# Woolworths Mobile

CASE STUDY

## Driving foot traffic into Woolworths supermarkets





skyfii

WRAPPR

# Introduction

Woolworths ran a campaign with Wrappr to grow awareness and consideration of their Woolworths Mobile brand. This case study outlines the impressive secondary benefits of this campaign, whereby Woolworths Mobile advertising drove significant levels of foot traffic into Woolworths supermarkets.



# Measurement by Skyfii

Skyfii was tasked with independently measuring the impact of this campaign. Using their Blix smartphone sensors, they measured the cross-flow of smartphones between Woolworths Mobile wrapped vehicles to sensors located close to Woolworths supermarkets. Skyfii used a control group to see the baseline levels of foot traffic that were occurring, which allowed them to isolate the impact of the Woolworths Mobile wrapped vehicles on foot traffic.

# Results

## 14th January - 12th April

	Exposed	Control	Uplift
Unique Devices Detected	1,367,533	1,367,533	
Converted Into Store	198,173	124,432	73,741
Converted %	14.49%	9.10%	+59%

There was a minimum uplift of 73,741 additional customers into Woolworths supermarkets over the 12 week period.





### **Comparing the Results**

Dan Murphy's conducted a similarly sized campaign (26 vehicles over a 6 week period) leading up to Christmas, the busiest period of year for the alcohol retailer.

The foot traffic differences between the exposed and control groups from this campaign were stronger than those seen by the Woolworths Mobile campaign, despite the foot traffic results for Woolworths being impressive in their own right.

Dan Murphy's saw 0.34% of their control group convert into store, whilst 2.07% of the exposed group converted. This represented a 609% uplift from people exposed to the advertising, compared with Woolworths' 59%. Furthermore, Dan Murphy's was able to generate 275,173 additional customers during the campaign period, whilst Woolworths generated 73,741. The likely reasons for these differences are: 1. Christmas is a time period where shopping for alcohol becomes much more important to consumers, which gives the advertising more leverage.

2. Woolworths has a significantly higher baseline of foot traffic to begin with (9.1% vs 0.34% for Dan Murphy's), so getting an uplift on an already incredibly high baseline will be more difficult.

3. The foot traffic effects of the Woolworths Mobile campaign were not the primary objective of the advertising, so we aren't comparing like-for-like advertising.

Considering these factors, the Woolworths foot traffic uplift of 73,741 was an excellent result.

The full Dan Murphy's case study can be found here.



# Understanding the Results

We believe that the ubiquity of Woolworths stores, the unique, high-impact nature of the advertising, and the deep level of community engagement drove these results.

Supermarket shopping for many consumers is a frequent and low friction activity. Woolworths stores are often just around the corner, with 498 of them located in the campaign footprint. Having wrapped vehicles roaming around can trigger customer visits to supermarkets by reminding them of items they need to purchase. For example, seeing a wrapped Woolworths vehicle on your drive home from work, or from picking up the kids from school can remind you that you need to pop to the shops.

This trigger effect is ensured by the Wrappr format being a high cut-through medium. Unlike other forms of advertising, wrapped vehicles are seen in unexpected locations, and are incredibly high impact. Vehicles might be seen at the park, gym, shops, beach or passing you on the street, and when you combine this with people's requirement to be alert around traffic an opportunity to make an impression is rarely missed. Lastly, anecdotal feedback from the Woolworths Mobile advocates suggests that there is a significant amount of positive word of mouth being generated by the wraps, with approximately 19 conversations held per advocate per week. Friends, family, colleagues, neighbours and people on the street frequently talk to the advocates about the wrap on their car and hence at the same time salience and consideration for Woolworths supermarkets and Woolworths Mobile grows. Multiplying this across a fleet of 22 advocates and a campaign of 12 weeks (at the time of writing), that's 5,016 conversations that will likely have occurred.

Overall, the impact of the Woolworths Mobile advertising on the Woolworths supermarket business was impressive!



# About





# skyfii🥺

Skyfii is an ASX-listed Australian software technology company providing analytics and data driven marketing products. They are the parent company of Blix, whose network and technology was used for this campaign.

# WRAPPR

Wrappr is pioneering the new Advocate Out Of Home (OOH) advertising category in Australia. Advocate OOH lets everyday people earn an extra income by promoting brands they love with a wrap on their vehicles.

# Appendix

### Experimental setup

### Objective of this case study

To answer the question "What was the impact of Wrappr on Woolworths supermarkets foot traffic during the campaign period?"

### <u>Method</u>

### Step 1a - Technology setup

Skyfii sensors were placed in 22 Woolworths Mobile Advocates' vehicles. These sensors have the ability to detect wifi probe requests being emitted by smartphones up to 100 metres away, although on average the range is 80 metres.

Once a probe request is detected, sensors are able to fingerprint the device 99.9% of the time, and then will hash it's ID before uploading to the cloud, thus making the device ID unable to be cross-referenced with any third-party database which may contain PPI.

As Woolworths Mobile advocates' drive, some (not all) smartphones which they pass will thus be detected and their hashed fingerprint stored by Skyfii.

### Step 1b - Selecting 15 Woolworths supermarket locations

Simultaneously, Skyfii sensors located in other retail stores within 1 kilometre of 15 Woolworths supermarket locations are able to be used to monitor nearby smartphones as well.

This allows the cross referencing of devices detected by Woolworths Mobile's Advocates sensors and the devices detected by sensors in retail stores close to Woolworths locations and the identification of any correlation between being near a Woolworths Mobile Advocate, and going close to a Woolworths store.

These sensors were in the following suburbs/locations:

- Sydney CBD
- Bondi
- Bondi Junction
- Indooroopilly
- Brisbane CBD

- Brisbane DFO
- Melbourne CBD
- Chadstone
- Melbourne Central

### Step 1c - Creating the control audience

Non-Woolworths branded vehicles driving in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane with Skyfii sensors installed in them were used to generate the control audience. The brands used for the control vehicles were Jimmy Brings, Dan Murphy's, Powershop and Wrappr's own fleet of branded vehicles.

#### Step 2 - Data collection

Over the period from the 14th of January to the 21st of February sensors within the Woolworths Mobile advocates' vehicles detected nearby smartphones, as did sensors located close to Woolworths stores and this data was used for the analysis by Skyfii. Data collection continued beyond the 21st of February, but this data wasn't used as part of Skyfii's cross-flow analysis.

#### Step 3 - Determining uplift rates

Skyfii looked at a sample of 455,000 exposed and control devices and identified how many of these were detected by the sensors close to the 15 Woolworths locations. This allowed them to determine the conversion rates to which a customer exposed to Woolworths Mobile Advocates' results in that customer being near a Woolworths location, and then compare this with the control group's conversion rate to determine the uplift rate.

#### Step 4 - Extrapolating the data across the whole campaign footprint

Two extrapolation steps were taken in order to get a true picture of the impact of the advertising. Firstly, as there were only 15 Woolworths stores measured by Skyfii, but there were 498 stores within the campaign footprint (metropolitan Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane) the Skyfii results were multiplied by 33.2 (498/15). Secondly, as the Skyfii results only looked at 455,000 exposed devices which were detected over a 5 week period but the campaign (at the time of creating this case study) had 1,367,533 exposed devices the results were again multiplied by 3 (1,367,533/455,000).

### Skyfii Report

A copy of the Skyfii report can be found here.