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Executive Summary

The overall aim of this thesis is to investigate to what extent product placement in TV shows influences brand equity. The objective is to gain insights into the effectiveness of product placement by reviewing and exploring previous studies and relevant literature in order to identify factors that are considered to influence product placement effectiveness in relation to brand equity. Through this discovery, a conceptual model with relevant factors is created to demonstrate relationships set to investigate, consisting of hypotheses and research statements. The deduced hypotheses and statements are utilized to detect relationships between the identified factors and the consumer mindset.

A cross-sectional research design consisting of a quantitative questionnaire and qualitative focus group interviews empirically test the conceptual model. To achieve this, stimuli are provided with video clips from the TV shows *Gossip Girl* and *The Big Bang Theory* for participants to see.

The findings revealed that modality, brand familiarity, placement fit, character liking, viewer character relationship, program involvement and attitudes toward placements in general affected brand equity at all levels, but to a different extent. Familiar brands and brands that fit well within the TV show generated greater attention among viewers, thus positively influenced brand equity. Associations and attitudes toward the brand were positively influenced with the leveraging of secondary brand associations from the characters to the brand, and the strong relationship between the viewer and the character aided in the influence on brand attachment. For product purchase to happen, all of the factors needed to be present, although viewer-character relationship was considered to play a leading role in purchase decision making.

Even though the research findings cannot be fully generalized, they provide useful insights for marketers in taking the right steps toward effective product placements. Since no clear theoretical foundation exist to guide marketers in evaluating the most optimal approach, decisions are often based on intuition due to lack of industry knowledge. Thus, future research on how to implement and integrate the already discovered factors into the product placement practice should be considered.
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1. Introduction

“Chandler: (Entering the apartment.) Oh, hey. Rachel sweetheart? You have got to tell the post office that you have moved. OK? We are still getting all your bills and stuff. (He hands her all of her bills and junk mail.)

Rachel: Oh – oh. Pottery Barn! (She grabs the Pottery Barn catalog and hands the rest back out to Chandler.) You can throw the rest away.

Chandler: I’m not your garbage man. I’m your mailman.

Rachel: Monica, look! Look – look – look! Here is that table that I ordered. (She shows her the picture.)

Monica: You got it from Pottery Barn?

Rachel: Yeah! It’s an apothecary table. Does anyone even know what apothecary is?

Chandler: A pharmacist. (Rachel mocks him)” (Russell, 2002).

Although, this might seem as a script of a television commercial for the retail store Pottery Barn, it is part of a scene from the popular TV show Friends (aired January 6, 2000), in which the majority of the episode deals with characters and their adventures with products bought from Pottery Barn (Russell, 2002). According to Pottery Barn’s executive Patrick Connolly “the phones light up with catalog request every time it airs” (Viveiros, 2004), suggesting that the integration of the brand to the episode’s plot has created attention among viewers. This reference to a brand, exemplifies the concept of product placement, a method that is being integrated frequently in the content of mass media programming (Russell, 2002).

“Due to media fragmentation, media proliferation, and declining advertising efficacy” (Williams, Petrosky, & Hernandez, 2011, p. 2), marketers have become less confident toward results of traditional advertising methods\(^1\). Consequently, brands are facing fierce competition in the battle of reaching its target audience through traditional marketing communication activities (Williams et al., 2011).

---

Difficulties in reaching consumers through traditional advertising methods are for instance associated with overexposure, which makes it harder for marketers to penetrate the market and influence consumers. Just in Denmark, the average number of minutes of commercial spots on the TV channel TV2, has risen from 117 minutes per day in 2004 to 217 minutes per day in 2011 (TNS Gallup, Tv-meter årsrapport, 2012a) (Appendix A). Furthermore, consumers are becoming more educated and knowledgeable about advertising and its methods, therefore enabling them to reject advertising messages more easily (Sørensen & Hebsgaard, 2007).

In addition, technological developments such as TiVo, video on demand, VDR (digital video recorder) downloads, live streaming, and the internet in general, give consumers an opportunity to skip over commercials, or totally avoid them. As consumers have more channels to choose from, they have the possibility to zap forward when commercial blocks are being aired. Besides, it has been acknowledged that smart phones and game consoles have begun to threaten the TV experience, as people tend to multitask, surfing on the Internet and use Facebook, while watching television, which diminishes the viewers’ attention (McKinsey, 2006).

By looking into Danish consumers, statistical evidence clearly shows development in consumers having more alternatives to choose from, as the number of people with more than 50 TV channels has risen by 82% from 2008 to 2011 (TNS Gallup, Annual Survey, 2012a). Furthermore, the number of Danish households with access to Internet has increased by 19% from 2008 to 2011 (TNS Gallup, Annual Survey, 2012b) (Appendix A).

Considering only the television medium, statistics show that Danish consumers, 3 years and older, watched 54 minutes more TV in January 2011 compared to what they did in January 2004 (TNS Gallup, Tv-meter årsrapport, 2012b). Even though the numbers of minutes have increased every year since 2004, traditional television advertising is losing its power due to the reasons mentioned above. Other traditional advertising channels face the same problems, due to over exposure. Despite this, total advertising turnover for traditional media channels increased from 11.022 Million DKK in 2004 to 12.960 Million DKK in 2011 (Dansk Oplagskontrol, Reklameforbrugsundersøgelsen i Danmark, 2012) (Appendix A). This raises a question whether traditional advertising is losing its value, with marketers becoming less confident toward its effectiveness, even though advertising turnover is increasing (McKinsey, 2006).

As a result of the difficulties of getting a message across to the target audience through traditional advertising, marketers have had to explore other options using creative, (less costly) and
untraditional advertising methods to communicate with consumers (Gupta, Balasubramanian, & Klassen, 2000; Langer, 2010).

Some of these new marketing communication methods take advantage of the technological development, especially online marketing, such as blogs, online communities and social networks. Other methods focus more on sponsorships, events, endorsements or product placements in order to reach consumers. What differentiates most of these untraditional methods from traditional advertising methods is that the marketing strategy is not based entirely on a push strategy, which means that brands are sacrificing some of their control of how the content is created, and thereby understood and perceived by consumers. Due to this lack of control, some marketers tend to stick to the more traditional and less risky advertising forms (Langer, 2010; Williams et al., 2011).

Product placement is one of the popular forms of untraditional advertising that has experienced growth in recent years, as a way to get in touch with retreating consumers. The concept is fairly simple and involves the incorporation of branded products in movies (or other media), as a way to influence audiences, either for payment through contracts or free of charge (Avery & Ferraro, 2000). This marketing communication tool has been designed to increase awareness, build brand equity, and in the course of time increase sales (Nelson, Keum, & Yaros, 2004). Evidence of increase in sales was for example seen when *Ally McBeal* wore a Nick & Nora pajamas as a lounging outfit. Sales of the pajamas increased by 35% between 1995 and 1998, therefore proving the product placement strategy to be effective in practice (Russell & Stern, 2006).

The product placement industry is a fast growing multi-billion dollar industry and is soon believed to outperform traditional advertising and marketing. In 2006, global paid product placements were valued at $3.07 billion and global unpaid product placements $7.45 billion according to the research company PQ Media. Product placements in television are the dominant choice of marketers, accounting for 71.4% of global spending. Since it is highly believed that product placement will be the future of television advertising (Williams et al., 2011), it reinforces an interest to shed further light into this phenomenon, therefore being the focus of this thesis.
1.1 Problem Identification

Product placement concerns incorporating commercial content in a purposeful way into a non-commercial situation, hence, it is branding, created through the mixing of advertising and entertainment. Product placement is becoming common practice in today’s marketing world, and can be experienced in a vast amount of mainstream media such as movies, TV series and shows, computer games, blogs, music and music videos, books, theatre plays, radio and etc. (Williams et al., 2011).

The motivation behind the use of product placement is that the advertiser is able to expose the brand to the consumer in an indirect manner, and therefore to some extend avoid the consumers’ defense mechanism and learned resistance toward traditional advertising. This becomes possible, because the consumer is in a comfortable situation consuming entertainment, such as a computer game or TV show, when the exposure happens, so the consumer is therefore not expecting to be exposed to advertising. At the same time, it gives the advertiser the opportunity to expose the brand to the consumer in a natural and realistic setting, which altogether should lead to positive attitudes toward the brand (Langer, 2010).

The product placement field is rapidly advancing in practice and no Hollywood production today is without product placement. Still, it is seen as a quite new academic field of study. As an academic research field it is only around 15 years old, and most research has so far mainly described and investigated the use of product placement as a marketing tool in general. Disagreement also remains regarding the definition of product placement, the reason for the methods growth, its effect and how to actually measure the effects (Langer, 2010). Hence, no apparent theoretical framework that describes product placement exists (Russell, 1998). According to Langer (2010) product placement effectiveness measurements methods are far behind traditional advertising measurement methods, and research still lacks results and findings for its growth and its effects on advertisers, media producers and consumers. This problem is also experienced in practice as the industry according to Rocha (2005) lacks knowledge, and marketers therefore have to base decisions on intuition and opportunities that emerge along the way.

Particularly lack of research on product placement effectiveness and measures on consumers grasps attention, since they are the ones that are being targeted and ultimately decide whether to buy a brand or not. According to prior studies, it is believed that product placement effectiveness is influenced by multiple factors; thus, making this phenomenon very challenging to investigate.
Previous studies have mainly focused on movies and most of them have measured product placement effectiveness through brand awareness with little attention to how the placed brands affect viewers’ attitudes, preferences, emotions and purchasing behaviors (Russell, 1998; Williams et al., 2011).

Brands are nowadays considered the company’s most valuable asset. Strong brand equity results in a different outcome due to a marketing activity of a branded product or service, compared to the same product or service not branded. By making products or services memorable and easily recognizable in the eyes of consumers and superior in quality, companies create brand equity. Due to this, the brand equity concept reinforces the importance of choosing the right marketing strategies, so consumers will have the right type of experiences that ultimately become linked to the brand (Keller, 2008).

Considering that product placement is a communication tool designed to build brand equity, with hope of leading to increase in sales, it becomes highly appropriate to examine to what extent it influences brand equity. Meaning, whether viewers only notice the placed brands, therefore only influencing brand awareness, or if product placement is effective enough to influence viewers’ attitudes toward the brand that could further initiate a change in behavior.

Given the fact that movies have been the main focus among researchers in measuring product placement effectiveness, it opens up an opportunity to shed light into the effectiveness in other types of media. Since television viewers are believed to be far larger in numbers than movie viewers, including the television viewers’ chance of developing relationships with their favorite characters (Avery & Ferraro, 2000), suggests that product placements in TV shows could be more effective in influencing brand equity than product placements in movies.

Moreover, advertisements differ in portrayal and can be seen as either informational or transformational. Where informational advertisements emphasize on product functionality, transformational advertisements tap into people’s emotions. Taking this a step further in relation to product placement, literature review has not revealed studies that investigate differences in effectiveness between informational or transformational product placements. Investigating the difference in effectiveness between these two approaches is believed to be very relevant, and could provide some knowledge to the product placement research field.
1.1.1 Research Question

Based on the above-mentioned issues, this thesis main focus is to investigate what marketers should emphasize on to effectively use product placements to build brand equity. Based on this the following research question is:

*To what extent does product placement in TV shows influence brand equity?*

In order to answer the research question, two sub questions have been derived as a way to give a clearer picture of the overall aim of this thesis.

**SQ1.** What effect does product placement have on viewers’ brand awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity?

**SQ2.** Is there any difference among viewers how they think and feel about the brand if the placement is informational or transformational?

To see how product placement influences brand equity, the investigation will emphasize on the effects product placement has on viewers in relation to awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Product placement effectiveness is therefore seen in respect to the strength it has in influencing one or more of the above elements. Eight factors that are believed to be important in affecting product placement effectiveness are used as a foundation in the overall analysis. If product placement is able to accomplish high level of brand awareness, transfer associations to the brand and make viewers develop positive attitudes toward the brand, possibly leading to purchase and brand loyalty, it is save to say that product placement is a powerful marketing strategy.

1.2 Delimitations

This thesis only investigates product placement influence on brand equity in relation to fictional TV shows. Although found in vast amount of mainstream media, most researches have focused on effectiveness measurements in regards to movies. Media choice is therefore based on previous researches and the considerations of the relative large impact TV shows have on viewers.

The potential influence that product placement is considered to have on viewers only refers to American productions, as they constitute the magnitude of worldwide distribution. Although different rules apply in every country, American TV shows are difficult to avoid. Moreover, the
American industry is very much developed and is known for using product placement to a large extent, which therefore made it less difficult to find examples and measure its impact.

Even though cultural differences are important to reflect upon, as people in different cultures may perceive brands differently, these possible differences are not taken into consideration. In addition, there is a possibility that the brands appearing in the TV shows are currently running a marketing campaign, which may influence the effectiveness of the placed product. However, product placement effectiveness in this thesis is seen as a result from an isolated marketing activity.

The measurement on product placement influence on brand equity is only related to the business-to-consumer market. Product placement can be utilized in the business-to-business context, where an emphasis is based on e.g. construction equipment exclusively sold in B2B markets. Product placement influence on B2B calls for another study.

Whether the product is categorized as a high- or low-involvement will not be taken into consideration, as this thesis investigates product placement effectiveness in general. Moreover, on the grounds that the brand equity model is static framework, only short-term memory effects will be investigated, thus excluding product placement effectiveness on long-term memory.

Lastly, this thesis does not take into account product placement effectiveness on implicit memory. Brand awareness is measured in terms of recall and recognition and therefore emphasizes on explicit memory. It is however a possibility that the viewer’s subconscious memory will record the brand and evoke emotional associations from the TV show.

1.3 Thesis Structure

This thesis consists of nine chapters that are divided into five parts (Figure 1). The first part has up to this point introduced several reasons for why it has become more difficult for marketers to reach consumers through traditional advertising methods. With a focus on product placement as a way to approach consumers, literature review revealed several aspects that needed to be investigated further, leading to the development of a research question. This first part concludes with an overview of product placement in general. The phenomenon is defined and different types of product placement strategies are introduced. Furthermore, product placement ethics, advantages and disadvantages are addressed, and results of previous studies related to product placement are reviewed.
The second part, gives insight into the theoretical framework used in this thesis. Brand equity, the main theoretical foundation, which the analysis is based upon is explained and demonstrates how product placement effectiveness is measured. Furthermore, other theories related to how product placement affects consumers are addressed. Eight factors that are considered important in relation to product placement effectiveness are then presented. Hypotheses are derived from each factor, leading to the drawing of a conceptual model that illustrates the relationships set to be investigated.

Part three outlines and justifies the research methodology chosen for this research in order to achieve the desired research objectives. The chapter starts with addressing the main purpose and approach of this thesis and then attends to the research design. To be able to answer the overall research question, two data collection techniques are employed and discussed in details. The empirical findings from the quantitative and qualitative researches are presented and analysed in part four and finally, part five comprehends a discussion and conclusion of the research findings. Limitations are taken into consideration and suggestions for further research are proposed.

Figure 1. Thesis Progression Model
Source. Own production
Product placement is said to have emerged with the birth of motion pictures in the mid 1890s; however, scholarly literature is inconsistent in the evaluation of the beginnings (Newell, Salmon, & Chang, 2006). Originally, the idea was for movie studios and television networks to borrow props in order to reduce production costs, and to add greater level of reality to the film by incorporating real brands into the stories (Shrum, 2004; Williams et al., 2011).

It was not until 1982 that the practice became more widespread, as a result of the placement of Reese’s Pieces candy in the movie E.T.: The Extra-Terrestrial in 1982, in which an alien was shown to follow a line of Reese’s Pieces. Three months after the film was released, sales of the candy had increased by 65%. Positive results also appeared the year after with the placement of Ray-Ban sunglasses worn by Tom Cruise in the movie Risky Business. Sales of the sunglasses tripled in one year. Due to this unexpected commercial value of placement opportunities, interest in product placement grew tremendously, and today, a variety of branded goods in different product categories have pushed themselves onto the silver screen (Gupta & Lord, 1998; Gupta et al., 2000; Shrum, 2004).

The product placement process usually starts when companies approach movie studios or TV shows, and suggest them to use their products. This can also work the other way around. However, using intermediaries such as placement agents has become more frequent. These agents function as middlemen between advertisers and movie/TV producers, working on either ad hoc or retainer basis. Seeing that product placement has become highly attractive, studios have established special departments, were opportunities for placements are being explored at all times. The cost can range from less than $10,000 to several hundred thousand dollars, depending on its visibility. It is however estimated that the majority of placements in movies are done on barter bases, where the product has been traded for a movie exposure (Karrh, 1998; Williams et al., 2011). In general more strict rules apply for placement activities in television, and therefore placements in television programs are more or less unpaid (Avery & Ferraro, 2000).

It has been suggested that the commercial impact of placing a branded product on television may be greater than in movies, as television viewers are far larger in numbers. Consumers can choose when to see a movie, while television has become more pervasive in consumer lifestyles and more difficult to avoid. Results from surveys on American households have shown that the television is set on for 7.2 hours a day and that people spend 40% of their free time watching television. Also, viewers can
start to develop loyalty toward the program or its characters as a result of watching favorite shows for an extended period of time. So, pairing a product with a character that the viewer is loyal to can increase product placement effectiveness, as the character brings the personality of his or her character to the product and therefore giving an opportunity of establishing a stronger message approval (Avery & Ferraro, 2000).

2.1 Product Placement Definition

As the product placement industry keeps on developing in such a rapid pace, there are constantly new and creative ways to utilize this advertising practice. With new creative ways, new term and phases also develop. This means that the terms used in the product placement industry can fill up a rich vocabulary, as there are many synonyms and subcategories of product placements, such as non-spot advertising, stealth marketing, program sponsoring and program tie-ins etc., which makes an agreement about one definition hard to find.

One thing that the industry and academic research field agree about is that product placement is a hybrid message. Balasubramanian (1994) defines hybrid messages as:

All paid attempts to influence audiences for commercial benefits using communications that project a non-commercial character; under these circumstances, audiences are likely to be unaware of the commercial influence attempt and/or to process the content of such communications differently than they process commercial messages (p. 30).

Hybrid messages can therefore be placed between traditional advertising and public relations (also called PR), as it contains elements from both advertising and PR. According to Balasubramanian (1994) it provides a benefit mix of the two elements, since the advertiser keeps some control over the message exposed to the customer, and the message is perceived credible by the audience because they will not be aware of the attempt of commercial influence, making their resistance toward the commercial message lower.

These hybrid messages consist of much more than a company promoting its commercial products and services. Individuals, political and religious organization, public institutions and NGO’s also take advantage of hybrid messages. Langer (2010, p. 266) categorizes these different kinds of hybrid messages under different product placements forms:
Brand placement: Placement of commercial content, products and services, or the advertiser in general.

Image placement: Positive presentation of an individual, organization etc. such as a politician or NGO’s.

Location placement: Positive presentation of a geographical location, such as a country or city.

Generic placement: Placement of an entire product group, such as wine or chocolate.

Idea placement: Positive presentation of an idea, such as healthy lifestyle (p. 266).

In this thesis, the focus will be on the first category that Langer (2010) mentions. Brand placement, product placement, placement, placed brand, placed product and branded placement will therefore be used interchangeably from now on.

Karrh (1998) defines brand placement as: “Brand placement is better defined as the paid inclusion of branded products or brand identifiers, through audio and/or visual means, within mass media programming” (p. 33). With this broad definition, Karrh (1998) takes into account some of the shortcomings that are related to earlier definitions of product placement. Such as no limitations on the media choice to TV and movies, the different modalities of the placement, that branded placements are paid for, and that it is not always unobtrusive in nature.

This paid inclusion part of Karrh’s (1998) definition is an important aspect to consider, as the empirical and statistical evidence given in the articles above (Williams et al., 2011; Avery & Ferraro, 2000) provide numbers for both paid and unpaid placements. This means that in practice, product placements can be both paid and unpaid, and since the authors of the thesis and consumers in general do not have knowledge of whether the placement is paid for or not, the definition used in this thesis will be as follows:

“Product placement is defined as the inclusion of branded products or brand identifiers through audio and/or visual means, within mass media programming” (Inspiration from Karrh, 1998, p. 33).
2.2 Types of Product Placements

Since Karrh’s (1998) definition of product placement is considered as relatively broad; other authors (D’Astous & Séguin, 1999; Jantzen & Stigel, 1995; Russell, 1998) have taken a step further and divided product placements into more specific categories, where the audio and visual elements, and level of involvement are regarded as important. Besides Karrh’s (1998) definition, this thesis will use Russell’s (1998) more thorough categorization of placements in movies and TV shows.

According to Russell (1998) product placements can operate along three main dimensions; visual, audio and visual/audio. The first dimension is visual product placement. This refers to placements that can only be seen on the TV screen and are a part of the scenery in a production. Visual placements can vary in nature depending for instance on how many times it is shown in a production, or how much in focus the placement is when it is exposed. The second dimension is verbal and is called audio placement. Audio placement concerns the placement being mentioned verbally in a production. Audio placement varies for instance in the context it is mentioned in, how many times it is mentioned, and the tone of voice. The last dimension is audio/visual placement and this type of placement is both visual and verbal. It differentiates itself from the two other dimensions as it holds a major position in the plot of a production, and is therefore used to describe for instance a character or a group of people. Audio/visual placements can be of both of high or low intensity. High intensity audio/visual placement can for instance be Carrie from Sex and the City buying, wearing and talking about Manolo Blahnik shoes. Low intensity audio/visual placement is only shortly showing and mentioning the brand.

These different dimensions above proposed by Russell (1998) exemplify how complex it can be to examine in which way consumers may process product placements. This multidimensional nature of product placement shows that a variety of psychological processes can be in function, when a viewer is exposed to a brand in a movie or TV show (Shrum, 2004).

2.3 Benefits of Product Placements

Considering that product placement is a fusion between traditional advertising and PR, it has both its advantages and disadvantages for the marketer, the media producer and the consumer (Langer, 2010).

First of all, a great benefit for media producers is that product placement can offset production cost. It also provides a venue where products can be portrayed, and possibly demonstrated in a realistic
setting (Langer, 2010). Depicting characters using certain products, or going to stores and restaurants with no names on them is considered meaningless (Gupta et al., 2000). Furthermore, portraying a reality is not only believed to be beneficial for media producers, but for the marketers as well. As one advertising agency executive stated: “With ordinary advertising you can only say so much. With placements you can hint at what kind of product it is far more effectively” (Murdock 1992, in Morton & Friedman, 2002, p. 34).

The benefits for marketers include the facts that with product placements potential reach is greater than with traditional advertisements, since the audience cannot switch channels as with commercial breaks. Likewise, the message life becomes longer as movies and TV shows are usually released overseas and on DVD. Benefits from investments in product placements (such as brand awareness) may therefore be received many years after the original release (Morton & Friedman, 2002). In addition of being able to expose brands in a natural environment, marketers have an opportunity to keep control on how they want their brand to be perceived by the audience, for example whether they want to connect it to violence or dramatic material (Adage, 2003). Associating product with a celebrity actor can also enhance the persuasiveness of the placement message, where the audience may connect the trustworthiness of an actor to the brand, and therefore perceive it as more credible (Morton & Friedman, 2002). Advertisers can somewhat avoid noise from other brands when using product placement, and at the same time avoid the negative association consumer get from traditional advertising (Langer, 2010).

Last but not least, the primary advantage of product placement with regards to consumers is that the produced media becomes cheaper. Consumers are benefitting from the fact that producers have been able to save costs through product placement, allowing them to produce new and higher quality productions. Moreover, consumers can also benefit from the realistic setting, where they can see the brand being used, become aware of it, which could end with a satisfied customer. As the advertisement is not the media production, consumers can become less annoyed compared to traditional advertising (Langer, 2010). In addition, consumers can also form perceptions regarding the placed brand based on the celebrity actor (Morton & Friedman, 2002).
2.4 Potential Disadvantages of Product Placements

Regardless of the benefits, placing a branded product in various media has some disadvantages. Media producers have become more dependent on using advertisements as a way to offset production costs and a large part of the entertainment industry, such as the sport and film industry relies on product placements and sponsorship agreements. With the potential of media producers losing their decision power to advertisers, it also leave the risk that they lose their most important asset, their credibility, since they are not commercially independent anymore. In the long run, this could mean that when producers use product placement, they destroy their own raison d’être, as movies for example are becoming more or less long advertisements (DeLorme & Reid, 1999; Langer, 2010). If consumers feel that they have been exposed to too many branded products, it could result in having a negative effect (Williams et al., 2011).

Another downside of using product placement is that advertisers do not have the same control over the exposure process as they do with traditional advertising. This raises a question whether the brand is realistically and clearly presented and used. It is therefore important for advertisers to exert greater control over product or brand appearances in order to ensure their prominence. In addition, advertisers have no influence whether a specific media program will be successful and if it actually reaches a large audience. Hence, it is difficult to predict where to place brands in order to get a maximum positive exposure. Associating a product with a special character can also have negative consequences if the character does something inappropriate. The target audience may change attitudes toward that character and accordingly change their attitudes toward the product being used by the character (Langer, 2010; Williams et al., 2011).

For the consumer it can be difficult to identify when commercial content is being shown and when it is not. Further, it can be difficult to detect from whom the message is coming from, and whether it has a commercial purpose. Moreover, the consumer also does not have the opportunity to deselect the commercial content, as they do with traditional advertising (Langer, 2010).

Measuring the effectiveness of product placement has given conflicting results and measurement tools are still in development. Therefore, they are not being as precise as the effect measurement methods used in traditional advertising and PR. Regardless of which measurement system and variables are used, differing opinions are said to exist regarding the value of product placements and how to measure that value (Langer, 2010; Williams et al., 2011).
2.5 Ethical Consideration

The motivation behind using product placement is as mentioned in the introduction that the advertiser becomes able to expose the brand to the consumer in an indirect manner, and therefore to some extent avoid the consumers’ defense mechanism and learned resistance toward traditional advertising. However, this is also the reason why the product placement practice is widely discussed, because it brings up legal and ethical issues concerning exposing consumers indirectly and with more subtle messages. Especially, consumer councils, film critics and academic researchers participate in the ethical debate. The critics argue that the difference between advertising and information is vanishing, which makes it hard for the consumers to distinguish between commercial messages and non-commercial messages. Particularly, product placement toward children and young people are criticized. The same goes with ethically charged products such as alcohol, porn, weapons and cigarettes (Langer, 2010).

To protect consumers, legal restrictions and product placement codices exist. Being different from country to country, the EU holds more legal restrictions compared to the US (Langer, 2010). Nonetheless, the product placement practice is developing in a fast pace, and the tendency shows that legal restrictions are being loosened in countries, such as Denmark and the United Kingdom (Buhl Andersen, 2010), since the exposure of product placement from international, especially American productions, cannot be avoided (Langer, 2010). The loosening of restrictions is becoming more common, as TV channels are facing economical problems due to the crisis. As product placements are seen as means to lower production cost, they enable TV channels to compete with international TV productions (Buhl Andersen, 2010; Hansen, 2009).

2.6 Empirical Background

No apparent theoretical framework exists to describe the product placement phenomenon, even though product placement has been accepted as an advertising tool among practitioners (Russell, 1998). By reviewing previous studies, it becomes apparent that measuring the effectiveness of product placement depends on myriad of factors, therefore making this field of study extremely challenging. Majority of previous studies have emphasized on movies and focused on measuring effectiveness of product placements through brand awareness (recall/recognition) and audience’s attitudes toward product placements in general. However, it seems that little attention has been given to measures of product placement effectiveness with regards to attitudes, preferences, and
emotions toward a product or a brand. Furthermore, focus on purchasing behavior has also been inadequate (Russell 1998; Williams et al., 2011).

Brand awareness has been the main focus among researchers in measuring product placement effectiveness. An empirical study conducted by Babin and Carder (1996) showed that viewers were able to recognize brands placed within a film. However, the study dealt with one type of product placement, where the brand only appeared visually on the screen. Gupta and Lord (1998) measured recall effectiveness in films, but were more specific and proposed several product placement strategies. In addition of comparing the different types of strategies, they also compared them with advertising. Their research reported a significant advantage for prominent audio and visual placements over more subtle visual placements. Furthermore, brand recognition appeared to be higher for prominent placements compared to brand advertisements. Likewise, Russell (2002) investigated the role of congruence and modality (audio and visual) in relation to the effectiveness of product placement. Results showed that recognition improved when modality and plot connection were incongruent.

Several researches have focused on attitudes toward the practice of product placement. Results indicate that people have favorable attitude toward them in general, unless there are too many. Placing a branded product in a movie or in television is said to enhance realism, aid in character development and provide a sense of familiarity (Nelson et al., 2004). However, alcohol, cigarettes and guns or so-called ethically charged products are regarded as less acceptable (Gould, Gupta, & Grabner-Kräuter, 2000; Gupta & Gould, 1997). Another study by Gupta et al. (2000) provides a richer interpretive context for findings in the Gupta and Gould (1997) study. In addition of measuring attitudes toward placements in general, which were found to be generally positive and therefore consistent with prior research, they included in their analysis ‘those who like ads more’ and ‘those who like ads less’. They found out that the latter group had stronger attitudes against placements for ethically charged products compared to the former.

Only one study that related to consumer attitudes toward the placed brand was found. Russell and Stern (2006) made an investigation in television serial comedies, where it was predicted that consumers align their attitudes toward products in the same way that characters do. This process was driven by the consumers’ parasocial attachment to the characters. Results showed that when the connection between the consumer and the inside program character was strong, and the characters’ attitudes toward the product were positive, consumers’ attitudes toward the product were also positive. These results are believed to give a rich understanding of product placement.
effects, showing that characters have the possibility of affecting consumers’ attitudes toward products.

Few studies on product placement have been carried out that link believes with behavioral outcomes. A study used the movie Wayne’s World to test purchase intention after being exposed to the brands in the film. Results showed that repeated purchase behavior was higher for the brands that appeared in the movie (Karrh, 1998). American consumers were also likely to buy products seen in movies and males more than females in a study conducted by Gould et al. (2000). This investigation compared American, Austrian and French consumers. Morton and Friedman (2002) examined the relationship between consumers’ beliefs about product placement and product usage following exposure. They found that subset of beliefs; especially, those associated with how the product was portrayed in a movie might predict audience’s behavior. It could therefore be said that consumer beliefs might be more influenced by those characters that use the products in the movie and how they use them. Thus, portraying the product positively can be a contributor for the audience to purchase or use the product, while at the same time having an opposite effect by portraying the product negatively.

Another factor that is considered important to mention is the short- and long-term effects in evaluating the effectiveness of product placement. Academic studies have only measured short-term effects of recall, recognition, etc., or more precisely measured the effects shortly after being exposed to the movies or TV shows. However, it is believed that product placement, similar to traditional advertising, can have long-term effects on the brand image and equity. Even though it is considered difficult to measure the long-term effects, they are believed to be an important contributor to product placement effectiveness (Shrum, 2004).

This overview of product placement in general and previous studies has been presented in order to give the reader background knowledge of this phenomenon. Next chapter reveals the theoretical framework used in this study.
3. Theoretical Framework

Tangible assets such as land, buildings and machines were considered the most valuable resources a company could have during most of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Although companies were aware of intangible ones, its specific value remained unclear, and therefore value assessment was based on exploitation of tangible assets (Lindemann, 2003). As time has changed, companies today have increasingly realized that some of their most valuable assets are intangible ones, such as brand names associated with their products or services (Keller, 2008).

In general, a brand is described as the identity of a product or service that appears in various forms (name, term, sign, symbol, or a combination of them), as a mean to distinguish it from competitors (Keller, 2008). Over time the word has developed and now represents the entire product personality, where the brand becomes a symbol, connecting the company or its products with its customers in a relationship (Prasad & Dev, 2000). To have strong brands with significant equity is considered beneficial for companies, as they are believed to be less vulnerable to marketing crises and competitive marketing actions. Furthermore, companies that have strong brands are able to achieve larger margins, greater customer loyalty, and customers respond more favorable to price increases and decreases (Keller, 2001). Accordingly, by developing loyal customer franchise and creating perceived differences among products through branding, marketers create value that can result in financial profits for the firm (Keller, 2008).

3.1 Brand Equity

The value of a company can be increased with brand equity. Brand equity is the added value of products or services and can be seen as an indicator of the success of a brand (Keller, 2008). According to Aaker (1991):

\begin{quote}
Brand equity is a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name, and symbol, that add to or subtracts from the value provided by a product or service to a firm and/or to that firm’s customers (p. 15).
\end{quote}

These assets and liabilities that build brand equity are composed of brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality, brand associations and other proprietary brand assets, such as patents and trademarks (Aaker, 1991).
Keller (2008) defines brand equity from the perspective of the individual consumer, “as the differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer response to the marketing of that brand” (p. 48). This is referred to as customer-based brand equity. When a consumer is familiar with a brand and holds some “strong favorable and unique brand associations in memory” (p. 53), customer-based brand equity is said to occur.

Although the concept of brand equity has been viewed from various perspectives (Keller, 2008), both Aaker (1991) and Keller (2008) see brand equity from the perspective of the consumer. Aaker (1991) includes tangible assets in his definition that are not consumer related, whereas consumer responses are the only sources of building brand equity according to Keller (2008). Since the aim of this thesis is to investigate to what extent product placement in TV shows influences brand equity, the main theoretical foundation for the upcoming analysis is be based on Keller’s definition, as brand equity is evaluated according to the viewers’ responses to the placed products.

Keller (2008) argues that brand knowledge, which is based on brand awareness (recognition and recall) and brand image, is the fundamental part in creating brand equity. Brand awareness relates to the strength of a brand node or trace in memory, showing how consumers are able to identify a brand under different conditions. Brand image reveals how consumers perceive the brand, reflected by associations held in consumer memory. With high level of brand awareness and positive brand image, the probability of people selecting the brand increases (Keller, 1993).

3.1.1 CBDE Model

Building a strong brand is not considered to be an easy process, thus Keller (2008) developed the customer-based brand equity (CBBE) model, which is a pyramid consisting of six brand building blocks; salience, performance, imagery, judgments, feelings and resonance. The model outlines what brand equity is and how it should be best built, measured, and managed. Significant brand equity only occurs if brands reach the top of the pyramid.

The model is created with the above-mentioned in mind that the strength of the brand depends on the customers evolving experience with the brand. In other words, “the power of brand lies in what resides in the minds of customers” (p. 48). A brand is said to have positive (negative) customer-based brand equity when customers react more (less) favorably to marketing activity for the brand, compared to when the same marketing activity is used to an unnamed type of the product or service.
Hence, a challenge for marketers is to make sure that customers have the right type of experiences with their products and services, which ultimately become linked to the brand (Keller, 2008).

According to the CBBE model presented in Figure 2, building a strong brand can be thought of as a sequence of steps, in which each step needs to be successfully completed before moving on to the next step. First of all, there is a need to establish brand awareness (salience), so consumers can identify the brand and associate it with a specific product class or category need. Second of all, the meaning of the brand (performance and imagery) needs to be established in the minds of customers by linking it with a collection of tangible and intangible brand associations. Third of all, there is a need to bring forth customers positive brand attitudes (judgments and feelings) established from the brand associations and lastly, convert the positive brand attitudes into an intense, active relationship between customers and the brand (resonance).
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**Figure 2. CBBE Model**

Source: Keller (2008)

For marketers, it is possible to control the first two steps in the pyramid with the establishment of the product’s identity and its meanings through marketing activities. From thereafter, marketers have no control of how consumers respond to the brand (Keller, 2008). This emphasizes the importance for companies to position and market their brands in the right way from the start, as it can be difficult and time consuming to change people’s attitudes for the better, if being negative.

The CBBE model also distinguishes between a rational and emotional approach. The building blocks up the left side of the pyramid represent a more rational route, where consumers form brand
attitudes based on rational thinking, whereas the right side represent a more emotional route. Most strong brands are built by going up both sides of the pyramid (Keller, 2008). Each brand building block is explained below.

3.1.1.1 Brand Salience

The first brand building block in the pyramid consists of brand salience. In order to achieve the right brand identity, salience needs to be created with customers. Brand salience measures awareness of the brand, such as how often and how easily it comes to mind and under what circumstances. It is possible to distinguish brand awareness in terms of recognition and recall. With brand recognition, the consumer can confirm a prior exposure to the brand when he or she is given the brand as a cue. Recall on the other hand is when a consumer can retrieve the brand from memory when given either the product category, or purchase/usage situation as a cue. To increase the possibility of consumers being able to remember a brand, it is considered essential to make a proper link between the brand and various categories and cues in the minds of customers (Keller, 2008).

3.1.1.2 Brand Performance

Consumers build associations with products based on their performance, constituting the second brand building block. This could be product reliability, durability, serviceability, style, design and price. Thus, a prerequisite for successful marketing is to design and deliver the product in a way that fully satisfies consumers’ needs and wants. If consumers’ experiences with the product meet or surpass their expectations, brand loyalty and resonance can be established. It can be said that the product itself is at the heart of brand equity (Keller, 2008).

3.1.1.3 Brand Imagery

Imagery, the third brand building block, deals with more intangible aspects of the brand. This relates to linking associations to the brand in a more general way, instead of thinking about what the brand actually does. These associations can be formed both directly and indirectly, from own experience of the brand, through advertising, or from other sources of information e.g. word of mouth. Various intangible associations can be linked to a brand, but user profiles, purchase, usage situation, personality, values, history and experiences are considered to be the main ones (Keller, 2008).

3.1.1.4 Brand Judgments

The fourth branding block involves judgments that people have formed about the brand. This brand response arises from people’s head and includes personal opinions or attitudes, where consumers
gather all the different brand performance and imagery associations described above. Even though people can hold a number of attitudes toward a brand, the most important attitudes usually relate to perceived quality and to customer value and satisfaction. The brand needs to be superior and/or unique, in order to build an intense and active relationship with customers (Keller, 2008).

### 3.1.1.5 Brand Feelings

The last building block before reaching the top of the pyramid is brand feelings, which consist of attitudes people form from their heart. These feelings are customers’ emotional responses and reactions to the brand, and can be both positive and negative. Since emotions evoked by a brand can become strongly associated when the product is being used or consumed, firms have increasingly tried to tap more into consumer emotions with their brand. Warmth, fun, excitement, security, social approval and self-respect are seen as important factors in brand-building feelings (Keller, 2008).

### 3.1.1.6 Brand Resonance

The last step in the CBBE model describes the relationship customers have with a brand and can be characterized by intensity and activity. People may form behavioral loyalty toward a brand in terms of repeat purchases. Even though it is necessary for resonance to occur, it is not sufficient. Therefore, the need for personal attachment comes into play. Customers should go beyond having positive attitudes toward the brand and view it as something special. With sense of community, a brand even takes on a broader meaning. People identify themselves with a brand community and form a relationship with other members associated with the brand. The strongest affirmation of brand loyalty occurs when customers are engaged with the brand, and willing to invest time and other resources on the brand, in addition to those expended during purchase or consumption (Keller, 2008).

### 3.1.2 Possible Ineffectiveness of the CBBE model

Ponnan and Krishnatray (2008) argue that there are some missing elements, which limit the use of the CBBE model in strategic brand management processes. According to them, Keller’s (2008) model does not take time as a variable into consideration when brand equity is measured, therefore making it a static framework. Thus, it becomes difficult to measure how brand equity changes over time, and how to sustain it or enhance it over a longer period of time. In addition, Keller compares consumer’s reactions to a marketing mix of a brand to an unnamed brand. Ponnan and Krishnatray (2008) state that it is vital to compare brands with competitors. Even though brands may have more positive
brand equity than they used to, competitors may also have increased theirs over the same period of time. So to measure a real health status of a brand, it needs to be measured against actual marketplace behavior.

Although it is acknowledged that Keller’s (2008) model has some disadvantages, other brand equity measurement models are said to have drawbacks as well, including Aaker’s (1991) (Ponnam & Krishnatray, 2008). Therefore, these faults are not taken into consideration when measuring the influence of product placements on brand equity. Keller’s (2008) model is used as a foundation in the overall analysis of this thesis, and is considered a fundamental part when defining the criterion: awareness, associations, attitudes, and attachment/activity addressed below, that are used to evaluate how viewers respond to product placements in TV shows.

3.1.3 Measuring Brand Equity

To assess sources and outcomes of brand equity, Keller (2008) developed the brand value chain (BVC) model to ease the understanding in what ways marketing activities create brand value. Its basic postulation is that the value of a brand ultimately resides with customers. The model assumes that the brand value creation begins with the company’s investment in a marketing program (stage one). This marketing activity affects the customer mindset, what customers know and feel about the brand (stage two). The outcome of the customer mindset then influences how the brand performs in the marketplace (stage three) and finally, the financial market assesses the shareholder value and the value of the brand (stage four).

The aim of this thesis is to measure to what extent product placement influences consumers and therefore brand equity evaluation will be based on stage two in the BVC, or the customer mindset, where the CBBE model plays a central role. Five dimensions have been derived from the four brand building steps in the CBBE model (Keller, 2008), which are used in the forthcoming analysis. The intention is to examine how product placement influences the five dimensions mentioned below.

**Brand awareness:** Explores whether respondents remember seeing and/or hearing any brands that are presented to them. Unaided recall is investigated by asking respondents if they can remember seeing and/or hearing any brands without giving them a cue. To measure aided recall, respondents are given the brand’s product category as a cue, and with recognition, respondents are given all the brands as a cue.
**Brand associations:** Relates to the respondents’ perceived attributes and benefits for the brand. The purpose is to investigate whether the placed brands have an influence on the respondents’ already established brand associations, hence whether the meaning of the brand or how they perceive it has changed. It is hoped that the television character using the brand is able to transfer associations held toward the character further to the brand.

**Brand attitudes:** Concerns the respondents’ overall evaluations of the brand. The intent is to examine whether the placed brands influence already established brand attitudes, or what respondents feel and think about the brand. It is believed to be likely that if the respondent has a positive attitude toward the television character, this positive attitude will transfer from the character to the brand.

**Brand attachment:** The degree of respondents’ loyalty and attachment toward the brand. The goal is to measure whether placed brands have any influence on the respondent’s attachment or connection to the brand. It is assumed that if respondents identify themselves with one or more television characters, it becomes likely that they choose the brand used by the character over competitors’ brands.

**Brand activity:** The extent to which respondents use the brand, talk to others about it etc. Investigate whether placed brands influence further activity, such as brand purchase.

---

**Figure 3. Link Between Brand Equity and Customer Mindset**

Source: Inspiration from Keller (2008)

As seen in Figure 3, the CBBE model has been adapted to ease the following investigation concerning the extent to which product placement influences brand equity. Instead of analyzing step two, performance and imagery separately, the two building blocks have been combined. The intention is
not to find out whether there is any or more influence on either tangible or intangible aspects of the brand, only if there is any influence in associations overall. The same applies for step three in the pyramid, judgments and feelings. An emphasis is put on change in attitudes as a whole, and is therefore not analyzed separately. Moreover, the last two dimensions in the customer mindset, attachment and activity are both related to resonance.

By looking into the effectiveness of product placement in TV shows with a very positive eye, it is assumed that the ‘perfect’ product placement should be able to touch upon all of the dimensions mentioned above: awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. First of all, the motivation behind using product placement is to hope that viewers become aware of the placed brand. Second of all, by leveraging secondary brand associations (section 3.3) such as showing a character using a product may transfer associations that are held toward the television character further to the brand. This becomes beneficial for the viewer, as more associations held in the viewer’s memory increases the likelihood of recalling or recognizing the brand thereafter. Third of all, it is estimated that television characters can influence the viewers’ attitudes toward the placed product. If a viewer has positive attitudes toward a television character, it may be likely that these attitudes will transfer from the character to the brand (section 3.3.2.). At last, and to the more extreme, viewers can start developing intimate bonds and get attached to characters as a result of following the same TV shows for a long period of time. This may lead to a purchase of the placed brand, as the viewer is believed to accept the character as a role model of correct product decisions (section 3.3.3.), which ultimately leads to loyalty toward the brand.

It is considered possible that product placement can have such an influence on all of the dimensions. Nevertheless, it is believed that majority of the placements only have an effect on the lower levels of the CBBE pyramid. In this research, product placement is seen as an isolated marketing activity and the exposure alone may not be sufficient to create such a strong connection between the viewer and the brand. To make a stronger influence on brand equity, product placement should be more effective if integrated with other marketing communications (Keller, 2008). Moreover, individuals are different and the extent to which they involve themselves in TV shows varies. This influences the likelihood in transforming attitudes. For product placement to positively influence brand equity, various factors need to be taken into consideration. These are discussed in details in Chapter 4, followed by a presentation of a conceptual model, created in order to develop and test proposed hypothesis.
In addition to Keller’s (2008) CBBE model, which is used as a foundation for the overall analysis in this thesis, supplementary theories that are considered to have an influence on product placement effectiveness in TV shows and therefore on brand equity are addressed in the sections below.

### 3.2 Dual Coding Theory

The dual coding theory is relevant to product placement, especially when measuring the impact on brand awareness in relation to how information is stored. Proposed by Paivio in 1971, this theory of cognition assumes that the human mind consists of two separate classes of subsystems, verbal subsystem and visual subsystem, each of them having a different function. The verbal subsystem processes and stores linguistic information and the visual subsystem processes and stores pictorial information and images. Thus, human memory consists of two memories, verbal memory and imagery memory. Since memory can be stored in these two locations, it gives a greater possibility of retaining and retrieving information, compared to if memory would only be located at one place (Thomas, 1997).

Even though verbal memory and imagery memory are positioned in separate places, hence being independent, they are also interconnected. Both systems can be active without the other or both at the same time, and activity in one system can trigger activity in the other. This connection of the two systems allows dual coding of information (Paivio, 1990). When associating a word to an image, two separate but connected memory traces are laid down in the brain, one in each memory system, which increases the chance of remembering the word or image due to the greater amount of memory traces (Thomas, 1997). By relating the dual coding theory to product placement, it is assumed that placements, which can activate both the verbal and imagery memories, are able to create stronger brand salience compared to if only one of the memories were activated.

### 3.3 Secondary Brand Associations

Leveraging secondary brand associations is important when building brand equity. This is accomplished by linking already established brand associations to other entities, such as people, places and things that have their own associations. Hence, the brand borrows some brand knowledge from the other entities and perhaps some brand equity, leveraging on the associations representing that entity. This secondary brand knowledge is presumed to be quite essential in order
to create positive responses and strong, favorable, and unique associations, especially if existing ones are inadequate (Keller, 2008).

In addition to strengthen already existing associations in consumers minds, linking a brand to an entity can create a new set of associations, as well as affect existing ones. Creating a new set of associations is beneficial when products are new on the market, especially when consumers do not have enough knowledge about product-related attributes. In other words, consumers may be more likely to make brand decisions based on the knowledge of secondary associations they have linked the brand to. In relation to affecting existing associations, consumers may infer associations, judgments, or feelings characterizing an entity also characterizing the brand (Keller, 2008).

Keller (2008) mentions three important factors that need to be taken into consideration for the leveraging process to become successful:

1) *Awareness and knowledge of the entity* – Consumers have to have knowledge or be familiar with the secondary entity. If not, there is nothing they can transfer from it. It is desired that consumers have positive attitudes toward the entity, in addition of holding strong and favorable associations with it.

2) *Meaningfulness of the knowledge of the entity* – Additionally of holding positive attitudes and associations toward the entity, the knowledge needs to be meaningful for the brand.

3) *Transferability of the knowledge of the entity* – By assuming that positive attitudes and meaningful associations can transfer from the entity to the brand, how strongly is this knowledge linked to the brand?

In respect to product placement, viewers need to hold strong and favorable associations in memory and have positive attitudes toward the character or the TV show, in order to transfer these associations effectively to the brand. A common approach in leveraging secondary brand associations is to pair well-known people with a brand as they can draw attention and shape consumer perceptions about it (Keller, 2008). This way of leveraging secondary brand associations is believed to be central in measuring the effectiveness of product placements, as it is estimated that television characters can influence viewers’ attitudes toward the placed product.

The method of pairing a product with a TV show or characters, and an investigation how viewers alter attitudes and form special bonds with characters are discussed below. All of these means are considered to leverage secondary brand associations.
3.3.1 Classical Conditioning

Classical conditioning is a method that marketers have taken advantage of that aids in the process of leveraging secondary brand associations. Since the concept of product placement is based on the idea of pairing a branded product with a host show (Russell, 1998) this mechanism is relevant to consider. With classical conditioning, a conditioned stimulus that does not naturally produce a response, such as brand or a product, is paired with an unconditioned stimulus, e.g. music, scene, or a character. With repetition, (although possible with one repetition) the conditioned stimulus starts drawing out similar favorable responses, because it has been associated with the unconditioned stimulus (Grossmann, 1997).

A Russian physiologist, Ivan Pavlov, first discovered this phenomenon when doing a research on salivation in dogs. He paired a bell (neutral stimulus) with meat powder (unconditioned stimulus), as he knew that when the meat powder was in front of the dogs, they would start salivating. Over time, the dogs associated the bell (which became a conditioned stimuli) with the meat powder and started to salivate at the sound of the bell only (Solomon, Bamossy, Askegaard, & Hogg, 2010). It has been acknowledged that humans do respond to such stimuli as well, and that they can be conditioned to form an attitude (favorable/unfavorable) toward an image (stimuli). Even though marketers do not utilize strict classical conditioning in advertising, this procedure is nonetheless being employed (Grossman, 1997).

Based on this theoretical perspective, it can be said that product placement is a form of classical conditioning. Attitudes from a well-liked stimulus such as TV show or television character can be transferred to an affectively neutral stimulus, when presented together (Baker, 1999). Hence, it can be expected that affective conditioning prompt most of the product placement process. Since the conditioning is said to occur unconsciously, the viewer does not notice when the transfer happens. This is beneficial for marketers, as it is less likely that the viewer rejects the message (Shrum, 2004).

Russell (1998) argues that classical conditioning mostly applies for products that are not placed to be the center of attention, and refers to products that are placed in the background of the scene. Although she says that classical conditioning may be at work in other types of placements, such as high intensity audio/visual placements, higher-order processing applies under those circumstances, where the viewer is conscious when the transfer happens. This leveraging of secondary brand associations that viewers are believed to be conscious about are addressed below.
3.3.2 Balance Theory

The exposure of a branded product in a TV show may not be the only influence on viewer’s attitudes toward the brand. The way in which characters interact with the product also have something to say about how viewers perceive the brand. Balance theory suggests that viewers alter their attitudes toward a brand based on their liking with television characters. If the liking is strong, positive attitudes and meaningful associations can transfer from the character to the brand (Su, Huang, Brodowski, & Kim, 2011).

According to the theory, an individual holds a relationship between three elements that he or she perceives as connected, which compose a triad. Each triad contains a person and his or her perception of an attitude object, and other person or object. Based on these elements, individuals have a desire of maintaining consistency or balance among these linked attitudes. If inconsistency occurs, a state of tension will exist until individuals have changed their perception, and restored the balance (Solomon et al., 2010). Therefore, the individual will adjust his or her attitude toward the object and perceive it in the same way as the character perceives it, hence achieving cognitive consistency (Russell & Stern, 2006).

Figure 4. The Balance Model

As illustrated in the figure above, Russell and Stern (2006) state that viewer’s attitudes toward placed products in TV shows can be influenced by television characters in three ways: (1) Relationship between the television character and the placed product. (2) Relationship between the viewer and the television character. (3) Strength of relationship between the viewer and the television
character, ultimately influencing the viewer’s attitudes toward the placed product. Based on this, viewers will strive for balance by altering their feelings toward a character holding attitudes toward a product. This process is driven by the relationship between the viewer and the character, and the relationship between the character and the placed product.

As viewers are said to align their attitudes based on television characters, this theory is believed to create valuable information in measuring to what extent product placement influences brand equity. The fact that viewers can develop interpersonal relationships with characters in TV shows because they are being aired regularly (Su et al., 2011) suggests that this medium is very appropriate for marketers to expose their brands.

3.3.3 Parasocial Theory

The difference between movies and TV shows lies in the bond that can be created between characters and viewers. While movies are being watched once in a while, TV shows are aired more frequently, usually once per week, or sometimes even daily. Accordingly, TV shows give viewers an opportunity to develop strong relationships between the program and its characters (Russell, Norman, & Heckler, 2004).

Parasocial theory, introduced by Horton and Wohl in 1956, states that viewers tend to get attached to or distanced from fictional characters they perceive as real. Viewers are considered likely to develop attitudes toward characters after following a single episode, but after watching multiple episodes of the same shows, they can start forming intimate bonds with the characters. Viewers begin to follow the characters closely, care about them, talk to others about them, and sometimes interact with them like they were real persons (Russell & Stern, 2006). Over time, they may come to feel that they know these characters just as well as their real-world friends or neighbors. This type of companionship and engagement leads to the formation of parasocial attachment. Viewers become so emotionally attached to the fictional characters in many cases, that when a character dies or when a TV shows ends, viewers become very emotionally upset (Net Industries: Education-Knowledge-Information, 2012). In relation to product placement, since viewers can form such close relationships with characters, they are believed to accept them as role models of correct product decisions (Russell & Stern, 2006). TV shows such as Sex and the City, Desperate Housewives, Friends and Seinfeld that have been running for several years, have given viewers an opportunity to develop deep and powerful relationships with the program characters. Nevertheless, individuals are different, consequently it is not expected that all viewers form parasocial attachments to characters.
Based on this parasocial literature, the influence from characters on viewers is assumed to play an important role, as the parasocial attachment can strengthen the transfer of positive attitudes and meaningful associations as suggested with the balance theory. This attachment is believed to increase the effectiveness of product placements and have a positive influence on brand equity.

Attitudes are considered an important determinant when measuring brand equity, as they form the overall evaluation of a brand in terms of how much a person likes or dislikes it. Therefore, it becomes more likely that a brand is purchased when attitudes toward it are favorable. Depending upon what beliefs customers hold for a brand, marketing communications such as product placement, gives an opportunity to create, increase, maintain, modify, or change existing brand attitudes (Percy & Elliot, 2009).

3.4 Hierarchy of Effects

In order to understand how product placement can influence consumers’ attitudes toward a brand, an overview of how consumers process information provided by marketing communication is needed. This refers to what goes on in the mind of people, after being exposed to any kind of marketing activity (Percy & Elliot, 2009).

How consumers’ process information can be explained through hierarchy of effects. These models consist of three different stages that consumers go through before they can develop attitudes toward a brand. When responding to marketing communications, consumers go through cognitive, affective and conative stages, also recognized as think-feel-do sequence.

*Cognitive stage:* When a person is exposed to information, mental processing occurs. This mental (thinking) process leads to awareness and knowledge about the communicated brand. A person becomes through cognition aware of the brand.

*Affective stage:* A person responds to the brand emotionally and associates the advertised brand with his or her feelings. At this stage, attitudes toward the brand are formed.

*Conative stage:* Concerns behavioral actions that a person engages in, such as buying or talking about the advertised brand.

It is assumed that consumers go through these different stages in this exact order. Before they can form an attitude toward a specific brand, consumers have to become aware of the brand and know something about it. When attitudes have been formed, consumers decide whether they want to buy
the brand or not. Disagreement about whether consumers respond to marketing messages in this order only exists. Hence, alternative models have been developed that propose different orderings (Pelsmacker, Geuens, & Van den Bergh, 2010).

The reason for this is due to perceived risk, fiscal or psychological, that consumers are confronted with when choosing, or buying a product or service. If there is a perceived risk in a purchase, consumers think more carefully whether they want to buy the product or not. When there is perceived risk in a product decision, the decision process is described as high-involvement, but low-involvement when the decision process includes little perceived risk (Percy & Elliot, 2009).

![Figure 5. Three Hierarchies of Effects](image)

Source: Solomon et al. (2010)

When deciding to buy a high-involvement product, consumers are believed to go through the standard learning hierarchy, as they want to gather information first and weigh alternatives before taking any action. In the low-involvement hierarchy, consumers act on the ground of limited knowledge, and from thereon form attitudes about the brand after having experienced the product. The experiential hierarchy proposes that consumers act on their emotional reactions obtained from the marketing message, and form their attitudes based on how the product or service made them feel (Solomon et al., 2010).
Despite the possibility of different ordering, this thesis is not set to investigate which route applies for the respondents. Since the aim is to measure the influence of product placement on brand equity, respondents base their evaluations on cognitive and affective outcomes. Whether respondents actually buy the brand after seeing and/or hearing the product placement cannot be examined, even though they might say they would. Moreover, even though conative components are said to have an influence on brand attitudes, most people studying consumer behavior see it as a separate idea, and therefore see brand attitude as made of only cognitive and affective components (Percy & Elliot, 2009).

3.5 Informational/Transformational Advertising

Mentioned in the section above, brand attitudes can be seen as the fundamental reason behind how people behave. This behavior is also known as motivation. When people are evaluating brands or making purchase decisions, they base their decisions on their motivations. These motivations can either be negative (negatively originated), when people want to remove or avoid a specific problem, or positive, when people want to ‘feel’ good or seek personal satisfaction. Based on these different kinds of motivations, advertising strategies tempt to address these dissimilar motivational factors, in order to influence people’s attitudes toward the brand in a positive way (Percy & Elliot, 2009).

According to Puto and Wells (1984) marketing messages are either informational or transformational. Informational advertising is a message strategy used to provide information about the advertised product, or as Puto and Wells (1984) define it “one which provides consumers with factual, relevant brand data in a clear and logical manner such that they have greater confidence in their ability to assess the metrics of buying the brand after having seen the advertisement” (p. 638). This strategy is rational in its appeal, and is used when consumers are negatively motivated, where the benefit that will resolve or avoid the problem is presented (Percy & Elliot, 2009).

With transformational advertising, the idea is to “associate the experience of using (consuming) the advertised brand with a unique set of psychological characteristics which would not typically be associated with the brand experience to the same degree without exposure to the advertisement” (Puto & Wells, 1984, p. 638). This strategy is used when consumers are positively motivated, thus, unlike informational strategies, products are associated with certain feelings, images, or meanings that then transform the experience of using the product. With this, consumers are offered a special experience that is different from when using a similar brand in such a way that “consumers cannot
It can therefore be said, that a part from background product placements that are driven by classical conditioning, audio/visual placements are either informational or transformational. Russell (1998) however argues, that unlike traditional advertising, the intention with product placement is not to inform viewers about a specific product. Even though informational product placement can benefit from showing how the product works, she thinks that transformational product placement benefits more by associating the brand with an experience or a specific feeling.

Although majority of audio/visual product placements can be categorized as transformational, informational product placements are seen on the television screen. This raises an interest to investigate if there is any difference in effectiveness amongst these two strategies, as Russell (1998) argues that transformational product placements are more beneficial. Since brand attitudes are considered the fundamental reason behind how people behave, it is interesting to investigate whether there is any difference in how viewers think and feel about the brand if the placement is informational or transformational.

The definitions of informational and transformational placements can be viewed as two extremes. In practice, transformational placements sometimes contain product information and informational placements mention product facts without solving a problem (negative motivation). The categorization of product placements into informational or transformational, even though they are less extreme, is therefore done by considering whether they emphasize facts or feelings.

### 3.6 Persuasion Knowledge

Over time, consumers become knowledgeable about the methods marketers use when they are trying to persuade people to choose a specific product over another. With the development of this knowledge, also known as persuasion knowledge, consumers are able to identify how, when, and why a message is designed to influence them. When consumers detect this persuasion attempt, it can lead them to counter-argue the marketing message, which can result in development of negative attitudes toward the brand (Friestad & Wright, 1994).

The persuasiveness of a message can be affected if the consumer feels a reporting bias from the message communicator. For instance, if an endorser is advertising a product, people make inferences that this particular person was paid to say good things about the product. So, if consumers have an
impression that the message communicator is not transmitting honest and accurate information, the persuasiveness of the message is diminished, making the message communicator look insincere and manipulative in the eye of the consumer. Placing a product in movies or TV shows is therefore seen to be advantageous, as it is less likely that consumers will think that the spokesperson had something to gain financially from the persuasion attempt. Since actors are not hired on behalf of the company representing the brand, but the production company, consumers are believed to be more willing to accept their messages (Balasubramanian, 1994; Gupta et al., 2000).

Compared to traditional advertising, product placement is beneficial, as marketers are able to hide their persuasion attempt. Even though viewers notice the placed product, there is a thin line of making it fit in with the story line, and not expose the product so becomes too obvious. If this is done in an appropriate way, viewers may not perceive it as a persuasive message. However, brands placed in movies or TV shows need to compete for attention against a rich array of stimuli. This applies to the plot, characters, costumes and most importantly other brands. This competition can lead marketers to think that their brand may be overlooked, therefore making them take a more drastic approach, in order to make their brands more apparent. This could be a disadvantage for the brand, as it becomes the highlight of a scene, viewers may think it is more likely that the product is being placed there in order to persuade them, hence activating their persuasion knowledge, just as when being exposed to traditional advertising (Kong & Hung, 2012).

Even though persuasion knowledge evolves from firsthand experiences, it differs between individuals. Whether it is learned from interactions with friends, family, co-workers, through advertising, or other marketing tactics, research demonstrates little knowledge about its occurrence (Campbell & Kirmani, 2000; Friestad & Wright, 1994). It is believed that with informational product placements, viewers are more likely to use their persuasion knowledge, if they already have it. This is because the placed brand becomes a focal point of attention, as the placement looks more or less like a mini advertisement. This obvious focus on the brand makes the placement seem too obvious and therefore eliciting counter-argumentation, which leads to negative attitudes toward the brand. Transformational product placements on the other hand seem more natural, as viewers do not spend much time on analyzing why they are there, therefore making access to persuasion knowledge less likely (Russell, 2002). To give a more comprehensive picture of the chosen theories, the next section extracts the main points from the theoretical framework addressed in this chapter.
3.7 Summary

When consumers react more favorably to a marketing activity of a specific brand compared if the same marketing activity is used for an unnamed product or a service, a brand is said to have positive customer-based brand equity. Hence, it is a challenge for marketers to make sure that customers have the right type of experiences with their products and services, as they ultimately become linked to the brand.

With the application of the customer mindset to the CBBE model, it becomes possible to explore how viewers respond to product placements, and accordingly detect to what extent it influences brand equity. The five dimensions of the customer mindset are used to measure the influence, so it is investigated if product placement has an effect on awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity.

When measuring the influence that product placement has on brand awareness, the dual coding theory proposes that the human mind consists of two separate classes of subsystems; verbal and visual. Memory is therefore stored at two different locations and activity in one system can trigger activity in the other. Due to this, the opportunity to remember a word or an image increases, since memory traces are greater.

Product placements can benefit from leveraging on secondary brand associations. By linking a brand to an entity, such as a television character that has its own associations may influence how consumers perceive the brand. It can be said that product placement is a form of classical conditioning, as pairing a brand with a well-liked character can start drawing out similar responses to the brand, because it has been associated with the character. However, this is believed to happen unconsciously, so the viewer does not know when the transfer happens. The balance theory on the other hand suggests that viewers alter their attitudes toward a brand based on their liking with a television character. According to the theory, a state of tension exist if there is an inconsistency in the triangle, and therefore viewers adjust their attitudes toward the brand and perceive it in the same way as the character perceives it, hence restoring the balance. The opportunity to form a strong relationship with television characters enhances with TV shows, because they are being aired more frequently. In some cases, viewers start forming intimate bonds with characters, which is in line with the parasocial theory, stating that viewers tend to get parasocially attached to or fictional characters they perceive as real. This parasocial attachment is therefore considered to ease the transfer of positive attitudes and meaningful associations from the character to the brand.
This leveraging on secondary brand associations is believed to be very important when measuring to what extent product placement influences brand equity, as viewers may make brand decisions based on the associations they have linked the brand to. Hence, if associations and positive brand attitudes are transferred to the brand, it becomes more likely that the brand will be purchased.

Furthermore, the chapter addressed how consumers process information after being exposed to any kind of marketing activity. Before consumers can form an attitude toward a brand, they need to become aware and be knowledgeable about the brand. When an attitude has been formed, they decide whether they want to buy the brand or not. Consumers’ evaluations are therefore based on cognitive and affective outcomes. Based on this theoretical background, this thesis is set to answer the first sub-question introduced in Chapter 1:

What effect does product placement have on viewers’ awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity?

Informational advertising strategies provide information about the advertised product, and transformational strategies try to tap into people’s emotions. Although the majority of product placements are categorized as transformational, informational product placements are used, which raises an interest to investigate if there is any difference in effectiveness between these two strategies.

According to the persuasion knowledge theory, consumers may counter-argue a marketing message if they detect a persuasion attempt, which can result in development of negative attitudes toward the brand. Because informational product placements include facts they become rather obvious in the scene and viewers may think the product is being placed in the TV show in order to persuade them. Informational product placements are therefore believed to activate viewers’ persuasion knowledge, hence leading to the development of negative attitudes toward the brand. As transformational product placements are seen to be more natural, access to persuasion knowledge becomes less likely. These considerations lead to the answering of the second sub-question:

Is there any difference among viewers how they think and feel about the brand if the placement is informational or transformational?

The chapter below discusses eight factors that are considered important in relation to product placement effectiveness on brand equity. Hypotheses are derived from each factor, which concludes with the drawing of a conceptual model, illustrating the relationships set to investigate.
4. Conceptual Framework

Associating Manolo Blahnik shoes with Carrie Bradshaw in HBO’s popular TV show *Sex and the City* has created attention among viewers, mainly females. The shoes have been associated with a character that is cool, stylish, and with a great sense of taste. This link that has been created between the placement and the brand is believed to have become a great success. By linking Carrie with the shoes, by wearing them and talking about them, may stimulate women to purchase the shoes, therefore questioning if traditional advertising could have generated the same results.

This process of leveraging secondary brand associations when watching a TV leads to affects being transferred from the character to the brand. Since positive and negative emotions can be evoked when watching a TV show, it is believed that these emotions draw out similar responses to the placed brand (Russell, 1998). Due to this, it becomes important to avoid negative-paired associations, as it can damage the image of the brand (Balasubramanian, 1994). Even though brand owners can control the exposure process, brands are sometimes being used without authorization from its owners. Usually, brand owners favor this free publicity, but if the brand is portrayed in a negative way it can hurt the brand’s image. Caterpillar for example sought for a temporary restraining order on the release of the Disney movie *George of the Jungle 2*. Their argument was based on the association of the Caterpillar equipment with the villains in the plot. By showing their equipment in such a negative light, the company was afraid that its brand would be tarnished (BBC News, 2003; Glickman & Lastman, 2012).

The growth of product placement has raised an interest in measuring its effectiveness. Evidently, it is essential to understand how this rapidly growing ‘new media’ influences consumers in how they respond to the placed brands. As already mentioned in Chapter 2, most placement studies have focused on brand awareness and attitudes toward placements in general (cognitive effects). Less attention has been given toward measures of product placements effectiveness in relation to brand attitudes, preferences, emotions and purchasing behavior (affective and conative outcomes) (Balasubramanian, Karrh, & Patwardhan, 2006).

In addition to measure the impact product placement has on cognitive effects, this thesis therefore tries to shed some light into the areas that have gained less focus among researchers, affective and conative outcomes.
Balasubramanian et al. (2006) have presented an integrative model, which includes various variables or factors (collected from previous studies) that are considered likely to influence the effectiveness of product placements. Taking a departure from this model, the authors have chosen factors that are believed to be relevant for this study and added three, in order to create a more holistic picture. Balasubramanian et al. (2006) argue that factors such as modality, brand familiarity, program involvement, judgment of placement fit, and attitudes toward placements in general, all need to be taken into consideration when measuring to what extent product placement influences consumers’ responses. Furthermore, Russell and Stern (2006) discuss the importance of the influence that television characters can have on viewers. Accordingly, the authors have added three supplementary factors, character liking, viewer-character relationship, and transformational vs. informational placements into the framework, each factor is presented below.

4.1 Modality

Modality represents different product placement strategies and is categorized depending on the mode that the product placement is shown as. Each mode provides brand information differently; hence, it determines how the placement is transmitted to the viewer, which therefore has an influence on how the brand message is perceived (Gupta & Lord, 1998).

The product placement strategies are categorized in three modes inspired by Russell (1998), which are two single modes; visual and audio, and a dual mode; audio/visual.

The **visual dimension**: The visual mode shows the product or the brand. This placement is solely visual, which means that no audio track supports the visual placement.

The **audio dimension**: The audio mode verbally mentions the brand name or another relevant brand related message. This type of product placement is therefore written into the TV show’s script. The brand is not visually presented during this mode.

The **audio/visual dimension**: The audio/visual mode is a combination of the two other modes. Here the product placement is shown visually on the screen through a product, logo or another visual brand identifier, while at the same time the brand or another relevant brand related message is being verbally mentioned.

Each of the three dimensions varies along a relative prominence scale, where one end is prominent and in the other end is subtle. The prominence scale can position product placement in relation to
how central a placement is to the audience’s focus (Gupta & Lord, 1998). A prominent placement is one that is made highly noticeable, for instance by long exposure time, central to the plot of the TV show, the size or camera focus. Subtle product placement on the other hand has lower exposure time, is in less focus or smaller in size, perhaps as a background prop.

The dual coding theory proposed by Paivio in 1979 can be used to theoretically describe the expected differences in the effectiveness for each of the product placement modes (Russell, 1998). According to the theory, the verbal subsystem processes the audio product placement and the visual subsystem processes the visual product placement. An audio product placement is therefore only stored in the verbal memory and a visual product placement is only saved in the imagery memory. The dual coding theory argues that audio/visual product placement is easier to retrieve from memory, due to the placement being stored in both verbal and imagery memory.

Theoretically, audio/visual product placement should be more effective in creating brand awareness, as recall and recognition is higher when both the visual and verbal subsystems have the opportunity to process the placement. Empirical findings have also supported the dual coding theory, as Brennan and Babin (2004) discovered that brand recognition in audio/visual product placement exceeded brand recognition of visual product placement.

Considering the effectiveness of the single modes, audio and visual product placements, different theoretical approaches exist that argue for the effectiveness of audio over visual and vise versa.
Russell (1998) argues, based on findings in consumer behavior that disagreements exist, because people have individual processing styles, which means that it is different from person to person, whether one processes verbal cues or visual cues better. This means that individuals with verbal processing styles will allocate more attention to audio product placements, whereas individuals with visual processing styles will allocate more attention to visual product placements. Based on Russell’s (1998) argumentation, is it not possible to generalize about the effectiveness of visual over audio product placements or vice versa, as the authors of this thesis do not know which processing style their respondents has. Thus, it will only be investigated whether audio/visual product placements are more effective than visual and audio product placements.

Based on the dual coding theory, it is argued that audio/visual product placements produce higher brand awareness compared to the single modes, visual or audio. The following hypothesis is therefore derived:

\[
\text{H1: Compared to visual and audio product placements, audio/visual product placements create higher brand awareness.}
\]

As from now on, the first factor considered to have an influence on brand equity has been presented, which is related to different types of product placement strategies. This factor is only linked to brand awareness (the bottom of the CBBE hierarchy), because a placement cannot be presented without being categorized in one of the three modes. Due to the fact that audio/visual placements are considered to be the most effective in creating awareness, this type of placement will be used to investigate the other factors that can influence higher up in the CBBE hierarchy. Hence, modality is the foundation from where other factors can influence brand equity. The other factors are addressed below.

### 4.2 Brand Familiarity

Brand familiarity is another element that is considered to be an important factor when determining the influence of product placement, especially on brand awareness. Brennan & Babin (2004) affirm that familiar brands are more likely to be remembered than unfamiliar brands.

Brand familiarity relates to the experiences that consumers have had with a specific product, whether it is through usage, advertising, word of mouth, or other consumer related activities (Keller, 1993). When brands are unfamiliar, consumers have little or no knowledge about them, as they are
either new on the market, or consumers have not been exposed to them yet (Campbell & Keller, 2003). Due to prior and repeated exposure to a brand, consumers should be more likely to recognize and recall a brand when being exposed to it (Keller, 1993). The reasoning for this relates to the knowledge structure held in consumers’ memory, or the number of associations that consumers already hold as a result of the prior exposure to the brand. Familiar and unfamiliar brands differ in terms of this knowledge structure, as consumers tend to have a collection of associations for familiar brands. Consumers may have tried or used the brand, or they may have friends and families that have tried or used the brand that have told them about their experiences. They might as well have seen marketing communications or previous advertisements for the brand, or may know the color, package, or what the product is used for from the press. Because consumers have not had any of these experiences with unfamiliar brands, they lack associations (Campbell & Keller, 2003), which are considered crucial in order to influence brand awareness.

Since familiar brands hold more associations in consumers’ memory, Delgado-Ballester, Navarro, & Sicilia (2012) argue that less effort is required when consumers process information about familiar brands, as it is easier to retrieve and store the information. This is in line with Brennan and Babin’s (2004) statement that familiar brands are likely to benefit from “encoding advantages” (p. 193) compared to unfamiliar brands. Moreover, consumers are also believed to be willing to spend more time on cognitive effort when processing a message, as they may link previous experiences to the brand (Scott & Craig-Lees, 2006).

Based on this, it is argued that if viewers are familiar with a brand, it becomes more likely that they will notice the product when it is placed in a TV show. It is therefore believed that product placements containing familiar brands are recognized and recalled more easily, compared to product placements comprised of unfamiliar brands. Hence, the following hypothesis is derived:

\[ H2a: \text{Compared to unfamiliar brands, familiar brands obtain higher level of brand awareness.} \]

Seeing that familiar brands will accomplish higher levels of brand awareness compared to unfamiliar brands, it is assumed that familiar brands also have a positive influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. This is due to already established brand associations in respondent’s memory, and because they are holding some attitudes toward the brand. Thereby, they are believed to be more willing to process the message, as the brand is familiar to them. Consequently, it is further hypothesized that:
4.3 Placement Fit

Regardless of the media used, product placement needs to have a fit in order to be noticed by the audience, and in such a way that the brand image will not be harmed (Williams et al., 2011). Product placement fit concerns the integration of the placed brand into the TV show and how well this integration is done. Placement fit is therefore an important factor to consider, as the amount of fit will affect how the audience memorize the brand, and how persuasive the brand is. Product placement fit deals with matching the placed brand and the TV show so it seems like the brand is a natural part of the TV show. This is important, as it makes sure that the placed brand is being communicated correctly to the audience (Balasubramanian et al., 2006). For that reason, the storyline, the characters and how the brand is being used all play important roles in the effectiveness of product placements (Su et al., 2011).

Russell (2002) divides product placement fit in two categories; congruent placements and incongruent placements, where congruent placements have a match between the chosen modality and the connection to the plot, whereas incongruent placements have a mismatch between the chosen modality and the plot. Examples of incongruent product placements is a visual placement, which is very prominent even though it is not relevant to the storyline; hence, the placement becomes too obvious as it takes focus away from the action. It could also be an audio placement, where the brand or brand identifiers are mentioned without having context to the rest of the dialogue in the TV show.

Russell (2002) argues that there is a non-linear memory-attitude relationship, which can be applied to the congruent/incongruent product placement categorization. According to her, incongruent product placement stimulates cognitive elaboration, and because the audience perceives the

\[
\begin{align*}
H2b: & \text{ Compared to unfamiliar brands, familiar brands positively influence brand associations.} \\
H2c: & \text{ Compared to unfamiliar brands, familiar brands positively influence brand attitudes.} \\
H2d: & \text{ Compared to unfamiliar brands, familiar brands positively influence brand attachment.} \\
H2e: & \text{ Compared to unfamiliar brands, familiar brands positively influence brand activity.}
\end{align*}
\]
placement unnatural, it creates attention to the placement and thereby increases brand awareness. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

| H3a: Incongruent product placements create higher brand awareness than congruent product placements. |

Incongruent placements catch the audiences’ attention, due to the misfit between the brand and the TV show’s storyline. According to Russell (2002) this misfit creates adversely attitudes toward the placement, explaining the non-linear memory-attitude relationship. Negative attitudes toward the brand occur, because the audience question why the brand is inserted in the TV show, as it seems unnatural. This can trigger the audiences’ resistance toward advertising and the generation of negative attitudes. As a result, the audiences do not rise further up in the CBBE hierarchy. Congruent product placements on the other hand are more natural and audiences’ attitudes are more likely to be more positive, as their resistance and counter argumentation against advertising is not provoked. Henceforth, the following hypotheses are derived:

| H3b: Congruent product placements positively influence brand associations compared to incongruent product placements. |
| H3c: Congruent product placements positively influence brand attitudes compared to incongruent product placements. |
| H3d: Congruent product placements positively influence brand attachment compared to incongruent product placements. |
| H3e: Congruent product placements positively influence brand activity compared to incongruent product placements. |

### 4.4 Character Liking

Character liking is the fourth factor believed to influence brand equity. The difference between movies and TV shows is based on the character’s story, which usually ends with the movie. TV shows are known for its recurrence (Russell, 1998), consisting of the same characters, “designed to be familiar, recognizable, and stereotypical” (Russell & Stern, 2006, p. 8).

Viewers may for the first time respond to characters by liking them or disliking them, but over time, they become familiar with them, and whether based on behavior, appearance or other personal
elements, they make inferences about them. After watching many episodes for a long period of time, a one-way relationship can be created between the viewers and the television characters. This relationship is built on several reasons, such as the viewer feeling close to the character, similarity to the character, attraction to the character, or desire to be just like the character (Cohen, 2001). Hence, it is not just the exposure of the placed brand that influences viewers’ attitudes toward it, but more the way in the characters interact with the brand (Su et al., 2011). If viewers like the characters, it is assumed to be more likely that they respond more positively to the brand.

Russell and Stern (2006) argue that consumers align their attitudes toward products in the same way that characters do. In order to understand how this relationship between the character and the viewer influences the viewer’s perception of the brand, one can take a closer look at the balance theory. The theory proposes that if a character likes a product, the viewer will also like the product if he or she likes the character. If inconsistency occurs in the character-viewer-brand triangle, the viewer strives for balance by altering his or her attitudes. The stronger the relationship is between the character and the viewer, the more likely it becomes that positive attitudes and meaningful associations transfer from the character to the brand.

By liking a character the viewer can replace some of his or her own identity with the identity of the character, due to identification with this character (Cohen, 2001). Although the viewer may not be able to ‘become’ the character, some parts of the persona can be adopted with using the same products as used by the character (Karrh, 1998). The Ray-Ban’s Wayfarer sunglasses worn by Tom Cruise in the movie Top Gun became enormously popular (Balasubramanian, 1994). Tom Cruise played such a cool character, and it is believed that the people, who bought the sunglasses, were trying to embrace his characteristics.

Pairing a product with a character that is liked by the viewer is thought to increase product placement effectiveness. The character has already some kind of a knowledge structure or associations in the mind of the viewer, and since the character’s personality is associated with the product, it is believed to establish a stronger message approval (Avery & Ferraro, 2000). It is therefore assumed that viewer’s awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity is positively influenced by liking a character, as the respondent will pay more attention to what the character does in the TV shows. Following hypotheses are derived:

\textit{H4a: Liking a character will have a positive influence on brand awareness.}

\textit{H4b: Liking a character will have a positive influence on brand associations.}
4.5 Viewer-Character Relationship

Before continuing further, it is seen important to make a distinction between the factor presented before, character liking and viewer-character relationship. They may seem similar, but they are based on different constructs; and therefore may lead to differences in product placement effectiveness. While character liking refers to how viewers align their attitudes based on positively inclinations toward a character, viewer-character relationship refers to the degree of closeness to a character (Russell & Stern, 2006).

Viewer-character relationship is a variable explaining the strength of the relationship between viewers and characters. Since viewers can form strong relationships with characters, it is believed that characters can draw viewers’ attention to the placed brand, and further influence their associations and attitudes. Even though (as mentioned earlier) it is thought unlikely that product placement alone as a marketing communication activity influences attachment/activity, or the last building block in the CBBE pyramid, this variable is considered as one of the strongest, and thereby the most influential. If any factor can create such an intense relationship with a brand, it is believed to be this one.

Viewers do every now and then think they have a special bond with media characters, where they feel that they personally know them (Eyal & Cohen, 2006). Because of repeated viewing of episodes portraying characters in social interaction, intense relationships are be developed. Due to this frequent exposure to characters, viewers start to care about the characters, talk to others about them, and interact with them as if they were real persons. Eventually, they may come to feel that they know these characters just as well as their real-world friends (Russell & Stern, 2006). TV shows that air regularly ease the opportunity for viewers to develop a parasocial relationship with characters (Russell et al., 2004).

This creation of parasocial relationship is in line with Horton and Wohl’s parasocial theory, which states that viewers have a tendency to be attached to fictional characters they believe to be real. It has been identified by media researchers that television characters have the potential to serve as
behavioral models (Russell & Stern, 2006). Russell et al. (2004) found in their study that referential influences occur via parasocial interactions. The stronger the parasocial relationship, the more likely characters are to become referent others, which results in greater influence on viewers. Russell and Puto (1999) found that viewers tend to identify with characters the closer they become, and even accept them as role models of correct product decisions. Based on this parasocial literature and the fact that parasocial relationships have not been used to measure the true impact of advertising until recently (Sue et al., 2011), it is considered essential to include when measuring product placement effectiveness.

To demonstrate the power of a relationship between a viewer and a character, one can take a closer look at Rachel in Friends that was known for her beautiful long hair. The most spectacular trend-setting phenomena occurred when this popular character cut her hair shorter. Girls and women ran in groups to the hair saloon to ask for the ‘Rachel’ haircut and in a very short time, the hairstyle had spread across the US (Russell & Puto, 1999). In this case, Rachel is seen as a referent other, and by having hair hairstyle help viewers constructing their identity.

Russell et al., (2004) have presented evidence that products placed in a program do affect cognitive measures in relation to parasocial relationships, but point out the need to study these effects at the affective and conative level. Consequently, this study explores to what extent viewer-character relationship influences awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. It is believed that the stronger the relationship between viewers and characters, positive associations and attitudes are more likely to be developed. Moreover, the stronger the relationship, the more likely it is to influence attachment/activity, as viewers are believed to have a stronger desire to copy the characters’ action. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

- **H5a**: Strong viewer-character relationship will have a positive influence on brand awareness.
- **H5b**: Strong viewer-character relationship will have a positive influence on brand associations.
- **H5c**: Strong viewer-character relationship will have a positive influence on brand attitudes.
- **H5d**: Strong viewer-character relationship will have a positive influence on brand attachment.
4.6 Program Involvement

Viewers can like a TV show without liking a specific character. If viewers like a TV show they are more involved and feel more connected to it. This is important as, “viewer’s involvement with a program’s content influences the effectiveness of its embedded placements” (Bhatnagar, Aksoy & Malkoc, 2004 in Balasubramanian et al., 2006, p. 129). The more involved viewers are with a TV show, they tend to follow it more frequently, pay more attention to it, interact with other program fans, have rituals surrounding the viewing experience or imitate program behaviour (Russell, 1998). Furthermore, it can mean that these involved viewers do not perceive embedded brands as commercial objectives (Balasubramanian et al., 2006). Thus, involved viewers of a TV show are more acceptable of product placements and more open to being influenced by these. As it is more and more common today that people search the media landscape for brands that can express their identity, it is reasonable to consider that brands used as product placements are used to express people’s identity as well (Balasubramanian et al., 2006). Hence, the more involved viewers are with a program, the more likely they will use embedded brands in that show to express themselves. They will therefore also pay more attention to the product placements to find brands that can utilize their personality, thus program involvement can influence brand equity. The following hypotheses are therefore derived:

- **H6a**: Program involvement will positively increase brand awareness.
- **H6b**: Program involvement will positively increase brand association.
- **H6c**: Program involvement will positively increase brand attitudes.
- **H6d**: Program involvement will positively increase brand attachment.
- **H6e**: Program involvement will positively increase brand activity.

4.7 Attitudes Toward Placements

Another factor, which should be considered, is the audiences’ attitudes toward product placement in general. People have become more knowledgeable about advertising tactics; hence, they have also become more sceptic about advertising. Scepticism is according to Balasubramanian et al. (2006) “a defence mechanism triggered when a message recipient is presented with information that strains...
credibility, involves the suspension of belief” (p. 128). Gupta et al. (2000) found empirical evidence for the fact that the more scepticism people hold toward product placement, the less positive attitudes are produced, and people who were less sceptic held more positive attitudes toward product placements. It is therefore interesting to investigate if there is a correlation between the attitudes the respondents have toward product placement in general and brand equity. Hence, it is hypothesized that:

\begin{verbatim}
H7a: Positive attitudes toward product placement will positively influence brand awareness
H7b: Positive attitudes toward product placement will positively influence brand associations.
H7c: Positive attitudes toward product placement will positively influence brand attitudes.
H7d: Positive attitudes toward product placement will positively influence brand attachment.
H7e: Positive attitudes toward product placement will positively influence brand activity.
\end{verbatim}

4.8 Informational vs. Transformational

As mentioned before, marketing messages according to Puto and Wells (1984) are either informational or transformational, where informational advertisements provide information or facts about the advertised product, and transformational advertisements associate the product with certain feelings, images, or meanings that then transform the experience of using the product. With transformational advertisements, consumers are therefore offered a special experience that is different from when using a similar brand. By applying this in relation to product placement, Russell (1998) argued that even though informational product placements can benefit from illustrating how a product works, transformational product placements are considered more suitable.

Kong and Hung (2012) investigated product placement in TV drama in relation to information-overload placements and found that even though viewers better remembered the information-overload placements, they did not guarantee an increase in brand attitudes. They therefore suggested that if marketers are aiming to enhance product attitudes, large amount of product
information should be avoided. If the aim on the other hand were to boost brand awareness of a new product, an information-overloaded placement would be more beneficial, as it draws viewers’ attention from the story and increases cognitive effort toward the placed brand. The reasoning for the non-increase in brand attitudes can be associated with the persuasion knowledge. Since the placed brand becomes the center of attention and looks more like a mini advertisement, it seems obtrusive, and therefore prompts counter-argumentation. This can lead to negative attitudes being transferred to the brand (Russell, 2002).

Even though it is believed that there is a difference between information-overloaded placements investigated by Kong and Hung (2012) and informational placements, they are still assumed to generate similar responses by viewers. Just mentioning some functional elements of the brand is believed to trigger a persuasion attempt, therefore activating viewers’ persuasion knowledge, leading to formation of negative attitudes toward the brand. Since transformational placements seem more natural, access to persuasion knowledge is less likely (Russell, 2002). Thus, it is stated that:

**S1:** Compared to transformational product placement, viewers develop more negative attitudes toward the placed brand if the product placement is informational.

Moreover, Kong and Hung (2012) focused in their study on character involvement. The results showed that the negative effects of information-overloaded placements diminished if viewers were involved with the television characters. Because viewers are involved with the characters, they become less critical and thereby more likely to accept the overloaded placement. It is therefore further stated that:

**S2:** Liking a character diminishes the negative attitudes toward the placed brand that result from informational product placements.

Based on the above-mentioned factors presented in this chapter, a conceptual model has been derived in order to give the reader a clearer picture of what relationships the thesis is set to investigate so the research question can be answered. All factors are believed to influence brand equity and as seen in Figure 6, it illustrates how each research hypothesis and research statement is connected to awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity.
Figure 7. Conceptual Model

Source: Own creation
5. Methodology

The following chapter outlines and justifies the research methodology chosen for this research, in order to achieve the desired research objectives. The chapter starts with addressing the main purpose and approach of this thesis and then attends to the research design. In order to answer the overall research question, two data collection techniques are employed and they are discussed in details below.

5.1 Research Purpose & Approach

As stated in Chapter 1, the overall research question of this thesis is to investigate to what extent product placement in TV shows influences brand equity. The objective of this thesis is therefore to (1) gain insights into the effectiveness of product placement by reviewing and exploring previous studies and relevant literature on product placement, consumer behavior and marketing. (2) Identify relevant factors that are considered to influence product placement effectiveness in relation to brand equity by developing a conceptual model and (3) empirically test the conceptual model to detect associations between variables.

For this thesis, an exploratory research with a deductive approach seemed most appropriate, seeing that limited knowledge existed about product placement effectiveness on viewers and regarding the phenomena in general (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2007). Existing literature and previous studies on product placement formed the starting point and provided ground for the theoretical framework used in this study. This enabled the authors to detect the most important factors that are considered to have an influence on brand equity. The research was formalized and hypotheses and statements were deduced; hence, turning the research in a descriptive direction, which provided an opportunity to give a clear picture of what kind of data needed to be collected.

To provide a solid foundation for data collection, both quantitative and qualitative researches were chosen. Through a relatively structured approach the deduced hypotheses were investigated in a quantitative research in order to detect general trends about the effectiveness of product placement in TV shows. Furthermore, the qualitative research investigated the statements that aided to get insights and understanding from participants in relation to the effectiveness between informational and transformational product placements.
To test the derived hypotheses and statements, concepts had to be operationalized to ensure that they were transformed into clear researchable entities (Saunders et al., 2007). Thereafter, data was collected and analyzed, which made it possible to discover if there were any associations between the independent variables and awareness, associations, attitudes, and attachment/activity.

A strict deductive approach is seen as a linear process that does not leave much room for flexibility. Therefore, the inductive approach was applied to create adaptability. The inductive approach enabled the authors to modify during the working process, by going back and forth in their written work and mindset. As more and more knowledge was gained about the product placement field, new ideas emerged, and old ideas were altered in order to ensure the strongest research possible (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The deductive approach was used to structure the research almost throughout the entire period, until in the final stages of thesis process, where the inductive approach was utilized, as the analysis revealed which hypotheses and statements were supported or rejected based on the empirical findings. The experience and knowledge gained from working with the empirical data summed up the results and observations in the analysis. Thereafter, a loop was created back to the initial conceptual framework and the factors were revised based on the knowledge that was generated through the research enquiry and analysis. Hence, the conceptual model and factors were adapted in order to match the empirical findings (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

5.2 Quantitative Research

A cross-sectional survey design with the use of a quantitative questionnaire was considered the most suitable research strategy to test the deduced hypothesis. This choice was based on the research question, which seeks to find general trends about TV show viewers and how they are affected by product placement. Therefore, it needed to be examined if any associations between the independent variables (seven factors), derived in the conceptual framework, and brand equity existed. This research design allowed data to be collected from more than one person at a single point in time, and gave an opportunity to collect large amount of data, in a systematic and standardized manner (Bryman & Bell, 2011). By working with two or more variables, the data collected allowed the authors to examine whether any associations between the variables existed. Since data collected was standardized, it became possible to make direct comparisons among a large number of respondents, and tap into factors that were considered difficult to obtain with the use of other methods (Hair, Bush, & Ortinau, 2009). Moreover, based on the available resources, especially
the fact that the authors have a hand-in deadline for the thesis and a low research budget, a cross-sectional quantitative questionnaire was best suited, as it can be produced at a fairly low cost and distributed online free of charge.

An important consideration about the research design was that to empirically test the influence of the independent variables on brand equity, respondents needed to be directly exposed to a stimulus. This called for creating a video, containing product placement in TV shows for the respondents to watch. This direct exposure was considered necessary, as making a questionnaire about product placement in relation to the derived conceptual framework, without giving respondents examples to relate their answers to would not have provided sufficient results to answer the research question. In addition, investigating brand awareness that is considered a very important factor would not have been possible.

5.2.1 Stimuli

It was needed to show the respondents visual examples of TV shows containing three distinctive product placement modalities; visual, audio and audio/visual. Since the normal length of a TV show varies from approximately 20-40 minutes, it ruled out the opportunity to show an episode in full length, as it had been decided to post the survey online. Therefore, it was agreed upon to choose a show, view myriad of episodes, detect different types of product placements, and cut diverse scenes into a video clip that respondents could view on YouTube before answering the questionnaire.

The reasoning for cutting various scenes and creating a video clip that can be viewed online before answering the survey, was that alternative methods were either too expensive or too time consuming. The authors had no resources to produce a TV show and do laboratory manipulations. Furthermore, it was considered quite time consuming to collect enough responses by inviting respondents over, or ask them to see a full episode of a TV show by themselves, and then answer the survey. The tradeoff of this choice can accordingly create response biases, as the video clip and survey were seen and answered in an unrealistic TV show environment. With this method, the respondents might have realized the intent with the survey, even though product placement was not mentioned. Thus, if the respondents had been at home watching a TV show in full length, the survey might have generated different results.

To reduce the chance of biased responses, the video clip needed to look more similar to an actual TV show experience. Due to the importance of characters and how they are believed to have a great
influence on product placement effectiveness, showing examples from one TV show was not considered to be sufficient, by reason of differences between males and females. Therefore, it was decided to create two video clips with two different TV shows, where *The Big Bang Theory* and *Gossip Girl* were chosen as stimuli. *Gossip Girl* is believed to appeal more to female audiences and *The Big Bang Theory* to male audiences. Hence, selecting these two shows was considered to enable broader reach in respondents.

Both of the TV shows are very popular American productions, they have been aired in Denmark, and should be rather well known among the target population. Furthermore, they have a lot of product placements, and thus provided a good opportunity for data collection. Additionally, the reason for selecting these two particular TV shows, beside the above-mentioned arguments is that the shows also attract different kinds of placed brands. Brands placed in *Gossip Girl* are mostly high-involvement, thus more expensive compared to brands placed in *The Big Bang Theory*, which are more or less low-involvement. The boxes below provide a short description of each TV show.

### The Big Bang Theory

The comedy show *The Big Bang Theory* aired on TV in 2007 and is currently running its 6th season. The show is about the four nerdy scientists Sheldon, Leonard, Howard and Raj and the beautiful actress Penny. Penny lives across from Leonard and Sheldon. The boys use most of their time on computer/video games, comic books and science fictions movies, when they are not working in their laboratories. They have little social interaction with girls, but Penny is trying to learn them to be more sociable and less awkward. At the same time Leonard and Penny have an on off relationship, which the entire cast must deal with (IMDb).

### Gossip Girl

The drama show *Gossip Girl* aired on TV in 2007 and is currently running its 6th season. The show is about the rich and privileged teenagers Blair and Serena and their social circle and their extravagant life on New York’s Upper East Side. The show portraits the live that most people wished they had with luxurious lifestyle, shopping, fancy bars and restaurants, but also that life in not perfect for New York’s elite. A vast amount of drama exist due to rivalry for attention, who is the most popular, pressure and expectations from parents, fights over boyfriends and family problems (IMDb).
Each clip was around six minutes in length (Appendix B). Even though the authors would have chosen to create and show respondents a clip that lasted about three to four minutes, they were afraid that it would be too obvious that this research was about product placement. So, instead of cutting each scene right after the appearance of the brand/product, the scenes were evaluated and cut in accordance to the dialogue. If otherwise, it were assumed that the respondents would pay more attention to the inserted brands, consequently biasing the results, especially in relation to brand awareness.

The video clips also excluded informational product placements. Since informational product placements are not that common in TV shows, it was decided to leave them out and investigate the difference in effectiveness between informational and transformational placements separately. Adding informational placements in the research design would have been too complicated and not to mention that respondents would have had to spend more time on answering the questionnaire.

When making the video clips, it was sought to have a balance between the clips, so the amount of product placement in each clip was taken into consideration. The amount of audio/visual product placements was twelve in total, or six in each TV show. *Gossip Girl* included ten visual and five audio placements, and *The Big Bang Theory* included ten visual and three audio placements.

The scale of prominent and subtle product placement is relative (Gupta & Lord, 1998); hence, it became rather difficult to specify how prominent or subtle each product placement was. Nevertheless, based on the authors’ own judgment, all audio/visual and audio placements were characterized as prominent as they were either considered central on the screen, or important in the character’s dialogue. Majority of the visual placements were characterized as subtle, as they were used in the background or without visual focus, however some were considered prominent. An overview of all brands is presented in the figure below.
5.2.2 Survey Considerations

The questionnaire (Appendix C) was designed through SurveyMonkey and then distributed via Facebook on August 16th – September 4th. The purpose of the research was explained to the respondents, however the mentioning of product placement was left out. If respondents would have known what the survey was exactly about, it was believed they would have watched the video with an unnatural eye, and therefore biasing the results. They were informed that in order to answer the questionnaire, they needed to choose between watching two videos on YouTube, before answering the questions. They were asked to pay good attention to the video, and if possible, to watch it in full screen with headphones. The approximate time, 10-15 minutes to complete the survey was specified, and respondents were notified that answers would be completely anonymous.
The questions asked were all closed-ended questions, except for two questions related to unaided recall and aided recall, meaning that respondents chose appropriate answers from set of fixed alternatives. Although open-ended questions could have given more detailed information, closed-ended questions were chosen to ease the analyzing process. This allowed enhanced comparability of answers, were comparisons between respondents or type of respondents were clear and effortless. Moreover, it was easier to detect relationship between variables compared with if open-ended questions had been used. On the other hand, when respondents are given forced-choice answers, there might be variations in how they interpret them (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Using a survey with closed ended questions, also require formulating questions in a short and simple manner; thus, it can be difficult to express the exact theoretical meaning of the questions.

The questionnaire and the video clips were both in English. This choice was made because the survey was sent out through Facebook, whereas English would enable most nationalities to answer and thereby creating a larger sample. Furthermore, finding the clips in English without subtitles was the cheapest alternative. This choice might have given some possible respondents difficulties with the language, but they got sorted away either while reading the introduction, seeing the video clip or when answering incomprehensible questions. However, it was believed that most of the invited respondents would be sufficient in English, so the sample size was not harmed.

The questionnaire was pre-tested among fifteen people before being sent out. This was done to make sure that people would understand the questions and to assess the length of the survey. The respondents were asked to pay attention to words, phrases and instructions and point out and exemplify if the questions were confusing or difficult to understand (Hair et al., 2009). Few of the test people mentioned that the length of the survey was fine, but that the videos were rather long and therefore risking that people would not participate. This was taken into consideration, but since the videos had already been made, it was not possible to alter them and make them shorter. The authors took a risk, seeing that the survey could have generated a higher response rate by showing shorter videos. The section below gives a reason for each question asked in the survey and shows how the hypotheses have been operationalized.

5.2.2.1 Measurement Questions

To start with, respondents were asked to choose either to see a video clip from The Big Bang Theory or Gossip Girl. Depending on their choice, respondents were directed to a different place in the survey, which included two identical sets of questionnaire but adapted to each show. After that,
some general questions about age, gender, and nationality were asked with the use of simple category scale and multiple-choice single response scales, before turning to more complex questions related to the hypotheses.

**Awareness**

Starting at the lowest level in the CBBE hierarchy, several questions addressed brand awareness, which is also a part of hypothesis 1 (Modality). Unaided brand recall was tested first with a simple category scale, meaning whether the respondents remembered seeing and/or hearing any brands in the video clip. If they did see and/or hear any brands, they were asked to write all the brands they remembered down, therefore giving descriptive data. Respondents were then asked if they remembered seeing and/or hearing any brands when they were given cues. All product categories that appeared in the video clip were written down and they asked to write the brands down next to the product category. This question tested aided recall and was descriptive. Finally, brand recognition was tested with a multiple choice-multiple response scale. All the brands that appeared in the video clip were given, and they asked to mark all brands they remembered hearing and/or seeing. To have the test more sensitive, brands that did not appear in the video clip were also listed. In accordance with the dual coding theory, it was believed that audio/visual product placements are better noticed, and would therefore have a higher effect on brand awareness compared to visual only or audio only product placements.

**Associations – Attitudes – Attachment/Activity**

One question intended to see if there had been any change in brand associations among respondents. They were asked whether the video clip had an influence on what the audio/visual brands meant to them, or how they perceived the brand. A similar question was asked in relation to brand attitudes, where respondents had to answer whether the audio/visual brands in the video clip had any influence on how they feel and think about the brand. For both questions, respondents assessed the influence on a five-point likert scale, from (1) definitely had a negative influence to (5) definitely had a positive influence. Turning to the top of the CBBE hierarchy, questions related to attachment/activity addressed to what extent the respondent identified him- or her-self with the brands shown in the video and whether they considered buying and/or using the brands. Identification was assessed on a five-point likert scale, from (1) definitely don’t identify to (5) definitely identify and purchase behavior through a multiple choice-single response scale.
Hypothesis 2-7

The rest of the questions revolved around hypothesis 2-7. Brand familiarity was tested with a single response scale by listing all audio/visual brands that appeared in the video clip, and respondents were asked to mark if they were familiar with them or not. It was believed that familiar brands were more likely to be remembered than unfamiliar brands. When measuring Placement fit, respondents were asked if they thought there were a good match between the TV show and the audio/visual brands. Assessed on a five-point likert scale, from (1) definitely not a good match to (5) definitely a good match, it was assumed that incongruent product placements created more awareness than congruent product placements, but congruent placement believed to initiate more favorable attitudes toward the brand. With Character Liking, it became possible to see whether respondents liked the characters in the video clip, measured on a five-point likert scale, from (1) definitely dislike to (5) definitely like. Based on the balance theory, it was believed that if a character likes a product, the viewer would also like the product if he liked the character. It was also necessary to look at Viewer-Character relationship to find out whether the respondent was a fan of one or more of the characters in the chosen video clip. This is why it was considered essential to have more than one TV show for the respondents to choose from. The question was assessed with a simple category scale. According to the parasocial theory, it was assumed that the stronger the relationship between the respondent and the characters, the more likely positive associations and attitudes were to be developed, in addition it would influence attachment/activity, as respondents have a strong desire to copy the characters’ actions. With Program involvement, respondents were asked if they had seen the chosen TV show before with a simple category scale. If they had seen the TV show before, they were asked to indicate how often. With the use of three-point ordinal scale, it became possible to rank the answers, although the range was not equal between the variables. It was assumed that if respondents followed the show on a regular basis, they must like the show. Therefore being more likely to be more involved and feel more connected to it, hence paying more attention to product placements. Last but not least, in relation to Attitudes toward placements, respondents were asked to what extent they agreed with the following statement; ‘I am fine with the use of product placement in TV shows’. Respondents assessed this question on a five-point likert scale from (1) definitely disagree to (5) definitely agree. It was believed that less positive attitudes would be transferred to the brand if people were skeptical about the use of product placement and the other way around if they were less skeptical.
5.2.3 Sampling Considerations and Sample Characteristics

Data was collected through non-probability sampling techniques, convenience and snowball sampling, because non-probability sampling techniques are advised when the researcher has difficulties in specifying a population and resource constrains (Saunders et al., 2007).

On the grounds that no records or statistics were found about characteristics of TV show viewers, it raised a problem when identifying the exact population of the research. As the TV shows Gossip Girl and The Big Bang Theory were chosen to provide examples of product placements, people aged 13-40 years old were primarily chosen as the sampling unit because these were assumed to be the main target audience of these two American TV productions. Thus, measuring product placement effectiveness should involve investigating the influence on the main target audience.

Accordingly, convenience and snowball sampling techniques were seen as the best approaches to reach the primary target audience, since this type of respondents can be reached via Facebook. Hence, these methods allowed for posting the survey free of charge in a public event on Facebook, where respondents could invite all their Facebook friends, and these friends could invite their friends, thereby utilizing the snowball technique. A notice was posted to the event several times in order to remind people how important it would be for the sake of the research, to make some time available and answer the survey. Facebook was also seen as an appropriate medium as most of the authors’ friends were people in the age between 13-40. Moreover, this is also the age group that uses Facebook the most (Burbary, 2011). Thus, utilizing Facebook gave an opportunity to reach as many respondents as possible, through a geographically widely dispersed area at relatively low cost (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The aim of the sampling methods was to attract as many respondents as possible within the primary target audience, thereby trying to avoid a low response rate, which is a risk with self-completing questionnaires (Saunders et al., 2007). Besides, since the population was unknown, it was desirable to create a large sample for this research. Based on time constraints Facebook was seen as the most convenient place to post the survey, as it would be time consuming to find and collect the same amount of respondents through personal contact, email or telephone. The use of Facebook enabled the respondents to answer the survey when it suited them and the authors were also convinced that this medium would be the most effective, since Facebook is currently the most visited site on the internet and often checked several times a day (Burbary, 2011). Consequently, non-probability
sampling was chosen as the best solution to reach respondents for this research, although these sample techniques can also produce some biases.

The survey can create a self-selection bias, since respondents choose themselves whether to respond to the survey or not. The outcome of this could be low response rate and a less optimal sample (Blumberg, Cooper, & Schindler, 2008). However, as the authors did several things to prevent low response rate, such as sending out reminders, and due to the fact that the population is unknown, it was not possible to know if the sample had become less optimal due to this bias.

By exclusively choosing Facebook as a medium to distribute the survey, there was a possibility that respondents that are not members on Facebook have been left out. However, as the survey was voluntary, the chance of non-Facebook users not answering was the same as with the invited Facebook users. Some patterns between non-users and users might have appeared, but since the survey was about product placement in TV shows, it was seen irrelevant whether or not the respondents were Facebook members or not.

Due to the subjective nature of non-probability sampling techniques, subjective evaluation bias can occur. This bias can affect the research accuracy, since the optimal sample size is based on the authors subjective reasoning, instead of calculating the sample size based on probability sampling. This was however impossible, since the population was unknown (Blumberg et al., 2008). The authors’ goal with sending out the survey was to get at least 100 responses. This goal was based on the time frame, which was fourteen days where the survey was available to respondents and the time (15 min.) it took to complete the survey.

Total number of respondents that started the questionnaire was 195 but the final sample ended up containing 134 respondents. People that did not finish the questionnaire, people that did not see/hear any brands in the video clip, and those older than the sampling unit were sorted out. The authors’ subjective sample size goal was reached. The subjective evaluation bias and the use of non-probability sampling could influence the research’ external validity, as results based on the sample might not be generalizable to the entire population, as this is unknown. It was however seen as the only feasible method to find respondents, and therefore there was no choice but to compromise with the generalization of results.
5.2.4 Validity and Reliability

In order to determine the quality of this research, validity and reliability must be addressed. For a researcher, it is important to lay a foundation for the validity of the research and accordingly, the research design needs to be well established. Furthermore, the issue of reliability needs to be taken into consideration, as to claim for validity of the findings, measures must be reliable. Therefore, measures need to be stable and consistent (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

As internal validity concerns whether a research design accurately identifies causal relationship, it can be said that this type of validity is relatively weak in cross-sectional survey designs (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Internal validity is created when a researcher becomes able to rule out extraneous variables that might have an influence on the predicting variable (Hair et al., 2009). Since the objective of this research is solely to investigate whether a significant association is apparent between variables, no experimental manipulation is conducted, therefore ruling out the possibility of identifying a cause and effect relationship. The literature review however, aided in the right direction of choosing the most appropriate factors that are considered to determine the effectiveness of product placement, which should to some extent strengthen the internal validity. Nevertheless, unidentified extraneous variables may exist. People’s mood may for example have an influence on placement effectiveness and is not taken into consideration in this research. Whether mood or other unidentified factors have the possibility of influencing the research results, internal validity may be diminished.

External validity refers to whether research results can be generalized from sample to population. With the use of non-probability sampling, the researcher cannot make inferences whether the sample is representative of the entire population, which consequently puts external validity into question (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Since there was no feasible way to identify all members of the target population, the snowball sampling technique was seen as the best alternative way to reach as many respondents as possible. This was done in the hope of representing the target population to some degree. Thus, it has been taken into consideration that the research may not generate a truly representative sample. Moreover, the video clips do not symbolize the realistic setting of watching a TV show and may therefore generate different results, hence threatening external validity. Despite of this, the research should be able to provide marketing managers with some insights into how to build brand equity with the placing of products in TV shows.
As mentioned above, reliability is another important element that needs to be taken into consideration when conducting a research. The internal reliability deals with whether indicators making up a scale are consistent. This relates to multiple-indicator measures, where it becomes important that scores on any one indicator are related to scores on the other indicators. It can happen that indicators supposed to measure the same thing lack coherence. A correlation analysis detects whether coherence is lacking or not. Seeing that this study only consists of single indicators, internal reliability test cannot be conducted. Usually it is recommended to use multiple indicators over single indicators due to the possibility of incorrect classification among individuals, as they may misinterpret or misunderstand the questions asked. Multiple indicators would therefore be able to offset the effect of misunderstanding (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, in order to achieve the greatest internal reliability, the fifteen people participating in the pre-test questionnaire enabled the authors to believe that that the questions asked were understandable and measuring the actual construct. The method of single indicators may nevertheless have weakened the internal reliability.

External reliability refers to the degree whether or not a measure is stable over time, meaning that it should be possible to administer a measure to a group, and if carried out again, results would show little variation. To overcome a problem of an unstable measure, one can conduct a test-retest, which allows people from a pre-defined sample to answer the same questions twice, but under different occasions. With a correlation test, it becomes possible to investigate whether respondents’ answer can be relied upon (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The test-retest, which is one of the fundamental ways of checking external reliability, was not administered in this study. The reasoning for this is that discrepancies in results were believed to occur, due to a limited time frame. Since there would have been little time between the test and the retest, it was assumed that respondents would have remembered their previous answers (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). Bryman & Bell (2011) argue that there is no obvious solution to surmount this problem of stable measures, unless by constructing a truly complex research design. However, the lack of test-rest can compromise the external reliability of this research.
5.3 Qualitative Research

A cross-sectional survey design with the use of qualitative focus group interviews was adopted to test the proposed statements. This choice was based on the second sub-question, which sought to explore if there was any difference in the effectiveness of a placed brand depending on whether the placement was informational or transformational, and how viewers’ attitudes toward the placed brand were affected.

Focus group interviews were seen as the most appropriate method to investigate this, because it enabled concepts to be explored in-depth and allowed important insights into viewers reactions to product placement to be gained. This facilitated a better understanding of the reasons for viewers’ attitudes and opinion changes (Saunders et al., 2007). Furthermore, as the quantitative survey was already considered time consuming, the video clips and the survey would have been too long if the informational/transformational factor had been added to the quantitative research. Alternatively, this research design enabled the research to focus on the specific factor of informational and transformational product placements. It was believed that a fixed set of questions in a survey would have limited the understanding of the reasons for attitudes changes, whereas a focus group interview could maintain a controlled focus, while at the same time find explanations for the way product placement affect viewers’ attitudes change (Saunders et al., 2007). Moreover, as already mentioned, based on the available resources, especially the fact that the authors have a hand in deadline for the thesis and a low research budget, the focus groups was suited, as it could be produced at a fairly low cost and did not require many participants.

To aid and facilitate the focus group discussion, visual examples of informational and transformational product placements were found. Video clips from Gossip Girl and The Big Bang Theory were therefore found for this part of the research as well, so the statements could be empirically tested and the participants had examples to relate their answers to.

5.3.1 Focus Group Consideration

The focus group participants were invited home to one of the authors, so they could watch the video clips on TV and the session could be video recorded. The purpose of the focus group interview was explained to the participants. The participants were told that they had to watch four different clips containing product placement and then afterwards discuss each clip, however the mentioning of whether the product placement was informational or transformational was left out to ensure that no leading answers were forced on to the participants (Saunders et al., 2007). Furthermore, they were
asked to pay good attention to the video clips and that if they needed to see the clip again, they were allowed to. The reason for explaining to the participants that they should watch video clips that contained product placements was seen to be necessary to get the group discussion started. Nevertheless, this could bias the results since they watched the clips with more emphasis on the placed brand than normally when watching a TV show at home.

Each session lasted approximately 20-35 minutes. The choice of making the session short was to maintain the discussion within the topic. If the discussion had been allowed to run more freely, interesting themes might have occurred. As this was seen outside the scope of this thesis, it was therefore a deliberate choice to control the discussion to ensure that the topic was covered, and limiting the amount of transcribing.

The questions asked were all open-ended semi-structured questions. These questions were prepared in an interview guide to ensure that the moderator would be able to control the focus group discussion and at the same time encourage the discussion without pushing the participants to certain answers. The advantage of an interview guide was that the moderator had the possibility to modify questions during the interview, which allowed the discussion to be run more freely. At the same time it provided the moderator with flexibility to pursue unforeseen cues by asking probing questions, when the moderator felt that something important and interesting could be explored further (Saunders et al., 2007).

The flexibility of this qualitative method also has its downsides, as this method to a large degree depended on the moderators’ interview skills, subjective judgments and evaluation. Thus, there was a potential risk of interviewer bias occurring. This bias could occur if the moderator’s comments, tone or behavior affected the participants to answer differently to the questions asked, due to the lack of trust and credibility to the moderator. The moderator could also enforce opinions and beliefs upon the participants or interpret the responses wrong. Interviewer bias could therefore lead to response bias, as this could make the participants answer differently for instance due to anxiety. Furthermore, a response bias could be created if one participant dominated the discussion, which could make other participants afraid of expressing their own thoughts (Saunders et al., 2007).

It has been tried to avoid these biases by developing the interview guide, which served as a checklist. Moreover, the participants were explained the aim of the focus group interview and they participated on their own free will. When they came to the interview, they were explained the purpose again and were told that they could ask questions whenever and about whatever they
wanted. The interview was conducted in a calm and comfortable environment where participants were offered soft drinks and snacks. The moderator made sure to hear and ask all the participants about their opinions. While one author acted as the moderator, the other author was in charge of the technical support. In addition, both authors were at the two sessions and worked with the data.

The focus group sessions were done in Danish, because this was the participants’ first language. This was a deliberate choice, as it would make the discussion more free flowing and therefore reduce the change of participants feeling anxiety, thus limiting response bias. The video clips were in English with no subtitles, but the participants’ English skills were sufficient, so this did not affect the research.

The interview guide was not pre-tested before use. The reason for this was that the focus group interviews were a personal meeting between the participants and the moderator and this enabled the moderator to reformulate the questions if necessary. The section below gives an explanation for the questions asked in the interview guide and shows how the statements have been operationalized. The interview guide can be seen in Appendix D.

5.3.1.1 Interview Guide

The first set of questions (1 – 5) sought to collect data about whether informational placements develop more negative attitudes than transformational placements. The first question investigated the participants’ immediate thoughts of the video clips and asked them to discuss whether they actually saw any difference in the portrayals of the brands. After this, more in-depth questions about how the different clips were transformational and informational were discussed. This was to investigate if the participants had any preferences of portrayal and how this affected their attitudes toward the brands. Furthermore, they were asked to reveal if some placements seemed more commercial than others and what this meant to them. This was done in order to investigate whether persuasion knowledge was activated, and how this affected the participants’ attitudes toward the placed brands.

After this, the discussion was turned to the last set of questions (6 – 7), which focused on the influence a character can have on viewers’ attitudes toward the brand. Here the participants were asked to discuss if the characters made the placed brand better or less annoying. Moreover, they were asked if liking a character changed the product placement, so that the placement did not seem like a commercial attempt.
5.3.2 Stimuli

To test the informational/transformational statements, four video clips were found. Each clip contained either a transformational or informational product placement. The clips were defined as either transformational or informational, even though they did not fit completely into the definition of informational and transformational placement that were presented in section 3.5. The placed brands were all audio/visual placements and the brands shown in the clips were IPhone (Apple), Pringles, Tiffany’s and Harry Winston (Appendix B and H).

Since the focus group only focused on the affect of informational and transformational product placements, it was decided only to show clips of this instead of letting respondents watch full-length episode of the TV shows. This decision was taken, as it would have been too time consuming to ask the respondents to watch one or more full-length episodes, and this could have taken the focus away from the informational/transformational theme.

The choice of making the focus group in one of the author’s apartment was that the atmosphere would be more similar to sitting at home watching a TV show. However, it would never be as realistic as watching a TV show at home, seeing that the participant knew that they had to do a focus group interview and because only clips were shown. This tradeoff was seen as necessary, because it would have been difficult to investigate if the persuasions knowledge was generated without the focus group discussion. Biases could be created, since participants only watched the clips and were totally aware of the inserted brands. Thereby, persuasion knowledge could be stronger than when watching a TV show in full-length at home.

5.3.3 Sampling Considerations and Sample Characteristics

The participants for the focus group interviews were found through convenience sampling, because non-probability sampling techniques are advised when the researcher has difficulties in specifying a population and resource constrains (Saunders et al., 2007). On the grounds that no records or statistics were found about characteristics of TV show viewers, it raised a problem when identifying the exact population of the research. Since it was chosen to use the TV shows, Gossip Girl and The Big Bang Theory, for this part of the qualitative investigation just as it was with the quantitative research, the sampling unit were people aged 13-40 years old, because these were assumed to be the main target audience of these two American TV productions.
The authors asked people from their network within this age group to participate. To get a broad variety of the sampling unit, it was sought to find participants that followed one of the TV shows and that had never seen the TV shows before. This resulted in nine participants, three males and six females. Five of the participants followed *The Big Bang Theory*, whereas only two followed *Gossip Girl*, and three participants did not know much about either of the two TV shows (Appendix E).

Two focus group interviews were conducted, to ensure that all aspects were covered and no important points were missed that could have influenced the results. Nonetheless, it was difficult to know when the focus groups sessions would have nothing new to provide to the research.

Due to the subjective nature of this sampling technique subjective evaluation bias were seen as a potential risk. As these biases are discussed in section 5.2.3. it is referred to this section if the reader is interested.

### 5.3.4 Trustworthiness and Authenticity

Qualitative research must according to Lincoln & Guba (1985) and Guba & Lincoln (1994) in Bryman & Bell (2011) be evaluated by assessing trustworthiness and authenticity of an investigation, instead of trying to adapt validity and reliability, which has been designed for quantitative researches. To determine the quality of this research, authenticity and the four factors of trustworthiness need to be addressed.

Credibility concerns whether the research findings are honest interpretations of the collected data (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To make this study credible, the authors tried to avoid researcher biases. For this purpose, an interview guide was made to ensure both focus groups were asked the same questions and that the moderator did not ask leading questions. The interviews were transcribed in Danish to guarantee that no meaning was lost when the analysis began. The participants were made comfortable before the session started to make sure that they did not feel any anxiety about answering the questions truthfully. As the sample was found through convenience sampling, the possibility existed that the authors could be influenced by trying to reach certain answers, a variability of participants based on whether they followed one of the shows or not prevented this from happening (Saunders et al., 2007). Even though the above-mentioned strengthened credibility, other factors could have weakened it. The participants knew that they were doing a focus group interview and they only saw clips from TV shows. This unnatural environment might have influenced the participants’ answers (Saunders et al. 2007). Furthermore, it is recommended to do member
checks, to verify that the participants concur with the results from the data collection, so the researchers can guarantee that they correctly have understood the participants’ social world. This was however not done, so this can limited the credibility (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Transferability concerns the insurance of providing materials, descriptions and data that enables the research to be transferred to other milieus if others wish to do so. Dependability refers to safeguarding that others can establish whether or not proper procedures have been followed (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This research ensured transferability and dependability by documenting and thoroughly describing the entire research process, and by attaching important appendices, as well as considering the weaknesses of this research and its results in the end of the paper.

Confirmability deals with whether the research results have been reached with an objective eye, to warrant that biases and the researchers’ judgments have not influenced the findings. As mentioned above, it has been tried to avoid biases but since not auditing have been conducted, it is impossible to argue for complete confirmability (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

In relation to authenticity focus should be put on the issue of fairness. To ensure that the research was fair emphasis was put on representing the participants’ different viewpoints (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Through the transcribing process, the viewpoints were recognized so they could be taken into consideration during the analysis. This research is therefore seen as fair.

5.4 Research Ethics

Considerations were made to assure that the research was conducted ethically correct to protect the respondents of the survey and the participants in the focus groups. Before the respondents took the survey, they were told what the survey was about and that it was completely anonymous. Focus group participants were given information about what they should discuss and how the session would be conducted before they agreed to participate. Furthermore, the participants’ permission to film the focus group interviews was asked for. These procedures were made to out of respect of the respondents and participants to make them feel save and confident when being a part of the research (Saunders et al., 2007).
5.5 Data Analysis

The raw quantitative data was downloaded from Survey Monkey, and then uploaded and analyzed using the statistical software SPSS 20. Answers were already coded, meaning that numerical values had been assigned to each response, as the coding process had been incorporated into the design of the questionnaire (Hair et al., 2009). Questions regarding unaided recall and aided recall were however open-ended, and were therefore coded manually. Reviewing a printed representation of the entered data provided an opportunity to detect whether wrong numbers had been entered during the coding process.

Total number of respondents that started the questionnaire was 195. Screening each single variable through one-way tabulation enabled to detect missing responses and others not valid. After excluding respondents that did not finish the questionnaire, people that did not see/hear any brands in the video clip, and ones older than the sampling unit, 134 respondents were considered valid for analysis (N=134).

The focus group interviews were transcribed into word documents. After this the coding process began, where patterns between participants were looked for. To ease the coding process participants were grouped in three groups based on the prior knowledge with the TV shows. This enabled the detection of patterns between the different groups, whereby meaning from the collected data was discovered, which enabled the answering of the proposed statements. To ensure that the meaning of the participants did not get lost in the translation process, coding and data analysis were conducted in Danish.

5.5.1 Hypotheses Testing

When choosing appropriate tests to investigate relationships between variables, one can choose between parametric tests and non-parametric tests. Taking that into consideration, two things were looked at; the scale of measurement for each question and the distribution of the population. The use of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test allowed seeing whether the independent variables and the dependent variables were normally distributed. By applying the test, results indicated that data was not normally distributed. In relation to the scales of measurement, several variables were measured on a five-point likert scale. It is often difficult to decide whether to treat questions measured on a likert scales as ordinal or interval data, as they can fall into both categories. Since it is not possible to measure absolute differences between the choices given, e.g. definitely disagree, somewhat disagree and somewhat agree, definitely agree, they were treated as ordinal. The conditions for using
parametric test is that data needs to be normally distributed and scale of measurements are either interval or ratio (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). The collected data did not fulfill these conditions, thus non-parametric tests were applied to test the proposed hypotheses. The five-point likert scales were recoded from one to three for simplification. The ones who answered for example (1) definitely disagree and (2) somewhat disagree were grouped together, and the ones who answered (4) somewhat agree and (5) definitely agree were combined. The middle (3) that indicated neither disagree nor agree was kept as before.

The section below addresses the three different types of non-parametric tests used to investigate whether relationships existed between the independent and dependent variables. In all tests, the level of confidence reflected a significance level of 0.05, meaning that if the p-value is < .05 the findings are 95% of being true.

5.5.1.1 Chi-square test

The Chi-square test was applied when the dependent variable was nominal. By conducting a cross tabulation, it became possible to test for statistical difference between the frequency distribution of the independent and the dependent variable. The test compared observed frequencies or the respondent’s counts with expected frequencies (theoretical value) and therefore allowed for concluding if the observed data was distributed like expected, given the assumption that the variables were not related. In order for the test to give the most reliable results, more than 20% of the cells in the cross tabulation cannot have an expected count of less than 5 (Hair et al., 2009). Although the test could have been used in the whole analysis, many of the cells resulted in expected count less than 5 when investigating variables that had more than two categories, and therefore alternative test needed to be chosen as a way to overcome this problem.

5.5.1.2 Mann-Whitney U test

The Mann Whitney U test was employed in cases where the independent variable was nominal and the dependent variable was ordinal. The test compares two independent groups and is used when the dependent variable is ordinal. It evaluates whether the medians on an independent variable is significantly different between the two groups. If the two groups are different, then one of the groups is scoring higher than the other. The two groups are combined and rank ordered together. When combined, it becomes possible to see whether the values are randomly mixed or clustered together (Bryman & Cramer, 2005; Green & Salkind, 2005).
5.5.1.3 Kruskal-Wallis $H$ test

The Kruskal Wallis was used when both independent and dependent variables were ordinal. This test is similar to the Mann Whitney test meaning that cases in the different samples are rank ordered together in one series. However, it allows comparing of scores in more than two groups. Thus it evaluates if the population medians on a dependent variable are identical across all levels of a factor. If test results show a significant difference between the groups, a comparison between the factors needs to be conducted in order to see between which groups the significance lies in (Green & Salkind, 2005).
6. Research Findings and Analysis

The following chapter presents the main results from the quantitative and the qualitative research undertaken, along with more detailed analysis of the data. The seven factors introduced in Chapter 4 are measured in terms of seeing whether there is significant association between the proposed hypotheses relative to awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Moreover, investigation on the last factor in relation to informational vs. transformational product placement is carried out with detecting patterns between focus group participants, enabling the answering of the proposed research statements.

6.1 Quantitative Research

Drawing on the main results, the table below presents some general descriptive statistics regarding the survey respondents. Out of 134 people that answered the survey, majority were females. *The Big Bang Theory* was most often watched amongst the two video clips, however with little difference between males and females. Primarily women chose *Gossip Girl*. Majority of respondents were Icelandic and Danish in the age group 26-30, and approximately 87 % of the respondents had seen chosen TV show before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV show</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watched it before</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents*

*Source: Primary data*
Some similarities were detected when looking into the results retrieved from the dependent variables. As already mentioned, scales had been adapted and associations, activity and attachment were measured on a three point ordinal scale with (1) being negative, (2) neutral and (3) positive. Activity was left unchanged, with no neutral scale, indicating (1) no, (2) maybe and (3) yes, in regard to whether respondents would buy the product. With a mean of 2.2, majority, or 76% of respondents reported that the product placement had not influenced their brands associations or attitudes. A negative influence was detected among 2%, whereas 22% reported that the placement had a positive influence on their associations and attitudes toward the brand. In relation to attachment, the mean was 1.88, which resulted in 39% indicating that they did not identify with the brands and 33% being neutral. However, 28% of the respondents indicated that they indentified with some of the brands. At last, with a mean of 1.55, 58% implied that they would not consider buying or using the product as a reasoning of it being placed in the TV show. 30% pointed out that they would maybe consider it, and 28% of respondents said they would consider it.

Through the findings, where each independent variable was tested against the dependent variables, 20 out of the 31 hypotheses were supported. The supported hypotheses did however not take any other factors into consideration that might have had an influence on the independent variable and consequently the dependent variable. In order to overcome this problem and to achieve more reliable results, correlation analysis between independent variables enabled generating a greater or more holistic picture in detecting the factors that are considered to be the most important in influencing brand equity.

Overall, audio/visual brands were more likely to be noticed, than visual only and audio only, as already proposed. Whether through unaided recall, aided recall, or recognition, respondents were able to mention or recognize the audio/visual brands to a much greater extent compared to the other modalities. Little difference was found between visual prominent and audio placements, although audio placements generated higher mentioning when respondents had the brand names in front of them. Visual subtle placements were not able to generate sufficient awareness and had the lowest performance.

According to the findings, all levels in the CBBE hierarchy were affected as a result of the videos shown to the respondents. It was discovered that the characters played an important role in influencing respondents. In relation to brand awareness, respondents were more likely to notice the placement when they knew the brand, and when they were highly involved with the TV show. However, the characters primarily influenced respondents’ associations and attitudes toward the
brand. Likewise, it was important that the brand fitted well within the program. When moving higher up in the hierarchy, results showed that a strong relationship between viewer and the character was able to impact brand attachment. This relationship also seemed important in order to influence brand activity, as well as placement fit, viewer-character relationship and general attitudes toward the brand.

6.1.1 Modality

The first step undertaken in the analysis concerned testing the first hypothesis (H1) which proposed that audio/visual product placements would result in higher brand awareness than its counterparts, audio only or visual only. Hence, the intention was to investigate which type of product placements respondent remembered the most, through the measurement of unaided recall, aided recall and recognition. The aim was not to compare the results from the two TV shows, but rather to give an overall view of the impact from the different modalities. Thus, results do not differentiate between TV shows and individual brand performance. In order to attain the most reliable outcome, the TV shows were analyzed separately, and the final result consisted of the average of both of the shows. This was considered necessary, as the TV shows accommodated different brands, meaning that the total number of respondents were not exposed to the same brands. With collection of total frequency from each show, it became attainable to see which brands were noticed and how often the brands were seen/heard. Detailed results and individual brand performance can be found in Appendix F. As the brands had been categorized earlier according to modality, it became possible to assign them and measure the results in accordance to audio/visual, visual prominent, visual subtle and audio product placements.

Unaided recall was assessed first, and when respondents were asked whether they remembered seeing and/or hearing any brands in the video clip they selected, 87% of total respondents said they did. Among the 40 brands that appeared in the two videos, respondents were able to identify 30 of them. Results showed significant difference between the different modalities, and audio/visual placements performed the best where 44% of all the audio/visual brands were mentioned. Visual prominent and audio placements performed similar accounting for approximately 15%, but only 3% of all the visual subtle brands were mentioned.

When investigating aided recall, or whether respondents remembered seeing and/or hearing any brands when they were given the brand product category, total number of respondents increased from 87% to 93%. Compared to the results from unaided recall, aided recall was however similar
with very little increase. Audio product placements showed a slightly higher mentioning, or 21% of all the audio placements were named. It was noted that visual prominent placements dropped somewhat, indicating that some of the respondents forgot to write down the same brands as earlier, or the drop in percentage can be related to the increase in respondents that answered the question.

A change in recognition was observed when respondents had all the brand names in front of them. In 59% percent of the cases, respondents were able to mention the audio/visual brands, 19% of all the visual prominent brands and 10% of all the visual subtle brands. A part from audio/visual placements, the biggest change was remarked with audio placements. In 33% of the cases, respondents were able to remember brands that had been mentioned verbally. The results are illustrated in the figure below, showing difference in performance between modalities and the change in awareness from unaided recall to recognition.

**Figure 9. Total % of brands the respondents could hear and/or see**

Source: Primary data

According to the diagram above, it is clearly seen that the audio/visual product placements outperformed the visual prominent, visual subtle and audio placements relative to unaided recall, aided recall and recognition. In all cases, recognition increased when respondents were given the brand name and asked if they remembered seeing and/or hearing it. Nevertheless, it must be specified that some brands in the same modality achieved considerably higher awareness compared to others. However, combining them and taking the average gives a fair result. Based on these findings, it can be said that the first hypothesis (H1) proposing that audio/visual product placements result in higher brand awareness compared to visual only and/or audio only is supported.
6.1.2 Brand Familiarity

Two types of test were used to measure if a relationship existed between brand familiarity and brand equity. The Chi-square test was applied to see whether any difference was found between familiar or unfamiliar brands in the influence on brand awareness, whereas the Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine if brand familiarity had any affect on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. As already mentioned, the brands used were all the audio/visual brands that appeared in the video clips. Since each respondent was exposed to six audio/visual brands in total, he or she needed to mark for each brand whether he or she was familiar with it or not. This resulted in $N = 804$ (6 x 134) in total, seeing that there were 134 respondents. Before running the tests, descriptive statistics indicated that in 79% of the cases, respondents were familiar with the brands, while not being familiar with them in 21% of the cases.

Hypothesis (H2a) proposed that compared to unfamiliar brands, familiar brands would obtain a higher level of brand awareness. The results from the Chi-square test showed significant relationship between the two variables, $\chi^2(1) = 58.43$, $p < .05$, meaning that the pattern of responses (i.e. the proportion of the ones who were familiar with the brands and those who were not familiar with them) in relation to if respondents noticed the brands or not, was significantly different.

![Brand Familiarity](image)

**Figure 10. Association between brand familiarity and brand awareness**

Source: Primary data

The figure above shows the results from the Chi-square test, which illustrates the significant difference in brand awareness in relation to whether respondents were familiar with the brand or not. As seen in the figure, those who were familiar with the brands were more likely to notice the
placed brands, whereas those who were not familiar with them were less likely to notice them. If looking at the proportion of those who did not notice the placed brands, 34% were not familiar with them while 66% were. Of those who did notice the brands, 12% were not familiar with them, whereas 88% were. Thus, according to the results, it can be said that familiar brands were more noticed than unfamiliar brands, leading to the suggestion that respondents might have been exposed to the brand before, or had some kind of experience with it, which made it easier for them to detect.

The Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to test hypothesis (H2b, H2c, H2d, H2e), which proposed that compared to unfamiliar brands, familiar brands would positively influence associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Hence, the test evaluated the median between those who were not familiar with the brand and those who were familiar with it, respectively to each of the dependent variables. It was believed that respondents familiar with the brand would score higher, or be more positively influenced, compared to the ones not familiar with the brand. Since the mean (2.2) was the same for associations and attitudes, similar results were assumed to occur between these two dependent variables.

The results of the test were in the expected direction in respect to associations, attitudes and activity and significant, z = -5.05, p < .05 for associations, z = -4.21, p < .05 for attitudes and z = -3.653, p < .05 for activity. No significant difference was found between the two groups in relation to brand attachment, z = -0.604, p > 0.5, even though the mean rank was higher among respondents familiar with the brand. Table 2. shows the distribution of the scores on the four dependent variables for the two groups, those familiar and those not familiar with the brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mann Whitney U test results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Brand familiarity and influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity

Source: Primary data
According to the table above, those who were familiar with the brand scored higher on all the dependent variables, and therefore resulted with a higher mean rank. This means that the product placement was more likely to positively influence their associations, attitudes and activity. These results indicate that the respondents who were familiar with the brand were more likely to be positively influenced as they had already established brand associations in memory in addition to holding some attitudes toward the brand, which is assumed to have led them being more willing to process the product placement.

As the results from the two tests showed that there was a significant difference between brand familiarity and awareness, association, attitudes and activity, hypotheses (H2a, H2b, H2c and H2e) are supported, whereas (H2d) is rejected.

### 6.1.3 Placement Fit

The same procedure was performed to examine whether any association existed between placement fit and brand equity. The Chi-square test was used to detect relationship between congruent and incongruent product placements relative to brand awareness, and the Kruskal Wallis H test allowed to explore the influence on brand associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. The Kruskal Wallis H test was chosen alternatively to the Mann Whitney U test, as there were more than two groups that needed to be compared. Overall, respondents favored the brand in 60% of the cases by stating that there was a good match between the placed brand and the TV show, whereas in 14% of the cases the brand was not considered a good match. The rest of the brands, 26% were placed as neutral.

Hypothesis (H3a) suggested that incongruent product placements would create higher brand awareness than congruent placements. The Chi-square test results showed significant association between brand awareness and placement fit, $\chi^2(2) = 41.55, p < .05$. Thus, the proportion of the groups that evaluated how well the brand fitted with the TV show in relation to whether respondents could hear/see the brand was significantly different.
Figure 11. Association between product placement fit and brand awareness

Source: Primary data

According to the figure above, it can be seen that some difference is apparent between the three groups in whether they noticed the brand or not. Those who did not consider the brand a good match and those who were neutral were less likely to notice the brand, whereas those who considered the brand a good match were more likely to see the brand. The results indicate that brands that have a good fit within the TV show result in higher brand awareness. These findings are however contrary to what was hypothesized, as it was believed that brand awareness would increase when there was not a good match between the brand and the TV show. It was assumed that incongruent brands would create more attention and would therefore be more likely to be recognized.

Hypotheses (H3b, H3c, H3d, H3e) implied that congruent product placements would positively influence brand associations, attitudes and attachment/activity, compared to incongruent product placements. The Kruskal Wallis $H$ test measured the median between those who did not think there was a good match between the brand and the TV show, those who were neutral and those who believed the brand was a good match, as a result of each dependent variable. It was assumed that respondents, who evaluated the brand as a good match, would score higher compared to the other two groups, hence being more positively influenced.

Results showed significant difference relative to associations, attitudes and activity, $H = 39.63, p < .05$ for associations, $H = 34.84, p < .05$ for attitudes and $H = 40.59, p < .05$ for activity. Similar to brand
familiarity, no significant difference was found between the three groups in relation to brand attachment, $H = 4.63$, $p > .05$, although the mean rank was highest among the ones who considered the brand a good match. The table below demonstrates the distribution of the scores from the three groups, with respect to each dependent variable.

**Kruskal Wallis $H$ test results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruency</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Not a good match</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>378.90</td>
<td>39.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither not good nor good</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>345.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good match</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>432.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Not a good match</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>363.91</td>
<td>34.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither not good nor good</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>355.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good match</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>431.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>Not a good match</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>365.95</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither not good nor good</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>395.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good match</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>413.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Not a good match</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>348.08</td>
<td>40.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither not good nor good</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>344.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good match</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>439.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. Placement fit and influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity*

Source: Primary data

Even though results showed significant difference, a follow-up test was conducted in order to confirm between which groups (not a good match, neither not good nor good, good match) the statistical difference lied in. Accordingly, the Mann-Whitney $U$ test was used to compare two groups at a time. Findings showed that only those who considered the brand a good match resulted in significant difference when compared to the other two groups. Table 3. demonstrates that those who considered the brand a good match, scored higher on all the dependent variables and consequently had a higher mean rank. It was believed likely that negative attitudes toward the brand would occur if the brand did not fit well within the TV show, but the opposite when the brand fitted well, as resistance and counter argumentation would not be provoked. The results indicate this assumption, since the respondents scored higher when the brand was considered a good match and therefore it can be said that they were more positively influenced.

According to the Chi-square and the Kruskal-Wallis $H$ test, results showed significant difference between placement fit and awareness, associations, attitudes and activity, apart from attachment. The results in relation to brand awareness were however not in accordance to the proposed
hypothesis, as it was believed that incongruent product placements would result in higher brand awareness. Hypotheses (H3b, H3c, H3e) are supported, whereas (H3a, H3d) are rejected.

6.1.4 Character Liking

To measure whether character liking had any influence on brand equity, the Chi-square test enabled seeing whether significant relationship existed between brand awareness and if respondents liked the characters or not. Again, the Kruskal Wallis $H$ test revealed the influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Overall, majority of respondents, or 78% indicated that they liked the characters in the TV show, 14% were neutral, while 8% acknowledged that they disliked the characters.

The hypothesis (H4a) proposed that liking a character would have a positive influence on brand awareness. According to the Chi-square results, $\chi^2(2) = 5.045$, $p > .05$, the test showed no significant association between character liking and brand awareness. That is, whether respondents disliked, were neutral or liked the character did not seem to have an influence on if the brand was noticed or not.

![Character Liking and Brand Awareness](image)

**Figure 12. Association between character liking and brand awareness**

Source: Primary data

As seen in Figure 12., which demonstrates the results from the Chi-square test, there seem to be little difference between those who disliked, were neutral, or liked the characters in whether they noticed the placed brands or not. It is however remarked that respondents who disliked and were neutral were little less likely to notice the brands, while the ones who liked the characters were more...
likely to notice the brands. If looking at those who did like the characters, it can be seen that 74% of those who did not notice the brands liked the characters, and 80% of those who saw the brands liked them as well. Even though liking a character resulted in higher brand awareness, the difference was not statistically significant. This means that the degree of character liking did not seem to have any affect on brand awareness, even though it was believed that viewers would pay more attention to what the character does in the TV show. It can therefore be concluded that liking a character did not have a positive influence on brand awareness. Hypothesis (H4a) is rejected.

The Kruskal Wallis H test investigated hypotheses (H4b, H4c, H4d, H4e) that proposed that if viewers liked the television characters, it would result in positive influence in brand associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Accordingly, the test calculated the median between those who disliked, were neutral, or liked the characters relative to how they ranked each of the dependent variable. It was estimated that the ones who liked the characters would score higher compared to the other two groups.

Results from the test were in the expected direction, and showed a significant difference at all levels, $H = 41.36, p < .05$ for associations, $H = 36.23, p < .05$ for attitudes, $H = 78.87, p < .05$ for attachment and $H = 31.74, p < 0.5$ for activity. Table 4. shows the composition of the scores on all the dependent variables for the three groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Liking</th>
<th>Liking the characters</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>336.21</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither like nor dislike</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>326.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>423.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>316.80</td>
<td>36.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither like nor dislike</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>346.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>421.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>185.95</td>
<td>78.87</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither like nor dislike</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>368.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>431.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>295.52</td>
<td>31.74</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither like nor dislike</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>350.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>423.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Character liking and influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity

Source: Primary data
Similar to placement fit, there was a need to investigate between which groups the statistical difference lied in. Thus, a follow-up test was conducted on the four dependent variables with the use of the Mann-Whitney U test. Results showed that only those who liked the characters were statistically different from the other two groups. As seen in the table above, those who liked the characters scored higher on all the dependent variables, and as a result ended with the highest mean rank. The results indicate the assumption that it is more likely that viewers respond more positively toward the brand when they like the characters, as it becomes more likely that when the characters personality is associated with the product, positive attitudes transfer from the character to the brand. Hypotheses (H4b, H4c, H4d, H4e) are therefore supported.

### 6.1.5 Viewer-Character Relationship

Viewer-character relationship and its influence on the dependent variables were analyzed with the Chi-square test and the Mann Whitney U test, since comparison was being made between two groups only. The Chi-square test provided information in measuring if any relationship existed between brand awareness and whether respondents were a fan of the characters or not, and the Mann Whitney U test affirmed the influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Altogether, 57% of respondents stated that they were fan of the characters, whereas 43% said they were not fan.

Hypothesis (H5a) suggested that strong viewer-character relationship, or more precisely whether a respondent was a fan of the characters, would have a positive influence on brand awareness. Results from the Chi-square test showed significant association, $\chi^2(1) = 6.470, p < .05$, indicating that brand awareness was affected if respondents were either a fan of the characters or not.

![Figure 13. Association between viewer-character relationship and brand awareness](Source: Primary data)
Figure 13 shows the Chi-square test results, which clarifies the significant difference in brand awareness in relation to whether respondents were fan of the characters in the TV show or not. As seen in the figure, those who were not fan of the characters were less likely to notice the brand, whereas the ones who were fans were more likely to notice the brand. As the interest lies in fans, since it was believed that they would have a positive influence on brand awareness, it can be seen that 51% of those who did not notice the brand were fans, and 60% of all those who saw the brands were fans as well. Although the difference is not relatively large, the results from the Chi-square showed significant difference, meaning that being a fan of the character results in higher brand awareness. The strong connection between the viewer and the character is therefore believed to have drawn viewers’ attention to the placed brand.

Hypotheses (H5b, H5c, H5d, H5e) implied that strong viewer-character relationship would have a positive influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. The Mann-Whitney U test therefore evaluated the median between those who were a fan of the characters, and those who were not a fan, respectively to each of the dependent variables. It was assumed that the fans would score higher compared to the non-fans; hence the fans would end up with a higher mean rank.

Results from the Mann-Whitney U test showed a significant difference between all the dependent variables, $z = -4.190, p < .05$ for associations, $z = -3.693, p < .05$ for attitudes, $z = -10.405, p < .05$ for attachment and $z = -5.758, p < .05$ for activity. The table below demonstrates the distribution of the scores on the four dependent variables for the two groups, fans and not fans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mann Whitney U test results</th>
<th>Viewer-Character Relationship</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>I’m not a fan</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>373.53</td>
<td>-4.190</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m a fan</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>424.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I’m not a fan</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>376.92</td>
<td>-3.693</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m a fan</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>422.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>I’m not a fan</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>310.90</td>
<td>-10.405</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m a fan</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>472.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>I’m not a fan</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>354.81</td>
<td>-5.758</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m a fan</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>438.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Viewer-character relationship and influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity

Source: Primary data
The table shows that fans scored higher on all the dependent variables and therefore ended with a higher mean rank. It is possible to infer from these results that positive associations and attitudes were more likely to be developed when viewers are considered to have a strong relationship with the character. Moreover, it is a possibility that the influence on attachment and activity is due to the viewers’ strong desire to copy the characters’ action. As a result, hypotheses (H5a, H5b, H5c, H5d, H5e) are all supported.

6.1.6 Program Involvement

In the measurement of program involvement and its possible influence on brand equity, the Chi-square test enabled to see if significant association existed relative to how much respondents were involved with the TV show and brand awareness. Since comparing more than two groups, the Kruskal Wallis H test allowed to investigate the influence on brand associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Descriptive statistics indicated that 13% had not seen the chosen TV show before, 41% had only watched it a couple of times or every now and then, whereas 46% of the respondents watched the show on a regular basis.

The hypothesis (H6a) suggested that program involvement, or whether the TV show was watched on a regular basis, would positively increase brand awareness. The Chi-square test results showed a significant association, $\chi^2(3) = 17.72$, $p < .05$. Hence, the proportion of the four groups that were involved with the show to a different degree, in relation to whether respondents noticed the brand was significantly different.

![Figure 14. Association between program involvement and brand awareness](image)

Source: Primary data
The figure above can be used to illustrate the results from the Chi-square test. It can be seen that respondents who had not seen the TV show before, watched it a couple of times, or watched it every now and then, were less likely to notice the placed brand, whereas the ones who watched the show on a regular basis were more likely to notice the brand. By looking more thoroughly into the ones that follow the shows on a regular basis, it can be seen that 37% of those who did not notice the brand were regular viewers, whereas 52% of those you did notice the brand where also regular viewers. These results indicate that viewers that are more involved within the program pay more attention to what is happening in the show, and therefore more likely to notice the product placement. The hypothesis (H6a) stating that high level of program involvement positively influences brand awareness is supported.

It was proposed with hypotheses (H6b, H6c, H6d, H6e) that being involved with a TV show would positively increase brand associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Hence, the Kruskal Wallis H test weighed the median between the four groups i.e. the ones who had never seen the TV show before, those that had seen it only a couple of times, those who watch it occasionally and those who follow it on regular basis, relative to the dependent variables. It was highly believed that the ones who watched the TV show on regular basis would score higher compared to the other three groups.

Results from the test were in the expected direction, and showed a significant difference at all levels, $H = 12.23, p < .05$ for associations, $H = 18.99, p < .05$ for attitudes, $H = 57.66, p < .05$ for attachment and $H = 14.14, p < 0.5$ for activity. Table 6. shows the composition of the scores on all the dependent variables for the four groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Involvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seen it before</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>352.83</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a couple of times</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>397.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch it every now and then</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>404.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow it on regular basis</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>417.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seen it before</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>348.53</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a couple of times</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>401.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch it every now and then</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>387.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow it on regular basis</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>425.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seen it before</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>313.17</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a couple of times</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>338.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch it every now and then</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>383.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow it on regular basis</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>460.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seen it before</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>387.98</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a couple of times</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>351.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the table above shows that those who followed the show on a regular basis scored the highest on all the dependent variables, one needs to be careful to assume that this is actually where the statistical difference lies in. The Mann-Whitney U test helped to cast doubt upon the issue with the comparison of two groups at a time. The test results showed a clear implication that being involved with the TV program was not statistically different from the other three groups relative to all the dependent variables. Only brand attachment shown significant difference. This means that hypothesis (H6d) is supported, whereas (H6b, H6c and H6e) are rejected.

6.1.7 Attitudes Toward Placements

The final factor up for investigation concerned general attitudes toward product placement in TV shows. The Chi-square test revealed if there was a significant relationship between these general attitudes and brand awareness, and the Kruskal Wallis H test detected the influence on brand associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. According to the respondents, 82% of them agreed with the statement that they were fine with the use of product placement in TV shows, 10% were neutral and 8% of respondents did not seem to be fine with it.

Hypothesis (H7a) proposed that positive attitudes toward product placement would have a positive influence on brand awareness, meaning that they would be more likely to notice the brand. The results from the test did however not show any significant relationship between the two variables, $\chi^2(2) = 2.14, p > .05$, thus the pattern of responses in relation to whether they disagreed, were neutral or agreed, did not have an influence on whether respondents noticed the brand or not.
Figure 15. Association between attitudes toward placements and brand awareness

Source: Primary data

Figure 15, illustrates the results from the Chi-square test where it can be seen that there is very little difference between the three groups in whether they noticed the brand or not. Respondents who disagreed and agreed were more likely to notice the placement, whereas the ones who were neutral were less likely to notice the placed brand. If looking further into the ones who agreed, it can be seen that 80% of those who did not notice the placement, were fine with the use of product placement in TV shows, along with 83% of those who did see the brand. Thus, even though the ones who agreed had higher brand awareness, the difference is not large enough to be statistically significant. Therefore, it cannot be said that general attitudes toward placements have a positive influence on brand awareness. Hypothesis (H7a) is rejected.

Moreover, it was estimated with hypotheses (H7b, H7c, H7d, H7e) that positive attitudes toward product placement would positively influence brand associations, attitudes and attachment/activity. Hence, the Kruskal Wallis H test calculated the median between those who disagreed, were neutral, or agreed with the proposed statement. The ones who agreed were assumed to score higher than the other two groups, hence be more positively influenced.

According to the results from the Kruskal Wallis H test, a significant difference was detected on all the dependent variables, H = 9.31, p < .05 for associations, H = 15.97, p < .05 for attitudes, H = 24.50, p < .05 for attachment and H = 13.79, p < .05 for activity. However, those who were neutral scored higher on brand attachment, which is in contrast to what was hypothesized. Table 7. shows the composition of the scores on all the dependent variables for the three groups.
### Kruskal Wallis H test results

#### Attitudes Toward Placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I’m fine with use of ppl.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>340.96</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>404.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>408.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>322.80</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>397.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>411.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>291.77</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>469.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>405.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>327.44</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>364.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>414.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Attitudes toward placements and influence on associations, attitudes and attachment/activity

Source: Primary data

Furthermore, the Mann Whitney U test examined in between which groups the statistical difference lied in, relative to associations, attitudes and activity. In regards to associations and attitudes, the analysis showed no significant difference between those who agreed and those who were neutral, only between those who disagreed and those who were neutral, and those who disagreed and agreed. In relation to activity, results showed significant difference between those who agreed and the other two groups. The results indicate that attitude toward placements is less important than the factors presented above, although viewers need to accept this marketing practice in order to influence their brand purchase intention. Hypothesis (H7e) is supported, whereas hypotheses (H7b, H7c, H7d) are rejected. An overview of all supported hypotheses is given in the table below, marked as X.

![Table 8. Overview of supported hypotheses](94)
According to the analysis above, program involvement and attitudes toward placements in general appeared to have the least impact on brand equity, compared to the other factors; brand familiarity, placement fit, character liking, and viewer-character relationship. While program involvement proved to have an influence on brand awareness and attachment, attitudes toward placements only influenced brand activity. The rest of the factors appeared to have an impact on three or four out of the five dependent variables, except for viewer-character relationship, which turned out to be the strongest predictor on influencing brand equity.

The next step undertaken in the analysis concerned the examination of the strength of the association between the independent and dependent variables that proved to be statistically significant. This is considered to be important, even though a statistical significance is apparent between variables, the strength of the association can vary from being weak, moderate, or strong. If association is weak, variables may have something in common, however it is not much. Strong association on the other hand indicates a consistent and systematic relationship between the variables. Hair et al. (2009) state that a correlation coefficient between .81 and 1.00 is very strong, whereas a correlation coefficient between .00 and .20 can turn out to have no association. It is at least a very weak association, where the researcher needs to evaluate whether he or she will support or reject the hypotheses up for investigation.

A bivarial correlation analysis was carried out with the use of the Spearman’s rho and Cramer’s V in order to examine association strength. The reasoning for using two different types of correlation measures was based on the data characteristics. While both tests are non-parametric, it is suggested to use Spearman’s rho when the two variables are ordinal, but the Cramer’s V test when one variable is nominal (Bryman & Cramer, 2005; Hair et al., 2009). Results from the correlation analysis showed that the strength of the association between the independent and dependent variables was relatively weak if it is taken into account that a strong correlation is 1.00. In all cases, the correlation varied from .00 - .20, which Hair et al. (2009) describe as being very weak, and .20 - .40, which also indicates a rather weak correlation.

Furthermore, a correlation analysis between the independent variables was carried out in order to see whether some of the independent variables were correlated (Appendix G). Even though the analysis did not take any extraneous variables into consideration that might have had an influence on the dependent variables, the results from the correlation analysis should yield more precise knowledge about the weight of each factor. This means that two factors could have an influence on the dependent variable at the same time, although one being more controlling. The table below
shows the results from the correlation analysis between the independent and the dependent variables, which also indicate which of the independent variables were correlated.

**Cramer’s V and Spearman’s rho**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Primary data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation between independent and dependent variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Familiarity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Familiarity₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Fit₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Liking₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View-Char. Relationship₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Involvement₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward ppl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .001 level (1-tailed).**  
*Correlation is significant at the .005 level (1-tailed).**  
₁ = Brand Familiarity and Placement Fit are correlated  
₂ = Character Liking, Viewer-Character Relationship and Program Involvement are correlated

**Table 9. Correlation between independent and dependent variables**

By looking at Table 9, one should be able to assess the influence from the placed brands on brand equity. Brand familiarity had the strongest correlation with brand awareness compared to placement fit, viewer-character relationship and program involvement. Even though the association is rather weak, this implies that being familiar with a brand determined whether respondents noticed the placed brand. However, according to correlation analysis between the independent variables, placement fit and brand familiarity was fairly correlated. This suggests that in order for respondents to evaluate whether the brand was a good fit or not, they had to be familiar with the brand to make that judgment. The next two factors, viewer-character relationship and program involvement also showed to be correlated, indicating that being involved with a TV show aided the respondents in the chance of noticing the placed brand.

The influence on brand associations and attitudes showed similar results. Character liking, according to the table above, showed the strongest correlation in contrast to viewer-character relationship, brand familiarity and placement fit, although the association was relatively weak. This indicates that positive associations and attitudes were more likely to be transferred to the brand when the respondent liked the character. Since character liking and viewer-character relationship were highly correlated, and due to character liking having a stronger relationship on associations and attitudes, it
can be said that the strength of respondents’ relationship with the character did not matter. Furthermore, the correlated factors; brand familiarity and placement fit also suggest that in order to support the respondents’ transformation of positive associations and attitudes, the placed brand needs to fit within the TV show.

The influence on brand attachment showed that viewer-character relationship had the strongest correlation, relative to character liking and placement fit. Even though the relationship is still considered weak according to Hair et al. (2009), the relationship between these two variables showed to be the strongest overall. This indicates that respondents’ connection to the brand might have resulted by the character usage of the brand. The reasoning for the correlation between the three variables can be explained that viewers are usually highly involved with a TV show when they like or are fan of the characters. Regardless of how involved the viewer is with the show, it is the strong relationship with the character that has the power of influencing viewers.

In relation to brand activity, it can be seen that all factors except for one, showed statistical significant relationship toward this dependent variable. Placement fit and viewer-character relationship had the strongest correlation, even though there was little difference between them. Attitudes toward placements in general only influenced brand equity at this level, meaning that attitudes have to be positive for the respondents to consider buying the brand. The results are further discussed in Chapter 7, following the findings retrieved from the qualitative research analysis.

### 6.2 Qualitative Research

The four clips presented to the participants were categorized according to whether the placement was informational or transformational (Appendix H). Since informational advertisements according to Puto & Wells (1984) provide information or facts about the brand, and transformational advertisements associate the brand with certain feelings, images, or meanings, Russell (1998) stated that product placements could be categorized accordingly. Results from the data collection showed that all focus group participants were able to correctly identify the placement in clip 2 (Pringles) as informational and the placements in clip 1 (iPhone), clip 3 (Tiffany’s) and clip 4 (Harry Winston) as transformational. Moreover, participants also agreed upon what associations the placed brands were trying to transfer to them and their description of the brands came very close to the description of the brands in Appendix H. This is demonstrated in the examples below:
Clip 1. “I’ve never thought about that it was fun to pull of the plastic, but they’re totally right about that it’s fun and that you’ll only do it once” (Nanna).

Clip 2. “Clip 2 was pretty informational. Filled with facts” (Sofy). “Pringles there the facts were set straight. What is there exactly in Pringles” (Runa).

Clip 3. “It’s like a girl’s dream. I think that you’ll have to think about that it’s Blair’s engagement party and that she is marrying a prince, which gives the brand a lot of exclusivity. You think – OK Tiffany’s is the kind jewelry the royal chose. It puts the brand in a fancy wrapping” (Sofy). “Yes, it’s very exclusive and high society” (Mette).

Clip 4. “There was not much connection to the plot in the fourth clip. It was most about how much she loved the jewelries and the ring and how amazing it was. There was not really anything that could take the focus away from the fantastic jewelry” (Thomas).

It was believed that informational product placements triggered viewers’ persuasion knowledge. Thus, it was assumed that viewers would develop more negative attitudes toward the brand because the placement looked more or less like a mini-commercial. As presented above, participants were accurately able to identify each placement as either informational or transformational. Accordingly, it was expected that the informational placement containing the brand Pringles would activate the participants’ persuasion knowledge, leading to generation of negative attitudes toward the brand. Since the other placements, iPhone, Tiffany’s and Harry Winston seemed more natural they were not presumed to trigger participants’ persuasion knowledge. The research findings showed different results, and eight out of the nine participants considered the two clips from Gossip Girl, comparable to a commercial. Two participants stated:

“I think clip 3 and 4 – the way she is standing with the necklace on. If they had taken the sound off and had put some music on, it might as well have been an actress that was doing a commercial, because of the way she puts on the necklace and looks at the ring” . . . “But also the Tiffany’s clip, where they are filming around on the pretty decoration. It’s very breathtaking and staged” (Sofy). “The same with the Harry Winston clip, it could just as well have been a commercial” (Mette).

When discussing the placements in The Big Bang Theory, five participants that follow the show on a regular basis talked about that neither one of the clips from the show looked like a commercial. Thus, their persuasion knowledge was not activated in either the transformational iPhone placement, or in the informational Pringles placement. Some of the participants, Emil, Runa and Sofy mentioned though that the Pringles placement almost presented some negative aspects of the brand. Emil said that it was not inspiring to hear what is in the Pringles package and recommended that the
producers should have used another strategy in order to influence people attitudes toward the brand. He thought that the placement looked far from being like a commercial. The other four participants that have not seen the show before also agreed upon that the iPhone placement did not seem like a commercial, hence the placement did not activate their persuasion knowledge. However, they felt that the Pringles placement seemed like a poor advertisement. Mille said:

“\textquote I have never watch these two shows, and when I saw clip 2 I thought that it was like seeing a bad commercial.”

To sum up the above results, it can be said that persuasion knowledge were triggered in eight out of nine participants after they had seen the transformational placements in \textit{Gossip Girl}, and four out of nine participants’ persuasion knowledge were triggered, after watching the informational Pringles placement. None of the participants’ persuasion knowledge was activated from the iPhone clip. This means that it was not possible to verify the assumption that informational placements are more likely to trigger persuasion knowledge, since findings revealed that persuasion knowledge were activated from both informational and transformational placements.

The next step was therefore to examine if persuasion knowledge had any affect on the participants’ attitudes toward the placed brand, and to see whether there was any difference between informational and transformational placements. Data collection revealed that eight out of nine participants developed negative attitudes toward the two transformational placements in \textit{Gossip Girl}. There was an agreement that the placements were just way too obvious and it was indicated that they would leave more negative things behind. Runa and Jesper said:

“I just thought that the Gossip Girl clips were too much.....that girl with the Harry Winston clip was just too hysterical and uyhhe – I just thought please just stop now it is just jewelries” (Runa).

“Well I think that it is too obvious. It is too noticeable, if they had done a bit more discreetly, then it would have worked better on me. When they make it so obvious, then it becomes too unserious. Then I believe that it is somebody that is trying to cheat me” (Jesper).

The same participants were however positive in regards to the informational placement in \textit{The Big Bang Theory}. In general, participants talked about how well the brand fitted into the show and that the placement looked real. Therefore, the placement did not irritate them. Even though nobody developed negative attitudes toward the placement, it was discovered that participants that were familiar with \textit{The Big Bang Theory} favored the informational placement even more. Sofy said:
“Especially, because the product was interwoven so well into the show. It was very natural that he was standing there listing all those ingredients, so it was interwoven nicely into the show in a natural way.”

Nadia, who really likes Gossip Girl, was the only participant whose persuasion knowledge was not triggered and was positively influenced. She said that she liked the placements even though she admitted that the message was totally obvious. She further mentioned that the show revolves around nice clothes and jewelry and that the show would not be the same without all this glamour. Her attitudes toward the Pringles placement were also positive. Mille was the only participant that developed negative attitudes toward the iPhone placement. She inferred that the scene was too exaggerated based on the fact that the characters were only removing a crappy piece of plastic off the phone.

According to the results, little consistency was found between persuasion knowledge and influence on attitudes. The transformational placements in Gossip Girl activated persuasion knowledge and negative attitudes among all participants, except for Nadia that is very fond of the TV show. Although persuasion knowledge was activated among the four participants that do not watch The Big Bang Theory on a regular basis, their attitudes toward the informational placement were all positive. One participant developed negative attitudes toward the transformational iPhone placement, even though it had not activated her persuasion knowledge, whereas the rest of the participants’ attitudes were positive.

Based on these findings, the first statement (S1), which proposed that viewers are more likely to develop negative attitudes toward the placed brand when the product placement is informational rather than transformational, cannot be confirmed by the research undertaken. The reasoning is due to the fact that even though persuasion knowledge was activated in all circumstances, participants developed negative attitudes toward the transformational placements, whereas they developed positive attitudes toward the informational placement. This shows that no consistency was found in relation to the effectiveness between informational and transformational strategies when applied to product placements, leading to the proposition that other factors may play a role in influencing viewers’ attitudes toward the placed brand.

Since it had been proposed that viewers were more likely to develop negative attitudes from informational placements, it was further assumed that liking the television character would diminish these negative attitudes. It was believed that viewers would become less critical and therefore more
willing to accept the placed brand. Thus, persuasion knowledge should not be activated to the same degree when viewers like a character. Results should therefore demonstrate that the five participants who liked the characters in *The Big Bang Theory* were not supposed to generate negative attitudes toward the Pringles product placement, whereas the other participants should more likely be influenced in a negative way. From the discussion, it became clear that those who follow *The Big Bang Theory* on a regular basis all liked the characters. As Mette, Runa and Sofy stated:

“It is more The Big Bang Theory, where I just love the characters. I like them – they are very sympathetic” (Mette). “Very sympathetic and very geeky” (Runa). “Yes, that also have a lot to say” (Sofy).

Considering that five participants liked the characters, their attitudes toward the Pringles placement were revisited. While reviewing previous discussions regarding their attitudes toward Pringles, results showed that none of them generated negative attitudes toward the placement. Research statement (S2) suggesting that liking a character diminishes negative attitudes to be generated from informational product placements toward the brand is therefore supported. However, when looking into the differences between attitudes and character liking in relation to transformational placements, similar trend was detected as in informational placements. Nadia, who really likes the *Gossip Girl* characters, generated positive attitudes toward the show placements, whereas the rest of the participants developed negative attitudes. Results indicate that it does not matter whether the placement is informational or transformational, rather it is the character that is more powerful in influencing the viewers’ attitudes.

In addition, data analysis revealed that other factors could be more prevailing in influencing participants’ attitudes. The participants brought into the discussion the matter of authenticity in relation to the two TV shows. Eight out of nine participants agreed upon that they preferred the humoristic presentations in *The Big Bang Theory* and that the show presented a reality that they could relate to. Runa and Sofy felt the same and mentioned that in order for them to accept commercials they preferred relaxed and humoristic setting. Mette added that she could associate with the setting in the show where she is together with her friends and having fun and laughing. Nadia agreed to them but felt the opposite. She knows reality and lives in the reality and therefore she does not think it is very attractive. She further commented that she wants what she knows she will never get. They moreover discussed *Gossip Girl* and specified that the scenes from the clips were so extravagant and over the top, that they had a hard time relating to them. These results implicate
that it may be less important whether the placement is informational or transformational, rather that humoristic presentation of the brand might be more influential on attitude change.

Furthermore, they pointed out the placement modalities and how well the brands fitted into the TV shows. Participants agreed that the placements in *The Big Bang Theory* were more subtle in nature compared to *Gossip Girl*, and considered them a good match with the TV show/character. Nadia and Sofy stated:

“In the first two clips it was only one product, one phone and one chips tube, while there were thousands of jewelries in Gossip Girl” (Nadia).

“I especially thought that clip 2 just fitted perfectly into the show. Because you know that that Sheldon has a flypaper memory, so it just fitted very well with his character. They got the brand interwoven really well with his character, so it was just very natural that he could list all those ingredients and therefore I didn’t even think about that it was product placement” (Sofy).

There was also an agreement regarding *Gossip Girl* that there were a stronger focus on brand identifiers, Emil for example mentioned that he could see the Harry Winston brand when Blair entered the store, outside on the awning and he noticed very well that the camera zoomed on a necklace and a ring, just as Mille and Mette talked about Tiffany’s:

“The entire party wore huge jewelries, there was great focus on their jewelries” (Mille). “Yes exactly, I noticed the necklaces and not their dresses” (Mette).

To sum up, based on this analysis of the empirical investigation neither of the two proposed statements can be supported, thus no consistency was found in relation to the effectiveness between informational and transformational strategies when applied to product placements. Nonetheless, the research suggested that other factors are important for influencing viewers’ attitudes. These are character liking, modality and humoristic presentation. The above-presented analysis will be debated further in the following chapter.
7. Discussion

The research findings indicate that audio/visual product placements are better suited than audio only and visual only placements in influencing brand awareness. Results showed that respondents were able to recall and recognize audio/visual brands to a much greater extent, which supports Paivio’s (1979) dual coding theory, that brands are more easily recalled and recognized when both the visual and verbal subsystems are activated. Therefore, marketers need to evaluate what they are trying to achieve with the product placement before deciding on a preferred strategy. Audio/visual strategies appear to give a greater opportunity to influence the other elements higher up in the brand equity pyramid, due to their positive influence on brand awareness.

Based on audio/visual brands only, results indicate that brand familiarity is the dominating factor influencing brand awareness. According to the findings, familiar brands were more likely to be noticed than unfamiliar brands, as Keller (1993) indicated; consumers are more likely to recognize and recall a brand because they have had a prior and repeated exposure to the brand. The degree of placement fit into the TV show, also seems to have an influence on whether a brand is noticed or not. Balasubramanian et al. (2006) emphasized the importance of making sure that the placed brand is communicated correctly to the audience. According to Russell (2002), incongruent placements create more attention and therefore awareness, because the audience perceives the placement as unnatural. Results showed the opposite, and brands that had a good fit within the TV show resulted in higher brand awareness. After a correlation analysis had been conducted between the independent variables, a significant association between these two factors was detected. This means that a possible explanation for why incongruent placements were not noticed might be due to that respondents were not familiar with the brand. It is believed that viewers cannot judge if a brand is a good fit when they have no knowledge about the brand.

Furthermore, results showed two other correlated factors; program involvement and viewer-character relationship that were proven to influence brand awareness. Meaning that being involved with a specific TV show increases the chance of noticing a placed brand, since viewers pay more attention to what is going on in the show. Being highly involved with a TV show also indicates that viewers are fan of the characters in it, which explains the correlation between these two factors. Therefore, the main factors in influencing brand awareness are brand familiarity and program involvement. However, brand familiarity demonstrated being the strongest one.
It is believed that the findings show strong evidence that product placement in TV shows is able to affect brand salience. However, familiar brands may solely benefit from this marketing practice, as they are more likely to be noticed. This gives marketers an opportunity to strengthen their brand awareness, with hope of influencing the creation of strong, favorable and unique brand associations in memory. For products that are new on the market and for products that need to increase their share in brand awareness, other integrative marketing activities should be chosen alternatively, at least up to the point that sufficient awareness has been created. Moreover, when marketers scout the market for the right TV show, it should be considered what type of TV shows their target audience watch and prefer. Thus, potential customers are easier to influence, when they are involved with the TV show.

Although empirical findings showed that the majority (76%) of respondents’ associations and attitudes toward the brand were not influenced, 22% reported that the placement had a positive influence on their associations and attitudes toward the brand. The high amount of neutral answers raises a question of whether product placement as a tool is not powerful enough to influence associations and attitudes, or whether the research was not sensitive enough. It has been taken into consideration that respondents were exposed to little amount of stimuli and that the environment they saw the clips in did not represent a ‘real’ TV show experience. Thereby, it is not claimed that product placement does not influence associations and attitudes, but that the stimuli chosen for this research and the unnatural setting might not have been sufficient to influence majority of the respondents. However, the occurred change in associations and attitudes among respondents cannot be confirmed by other means than what the respondents actually answered, since no knowledge about their prior associations and attitudes toward the brand existed. Conducting a pre-test where participants would have answered questions about the brands prior for exposure could have given more precise information regarding these changes. This was however not possible to accomplish with such a large sample. Keller (2008) argues that in order to transfer secondary associations further to the brand, the viewer needs to hold some strong and favorable associations in memory, and have positive attitudes toward the character or the TV show. The reason for why respondents were not influenced might be because they had limited knowledge, or did not hold adequate associations with it, thereby making it difficult to transfer something meaningful to the brand. It is strongly believed that even though product placement did not influence majority of respondents’ associations and attitudes, evidence from the research undertaken shows that it has potential.
Character liking appears to be the strongest predictor in positively influencing associations and attitudes. According to the research findings, it was more likely that respondents responded more positively toward the brand when they liked the characters. It was assumed to be more likely that when the characters’ personality was associated with the product, positive attitudes would transfer from the character to the brand. Russell and Stern (2006) argued that consumers align their attitudes toward products in the same way that characters do. Therefore, it is believed that respondents were influenced in accordance to the balance theory, which states that if a character likes a product, the viewer will also like the product if he or she likes the character. If inconsistency occurs in the character-viewer-brand triangle, viewers will strive for balance and change their attitudes in accordance to the character. Liking a character did not show to be the only predictor in influencing brand associations and attitudes, so did viewer-character relationship. These two variables were highly correlated and since character liking showed more strength in associations and attitudes, it is assumed that the strength of the relationship between the viewer and the character does not seem to influence associations and attitudes toward the brand. Rather, it is sufficient enough to like the character.

Moreover, results also indicated that the two correlated factors; placement fit and brand familiarity influenced association and attitudes, at least to some extent. This indicates that to have a positive influence on associations and attitudes, the presentation of the brand has to match the TV show and be displayed in a natural way, at least up to the point that it does not irritate viewers. The correlation between placement fit and brand familiarity has been mentioned earlier, and denotes that to identify or evaluate how well the brand fits within the TV show, viewers have to be familiar with it. The main factors in influencing brand associations and attitudes are therefore character liking and placement fit, where character liking proved to be the strongest one.

These findings provide evidence that product placement in TV shows is able to influence viewers’ brand associations and attitudes. When placing a brand into a TV show, marketers need to take into consideration the importance of choosing a character that is considerately well liked among people, as he or she is the one who is endorsing the brand and consequently influencing viewers’ perceptions about it. Besides a well-liked character, the pairing of the character and the brand also needs to be considered to aid in the strength of the character endorsing the brand.

The findings also indicate that product placement in TV shows can influence on brand attachment and activity. Results showed that 28% of respondents were able to identify themselves to some extent toward the placed brands, which symbolizes the strength in which respondents feel that they
bonded with the brand. Keller (2008) stated that customers should go beyond having a positive attitude toward the brand and view it as something special. In some cases, it was believed that viewers tend to get attached to fictional characters they perceive as real, as they have been following them for a long time. Being in line with Horton and Wohl’s (1956) parasocial theory, this type of fellowship and engagement leads to the formation of parasocial attachment (Russell & Stern, 2006). Thus, the influence from characters on viewers was assumed to play an important role, as this parasocial attachment was believed to strengthen the transfer of positive attitudes and meaningful associations to the brand.

This assumption revealed to be accurate and viewer-character relationship showed to be the strongest predictor in influencing brand attachment. This indicates that respondents have been under referential influences, since a strong relationship increases the likelihood of characters becoming referent others, which results in greater influence on viewers (Russell et al., 2006). Hence, attachment was influenced by the characters’ usage of the brand, which made the respondents feel more connected to it. Although character liking and program involvement also showed to influence attachment, correlation analysis confirmed that these two factors were correlated with viewer-character relationship, which had the strongest statistically significant association on brand attachment. This comes as no surprise, since the reason for why viewers are highly involved with a TV show indicates that they must like the characters or are fans. Marketers must therefore acknowledge that without a strong viewer-character relationship, brand attachment will be difficult to achieve, thus it must be taken into consideration, which characters that the brands target audience consider as referent others.

Through the findings, it became apparent that product placement is also able to influence brand activity, as 28% of respondents claimed that they would consider buying the brand. Results showed that more factors were involved in this criterion than in the others, meaning that for viewers to buy the product, it is not enough to just be a fan of the characters. Findings demonstrated that placement fit was the strongest predictor in influencing brand activity, however little difference was detected between placement fit and viewer-character relationship. In addition, the attitudes respondents have toward product placement in general influenced whether respondents considered buying the product. So for marketers to get people to buy or consider buying their brand, they have to make sure that the placement fits well within the TV show, denoting that the story line, the characters and how the brand is being used, all play an important role. Although marketers cannot
control individual preferences toward placements in general, they have to be aware of that viewers do not see the placed brand as a persuasive message.

It is therefore affirmed that findings show adequate confirmation that product placement in TV shows is able to influence viewers’ brand attachment and activity. Still, precaution must be taken about whether this is a result of the product placement alone, especially the influence on activity, as there is a possibility that respondents’ answers might have been influenced by their prior knowledge and relationship to the brand. Respondents might already own some of the products shown in the clips, or they might already have considered buying them. Therefore, it is difficult to verify the influence on brand resonance, or the last step in the CBBE pyramid. Nevertheless, the importance of viewer-character relationship is seen to be crucial, if a purchase should result from product placement activity alone.

What effect does product placement have on viewers’ brand awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity?

To answer the first sub question, product placement shows to impact all five elements in the customer mindset, even though it is not possible to fully support its genuine influence due to relatively weak associations between variables. Results indicate that several factors are considered necessary to influence viewers and accordingly enhance product placement effectiveness. Findings demonstrate that familiar brands and brands that fit well within the TV show generate attention among viewers, thus affecting brand awareness, the lowest level in the CBBE pyramid. Furthermore, in addition to placement fit, the leverage on secondary brand associations held by the characters, contributes in the transfer of positive associations and attitudes further to the brand. A strong relationship between viewers and characters aids in the influence on brand attachment, as they are often seen in the eyes of the viewer as referent others. Moreover, attitudes toward product placement in general need to be positive for action to take place, although the strong relationship between viewers and characters is considered to play the leading part in purchase decisions making.

There is a weakness that needs to be taken into consideration that might have influenced the research findings. This concerns the issue of whether the instrument was sensitive enough to measure the changes in associations and attitudes, since results revealed no difference between the answers regarding associations and attitudes. It might be possible that respondents were not able to distinguish between the meanings of these two dependent variables in the questionnaire. The
reason for this problem can be found within the constructs of these two variables, as they are intangible and subjective in nature. Due to their intangible nature, difficulties in explaining and making each variable understandable to the respondents in a quantitative questionnaire, which is designed to ask short questions and be easy to understand, was problematic. Furthermore, due to the subjective nature of the constructs, there might not have been enough answer-options to choose from, thus the respondents were not able to express themselves. Thus, the use of multiple indicators might have given the respondents a better insight into the meaning of the questions related to associations and attitudes, consequently strengthening the internal reliability of the research. The use of multiple indicators could also have helped in verifying whether the variable activity was affected by the factors or if it was also influenced by respondents’ prior use or knowledge.

In relation to differences between informational and transformational product placements, it seems that transformational placements are not necessarily more beneficial than informational placements. It was proposed that it would be more likely that negative attitudes would be developed toward the placed brand if the placement were informational. Friestad & Wright (1994) postulated that persuasion knowledge could be triggered when consumers detect that a message is being designed to influence them, which could therefore result in development of negative attitudes toward the brand. Instead of viewers’ persuasion knowledge being activated in the informational placement, findings showed that persuasion knowledge was also activated when the placement was transformational. Attitudes toward the placements were also in line whether persuasion knowledge was triggered or not, although attitudes were not influenced even though persuasion knowledge was apparent in the informational clip. Therefore, results showed that participants developed more negative attitudes toward the placement when it was transformational. Due to this, it was not possible to support the first research statement. This means that the level of irritation among the participants was higher in the transformational placements. These findings are not in line with Russel’s (1998) argumentation, that since transformational product placements play on viewers’ emotions and feelings, they should be more beneficial than informational placements in influencing consumers’ attitudes toward the brand in a positive way.

Moreover, it was asserted that the negative attitudes developed from informational placements would diminish if the viewer liked the character. It was believed that a placement giving information or facts about the brand would trigger the viewers’ persuasion knowledge, as the placement looked more like a mini-commercial. Due to the level of character liking, it was assumed that the viewers would be less critical, hence more likely to accept the informational placement. Findings showed that
none of the participants that liked the characters generated negative attitudes toward the informational placement. The research statement was therefore supported. It is however possible to question this result, because even though participants’ attitudes were not influenced in a negative way in the informational placement because they liked the characters, the same results were found in the transformational placements in Gossip Girl. While almost all participants were negatively influenced by these placements, one participant really liked the characters in that show and therefore she was the only one that was not negatively influenced. This indicates that the character is a stronger predictor in influencing viewers’ attitudes toward the brand, like already discovered from the quantitative analysis, while it is not important whether the placement is transformational or informational.

It seems that it does not matter that a character provides facts about the product verbally. Results showed that even though characters were not talking about the brand, the visual overexposure and focus on several products was more likely to lead to irritation. This overexposure concerned that the brand was presented more than one time in a scene and the camera zoomed at the product. So it is suggested that if marketers are trying to influence viewers’ attitudes toward the brand in a positive way, they need to take modality and placement fit into consideration. It seems to be fine to provide facts, just as long as the placement is perfectly written into the script, without too much emphasis on the brand. When it fits well into the TV show, it looks more natural and therefore it becomes less likely that viewers perceive it as a persuasive message. The same applies for placements that are made to play on people’s emotions and feelings. In addition, placing a brand into a TV show might generate better results when presented in a humoristic setting. However, these are individual preferences which the marketer cannot control, thus the marketer needs to evaluate in what kind of setting he or she wants the brand to be linked with, and that it is in line with their target group preferences. Since liking a character seems to influence attitudes toward the brand, marketers also need to assess this factor together with the modality factor, before placing brands in TV shows. Pairing the brand with the right character not only makes the viewer less critical, it also makes the brand fit better into TV shows universe, which makes the placement easier to accept for the viewers.

Is there any difference among viewers how they think and feel about the brand if the placement is informational or transformational?

Based on the two proposed research statements, it is possible to answer the second sub question up for investigation. It is not possible to claim that there is a difference in how viewers think and feel
about the brand, since no consistency in effectiveness between informational and transformational placements was found. This means that participants did not generate more positive or more negative attitudes toward the brand as a result of these two different strategies. Findings showed that the characters in the TV shows are the ones influencing attitudes toward the placements. Although results indicated that negative attitudes did induce from transformational placements and not informational placements, it is not possible to conclude that the influence on attitudes was a result of these two strategies. Established from the empirical investigation, it is believed that the way in which the brand is presented has a stronger effect, and therefore the modality should be a factor to consider.

Some weaknesses were detected afterwards that are considered important to mention, as they could have influenced the focus group findings. First of all, there was only one informational clip presented to the participants. In order to generate a deeper understanding into the influence of informational placements, more than one clip should have been exhibited. Second of all, there were only nine focus group participants. Even though all participants did not agree with the placements in Gossip Girl, one of them did find them to be good and influential. Although she liked the characters, it is not enough to draw conclusions and generalize results based on one person. Therefore, it would have been preferred to have more focus group participants. Whether liking a character diminishes development of negative attitudes established from informational placements is difficult to tell. To measure the true effect, the participants would have had to been exposed to two informational clips, one where they liked the characters, and one where they were neutral or did not like the characters. It is believed that this measurement method would have given more accurate results. Second of all, results did not show enough strength to conclude what the participants were thinking or feeling. This means that it was difficult to analyze and interpret whether participants’ attitudes were actually transferred to the brand, or if they just had a preference of which of the clips they liked. Thus, their overall evaluation of the brands might not have been affected by seeing the clips. It is therefore a question whether this research has been sufficient in making it possible for the participant to distinguish between preference of the TV show clips, and changes in attitudes toward the brand. To have understood changes in participants’ attitudes toward the brand, probing would have been necessary until answers were satisfactory.
To what extent does product placement in TV shows influence brand equity?

Answering the overall research question, product placement in TV shows is, based on the research findings, able to influence brand equity at all levels from awareness to activity. For product placement to be effective, marketers must use familiar brands for their products to be noticed. This allows them to strengthen their product’s brand awareness, with hope of influencing the creation of strong, favorable and unique brand associations in the viewers’ memory. To further strengthen the effectiveness, factors such as modality and placement fit need to be taken into consideration. An opportunity opens up when viewers are fond of characters, and when they are using or talking about the brand, viewers often base their evaluations according to the character, which contributes in the transfer of positive associations and attitudes further to the brand, and even brand attachment if the relationship is strong. All these factors need to be present for product purchase to happen, including positive attitude toward product placement in general. Thus, the relationship between viewers and characters creates a platform from where product purchase can happen, which marketers can take advantage of.

It is not possible to fully generalize the results due to the non-probability sampling methods and since the respondents consisted mainly of Icelandic and Danish nationalities. Still, the findings provide marketers with insights into which factors should be taken into consideration when deciding to place a product in a TV show, at least to some extent how product placement influences consumers in the Scandinavian countries. Consequently, the research findings have created a foundation that can inspire further research in the creation of more accountable and measurable theoretical product placement frameworks, which can help marketers in taking more liable investment decisions in the future.
Figure 16. Refined Conceptual Model
Source: Own Creation
8. Conclusion

Product placement is seen as a quite new academic field of study, despite the fact that is it rapidly advancing in practice. The phenomenon’s complex nature makes product placement challenging to investigate, as it is influenced by multiple factors. Thus, no apparent theoretical framework has been acknowledged that clarifies the effect on consumers and how these effects are actually measured. This leaves marketers in the blind when they have to make product placement investment decisions. Therefore, the reason for undertaking an investigation toward the effectiveness of product placement in TV shows was to generate a deeper understanding of how product placement as a marketing tool is able to influence consumers’ relationship with a brand.

For that reason, this thesis sought to answer the research question: *To what extent does product placement in TV shows influence brand equity?* By taking departure in a conceptual framework developed by Balasubramanian et al. (2006) and related literature, eight factors believed to influence product placement effectiveness in TV shows were identified. A cross-sectional research design using a quantitative questionnaire and focus groups interviews enabled the investigation of whether the identified factors influenced brand equity.

The findings revealed that the factors; modality, brand familiarity, placement fit, character liking, viewer-character relationship, program involvement and attitudes toward placements in general affected brand equity at all levels, but to a different extent. This means that different factors must be taken into consideration when planning a product placement strategy. However, informational and transformational strategies did not show any difference in effectiveness relative to one another.

Findings demonstrated that familiar brands and brands that fit well within the TV show generated greater attention among viewers, thus positively influenced brand awareness. This enables marketers to strengthen their product’s brand awareness even more, with hope of influencing the creation of strong, favorable and unique brand associations in viewers’ memory. Associations and attitudes toward the brand were positively influenced with the leveraging of secondary brand associations from the characters to the brand, and the strong relationship between the viewer and the character aided in the influence on brand attachment. For product purchase to happen, all of the above-mentioned factors need to be present, although viewer-character relationship is considered to play a leading role in purchase decision making.
Even though the research results cannot be fully generalized, they provide useful insights for marketers in taking the right steps toward effective product placements. Furthermore, the research findings have created a foundation that can inspire further research in the creation of more accountable and measurable theoretical product placement frameworks, which can help marketers in taking more solid investment decisions in the future.
9. Limitations and Further Research

The research conducted highlighted the fact that various factors are important to consider, when marketers decide to influence or create brand equity with the use of product placement as a marketing tool. The interplay between the factors and the intangible nature of the different stages in the CBBE hierarchy makes product placement a complex subject to investigate. Since the research strategy was based on a cross-sectional research, the respondents were exposed to little amount of stimuli in an environment that did not represent a ‘real’ TV show experience. Furthermore, the long-term effects of the findings are unknown.

The results only indicate significant association between variables, thus it is unknown whether one variable is causing the effect on the other variable. Moreover, the chosen research approach did not allow the identification of extraneous variables that may influence awareness, associations, attitudes and attachment/activity.

The distribution of the sample population did not meet the conditions for using parametric tests. This means that data analysis was based on the use of non-parametric test. One can question whether these types of tests are weaker than parametric tests, since analysis is carried out on ranks rather than the actual data.

Due to the intangible and complex nature of the independent variables, respondents had a hard time distinguishing between the meanings of associations and attitudes. Therefore, similar results between these two dependent variables were discovered. This casts doubt on and limits the assurance of how effective the influencing factors were in affecting viewers’ associations and attitudes.

In order to affirm and refine the research results, further research should be conducted. The issue of the long-term effects of product placement in TV shows is worth to consider. Through a longitudinal study and repeated observation of the same factors over longer period of time, it should be possible to shred a more affirming light into how effective the factors revealed in this research are in influencing brand equity. This should be undertaken with stronger stimuli, such as different types of TV shows where viewers are exposed to the placed brands in a natural environment.

Although significant relationships were found between some of the variables, the associations were relatively weak. Conducting an experiment on the discovered factors would aid in confirming the results. Not only would it allow the factors to be manipulated, it would also affirm whether a cause
and effect relationship between the variables exist, in addition to discover whether unidentified factors are more prevailing than the factors already identified. The focus group findings indicated that humoristic setting might influence viewers’ attitudes. Future research investigating if the mood of different TV shows have an influence on product placement strategies could contribute a better understanding of the phenomenon and its effects.

Based on the research findings, it has been suggested what marketers need to take into consideration when they choose to place their products in a TV show. Thus, future research on how to implement and integrate the already discovered factors into the product placement practice should be considered. Since no clear theoretical foundation exist to guide marketers in evaluating the most optimal approach, decisions are often based on intuition and opportunities that emerge along the way. In order for marketers to have greater control over their product placement investments, the consideration of how these factors can aid marketers in their strategic decision-making process is interesting to investigate further.

The research did not distinguish between low- and high-involvement products. Therefore a future study could contribute toward the understanding of whether there is any difference in the effectiveness between these two types, since consumers act on different grounds when evaluating whether to purchase the product or not.
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Appendices

Appendix A

**FOR4216: Number, duration and coverage of TV-spots by channel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of minutes per day</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Gallup, Tv-meter årsrapport, 2012a
DIS131: Reception of TV-channels by number of channels

Reception of TV-channels by amount of TV-channels and time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U1-13</th>
<th>U14-26</th>
<th>U32-48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 50 TV channels

Source: TNS Gallup, Annual Survey, 2012a
### DIS134: Internet access by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>2097</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>2142</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Internet at home.

Source: TNS Gallup, Annual Survey, 2012b
### FOR4215: Average daily TV consumption in minutes (aged 3 and up) by month

#### Average daily TV consumption in minutes (aged 3 and up) by month and time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Gallup, Tv-meter årsrapport, 2012b
### VIR316: Advertising turnover by media

Advertising turnover by media and time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Advertising turnover in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12.960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dansk Oplagskontrol, Reklameforbrugsundersøgelsen i Danmark, 2012
Appendix B

CD with stimuli for quantitative and qualitative data + focus group interviews

Links to video clip for quantitative research (also found on CD).

*The Big Bang Theory:*

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iRaGSK3jsjU&feature=plcp

*Gossip Girl:*

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bjzoer0uyk&feature=context-cha
Appendix C

Master Thesis

As a part of our master thesis we highly appreciate if you could assist us and spend approx. 10-15 minutes to answer this survey about how TV shows influence the audience.

In order to answer the survey we kindly ask you to watch a video clip of either The Big Bang Theory or Gossip Girl, and from there answer some questions in relation to the chosen TV show.

Your answers are completely anonymous and confidential.

Please make sure to submit your survey. The survey has been submitted when you are directed to a page saying: “Thanks for completing this survey”.

Sincerely,
Ally & Time

*1. Please choose one of the following TV shows.
   - The Big Bang Theory
   - Gossip Girl

Example 1 - The Big Bang Theory

Before proceeding to the next page, you are asked to watch a video clip from YouTube.

It is very important that you pay attention from the beginning to the end. It is also suggested that you use a full screen and headphones if you are not in a quiet place.

Please do not answer the questions while watching the video clip – only after having watched the video!!!

In order to watch the video clip, please copy the URL below and paste it in a new window.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IRaG3K3jijU&feature=plcp

Example 1 - The Big Bang Theory

*2. Gender
   - Female
   - Male
3. Age
- 16 or under
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- 36-40
- 41+

4. Nationality

5. Have you ever watched the TV show The Big Bang Theory before?
- Yes
- No

6. If you answered NO to the previous question, please proceed to the next page.

If YES, please indicate how often you have watched the show.
- Only a couple of times
- Every now and then
- I follow it on a regular basis

Example 1 - The Big Bang Theory

7. Do you remember seeing and/or hearing any brands or company names in the video clip?
- Yes
- No

8. If you answered NO to the previous question, please proceed to the next page.

If YES, please write down all the brands or company names that you can remember seeing/hearing below.

Example 1 - The Big Bang Theory
9. Do you remember seeing and/or hearing any brands or company names in the following product categories in the video clip?

Please, write down all the brands you remember seeing/hearing below.

NOTE: If you don’t remember any, please proceed to the next page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food &amp; Drinks</th>
<th>Beverages</th>
<th>Clothing/Shoes</th>
<th>Computers and other Electronics</th>
<th>Hygiene Products</th>
<th>Watercraft Vehicles</th>
<th>Supermarket chains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Example 1 - The Big Bang Theory

*10. Do you remember seeing and/or hearing any of the below brands or company names in the video clip?

Please select all the remembered brands.

- Coca-Cola
- Sierra Mist
- Fanta
- Sprite
- Fiji Water
- Mountain Dew
- Evian
- Adidas
- Converse
- Vans
- Volcom
- Triumph

- Victoria's Secret
- Special Blend
- DC Comics
- Billabong
- Dell
- Alienware
- Nintendo Wii
- Xbox
- PlayStation
- Apple (Macbook Pro)
- Apple (iPhone)
- Logitech

- Samsung
- HP (Hewlett Packard)
- Germs
- Purell
- Hygel
- Kawasaki
- Yamaha
- Sea-Doo
- Target
- Wal-Mart
- K-Mart

I saw some brands in the video clip but they are not listed above. Please indicate what brands you noticed.

Example 1 - The Big Bang Theory
11. Are you familiar with the brands listed below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria’s Secret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nintends Wii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Dew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple - Macbook Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple - iPhone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Based on your knowledge about The Big Bang Theory and the brands listed below, to what extent do you believe there was a good match between the brand and the TV show?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Definitely a good match</th>
<th>Somewhat a good match</th>
<th>Neither a good match</th>
<th>Somewhat not a good match</th>
<th>Definitely not a good match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Big Bang Theory and Purell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Bang Theory and Victoria’s Secret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Bang Theory and Nintends Wii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Bang Theory and Mountain Dew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Bang Theory and Apple - Macbook Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Bang Theory and Apple - iPhone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 1 - The Big Bang Theory

13. Has the video clip influenced what the brands listed below mean to you/how you perceive the brand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Definitely had a positive influence</th>
<th>Somewhat had a positive influence</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Somewhat had a negative influence</th>
<th>Definitely had a negative influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria’s Secret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nintends Wii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Dew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple - Macbook Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple - iPhone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master Thesis

*14. To what extent do you like the characters in The Big Bang Theory?

- Definitely like
- Somewhat like
- Neither like nor dislike
- Somewhat dislike
- Definitely dislike

*15. Based on your previous knowledge of the brands listed below, has the video clip influenced your attitudes towards the brand (what you feel and think about the brand)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Definitely had a positive influence</th>
<th>Somewhat had a positive influence</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Somewhat had a negative influence</th>
<th>Definitely had a negative influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purell</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria’s Secret</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nintento Wii</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Dew</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple - Macbook Pro</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple - iPhone</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 1 - The Big Bang Theory

*16. Do you consider yourself a fan of one or more of the characters in The Big Bang Theory?

- I'm not a fan
- I'm a fan

*17. To what extent do you identify yourself with the brands shown in the video clip?

- Definitely identify
- Somewhat identify
- Neither identify nor don't identify
- Somewhat don't identify
- Definitely don't identify
**Master Thesis**

**18. After having watched the video clip, would you consider using/buying the products/brands listed below?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purcell</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria's Secret</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nintendos Wii</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Dew</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple - Macbook Pro</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple - Iphone</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**19. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?**

"I am fine with the use of product placement in TV shows"

- ☐ Definitely agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Definitely disagree

**Example 2 - Gossip Girl**

Before proceeding to the next page, you are asked to watch a video clip from YouTube.

It is very important that you pay attention from the beginning to the end. It is also suggested that you use a full screen and headphones if you are not in a quiet place.

Please do not answer the questions while watching the video clip – only after having watched the video!!!

In order to watch the video clip, please copy the URL below and paste it in a new window.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bjzoer0puyk&feature=context-cha

**Example 2 - Gossip Girl**

**20. Gender**

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
21. Age
- 16 or under
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- 36-40
- 41+

22. Nationality

23. Have you ever watched the TV show Gossip Girl before?
- Yes
- No

24. If you answered NO to the previous question, please proceed to the next page.

If YES, please indicate how often you have watched the show.
- Only a couple of times
- Every week and then
- I follow it on a regular basis

Example 2 - Gossip Girl

25. Do you remember seeing and/or hearing any brands or company names in the video clip?
- Yes
- No

26. If you answered NO to the previous question, please proceed to the next page.

If YES, please write down all the brands or company names that you can remember seeing/hearing below.

Example 2 - Gossip Girl
27. Do you remember seeing and/or hearing any brands or company names in the following product categories in the video clip?

Please, write down all the brands you remember seeing/hearing below.

NOTE: If you don’t remember any, please proceed to the next page.

- Softdrinks/Beverages
- Cars
- Make-up
- Video games and computers
- Clothing/Shoes
- Jewelry/Handbags
- Perfumes
- Facial tissues

Example 2 - Gossip Girl
Master Thesis

28. Do you remember seeing and/or hearing any of the below brands or company names in the video clip?

Please select all the remembered brands.

- Grey Goose
- Martini
- Jack Daniels
- Coca Cola
- Vitamin Water
- Evian
- Cadillac
- Bentley
- Porsche
- Jaguar
- Ferrari
- Lamborghini
- Mercedes Benz
- Kleenex
- Dr. Martens
- Cotton Soft
- Bulgari
- Tiffany & Co.
- Louis Vuitton
- Jimmy Choo
- Zanotti
- Louboutins
- Gucci
- Marc Jacobs
- Chanel
- Hermès
- Prada
- Dior
- No, I don't remember any

I saw some brands in the video clip but they are not listed above. Please indicate what brands you noticed.

---

Example 2 - Gossip Girl

29. Are you familiar with the brands listed below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bing</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martens</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanotti</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Jacobs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanel &quot;5&quot;</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar Hero</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Page 9
**30. Based on your knowledge about Gossip Girl and the brands listed below, to what extent do you believe there was a good match between the brand and the TV show?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Combination</th>
<th>Definitely a good match</th>
<th>Somewhat a good match</th>
<th>Neither a good match</th>
<th>Somewhat not a good match</th>
<th>Definitely not a good match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gossip Girl and Bing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip Girl and Dr. Martens</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip Girl and Zanotti</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip Girl and Marc Jacobs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip Girl and Chanel '5</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip Girl and Guitar Hero</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 2 - Gossip Girl**

**31. Has the video clip influenced what the brands listed below mean to you/how you perceive the brand?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Definitely had a positive influence</th>
<th>Somewhat had a positive influence</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Somewhat had a negative influence</th>
<th>Definitely had a negative influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martens</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanotti</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Jacobs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanel '5</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar Hero</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**32. To what extent do you like the characters in Gossip Girl?**

- ☐ Definitely like
- ☐ Somewhat like
- ☐ Neither like nor dislike
- ☐ Somewhat dislike
- ☐ Definitely dislike
**33. Based on your previous knowledge of the brands listed below, has the video clip influenced your attitudes towards the brand (what you feel and think about the brand)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Definitely had a positive influence</th>
<th>Somewhat had a positive influence</th>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Somewhat had a negative influence</th>
<th>Definitely had a negative influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martens</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanotti</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Jacobs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanel *S</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar Hero</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 2 - Gossip Girl**

**34. Do you consider yourself a fan of one or more of the characters in Gossip Girl?**

☐ I'm not a fan  
☐ I'm a fan

**35. To what extent do you identify yourself with the brands shown in the video clip?**

☐ Definitely identify  
☐ Somewhat identify  
☐ Neither identify nor don’t identify  
☐ Somewhat don’t identify  
☐ Definitely don’t identify

**36. After having watched the video clip, would you consider using/buying the products/brands listed below?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martens</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanotti</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Jacobs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanel *S</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar Hero</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*37. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

"I am fine with the use of product placement in TV shows"

- Definitely agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Definitely disagree
Appendix D

Interview Guide – English Version

Hi and welcome.

Hope you’re all comfortable. We will start by showing you some video clips on the TV. The clips are from the TV shows Gossip Girl and The Big Bang Theory. If you need to see the video clips again just say so.

After they have seen the clips:

The first thing we want you to discuss is how was the clips different from one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1:</th>
<th>Which difference in how the brands were portrayed in the clips did you see?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

After this discussion, if the don’t mention that some of the clip are more emotional and other provides more facts explain this to them to lead the discussion forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2:</th>
<th>What do think about the different portrayals? Did you like some of them more than other and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Now ask more into if some of them are more commercial – to see if persuasion knowledge is present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3:</th>
<th>Did you feel that some of the placements were more like a commercial? If which ones and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4:</th>
<th>How did that make you feel and think about the product? Were some more annoying than others? If why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5:</th>
<th>When you notice a product/brand that has been placed in a TV show to influence you with information about the product, do you get more irritated than if the product/brand was placed in the TV show without these information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Discussion must now be turn in the direction of the character liking/proposition 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6:</th>
<th>Did the character(s) talking/showing the brand make the placement better/less annoying? If why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7:</th>
<th>Would it make any difference if you liked the character? Do you think that the character is able to diminish the irritation you have toward the brand and thereby change your attitudes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thanks for helping us out and participating in the discussion.
Interview Guide – Danish Version

Hej og velkommen til.

Håber alle har det godt. Vi vil starte med at vise jer nogle videoklip på tv’et. Klippene er fra de to tv-shows Gossip Girl og The Big Bang Theory. Hvis I har brug for at se videoklippene igen skal I bare sige til.

Efter at de har set klip:

Den første ting, vi vil have jer til at diskutere, er, hvordan disse klip var forskellige fra hinanden?

Spørgsmål 1: Hvilke forskelle på hvordan mærkerne blev portrættet lagde i mærke til?

Efter denne diskussion, hvis de ikke selv nævner det, så forklar at nogle af klippene er mere følelsesladet og andre mere fakta orienteret. Forklar dette til at føre diskussionen videre.

Spørgsmål 2: Hvad synes i om de forskellige skildringer af mærkerne? Kunne i lide nogle af dem mere end andre, og hvorfor?

Spørgi ind til om de anser nogle klip for mere kommercielle - for at se om pursuasion knowledge er til stede.

Spørgsmål 3: Mindede nogle af produkt placeringerne mere om en reklame end andre? Hvis hvilke og hvorfor?

Spørgsmål 4: Hvor fik det dig til at føle og tænke om produktet? Var nogle mere irriterende end andre? Hvis hvorfor?

Spørgsmål 5: Når du bemærker et produkt / brand, der er blevet anbragt i en tv-udsendelse for at påvirke dig med oplysninger/informationer om produktet, bliver du så mere irriteret end hvis produktet / brandet blev placeret i tv-showet uden disse oplysninger/informationer?

Diskussion skal nu vendes i retningen af character liking / proposition 2.

Spørgsmål 6: Gjorde karakteren(erne) som taler om / viser produktet placeringen bedre / mindre irriterende og hvorfor?

Spørgsmål 7: Gør det nogen forskel, hvis du kunne lide karakteren? Tror du, at karakteren er i stand til at mindske den irritation du føler mod produkt placeringen og derved ændre dine holdninger til brandet?

Det var det sidste spørgsmål. Mange tak for at hjælpen.
Appendix E

Focus Group Participants Characteristics

### Focus Group 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Knowledge of show</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>TBBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>GG &amp; TBBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mette</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>TBBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mille</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Focus Group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Knowledge of show</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanna</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Union worker</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesper</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>TBBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td>TBBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Scientific assistant</td>
<td>TBBT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>70 %</th>
<th>6/9</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>30 %</th>
<th>3/9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11,1 %</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55,6 %</td>
<td>5/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33,3 %</td>
<td>3/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Knowledge of TV show / Watched it before | The Big Bang Theory | 55,6 % | (Female 60 % / Male 40 %) | 5/9 |
|                                          | Gossip Girl         | 22,2 % | (Female 100%)             | 2/9 |
|                                          | None                | 33,3 % | (Female 66,7 % / Male 33,3 %) | 3/9 |

Source: Primary data
## Appendix F

### Brand Awareness

Percentage of Respondents that could see/hear the brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement type</th>
<th>Brands</th>
<th>Unaided Recall</th>
<th>Aided Recall</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio/Visual</td>
<td>Bing</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR. Martens</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zanotti</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marc Jacobs</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chanel No.5</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guitar Hero</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purell</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nintendo</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macbook</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria's Secret</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Dew</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iphone</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.05%</td>
<td>44.08%</td>
<td>55.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.42%</td>
<td>45.94%</td>
<td>59.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Prominent</td>
<td>Cadillac</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaguar</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitamin Water</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chanel</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrari</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verizon</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Mist</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fanta</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.86%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>15.08%</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Subtle</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prada</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logitech</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipod</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiji Water</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alienware</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC Comics</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Converse</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vans</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Blend</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>18.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
<td>9.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>Cleanex</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martini</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgari</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louboutins</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dior</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-mart</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kawasaki</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hewlett</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.68%</td>
<td>18.43%</td>
<td>31.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.05%</td>
<td>20.84%</td>
<td>33.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

### Correlation Between Independent Variables

**Cramer’s V and Spearman’s rho**

Correlation between independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brand Familiarity</th>
<th>Placement Fit</th>
<th>Character Liking</th>
<th>Viewer-Char. Relationship</th>
<th>Program Involvement</th>
<th>Attitudes toward ppl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Familiarity</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Fit</td>
<td><strong>.440</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Liking</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.124**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewer-Char. Relationship</td>
<td><strong>.113</strong></td>
<td><strong>.158</strong></td>
<td><strong>.579</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Involvement</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td><strong>.100</strong></td>
<td><strong>.606</strong></td>
<td><strong>.631</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward ppl.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td><strong>.107</strong></td>
<td><strong>.220</strong></td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>.102**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .001 level (1-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the .005 level (1-tailed).

Source: Primary data
Appendix H
Transformational and informational clips

*The Big Bang Theory:*

Clip 1 - IPhone: Transformational (Season 5 Episode 14 min: 5.18 – 6.15)

Raj has brought a new iPhone 4s. Howard comes by the office to check it out. They are both very exited about this new gadget. Raj allows Howard to be part of the very important process of peeling the plastic of the new phone. In this clip the transformational aspect is apparent by transferring the feeling of excitement and curiosity that a new brought thing gives. It transfers that special moment when you open it and see it for the first time. Just like when you open up a Christmas present as a child.

Clip 2 - Pringles: Informational (Season 5 Episode 24 min: 1.51 - 2.22)

The clique is gathered to watch Howards space shuttle launch. Sheldon impresses with his flypaper memory by mentioning all the ingredients in Pringles chips in the order, which it is written on the chips tube. The others are holding the tube to check if he is right. This placement is informational, since it is more about presenting facts about the brand instead of connecting a certain feeling to the brand. This placement is informational, however to fit perfectly with the informational definition it should have been negatively motivating, which it is not, since it does not revolve a problem.

*Gossip Girl:*

Clip 3 - Tiffany’s: Transformational (Season 5 Episode 8 min: 24.10 – 25.54)

Serena is hosting Blair’s bridal shower, which has a Tiffany’s theme. The entire scene is dwelled in the classic Tiffany’s color white and tiffany blue and white pearls. Serena holds a welcome toast for Blair, where she associates the bridal Tiffany’s theme with the fact that Blair is becoming a princess of Monaco. The feeling this placement is transferring is the perfect life and the dream of every little girl finding her prince, who can buy all the jewelries in the world.

Clip 4 - Harry Winston: Transformation clip (Season 4 Episode 2 min: 24.23 – 24.51)

Blair is in the Harry Winston store in a gala dress. She is trying on a necklace trying to find the perfect piece of jewelry in this very exclusive store, when she sees a diamond ring that she thinks is just perfect. She talks about the rings clarity and carat. This placement transformational, as Blair explains how fantastic these Harry Winston jewelries are and this should transfer associations about how expensive and luxurious these jewelries are. Since she is also mentioning that the ring has clarity and carat the placement also contains facts about the ring.