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Abstract:
This research studies the conditions for successful adaptation of books to movies, in the eyes of readers/spectators, book publishers and film producers. Based on interviews with twenty-nine readers/spectators, we identify three key success factors that drive positive evaluations by readers/spectators: fidelity to the story, creative additions (music, actors, places) to the original story and the temporal gap between reading the book and watching the movie. Four interviews with experts (publishers and film producers) confirm but also complement our analyses and reveal a quite different perspective compared to readers/spectators.
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Introduction

“Putting together a film based on a highly acclaimed literary work full of phrasings and lines of dialogue that have forever been burned into readers' minds is largely a thankless task. Creating a film that maintains the heart and soul of such a literary work and even many of its most graceful lines is nearly impossible to accomplish.” (Jessica Rawden, cinema blogger – CinemaBlend.com)

This opening quote emphasizes a never-ending debate about the adaptation of novels to the screen. From a producer’s point of view, the desire to bring books to the movie theatre is easy to understand given that most box-office successes are movies based on books. An example is *The Intouchables* (2011), based on the novel *Le Second Souffle* and inspired by the life of Philippe Pozzo di Borgo. 21.4 million tickets were sold in France. More recently, in December 2012 *The Hobbit*, directed by Peter Jackson and based on J. R. R. Tolkien’s book *Bilbo the Hobbit*, was viewed by more than 4 million people in France (Première Magazine, 10/01/2013). From a publisher’s point of view, the adaptation of a novel can regenerate interest in the book and therefore increase sales immediately after the film release. For example, sales of *Bilbo the Hobbit* in France in November 2012, one month before the release of the movie, stood at 14,918 copies (GfK, edition *Livre de Poche*). In December 2012, after the movie had hit the big screen, they reached 77,845. These figures show that in the consumer’s mind there is a relationship between the book and its film adaptation. So how do consumers perceive adaptations (in terms of content – the story – and the medium, i.e. book
vs. movie)? What is their perception in terms of the gains/losses achieved by the adaptation? How does the first medium used (book or movie) influence perceptions of the second? How do the ongoing exchanges between the two media (book & movie) influence the overall experience?

Academics have extensively researched film adaptations. Indeed, several academic journals are entirely dedicated to the topic (e.g., *Adaptation*, by Oxford University Press, and *Literature/film Quarterly*, which has been around for more than 40 years and boasts an impressive amount of dedicated books and essays on questions relating to adaptations). Traditionally, this research field has focused on the debate surrounding the *fidelity* of the adaptation (to the original content – the book) versus a more *creative interpretation* where the emphasis is not on the source (the book), but on the way its meanings (spirit, soul, atmosphere) are reconstructed in the process of reception (Welsh and Lev, 2007). In the field of marketing, research on this topic is very limited. Where it has been addressed, the two media (book and movie) have not been explicitly linked (e.g., volitional reconsumption of books or movies – Russel and Levy, 2012; repeat consumption of the same movie – Collins, Hand and Linnell, 2008). Two noticeable exceptions are Joshi and Mao (2012) and Knapp, Hennig-Thurau and Mathys (2014), who link adaptation to box-office performance. However, they do not adopt a consumer-oriented perspective and use longitudinal aggregate data on book-to-movie adaptations. Moreover, by this procedure they do not differentiate between moviegoers who have and have not read the book.

The objective of this research is to investigate the cross-influences, potentially positive and negative, between the two media (book vs. movie) where the content (story) is similar. We propose a qualitative investigation from the spectator’s perspective, focusing on moviegoers who have seen the movie *and* read the book (in whichever order). First, we review the
literature on adaptation and associated concepts (repeat consumption, adaptation), before presenting our methodology and results. Finally, we discuss some conceptual issues and implications for practitioners.

Conceptual Development

Pleasure to see you again – analyzing repeat consumption

Repeat consumption has been extensively researched in marketing, especially in relation to repurchasing, loyalty, brand equity and relationship marketing (e.g., Keller and Aaker, 1992; Keller, 1993; Oliva, Oliver and MacMillan, 1992; Tsirod, Mittal and Ross, 2004). In a different vein, psychology researchers have studied the repeat consumption phenomenon as a strategy for individuals to respond more efficiently and rapidly to a task (e.g., Marsh, Hicks and Cook, 2005) – habitual repeat consumption of familiar product brands (e.g., food or convenience goods; see for example Wood, Quinn and Kashy, 2002) – or as an unmanageable and uncontrollable pathological state – addictive repeat consumption (e.g., pathological gambling, alcoholism or compulsive buying; see Hirschman, 1992). Finally, a major branch of research on symbolic consumption has investigated ritualistic repeat consumption that is culturally rooted and periodicity-linked (e.g., gift giving or celebrations; see for example Wallendorf and Arnould, 1991). However, research on repeat consumption of hedonic products is limited. A notable exception is the article by Russell and Levy (2012) on the volitional reconsumption of three types of hedonic products – books, movies and geographic locations – where volitional reconsumption is defined as “consumption experiences that consumers actively and consciously seek to experience again” (p. 341). The main contribution of this research is to emphasize that the reasons for re-experiencing hedonic products relate to “their richness in meaning, depth, and uplifting abilities” (p. 354). Indeed, this type of
reconsumption is presented as a dynamic process that can be as intense as a new experience. In the case of watching a movie again or re-reading a book, the repeat consumption is motivated by the fact that the readers/spectators liked the first experience and want to relive it, anticipating similar emotions (Hume, Sullivan-Mort and Winzar, 2007). During the movie consumption experience, individuals feel a great variety of emotions, positive and negative, which are organized into specific sequences (patterns) and play an important role in the evaluation of the experience (Aurier and Guintecheva, 2014). Indeed, repeat experiences are emotionally linked, providing a form of affective resonance that is catalyzed by the reconsumed object (Russell and Levy, 2012). Moreover, readers/spectators are more emotionally efficient as they anticipate and seek out the emotional peaks, the climax they know is available (Russell and Levy, 2012). Also, they may seek to refine the experience through repetition (Collins, Hand and Linnell, 2008). For example, the first consumption experience may be more focused on the story (the plot) as a whole but some details might be ignored. Then, during the repeat consumption consumers may notice other aspects (visual effects, decor, music, etc.) and identify subtleties due to their hyper-responsiveness (Russell and Levy, 2012). Similarly, in the case of returning to a particular geographical location, Hughes and Morrison-Sanders (2002) show that the first time visitors are more motivated by the desire to explore and learn, whereas when they repeat the visit they have more recreational pursuits such as relaxation. Finally, repeat consumption may be driven by a sort of cultural zeitgeist or fashion in which an individual wishes to participate, as in the case of Harry Potter mania (Collins, Hand and Linnell, 2008). For these reasons, the reconsumption of hedonic products does not result in erosion, satiation or habituation, and the renewed experience is seen as novel. In the specific case of film adaptations, reconsumption has some important particularities. When spectators watch a movie after reading the book (or vice versa), they are reconsuming the same story through a different medium with specific inherent technical
features. To date, there has few marketing research focusing explicitly on this type of reconsumption. Two notable examples are the researches of Joshi and Mao (2012) and of Knapp, Hennig-Thurau and Mathys (2014), which link adaptation to box-office performance. However, they do not differentiate between moviegoers who have read the book and those who have not. Moreover, the transition from one medium to another can raise several adaptation issues for both consumers and practitioners. Hence the importance of understanding adaptation issues.

*It wasn’t like that in the book…*: The challenge of adaptation (fidelity vs. deviation)

Common perceptions of adaptations tend to privilege literature over film. One reason may be the aura of the author (for example, it is not an easy task for a modern movie director to adapt a Shakespearean play). Another explanation may be the aesthetic value of the literature. Adaptation from a book to the screen requires a different script for the film whereby some scenes or descriptions from the book must be cut due to format constraints: films usually last no more than two hours while books can contain several hundred pages. This means that changes are inevitable as the medium shifts from the written to the visual form. Academics have done extensive research on film adaptations. Traditionally, they have focused on the debate surrounding the *fidelity* of the adaptation (to the original content – the book) versus a more *creative interpretation* where the emphasis is not on the source (the book), but on the way its meanings (spirit, soul, atmosphere) are reconstructed in the process of reception. Adaptation is therefore about recreation. François Truffaut once commented (in Welsh and Lev, 2007): “*what I do is to read a story only once, and if I like the basic idea, I just forget all about the book and start to create cinema*”. So adaptation is about recreation, although some may argue that famous filmmakers like Truffaut, Hitchcock or Tarantino get a special
dispensation from fidelity because they provide a brand name (Leitch, in Welsh and Lev, 2007). To further develop the debate surrounding fidelity versus creative deviation, we should also consider the spectator’s point of view. Even though very few marketing studies have emphasized this point, other fields have investigated the perceived importance of the source. Peracchio (1992), for example, shows that children prefer fidelity over creative interpretation. When children want to listen a story they already know, the repetition enables them to correct any deviation by the reader as it is retold. They seek predictability in the experience. Russell and Levy (2012) found that “when consumers seek an exact replication of the original object, the reconstructive re-consumption experience is anchored solely on the past and only succeeds if it is true to the original object” (p. 348). In a different vein, from an industry point of view, Joshi and Mao (2012) show that the adaptation of best-sellers to the screen is a risk-reduction strategy. First, this is because book-based movies can be considered as brand extensions of the best-selling originals. A book’s equity therefore has a direct impact on its extension (the screen adaptation) by positively influencing spectators’ evaluation thereof, and an indirect impact due to equity transfer as the parent brand (the book) is used as a cue in judgment. More importantly, the authors identify three factors that have an impact on the tendency of spectators to use the book as a cue for their judgment of the movie: book-movie similarity (studios often promote a movie by highlighting its close adaptation of the book); best-seller recency (consumers’ memory trace of recent best-sellers is strong, fresh, and readily retrievable); opening week vs. post opening (where the opening week accounts for 25% of a movie’s total revenue because during that time experiential information such as reviews is limited). Knapp, Hennig-Thurau and Mathys (2014) further develop this orientation by focusing on reciprocal spillover effects of the extension (movie adaptation) to the parent brand (book).
Methodology

Research field

This research focuses on French moviegoers who have seen book-based movies in a theatre and have also read the book (before or after seeing the movie). Only novels are taken into consideration, including various styles (teen literature, young adult literature, classics, chick lit – literature targeting young women, mostly involving love stories – and bit lit, which includes fantastic creatures, heroic fantasy, science-fiction, romance, historic novels, etc.). We have not considered comics, mangas or cartoon-based movies (Superman, Spiderman, Largo Winch etc.). As we have focused on the adaptation of books to the screen, it is important to emphasize the specific features of these two media. First, film is time limited and must compresses the events of a book into around two hours. Second, the meaning of a novel is controlled by only one person, the author, whereas the meaning of a film is the result of a collaborative effort. Third, movies may be consumed individually or collectively, whereas books are mostly read individually. There is also a difference in the immediacy of the immersion. Research suggests that movies are more easily and more immediately an immersive medium (Visch, Tan and Molenaar, 2010; Fornerino, Helme-Guizon and Gotteland, 2008). Cinemas are dark, the music is loud and there are no distractions, whereas reading a book requires the reader’s concentration, a quiet location and an effort to imagine the characters, places etc. This is an elaborate process, as the reader makes predictions, conjures up images, generates an affective response and combines knowledge and reasoning. It allows the reader to develop inferences not intended by the author as they work their way through the text (Mar et al., 2011). Finally, movies and books differ in the amount of effort their consumption requires (time to dedicate – Russell and Levy, 2012; immersion effort – Green, Brock and Kaufman, 2004).
Data collection and analysis

The data collection is based on 29 individual interviews and 4 expert interviews (publishers and filmmakers) carried out in France from February to April 2013. The respondents were recruited in France and selected on the basis of whether or not they had seen the movie and read the book (in either order). The interviews were conducted by the authors and two professional interviewers. Lasting between 40 minutes and 1 hour, they were audio recorded and transcribed. Individual respondents were invited to talk about the last book-based movie they saw. Respondents were selected after a control for age, gender and the frequency with which they watch movies at the theater and read books (Appendix 1). The interview guide addressed (1) respondents’ behavior concerning cinema (importance in their life, expertise, practice and expectations regarding movies), (2) their behavior concerning books (the same factors in relation to books), (3) their thoughts about film adaptations (spontaneous thoughts, an example of a book and movie and the order in which they read/saw them) and (4) cross-influences and the impact on final satisfaction (expectations, motivation, experience in itself and difference between the two media).

Results

First, the discourse content was quantified (number of words, occurrences, lemmatization and word associations). It contains 35,975 words (after deduction of auxiliary words and interviewers’ discourse/speech). Unsurprisingly, the highest occurrences are words related to movies – film (908), cinema (464), movie watching (724) – and literature – book (854), reading (761), and novel (229). The word story (301) is used in relation to both media. The most frequently cited adaptations are Harry Potter (129), Bridget Jones (28), The Leopard (13), The Hobbit (20), Twilight (12) and Le Hérisson (10). Two main factors structure the
respondents’ discourse regarding adaptation. The first is fidelity, namely how accurately the adaptation follows the story of the book. This is illustrated by the following words: different (78), true (75), wrong (41), accurate (35) and imagine (106). The second is temporality, with the following occurrences: time (113), life (111) and moment (110). Respondents emphasized the time limit inherent in the adaptation of a book to the big screen, which does not allow for all the events in the book to be adapted because of a time limit of approximately two hours. The factor analysis of lexical associations in the responses provided reveals four themes: the film, the book, the cinema and the story. The main words associated are as follows: watch, talk and go to the movies (film), read, novel and adaptation (book), talk about (cinema) and finally characters, book, like, reading and experience (story). Film is closer to “story” than to “book”, which may be explained by the fact that fidelity in the film adaptation is perceived as key.

The next step was to conduct a manual content analysis of the discourse data, progressing from categorization to abstraction, comparison, dimensionalization, integration, iteration and refutation (Spiggle, 1994). All of the discourse content data was categorized into themes related to the movie experience before abstracting the resulting categories into higher-order conceptual constructs.

Consumers’ paths: an ongoing exchange between book and movie

The discourse analyses show two main paths back and forth between the two media. First, the most frequent path is to start by reading the book and then watch the movie. This can be explained by the fact that adaptations are often based on best-selling books, so a significant proportion of the film audience has read the book before seeing the movie. Some respondents emphasized that even if they didn’t read the book before the release of the movie, they chose not to watch the movie until they had read the book. This suggests that the book is perceived
as the source of the content – the reference work. The prevailing expectation is that the movie will not be as good as the book: “when I hear of an “adaptation”, I’m always a bit skeptical, worried that there will be a gap that the film won’t have everything that the book conjured up” (Marine, occasional reader, devoted moviegoer). However, spectators are curious to see how the story was imagined by the filmmaker, so they can compare with their own imagination: “high expectations [about the adaptation] and often disappointed because I’m always very curious to see how a director interprets a book I loved, and often it doesn’t turn out how I imagined it ... I think it’s really about comparing two interpretations, mine and the director’s” (Alice, devoted reader, regular moviegoer). Because most of the respondents who follow this path are devoted or regular readers, they know the plot well and are curious to see what kind of adaptations were made (dialogue, scenes, characters, places, etc.)

The second path is to read the book after having watched the movie. It is mostly followed by devoted movie-goers & occasional readers and only when spectators liked the movie and wanted to extend the positive experience by adding further details, as they are conscious that the film is a limited representation of the book. Reconsumption is perceived as an investigation: “…there [in the book] will be greater detail. I want to find out more about the characters, get more information, piece together more of the story so to speak. The protagonist’s childhood might last twenty minutes in the film but take up 200 pages in the book” (Marine, occasional reader, devoted moviegoer). Nevertheless, they worry they will be disappointed by the book as they are aware of the intrigue and know how the story ends. Moreover, one important difference between these two paths is that in the first (from book to movie) the reader enjoys the style of the book (with its own literary techniques), whereas consumers following the second path (from movie to book) are looking more for additional details than to admire the literary style.
Drivers of readers’/spectators’ evaluations of adaptations

Another important result is the perception of what makes a “good” adaptation. Three elements drive readers’/spectators’ positive evaluations: fidelity to the story, creative additions (music, actors, places) and the temporal media distance between reading the book and watching the movie. First, as emphasized in the adaptation literature, consumers expect adaptations to follow the story of the book, which is perceived as the reference source. For them, fidelity is more about the chronology of the story and respecting the important events that make up the plot than repeating what they have already read: “...they [filmmakers] didn’t use the same chronology at all, which fundamentally changes the moral of the story. Not only the chronology, but even the bad guys... You might say that there are good guys and bad guys, but the good guys and bad guys aren’t the same in the film and the book” (Roland, devoted reader, regular moviegoer). If the chronology is not respected, this has a negative impact on the final evaluation. Moreover, fidelity is described as being about respecting the soul and the atmosphere of the book when adapting it to the screen. Readers expect the filmmaker to respect their own imaginary constructs, which is obviously an impossible task as it is very personal: “I do expect the director to respect the way I read the book, otherwise I don’t like the film” (Anne-Laure, devoted reader, regular moviegoer).

Second, even if readers/spectators expect chronological fidelity, at the same time they look for creative derivations from the book in order to be surprised. They value such interpretations in the choice of actors, places, images and especially music, which is strongly associated with the medium of cinema as a specific added value: “when you read a book, I think you definitely want to find roughly the same thing in the film, but with images and music” (Baptiste, regular reader, regular moviegoer). Nevertheless, they are very critical of filmmakers who make creative interpretative choices that are too far removed from the images they formed while reading the book: “in the book [If Only It Were True by Marc Levy] the guy is pretty cool
...[...] but in the film [Just like heaven by S. Spielberg] he’s this kind of drunk who spend his time drinking beer and does nothing with his life, even though in the book the guy is an architect and in the film he’s unemployed, he tells lame jokes, it’s awful. It’s not the same character at all” (Marine, occasional reader, devoted moviegoer). Finally, the third driver of readers’/spectators’ positive evaluations is the temporal distance between the consumption of the two media (book and movie). This driver was identified by Joshi and Mao (2012) and defined as best-seller recency. They found that the box-office performance is negatively correlated with the book’s recency. The consumer’s memory trace of recent best-sellers is strong, fresh and readily retrievable (vs. long temporal gap between the peak of the book and the movie release) and the comparison is easier. Our results confirm this effect but emphasize that readers are aware of it. In order to ward off this effect, they deliberately do not read (or re-read) the book before watching the adaptation: “Bilbo came out not long ago, but I deliberately didn’t re-read the book because I thought ‘if I go to see the film, I’ll keep saying to myself ‘that bit’s missing, that bit’s missing, that wasn’t in the book’, it will drive me crazy, so I deliberately didn’t re-read the book on the basis that I would enjoy the film more, which turned out to be true” (Anne-Laure, devoted reader, regular moviegoer).

Discussion

Professionals (publishers and filmmakers) have also identified key success factors of adaptations even though their notion of success is quite different: “A film always targets the wider public more than a book. In a bookshop, if you reach 50 or 100,000 copies you’re very happy, but in the cinema any less than 500,000…” (GR, editor, Flammarion). Filmmakers above all look for a good story, rather than to adapt a specific book. Best-sellers are indicators of a “good” story: “film producers are not so much interested in adapting a book as adapting a success, a story that has visibly touched people... that has proved itself and already moved
people in another format” (LS, former head of production at TF1). Film producers might not target readers as their core audience, but they consider them as a captive audience who will ensure a promising film launch without being an absolute guarantee of success: “[film producers] don’t target those who’ve read the book... how many people are going to go see a movie when they’ve already read the novel? When you’ve enjoyed reading a book, there’s a good chance you’ll want to see what it’s like as an adaptation. But in the case of Millennium, for example, that didn’t work. Millennium was a colossal literary success but was nearly a flop in the cinema” (LS, former head of production at TF1). In some cases, the format of the medium can influence the quality of the adaptation. For example, a successful book can lead to a failed adaptation simply because the specific features of the cinematic medium have not been properly taken into account. Muriel Barbery’s best-seller in France The Elegance of the Hedgehog (Gallimard, 2006), which sold more than a million copies, was adapted for the screen in 2009 but attracted an audience of just 750,000. Adapting the book was a difficult task because of the “overly intellectual tone of the book”, which was not easy to translate into images. It is key to manage the specific features of each medium: “… the internal discourse of a character is very important in literature, but in the cinema a guy who’s standing there thinking doesn’t make for a great image. The language of cinema is a series of images, so you have to be able to use a series of images to reflect that internal discourse that you find in the book. These are two different languages” (LS, Director of Audiovisual rights at Flammarion). More importantly, these specific features go hand in hand with professional expertise and one’s knowledge of the respective medium (book vs. film), meaning that initiatives where the author adapts his/her own book to the screen usually end in failure: “… where the author of the book adapts his own work, for me that doesn’t sound right because everyone should stick to their own line of work. Frédéric Beigbeder’s Love Lasts Three Years is a nice book but the film is of little interest. The same is true of Delicacy. I think it’s difficult to adapt one’s own
work. As the author, you think you can be as faithful as possible to the story, but again readers have their versions of the story and the film, so whether it’s the author or someone else who adapts it, the reader will always see it as a betrayal” (GR, editor, Flammarion).

Another factor behind the success of an adaptation from the industry’s point of view is the characters: “I think the characters really play a key role. In that regard, I think that the representation and even the characterization of the characters is really essential” (LS, former head of production at TF1). This is not an aspect that was emphasized by spectators. One reason might be the expertise required of spectators in being aware of the way a character is constructed. Focusing on the fidelity of characters can be a winning adaptation strategy. A good example of this is the TV series *Legend of the seeker* by Sam Raimi (adapted from the epic fantasy saga *The sword of truth* by Terry Goodkind (Tor Books, 1994), which sold more than 30 million copies). It was adapted by capitalizing on a faithful representation of the characters but with a different story. Finally, it should be pointed out that absolute fidelity in adaptations is illusory. Professionals are aware that the prevailing sentiment towards adaptations is one of disappointment. One reason for this is the power of individual imagination: “…if you watch the movie of a book you loved, you’re always disappointed because nothing is more powerful than your own imagination. It’s always a disappointment to see how a director tries to transpose images that were once yours onto your imagination. Our own imagination is always more beautiful, more revealing and more moving than someone else’s” (LS, Director of Audiovisual rights at Flammarion). Creativity (even disruptive) and deviation from a book can also be a key success factor. A case in point is Baz Luhrmann’s *Romeo + Juliet*, a 1996 adaptation starring Leonardo DiCaprio. The text is taken directly from Shakespeare’s original tragedy, but the action takes place in the “rough” suburbs of contemporary America. Instead of swords, characters have guns for instance. This creates a really new interpretation and a new version of the classic drama.
Managerial implications

Considering the specificities of the adaptation process (e.g., fidelity to the story, creative elements, characters, consumption patterns, support format, etc.) might help practitioners to better understand the spectators’/readers’ evaluation process that takes place in book-to-screen adaptations. More concretely, this research suggests two main implications for managers. First, it emphasizes the importance for practitioners of being aware that in the reconsumption process they need to deal with an aversive reconsumption audience. From the perspective of movie producers, the readers in the audience (considered as a captive audience during the launch of the adaptation) are always skeptical and consider that “the movie will not be as good as the book”. From the perspective of publishers, who decide to re-edit the book after the success of the movie, the new audience have appreciated the movie and are looking for further details but worry that they will be disappointed by the book as they are aware of the intrigue and know how the story ends. Second, this research emphasizes the ambivalent position of spectators with regard to the adaptation work. They expect fidelity but at the same time creative deviations. Here we suggest that adaptations need to remain faithful to the chronology and characters but can introduce creative additions to elements perceived as typical of the film format (music, sound and visual effects).

Conclusion, limitations and further research

The importance of adaptations is becoming a key strategic business for publishers. One illustration is the creation of dedicated audiovisual departments in publishing houses in charge of managing negotiations with filmmakers for on-screen adaptations. Publishers adopt a proactive approach towards the film industry, regularly suggesting stories for screen adaptations: “…we [publishers] send out a quarterly newsletter based on certain themes in which we inform producers about upcoming or recent publications, together with an
audiovisual file targeting ideas for an adaptation. We pitch the book in three lines and we provide a summary that reflects the book’s narrative in its simplest form and film references that illustrate the way we see the adaptation being done” (LS, Director of Audiovisual rights at Flammarion). From a publisher’s point of view, the adaptation of a novel can regenerate interest in the book and increase sales just after the release of the film. To market this interest, publishers often re-edit the book with a cover showing the film poster. In some rare cases, the success of the movie can even make the book a success. For example, *Le Second Souffle*, first published in 2001, was not much of a success initially. But following the enormous success of its on-screen adaptation in November 2011 (*Intouchables* – 21.4 million tickets sold), the book was rereleased in May 2012 (*Le Livre de Poche*) and sold 13,506 copies in the first month (GfK panels, 2013). The cover of the second edition uses an image from the movie (Exhibit 1). From a filmmaker’s point of view, the adaptation is a guarantee of a successful story that has already captivated audiences and can be easily transformed into a box-office success.

The findings of this research represent no more than an initial exploration of the adaptation challenge. Further research is needed to investigate several related issues: quantify the impact of adaption; understand how the level of readers'/spectators’ expertise influences the evaluation of the adaptation (devoted vs. occasional vs. regular); how genre impacts perceptions of the adaptation, etc.

*Exhibit 1: Cover of "Le Second Souffle" (book) and poster of “Intouchables” (movie)*
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## Appendix 1: Sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency of film consumption</th>
<th>Frequency of book consumption</th>
<th>Interview length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoît</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>55 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linsay</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>47 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptiste</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Sophie</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>58 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>55 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>38 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>41 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>1h05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>28 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Laure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>1h20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyria</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>37 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christophe</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>1h30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathieu</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1h25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetitia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>48 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Devotion</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvie</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>44 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>37 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gérard</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>57 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conception</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>34 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>36 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>55 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alain</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>1h00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*“Devoted” moviegoers: about once a week or more; “regular”: about one to three times a month; “occasional”: once a year to twice every three months (Centre National de la Cinématographie – Médiamétrie, [http://www.cnc.fr](http://www.cnc.fr)).

**“Devoted” readers: more than 14 hours a week; “regular”: from 3h30 to 14 hours a week; “occasional”: less than 3h30 a week (GfK,2012).