner (45%) with 23% coming on their own.
- They were predominately heavy cinemagoers, with over 61% going once a fortnight or more often, and 86% going at least once a month.
- 12% rented or downloaded a film once a week or more often with 60% doing it less than every 2 months.
- There were slightly more people watching DVD's with 23% once a week or more often, and 37% less than every 2 months.

### 3.3 DISCOVERING THE FILM

The most significant factors in finding out about the film were seeing the trailer before a film (25%) and being told by a friend or relative (25%). Online articles, reviews and online other sources totalled 30%. Posters were 1.5% with underground posters 3%. Online ads were also 3%.

From those people who read about it in the press, the Guardian was mentioned by 71%, with Time Out cited by 18%.

Asked specifically about online sources, 46% mentioned the cinema website or listing service, 40% had watched the trailer online, 14% referred to the official film website and 5% cited online adverts.

### 3.4 REASONS TO SEE THE FILM

Only 2% mentioned the Superticket offer as an influencing factor when they chose to see the film. 62% said the story appealed to them, 44% referred to the genre or type of film (documentary), 34% cited the trailer, 18% were attracted by the great reviews, 15% were asked to come by a friend or partner and 12% were influenced by the star ratings.

### 3.5 THE FILM'S RECEPTION

The film was very well received with 39% rating it excellent (against a UK norm of circa 30%), and 46% rating the film as very good (35% norm) - giving a total of 84% very good / excellent (65% norm). 64% would definitely recommend the film to a friend (50% norm). 84% would recommend it to men and women equally, 60% to every age group.

Given the extremely positive responses, it was not surprising that people were equally positive in their description of the film. 62% called it dramatic, 50% noted the good cinematography, 63% claimed that it held their attention throughout and 53% found it emotional and moving. 53% of people found it better than they expected.

25% would see it again via download (27% did not want to see it again) and 10% would see it again on DVD/Blu-ray.

### 3.6 THE SUPERTICKET AND THE AUDIENCE

#### Awareness prior to the visit:

9% claimed to know about the Superticket before coming to the cinema.

5% were aware it would be available online in 4 weeks time.

2% claimed this was a factor in coming to see the film.

#### Understanding or awareness after buying a ticket:

Only 60% of people answered the question '*in general how easy was it to understand the Superticket offer?*'.

One could conclude that the 40% who did not answer the question are probably people who were not aware of the Superticket even after buying a cinema ticket, which gave them (or entitled them to) the physical Superticket.

In addition, a further 9% said it was not easy to understand the concept, and looking at the questionnaires it is clear some people ticked this box to explain that they didn't actually know about the Superticket at all. It is possible therefore that a significant proportion of people were not aware of the promotion. Anecdotal evidence also points to a number of cinemas not actually giving out or explaining the Superticket at the point of purchase. The questionnaires seem to back this up.

#### Superticket influence:

Of the people who claimed to be aware of the Superticket, 74% said this did not influence their decision to see the film in the cinema, 20% said it did a little, and 6% said it did (with a low base of only 49 people responding to this part of the questionnaire). By contrast when people were asked if in general a Superticket offer would make them more or less likely to see a film in a cinema, a sizeable minority of 39% said more likely, with 60% saying no difference.

Of those who understood it, 32% wanted to see it again via download (against 25% of all respondents who wanted to see the film again but appeared not to have understood the offer).

62% of all people wanting to see it again via download easily understood the Superticket offer.

### Age difference and the influence on cinema visit:

There was a considerable difference between the ages. The younger people were, the more the Superticket was likely to influence their cinema visit as the table below shows, with 54% of 16-24 more likely versus 18% of 65 plus:

### Interest in seeing the film again via download:

25% of all respondents said they would be interested in seeing the film again via a download. Amongst people rating it excellent and very good this rises to just over 30%. For people rating it good, fair and poor it falls to 3%.

	MORE LIKEY	NO DIFFERENCE	LESS LIKELY	TOTAL
Q2: Years 16-24 (A)	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0
Q2: Years 16-24 (B)	54.17% 26	45.83% 22	0.00% 0	14.95% 48
Q2: Years 25-34 (C)	42.11% 56	55.64% 74	2.26% 3	41.43% 133
Q2: Years 35-44 (D)	36.07% 22	62.30% 38	1.64% 1	19.00% 61
Q2: Years 45-54 (E)	29.41% 10	70.59% 24	0.00% 0	10.59% 34
Q2: Years 55-64 (F)	23.53% 8	73.53% 25	2.94% 1	10.59% 34
Q2: 65 Plus (G)	18.18% 2	81.82% 9	0.00% 0	3.43% 11
<b>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>321</b>



### 3.7 DOGWOOF

A question was asked about the awareness of Dogwoof, and an open question allowed for people to comment. 22% said they were aware of Dogwoof. Those who were aware were much more likely to be heavy cinemagoers (53% going once a week +, versus 28% of all respondents). In the responses 42% had positive words attached (cool, quality, great, interesting etc.) with the remainder being more descriptive. Most people knew that Dogwoof are documentary focused.

### 3.8 THE SUPERTICKET MECHANIC AND REDEMPTION RATE

The following table gives the number of admissions per cinema, the number of vouchers sent to that cinema, the number of vouchers returned, and the percentage kept or given out by the cinema against the actual admissions

CINEMA	OPENING WEEK ADMISSIONS	SENT	RETURNED	GIVEN OUT	% GIVEN OUT
Aberdeen – Belmont Filmhouse	89	500	415	85	95%
Belfast – Queens Film Theatre	256	500	52	448	175%
Bristol - Watershed	292	1000	753	247	85%
Canterbury – Curzon Canterbury	39	500	467	33	85%
Derby – Quad Cinema	44	500	461	39	89%
Dublin – IFI	449	1000	577	423	94%
Edinburgh – Filmhouse	141	750	594	156	111%
Glasgow – Glasgow film Theatre	275	750	550	200	73%
Inverness – Eden Court	26	500	474	26	100%
Ipswich – Ipswich Film Theatre	62	500	607	143	98%
Leicester – Phoenix Cinema	103	500	416	84	81%
London – Curzon Bloomsbury	218	750	607	143	66%
London – Curzon Soho	299	1000	776	224	75%
London – Curzon Victoria	83	750	687	63	76%
London – Genesis Cinema	89	500	366	134	150%
London – Greenwich Picturehouse	182	750	629	121	66%
London – Hackney Picturehouse	222	1000	891	109	49%
London – ICA	216	1000	800	200	93%
London – Olympic Cinema	39	250	210	39	100%
London – Picturehouse Central	548	1500	931	569	104%
London – Ritzy Picturehouse	292	1000	182	818	280%
London – Tricycle Cinema	71	750	750	0	0
London – Watermans Art Centre	41	500	500	0	0
Manchester – HOME	284	1000	760	240	84%
Nottingham – Broadway	129	250	161	89	69%
Sheffield – Curzon Sheffield	34	500	476	24	70%
Wolverhampton – Light House	83	750	645	105	126%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>4,494</b>	<b>18,000</b>	<b>13,319</b>	<b>4,681</b>	<b>104%</b>



It is clear that the process and data capturing was not completely accurate – which is no surprise given the experimental nature of the project. From this data it looks like around 4,600 vouchers were given out or in circulation against circa 4,500 actual admissions. But, from the questionnaires it does seem that a large number of people - maybe 40% or more - were not aware of and therefore may not have been given the vouchers. This makes the redemption rate difficult to know.

There were 462 people who registered for the downloads. If there were actually 4,681 vouchers circulating, then this equates to a 9.6% take up. If, however the actual number of people who received vouchers was around 60% of admissions, then this would equate to a 16.6% take up.

What can be said is that the take up of the offer ranged between approx. 10% (not likely) to 17% (much more likely) of people who were actually given a voucher. This is a fairly high redemption rate.

Of the 462 who registered, 219 (47%) actually downloaded a copy of the film. This is a surprisingly high number given that (in theory) people had already seen the film. Again this demonstrates that this is an attractive offer for consumers.

### 3.9. THE EXTRAS

There is little evidence to suggest that the extras offer attracted more people to download the film via iTunes.

The typical platform sales split for Dogwoof for all their films in 2015, prior to the release of *Cartel Land* is as follows:

- iTunes 66%, Amazon Instant Video 12%, Sky Store 10%, Google Play 7%, Curzon/BT 5%

For *Cartel Land* the split was as follows (as of mid December 2015)

- iTunes 66%, Sky Store 30%, Curzon/BT 2%, Google Play 2%, (Amazon TBC - Amazon only report quarterly)

On iTunes, the typical VOD / EST splits and HD / SD splits for all Dogwoof films are as follows in terms of units:

- 72% VOD (52% HD, 47% SD); 28% EST (71% HD, 29% SD)

For *Cartel Land*, the following was the split.

- 78% VOD (56% HD, 44% SD); 22% EST (79% HD, 21% SD)

So, despite the extras being exclusive to iTunes, the platform share for iTunes was exactly the same as the benchmark of all other releases. There is little difference in VOD / EST sale splits within the iTunes platform.

## CHAPTER FOUR

# OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

---

### 4.1 CONSUMER AWARENESS OF THE SUPERTICKET

It is clear that there was almost no awareness of the Superticket before entering the cinema even in London where Underground posters carried the message. Without awareness before the cinema visit there cannot be any advantage to the cinema or the distributor to an increase in cinema visits. Indeed, the only financial factor is likely to be a 'downside' with those people who would have bought a download of the film to watch the film again, now being able to get it for free. In other words, there can be no additionality without prior awareness and an understanding of the offer.

This is a significant challenge. There is no readily identifiable Superticket brand that consumers can understand quickly and easily. So getting the message over to potential cinemagoers is difficult, and also potentially expensive. Unfortunately, it is essential. The message must be understood for any benefits to be gained by the distributor and indeed other stakeholders.

Some thinking around a Superticket 'brand' might help. Messaging and media partners might also assist.

### 4.2 THE SUPERTICKET MECHANIC

The single biggest problem was getting cinema staff to consistently apply the offer to all customers buying a cinema ticket. The consumer lack of awareness meant that there were no issues at the box office with consumers asking for the promotion and not actually getting it. But if there had been real awareness then there might have been some customer complaints (for example two cinemas didn't give any Superticket vouchers out at all, so one presumes none of their staff were aware of the offer. If there had been wide consumer prior awareness one can imagine the front of house issues that might have arisen). This factor would need addressing for the future.

There were also issues around accountability – with more Superticket vouchers given out than actual admissions. For a pilot this is acceptable, but for a bigger broader or longer lasting promotion this is something that will need to be addressed.

### 4.3 THE SUPERTICKET EFFECT ON CONSUMERS

There is some significant evidence that people might be more likely to go to see a film at the cinema if they also get a free download of the film. This is especially true for younger people. However, this has to be tempered by only 6% (small sample size) of people who were aware of the promotion before coming to the cinema who said it influenced their decision to visit 'a lot'. This conundrum needs more exploration. In reality this promotion can only have an incremental effect on those people who would not really want to see the film (unlikely to be swayed by a Superticket offer) and those who might want to see it and were not sure. In general people like the idea; but in reality how attractive is it to overcome any reluctance or ambivalence to watch a film?

Notwithstanding the above, 54% of 16-24 year olds and 42% 25-34 year olds said in general they would be more likely to watch a film in the cinema where the Superticket concept is attached. This is a very exciting response and one that definitely warrants more follow up and testing.

### 4.4 THE SUPERTICKET: EXTRA INCOME OR LOST REVENUE?

Given the lack of prior awareness it is difficult to evaluate any increased cinema admission effect. (See 4.1). The 'loss' would be from those people who would have paid for a download but didn't then need to. *Cartel Land* was extremely well received, and 32% of those rating the film excellent and very good wanted to see it again on download. Most films however don't reach these levels of appreciation with the average being substantially below that – 65% excellent and very good versus *Cartel Land's* 84%.

In effect the worse a film plays the better it is for the distributor as less and less people are likely to want to see it again. The logical approach would be to have a Superticket offer for a film that appealed to young people who are more likely to respond to the offer and watch it in the cinema (giving extra revenue) but was not going to play well and therefore had a limited take up (minimizing the lost revenue).

Clearly this area needs more research and testing. This experiment did not have any increase in the cinema ticket price (for example) so the Superticket was essentially the price of a normal cinema ticket. Other versions and thinking of a Superticket have been for a higher ticket price allowing access to the

film across many digital platforms and formats. Essentially the consumer will decide upon the value which, if packaged correctly, could match the needs of the whole value chain.

One very important finding has come out of the research. For an average film, about 21 in a 100 people will want to see the film on download (32%

of excellent / very goods, and 3% of good / fair / poor) Therefore around 79 people will not choose to see the film again. Can the extra income these people generate through a Superticket offer compensate for the 21 people benefiting from the free download that they might have bought without the Superticket offer? This needs further testing and research.



## CHAPTER FIVE

# FINAL THOUGHTS

---

### 5.1 THE MECHANIC

This is a complex area that is going to need some careful thought and process mapping. It is vital that the consumer has the easiest and simplest experience of the promotion. Equally, the behind the scenes process needs to be accountable, accurate and consumer focused.

A start might be to look at a paperless system. The electronic voucher system put into place for Orange Wednesdays initially had strong resistance especially from cinemas. It is now embedded into the box office systems of most cinemas. It might be adaptable for this promotion and/or a different version could be worked up.

Service Design Thinking-style workshops might help define the 'pain points' in the process for the customer as well as the stakeholders. A thorough mapping of the process might reap rewards.

The messaging of the promotion into the cinemas obviously needs looking at. This is again difficult to do without a clear revenue benefit for the cinemas. Looking at the pricing structure of a Superticket and who benefits along the value chain could result in some exciting experiments.

### 5.2 PROMOTING THE SUPERTICKET TO CONSUMERS

This is a very difficult one to resolve. First the whole offer needs to be tested again to define if it could really deliver extra revenues across the value chain. It might be a pilot scheme targeted at a small consumer group who are messaged and then measured for responses. This could be done via an email list or media partner to minimise cost and wastage.

Research is probably needed in designing a brand for the concept so it is easily understandable and quickly communicable on advertising material for films.

### 5.3 VALUE

This pilot has gone a long way in seeing if further work is worth doing. In this writer's mind it is. There is sufficient evidence that overall there could be a profitable Superticket offer. Further work around the price of the Superticket, the type of film and its audience and the additionality of the offer overall seems sensible.

### 5.5 DOGWOOF – AS AN ASIDE

There was a good response to Dogwoof who scored 22% recognition amongst the respondents. This is quite high. More impressive is the high percentage of those people having a positive view of the company. This has real value. This writer has no insight into Dogwoof's brand strategy or customer relationship plans. But it is clear that there is a lot of potential in thinking about and building on the attributes people are seeing in the company.

