

5-2020

## Negative Brand Placement: Directions for Future Research

Fernanda Baez Calvillo  
*Northeastern Illinois University*, [fsbaezcalvil@neiu.edu](mailto:fsbaezcalvil@neiu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://neiudc.neiu.edu/uhp-projects>



Part of the [Marketing Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Baez Calvillo, Fernanda, "Negative Brand Placement: Directions for Future Research" (2020). *University Honors Program Senior Projects*. 9.  
<https://neiudc.neiu.edu/uhp-projects/9>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses and Projects at NEIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Program Senior Projects by an authorized administrator of NEIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [neiudc@neiu.edu](mailto:neiudc@neiu.edu).

NEGATIVE BRAND PLACEMENT: DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE  
RESEARCH

A Thesis Presented to  
the Faculty of the University Honors Program  
Northeastern Illinois University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
of the NEIU Honors Program  
for Graduation with Honors

Fernanda S. Baez Calvillo  
May 2020

HONORS SENIOR PROJECT  
ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL FORM

Fernanda S. Baez Calvillo

Negative Brand Placement: Directions for Future Research

This thesis has been reviewed by the faculty of the NEIU Honors Program and is found to be in good order in content, style, and mechanical accuracy. It is accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the NEIU Honors Program and graduation with honors.

---

Prof. Deepa Pillai, Ph.D. Date  
Department of Management and Marketing  
Faculty Advisor

---

Prof. James E. Haefner, Ph.D. Date  
Department of Management and Marketing  
Faculty Reader

---

Honors Curriculum & Standards Board Date

---

Prof. Jon B. Hageman, Ph.D. Date  
Department of Anthropology  
Coordinator, University Honors Program

## ABSTRACT

Brand placement, or product placement, is a marketing communication tactic for promoting a brand through media platforms by embedding the brand within the content. It has been proved to be effective in creating product awareness within consumers as well as in altering or at least influencing consumer attitudes towards the brand. Negative brand placement on the other hand, places a brand in a bad light. As a marketing tactic, this can – theoretically – be placed by competitive brands, or the negative portrayal could occur organically as part of program content. It is in the marketer’s best interests to understand the impact that negative brand placements may have on consumer behavior. This thesis finds that while there has been a significant amount of academic research on typical, positive brand placements, research is lacking in the area of negative brand placement. Current research in this area is examined, followed by a future research proposition. The suggested research focuses on negative brand placement presented by talk show hosts using humor as an artistic expression, and its effects on consumer attitudes toward the brand. The findings are expected to fill the current gap in literature in this domain as well as have implications for marketing practitioners.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank several professors by name who presented their sincere support in the building of this thesis project. First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor Dr. Deepa Pillai. Thank you for your guidance, patience, and feedback throughout this journey. Your expertise in product placement influenced me to work hard and contributed to the refining of this project. I am delighted to have had you as my faculty advisor.

Besides my faculty advisor, I would like to thank the rest of my honors thesis committee: Dr. James E. Haefner, Dr. Blase E. Masini and Dr. Jon B. Hageman for your insightful comments. Thank you for your time and the kind words of encouragement - they led me to believe in myself.

Lastly, I want to thank the University Honors Program community, who provided encouragement and warm smiles for my colleagues and me, including resources for the accomplishment of our thesis project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	V
INTRODUCTION .....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	3
PRODUCT PLACEMENT .....	3
EFFECTIVENESS.....	4
LEGAL ISSUES .....	6
PRODUCT PLACEMENT IN TALK SHOWS .....	7
NEGATIVE PRODUCT PLACEMENT.....	9
SUGGESTED METHODOLOGY .....	12
CONCLUSION.....	13
REFERENCES .....	14
APPENDIX.....	18

## INTRODUCTION

Brand placement has been defined as “the inclusion of a brand name, product package, signage, or other trademark merchandise within a motion picture, television show, or music video” (Steertz 1987, p. 22). Subsequent iterations of this definition have taken into account significant advances in technology and the increasing number of entertainment options. Today, it is “the paid inclusion of branded products or brand identifiers, through audio and/or visual means, within mass media programming” (Balasubramanian, 2016). Placement can be found everywhere - in radio, video games, novels, and even theater productions (Rowe, p. 4). In its simplest form, it is a communication technique used by brands to influence consumers.

A practical advantage of brand placements over traditional forms of communication such as advertising is that it can circumvent the problem of consumers zipping through television commercials, resulting in wasted effort and resources. Another positive side to product placement is that “audiences are more likely to counter-argue in response to advertising than to product placement as they perceive the explicit persuasive intention of advertising” (Balasubramanian et al., 2014). It is no surprise then, that the amount of capital put into product placement within media has been increasing year after year. In fact, it was projected that “11.44 billion U.S. dollars would be spent on product placement in the United States in 2019, up from 4.75 billion in 2012” (Global, 2019). Product placement thus continues to be a trusted investment for many – one which holds various advantages along with its potential in reaching large audiences.

As is to be expected, marketers would prefer that their brand be portrayed positively at all times, hence most brand placement is positive. Positive brand placements

have been studied from a variety of perspectives and over the years, resulted in a significant amount of research. However, there is a gap in academic research on placements that portray the brand in a negative manner. This study aims to close the gap in academic research by exploring the consumer attitudes toward brands that are portrayed in a negative manner, specifically in talk shows. This practice, when engaged by competitive brands, crosses ethical and legal boundaries, hence there are very few published examples with most cases being anecdotal. However, there are examples of this kind of placement being embedded in the content of talk shows. The suggestion research study not only explores the effects that negative brand placement has on audiences, but also takes into account the manner in which a talk show host presents the negative brand placement. More specifically, it covers the artistic expression of talk show hosts, and how their light vs. aggressive humor affects the viewer's attitude toward the brands being presented. The two main research questions that will be explored are:

(1) Does the talk show host's light hearted or aggressive humor when presenting negative brand placement have a direct correlation to a change in the audience's attitude toward the brand?

(2) Does negative brand placement, when presented with humor, cause a significant change in consumer attitudes toward the brand compared to their previous attitudes?

The results will provide answers to questions such as: Does negative brand placement cause more damage than good? Should marketers be concerned? Through negative brand placement, there may or may not be a competitive advantage for the brand



regardless of the negative portrayal. It is this study's intention to explore whether this competitive advantage exists within talk shows.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Product Placement*

Product, or brand placement, a hybrid of advertising and publicity (Balasubramanian, 1994), has become a multibillion dollar business (Scott, p. 411) and a preferred method of brand communication since its beginning in the 1800's. Concerning its purpose, both placement experts and academics claim that brand awareness is the central focus of product placement, and the most probable outcome (Begy et al.). In addition, "Product placement is also beneficial from the point of view of audiovisual production because the inclusion of brands adds realism to fictional action, helps identify the time period in which the action takes place, and contributes to defining the character's role" (Balasubramanian et al., 2006). Advocates of product placement in film state that some advantages are long shelf life, prominent exposure, and enhanced realism (Daughtery et al.). In addition, to put its value into perspective, a study on the economic worth of placement concluded that product placement imbedded in television has a positive and significant correlation with firms' stock prices (Begy et al.).

Arguably the most popular example of product placement success falls to the Disney film, *E.T.*. "The sales of Hersey's Reese's Pieces increased greatly after the extraterrestrial alien featured in the movie *E.T.* followed a trail of Hershey's Reese's Pieces to his new home. The movie *E.T.* was not only a commercial success, but it is significant for bringing the process of product placement to the attention of the general

public” (Nunlee, et al.). Ever since the release of *E.T.* product placement has come a long way to become a multibillion dollar business. Today, audiences are subject to placement every day of their lives in almost anything they watch or listen to.

A main advantage is its ability to increase brand awareness which can in turn lead to brand engagement. In film, advertisers receive a level of benefit from DVD releases and television reruns years after a movie is released or a television show airs (Daugherty et al.). Films are watched and re-watched several times, having no limit of individuals the product placement can be exposed to. An added benefit is that unlike commercials, product placement does not interrupt television programs. Therefore, since the audience is attentive during films and television shows, the seamless integration of products into the media is seen as a subtle technique in promoting brands - the viewer’s attention is drawn to the products without any influence to buy (Terry, 2001). This results in a drastic reduction of audiences perceptually blocking the product promotion. Ultimately, understanding consumer views of product placement along with consumers’ national and cultural backgrounds has become increasingly important as entertainment films and television shows are now globally available and produced (Sabour et al., 2016).

### *Effectiveness*

As a result of the immense efforts put into product placement by companies, substantial research attention has been given to brand placement’s effects on audiences and whether it is an effective form of marketing. There are many variables found to be at play when it comes to measuring placement effectiveness. Such variables include “prior familiarity with the brand; judgments about the “fit” of the individual with the story

character/editorial content/vehicle/medium; skepticism toward advertising; attitudes toward placements/other message types; and program involvement/program connectedness/motivation to process brand information.” (Balasubramanian, 2006). Due to there being an abundance of variables, there is no single measure of the ‘effectiveness’ of product placement (Pillai et al., 2014). Nonetheless, “most studies address the cognitive and persuasive effects of placements in terms of memory and brand attitude” (Sabour et al, 2016).

Today, placement effectiveness measurement in the advertisement industry is represented by the cognitive and affective metric categories derived from the Hierarchy of Effects model in the advertising domain (Sabour et al, 2016). Within the cognitive measurements, the testing of memory for brands and placements in studies showed that high involvement placements caused higher placement recall. Therefore, “recognition, salience, or recall measures are more appropriate for placements that elicit moderate to high levels of conscious processing” (Balasubramanian, 2006). Results from different studies have shown to vary when measuring attitudes, which pertains to the affective metric category. This is due to attitudes being subjective and influenced by variables that only the respondent would be aware of. In one example, “Karrh (1994) found no changes in evaluations of placed brands, even when those brands were made more memorable. Conversely, Russell (2002) found positive attitude change even when recognition of a placed brand was low” (Balasubramanian, 2006).

Some conative measures within product placement are purchase intention and brand usage. In measuring purchase intention, a study of 43 college-aged participants who viewed Wayne’s World reported that purchase intention for placed brands was 16%

higher than for brands previously identified as favorites by participants (Balasubramanian, 2006). Concerning brand usage, researchers Morton and Friedman conducted a study in which “a set of beliefs about movie placements (especially those linked to the portrayal of the placed product in a movie) emerged as useful predictors of product usage behavior” (Balasubramanian, 2006). Both studies concluded in results that explicitly showed a significant positive conative effectiveness of product placement. In measuring effectiveness, the persuasiveness of general communication is often measured and compared to consumer purchasing behavior. In this instance, the most often used tool is the elaboration likelihood model, outlined by Petty and Cacioppo (Redondo, 2012).

### *Legal Issues*

Product placement and other forms of marketing communication are lightly regulated in the United States by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The regulations are so light that placement in television is significantly more regulated than films (Sabour et al, 2016). For members of the European Union however, placement regulations differed greatly. For Finland and Italy, it was not until the establishment of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) that they had to follow enforced placement regulations. The AVMSD mandated strict regulations, turning Europe’s laws more stringent. The stricter regulations are that “programs may not emphasize the placed product(s) excessively, and that the disclosure of placements to viewers is mandatory (Sabour et al, 2016). Placement regulations differ from nation to nation – including in its enforcement.

There is always the possibility that a product placed in films can lead to consumer confusion concerning whether the trademark owner sponsored or had any part in the production of the film. This confusion can be derived from a symbol that resembles a trademarked brand or a trademarked brand placed causing consumers to question the intent. Therefore, laws are set in place to protect trademarks that can be infringed upon when placement is carelessly executed. A trademark infringement suit can be filed under the Lanham Act, while unfair competition can be filed under the Federal Trademark Dilution Act. To be safe, some film producers pixelate or blur out brand symbols to avoid consumer confusion and/or dealing with trademark legalities. Such displacement can also be due to preventing free advertising for the brand.

Today, product displacement in motion pictures for the avoidance of trademark infringement is not always necessary, seeing that trademark holders have limitations in preventing their brands from appearing in films. In deduction, “how the product is portrayed makes a huge difference for trademark owners, but it does not require filmmakers to seek consent for every use of a mark in his film.” (*Rodrigues Law PLLC*). Due to the immoderate restrictions on television placements, talk shows execute an artistic expression when presenting brand placements. In this way, talk show hosts and producers can freely execute both positive and negative brand placements.

### *Product placement in Talk Shows*

Within most talk shows brand placement is embedded in a multitude of forms. Arguably the most popular forms are in the host’s dialogue or in the show’s giveaway segment. According to Suzanne Vranica from the Wall Street Journal, “Such giveaways,

as well as simple mentions of a product on the air, are making daytime talk shows a hot area for marketers to place their products" (Vranica, 2004). The Ellen DeGeneres Show is one such show which has built a reputation for creating product buzz. Vranica adds, "[Ellen DeGeneres] may be the next golden gal for generating product hype . . . She offers marketers a family-friendly atmosphere and a wide audience range, from stay-at-home moms to men who work shifts. It's got a broad appeal" (Vranica, 2004). Product placement is generally implemented in media where a vast majority of viewers are part of the market for the product. By having a wide audience range like in The Ellen DeGeneres show, it creates an opportunity to generate higher brand awareness.

Concerning an Ellen DeGeneres episode where Ellen verbally promoted the website Crazygrazer.com, "The company's Web traffic following the show's airing jumped by 40%', says Bonnie Smith, director of marketing at Crazygrazer.com. 'Product placement gave us immediate exposure, and it doesn't cost a ton'" (Vranica, 2004). Similarly, The Oprah Windfrey Show holds an immense influence on its audience – making it a gold mine for product placement. For Greenberg Smoked Turkeys Inc., their brand presence in Oprah's show resulted in a huge spike in demand. According to Sam Greenberg, owner of Greenberg Smoked Turkeys Inc., "The business normally signed up 5,000 new customers annually. In the two weeks post-Oprah, 22,000 first-timers came calling at an average of \$50 per order" (Townsend, p. 24). With both Greenberg and Crazygrazer.com, the placement within the popular talk shows proves to be a significant strategy that creates an influx of revenue and brand awareness.

Although results vary, a multitude of businesses can relate with receiving positive results due to product placement in television shows, several moving towards more

passive integration of brands, where they are visible but characters don't need to endorse them (McClatchy, 2010). As of now, there is existing academic literature on the effectiveness of product placement in talk shows. There is an absence in literature though, on the effects of negative product placement in talk shows.

### *Negative Product Placement*

While product placement results in positive results for a sponsored brand (high brand awareness, increased brand engagement), negative product placement can theoretically do the opposite – cause damage to a brand's image. As mentioned, the questionable nature of this practice, if a competitive brand is the source has resulted in little to no published cases that are not anecdotal. However, there are several observed instances of these in talk shows.

*Full stomach, empty soul?' Stewart quipped. 'Actually, I think that's the slogan for Arby's.' As any regular 'Daily Show' viewer can tell you, it was by no means the first time Stewart had taken a shot at the fast-food sandwich chain. In fact, the Comedy Central host has made a sport of Arby's-ribbing over the last few years. So pervasive is the practice that it has hatched a number of conspiracy theories, including the theory that Arby's Restaurant Group Inc. (owned by Roark Capital Group and Wendy's) is, in fact, a secret Comedy Central advertiser paying for the derisive plugs. No publicity is bad publicity, after all, and the snarky comments at Arby's expense still get people talking about it (Zara, 2014).*

The quote above expresses the negative brand placement Arby's has been exposed to in Comedy Central's Daily Show hosted by John Stewart. For Arby's, the

negative brand placement within the Daily Show is created chatter, but did it create positive attitudes in consumers' minds? Negative placement, whether its brand or product placement, is known to be a strategy used by brands for the goal of having consumers disassociate from a competitor's products. Any publicity gets the word out, and has the means of starting conversation.

One known instance of the execution of negative product placement occurred in 2005, when a Denver news station broke out a story, right before Christmas, on toys that might have been unsafe for kids. "The news story was actually a video news release funded by Panasonic, Namco and Techno Source. All of the toys that were reported as being safe were manufactured by Panasonic, Namco and Techno Source; while all of the toys reported as "unsafe" were manufactured by rival companies" (Nunlee et al.). Other instances where this can be seen is in action films, where during a car chase the vehicles chasing the hero crash in the background. Those vehicles are most times made by a different make than the fast car, and are under negative product placement. Not only is there little research done on negative product placement, there is also minimal research done on its behavioral effects.

In an article formulated by Ignacio Redondo from the Autonomous University of Madrid, marketing and psychology were combined in the attempt to find the effectiveness of two types of negative placement – intrinsically and extrinsically connected to the brand. He had viewers watch the film "Goodbye Lenin!" where Coca Cola and Burger King showed different kinds of negative product placement. "The negativity of the Coca-Cola placement has an extrinsic and merely ideological source: The unfavorable view of this company arises from its association with capitalism—one



amusing scene shows, for example, that the most nostalgic character is entirely willing to accept Coca-Cola once she is convinced its unique formula was discovered in the former East Germany. By contrast, the negativity of the Burger King placement is intrinsically connected to the brand: The movie mocks the brand's marketing, suggests its food is harmful to people's health, and portrays the kind of work offered there as routine and menial" (Redondo, 2012). By separating the two types of placement and creating two groups of viewers, each watching a different type of placement, Redondo aimed to find two different types of behavioral effects. He found that consideration of intrinsically negative information discouraged the viewers from consuming the brand, more so when the movie content was seen as realistic. It was also found that the extrinsically negative information does not discourage the brand users from consuming the product, in fact, it stimulates the brand nonusers to consume it. Although there was no measurement of viewer's attitudes in this study, it supports the idea that not all negative product placement is damaging.

In addition, a study by Soonkwan Hong on finding appropriate methods for higher brand salience found that "in order to achieve a higher brand salience, product placements need to be either demonstrative or placed in negative context" (Hong, et al.). Although this study did not take into account consumer attitudes, it can be seen as support to research the effects of negative product placement on attitudes due to its findings that there is higher brand salience (prominence) in product placements within a negative context.

The above discussion leads to the following hypotheses:

(H1): Exposure to humorous characterizations of brands within talk shows will have a significant positive effect on consumer attitudes towards the brand in the case of consumers with pre-existing positive or neutral attitudes towards the brand.

(H2): Exposure to humorous characterizations of brands within talk shows will have a significant negative effect on consumer attitudes towards the brand in the case of consumers with pre-existing negative attitudes towards the brand.

(H3): A consumer's change in attitude towards a brand is related to the nature of the product characterization; aggressive (rather than light-hearted) humor will have a significantly stronger effect

#### SUGGESTED METHODOLOGY

An online survey has been created that has three embedded video clips that depict three different brand mentions (Arby's, Olive Garden, and Cheerios) that are portrayed in a negative context in three different talk shows. Respondents will be asked questions on attitudes towards specific brands, attitudes towards the talk show hosts and demographic information.

Data will be collected via a link to the survey embedded in an email requesting students and faculty to participate. The survey can be found in Appendix A. This email is recommended to be distributed through various departments within the university of choice, with the permission of the department heads. By distributing it this way, the primary investigator can avoid collecting personal identifiable information, such as respondent's email.

Once the data is collected, it can be exported into Excel. Using Excel's Data Analytic Solver tools, such as ANOVA testing and regression analysis, the statistical significance of the data can be measured. The next step is to look for any patterns (or lack of patterns which is just as important) within the data. The final conclusions derived from the data analysis can be expected to then be presented in the discussion section.

## CONCLUSION

The suggested study results are expected to fill a gap in brand placement literature by addressing the relationship between negative brand placement and talk show host humor. It is in the best interest of any marketer to gain a deeper understanding of negative product placement and its effects on consumer attitudes. The conclusions can thus be used by marketers to identify a competitive advantage (or lack thereof) in the case of negative brand placement. The results, if proven to show a connection between a talk show host's humor style and consumer attitudes toward the brand, can provide support for executing further research into negative product placement, challenging the view that it is always a damaging strategy.

## REFERENCES

- Balasubramanian, Siva K., et al. "Audience Response to Product Placements." *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 35, no. 3, Fall 2006, pp. 115–141. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.2753/JOA0091-3367350308.
- Balasubramanian, Siva K. "Beyond Advertising and Publicity: Hybrid Messages and Public Policy Issues." *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 23, no. 4, Dec. 1994, pp. 29–46. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1080/00913367.1943.10673457.
- Balasubramanian, Siva K., et al. "Modeling Attitude Constructs in Movie Product Placements." *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, vol. 23, no. 7, Nov. 2014, pp. 516–531. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1108/JPBM-04-2014-0552.
- Begy, Genevieve, and Vishal Talwar. "The Economic Worth of Product Placement in Prime-Time Television Shows." *International Journal of Market Research*, vol. 58, no. 2, Mar. 2016, pp. 253–275. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.2501/IJMR-2015-026.
- Christopher Zara. "Arby's On Jon Stewart's Beef: 'We Can Take A Joke'". *International Business Times News*, March 12, 2014 Wednesday. <https://advance-lexis-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:m:5BPY-J3Y1-JCMN-Y18Y-00000-00&context=1516831>. Accessed November 09, 2019.
- Daugherty, Terry, and Harsha Gangadharbatla. "A Comparison of Consumers' Responses to Traditional Advertising and Product Placement Strategies: Implications for Advertisers." *AMA Winter Educators' Conference Proceedings*, vol. 16, Jan.

2005, pp. 24–25. *EBSCOhost*,  
search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=19926343.

*Global Product Placement Spending 2019 | Statista.*

<https://www.statista.com/statistics/261454/global-product-placement-spending/>.

Accessed 10 Nov. 2019.

Hong, Soonkwan, et al. “The Effective Product Placement: Finding Appropriate Methods and Contexts for Higher Brand Salience.” *Journal of Promotion Management*, vol. 14, no. 1/2, Dec. 2008, pp. 103–120. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1080/10496490802492457.

“How To Use Brands And Products In Film.” *Rodriques Law PLLC*, 29 June 2017, [rodrigueslaw.com/blog/how-use-brands-and-products-film](http://rodrigueslaw.com/blog/how-use-brands-and-products-film).

Nunlee, Martin, et al. “Negative Product Placement: An Evolving Theory of Product Disparagement and Unfair Competition.” *Journal of Marketing Development & Competitiveness*, vol. 6, no. 2, Sept. 2012, pp. 11–27. *EBSCOhost*, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=91925702](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=91925702).

Pillai, Deepa, et al. “The Effect of Individual Level Variables on the Effectiveness of Brand Placements.” *Innovative Marketing*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2014, p. 11.

Redondo, Ignacio. “The Behavioral Effects of Negative Product Placements in Movies.” *Psychology & Marketing*, vol. 29, no. 8, Aug. 2012, pp. 622–635. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1002/mar.20548.

Rowe-Cernevicius, Brittany. *As seen on TV: Brand Placement and its Influence on the Identity of Emerging Adults*, Bowling Green State University, Ann Arbor, 2011.

*ProQuest*, <https://search-proquest->

[com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/919041496?accountid=14553](https://search-proquest-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/919041496?accountid=14553).

Sabour, Nadia I., et al. "Attitudes and Related Perceptions about Product Placement: A

Comparison of Finland, Italy and the United States." *International Journal of*

*Advertising*, vol. 35, no. 2, Mar. 2016, pp. 362–387. *EBSCOhost*,

doi:10.1080/02650487.2015.1031205.

Scott, Kristin A., and Margaret A. White. "MERE EXPOSURE AS A SIGNAL:

COMPANY OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS." *Journal of*

*Marketing Theory and Practice*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2016, pp. 411-421. *ProQuest*,

<https://search-proquest->

[com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/1819785352?accountid=14553](https://search-proquest-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/1819785352?accountid=14553),

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1080/10696679.2016.1205448>

"Second Coming for Product Placement in TV Soap Operas: Product Placement in

Television Serials Sees a Resurgence with the Advertising Industry Bouncing

Back." *McClatchy - Tribune Business News*, Jun 24, 2010. *ProQuest*,

<https://search-proquest>

[com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/516809978?accountid=14553](https://search-proquest-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/516809978?accountid=14553).

Steertz, Eva M. *The Cost Efficiency and Communication Effects Associated with Brand*

*Name Exposure Within Motion Pictures*, 1987. Print.

- Terry, Mark. "When Is a Prop Not a Prop: The Advantages of Product Placement." *Sports Marketing* (14608359), no. 74, Sept. 2001, p. 14. *EBSCOhost*, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=6139748](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=6139748).
- Townsend, Matt. "Riding the Oprah Wave, Ready or Not." *Bloomberg Businessweek*, no. 4230, May 2011, p. 24. *EBSCOhost*, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=60770701](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=60770701).
- Vranica, Suzanne. "Talk shows; Advertising: Talk shows are Hot Area for Marketers." *Wall Street Journal*, Nov 17, 2004. *ProQuest*, <https://search-proquest-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/398889026?accountid=14553>.

## APPENDIX

### Appendix A: Survey

---

How likely are you to notice a brand embedded in media?

- Never (1)
  - Very unlikely (2)
  - Neutral (3)
  - Very likely (4)
  - All the time (5)
- 

Are you comfortable having an opinion that goes against the majority?

- Extremely comfortable (1)
  - Slightly comfortable (2)
  - Neither comfortable nor uncomfortable (3)
  - Slightly uncomfortable (4)
  - Extremely uncomfortable (5)
- 

Are you willing to voice that opinion?

- Definitely yes (1)
  - Probably yes (2)
  - Might or might not (3)
  - Probably not (4)
  - Definitely not (5)
-



Do you watch talk shows?

- Yes (1)
  - No (2)
- 

If yes, how often?

- Far too often (1)
  - Moderately (2)
  - Neither too much nor too little (3)
  - Not very often (4)
  - Not often (5)
- 

How influenced are you by a talk show host's opinion on a product?

- Strongly influenced (1)
- Somewhat influenced (2)
- Neutral (3)
- Not really influenced (4)
- Not Influenced (5)

**End of Block: Default Question Block**

---

**Start of Block: Block 2**

Part 1 of 3

---

Have you ever dined at an Arby's restaurant?

- Yes (1)
  - No (2)
-

What is your attitude toward the brand Arby's?

- Dislike a great deal (1)
  - Dislike somewhat (2)
  - Neither like nor dislike (3)
  - Like somewhat (4)
  - Like a great deal (5)
- 

For the following statements please mark the option that most relates to you.

---

I feel good when I dine at Arby's

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
  - I have not dined at Arby's (6)
- 

Arby's makes me happy

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
  - I have not dined at Arby's (6)
-

Arby's gives me pleasure

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
  - I have not dined at Arby's (6)
- 



Did you watch the entire clip?

- Yes (1)
  - No (2)
-



	Disagree (1)	Somewhat disagree (2)	Neither agree or disagree (3)	Somewhat agree (4)	Agree (5)
I find John relatable (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think John is funny (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
John and I have similar opinions (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like to compare my views to John's (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I find John's comments intriguing (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For the following statements please indicate your attitude AFTER watching the clip.

I feel good when I dine at Arby's

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Arby's makes me happy

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Arby's gives me pleasure

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Would you say that the aggressive humor John Stewart added towards Arby's changed your previous attitude toward Arby's?

- Complete change in attitude (1)
- Slight change in attitude (2)
- No change in attitude (3)

---

Please explain in detail the reasoning behind your change in attitude.

---

If you have never been to Arby's, did this video make you want to dine at Arby's?

- Definitely yes (1)
  - Slightly yes (2)
  - Neutral (3)
  - Slightly no (4)
  - Definitely no (5)
  - I have been to Arby's before. (6)
- 

After watching the video, are you more or less willing to purchase an Arby's product?

- More willing (1)
  - Less willing (2)
  - No change (3)
- 

After watching the video, how likely are you to visit Arby's in the near future?

- Extremely likely (1)
- Slightly likely (2)
- Neither likely nor unlikely (3)
- Slightly unlikely (4)
- Extremely unlikely (5)

**End of Block: Block 2**

---

**Start of Block: Block 3**

Part 2 of 3

---

Have you ever dined at Olive Garden?

- Yes (1)
  - No (2)
- 

What is your attitude toward the brand Olive Garden?

- Dislike a great deal (1)
  - Dislike somewhat (2)
  - Neither like nor dislike (3)
  - Like somewhat (4)
  - Like a great deal (5)
- 

For the following statements please mark the option that most relates to you.

---

I feel good when I dine at Olive Garden

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
-

Olive Garden makes me happy

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Olive Garden gives me pleasure

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Please watch the following clip to answer the next questions.







	Disagree (1)	Somewhat disagree (2)	Neither agree or disagree (3)	Somewhat agree (4)	Agree (5)
I find Conan relatable (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think Conan is funny (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Conan and I have similar opinions (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like to compare my views to Conan's (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I find Conan's comments intriguing (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For the following statements please indicate your attitude AFTER watching the clip.

I feel good when I dine at Olive Garden

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Olive Garden makes me happy

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Olive Garden gives me pleasure

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Would you say that the light humor Conan added towards Olive Garden changed your previous attitude toward Olive Garden?

- Complete change in attitude (1)
- Slight Change in attitude (2)
- No change in attitude (3)

---

Please explain in detail the reasoning behind your change in attitude.

---

If you have never been to Olive Garden, did this video make you want to try Olive Garden?

- Yes (1)
  - No (2)
  - I have been to Olive Garden before. (3)
- 

After watching the video, are you more or less willing to purchase an Olive Garden product?

- More willing (1)
  - Less willing (2)
  - No change (3)
- 

After watching the video, how likely are you to visit Olive Garden in the near future?

- Extremely likely (1)
- Slightly likely (2)
- Neither likely nor unlikely (3)
- Slightly unlikely (4)
- Extremely unlikely (5)

**End of Block: Block 3**

---

**Start of Block: Block 4**

Part 3 of 3

---

Have you ever consumed the cereal Cheerios?

- Yes (1)
  - No (2)
- 

What is your attitude toward the brand Cheerios?

- Dislike a great deal (1)
  - Dislike somewhat (2)
  - Neither like nor dislike (3)
  - Like somewhat (4)
  - Like a great deal (5)
- 

For the following statements please mark the option that most relates to you.

---

I feel good when I consume Cheerios

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
-

Cheerios makes me happy

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Cheerios gives me pleasure

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Please watch the following clip to answer the next questions.





	Disagree (1)	Somewhat disagree (2)	Neither agree or disagree (3)	Somewhat agree (4)	Agree (5)
I find Stephen relatable (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think Stephen is funny (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stephen and I have similar opinions (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like to compare my views to Stephen's (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I find Stephen's comments intriguing (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For the following statements please indicate your attitude AFTER watching the clip.

I feel good when I consume Cheerios

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Cheerios makes me happy

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Cheerios gives me pleasure

- Strongly agree (1)
  - Somewhat agree (2)
  - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
  - Somewhat disagree (4)
  - Strongly disagree (5)
- 

Would you say that the light humor Stephen added toward Cheerios advertising changed your previous attitude toward Cheerios?

- Complete change in attitude (1)
- Slight Change in attitude (2)
- No change in attitude (3)

---

Please explain in detail the reasoning behind your change in attitude.

---

If you have never consumed Cheerios, did this video make you want to try Cheerios?

- Yes (1)
  - No (2)
  - I have had Cheerios before. (3)
- 

After watching the video, are you more or less willing to purchase a Cheerios product?

- More willing (1)
  - Less willing (2)
  - No change (3)
- 

After seeing the video, how likely are you to visit Cheerios in the near future?

- Extremely likely (1)
- Slightly likely (2)
- Neither likely nor unlikely (3)
- Slightly unlikely (4)
- Extremely unlikely (5)

**End of Block: Block 4**

---

**Start of Block: Block 6**



What is your approximate age?

- <18 (1)
  - 18-22 (2)
  - 23-27 (3)
  - 28-32 (4)
  - 33-37 (5)
  - 38-42 (6)
  - >42 (7)
  - Prefer not to answer (8)
- 

What is your gender?

- Male (1)
  - Female (2)
  - Other (3)
  - Prefer not to answer (4)
- 

How would you describe yourself? Select all that apply

- White or Caucasian (1)
- Black or African American (2)
- American Indian or Alaska Native (3)
- Asian (4)
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (5)
- Hispanic or Latino (6)
- Other (7)
- Prefer not to answer (8)

**End of Block: Block 6**

