

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FANTASY BRANDS VERSUS PRODUCT PLACEMENT
IN DRIVING CONSUMER PURCHASE:

By

HAYLEY ANN SCHWARTZ

A Thesis Submitted to The Honors College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Bachelors degree With Honors in

Marketing

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

MAY 2016

Approved by:

Dr. Yong Liu
Department of Marketing

Abstract

This paper explores fantasy brands and product placement in order to determine which method serves to be more effective to a targeted audience. A fantasy brand exists only in a virtual or fictional world. Reverse product placement is the process of transforming brands in a virtual world into products or services in the physical world. Common fictional brands include Willy Wonka Chocolate (*Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*), Duff Beer (*The Simpsons*), Dunder Mifflin Paper (*The Office*), Bubba Gump Shrimp Company (*Forrest Gump*), Central Perk (*Friends*), and Stay Puft Marshmallows (*Ghost Busters*). Previous research has suggested that people who are fans of a television show or movie are more likely to purchase a fantasy brand than those who are unfamiliar with the show or movie. Additionally previous research indicates that some people believe product placement is invasive and results in negative brand image. However, no previous research directly compared product placement to fantasy brands, and which a consumer might prefer. This paper will explore the advantages and disadvantages of both product placement and fantasy brands. The study conducted tested 175 subjects in a moderated laboratory setting to discover which form of advertising was more likely to drive a purchase interaction. This study goes on to provide evidence that consumers are more likely to purchase a fantasy brand when there is a high level of “fandom”. However, if they have a low level of “fandom” they are more likely to purchase the item in the form of product placement. This paper contributes to the idea of branding, experiential consumption, and advertising in an overcrowded era.

Keywords: Product Placement, Fantasy Brands, Reverse Product Placement, Fictional Brands, Purchase Habits, Consumption

Introduction

In the 1970s the average city dweller was exposed to 500-2000 advertisements in a day. In modern times this number has increased to 3000-5000 advertisements in a single day.¹ How do companies differentiate their products? How do advertisers ensure they have a positive brand image on their target markets without being intrusive? A study conducted by television networks in 2005 indicated that 90% of viewers skip all or most commercials when watching their DVR (“New Trends in Product Placement” 2). Therefore, agencies and networks must redefine the ways in which they try to reach consumers. According to previous research there are four classifications that can summarize the main interactions consumers have with brands. These include interacting with real brands in fictional worlds (Product Placement), virtual brands in fictional worlds (Proto-brands), Real brands in the real world (Most brands), and virtual brands in real worlds (Reverse Brand Placement) (Muzellec 12). Why purchase one of these brands? How does the consumer differ across these four interaction categories? Some scholars believe we use these products to help us reach our ideal selves: “Owning these goods may create a feeling of being part of that world or by bringing aspects of fantasy to life, may provide a momentary escape from reality” (Reading 158). Additionally these products not only express our wish to belong to a different world, but the difference between “who we are and who we want to be” (Reading 158).

Related Literature/Background

Product Placement

¹ USA Today (2006), Product placement- you can't escape it, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/money/advertising/2006-10-10-ad-nauseum-usat_x.htm Accessed April 1, 2016

Product Placement is suggested to “influence brand recognition, recall, attitudes, and acceptance of the placements in general” (Reading 159). However the success has also been found to depend on the consumer’s general level of acceptance regarding product placement. Additionally does recognition drive purchase? Often times there are both product placement successes and product placement failures.

Product Placement Successes

One of the oldest forms of product placement is in “Soap Operas”. The name was coined because the storyline mentioned various soap products in the story in exchange for financial support from cleaning companies. The crowning success story of product placement for a particular brand is Reese’s Pieces candy in the movie *ET the Extraterrestrial*. The candy’s sales increased by 65% following the movie’s release (Buss 36). This is also known as one of M&M’s biggest marketing blunders, as they chose not to be featured in the film (Morton 33). Previous research suggests that the effects of product placement can influence brand recognition, recall, and attitudes. Additionally, product placement success can depend on the movie or films background, incorporation into the plot, use of the item, and character’s reaction to the item. Other product placement successes include Ray Bans (*Risky Business*), BMW (*The Italian Job*), Transformers (*Transformers*), and Wilson (*Castaway*).

Product Placement Failures

Product placements can cause a negative shift in brand attitude. Previous research has shown that depending on factors including the “size of the product or logo, centrality of the screen, integration in the plot, centrality to the plot, number of mentions, duration on screen, and

strength of the placement” affect a viewer’s attitude towards the product. Additionally, viewers are more sensitive to interruptions if they are more involved in the shows and have a high program liking (Cowley 94). Netflix *House of Cards* was critiqued for having too many product placements with Blackberry, Dell, Samsung, Coca Cola, and Chevrolet. The movie *Transformers* was also critiqued for having too prominent of a placement for Beats Pills (one of the transformers changes into a beats pill).

Experiments indicated that high program liking viewers were more likely to remember seeing prominent placements (Cowley 96). This led to the conclusion that high program liking viewers were likely to recognize a placement, but they had lower brand attitudes after exposure. The lower program-liking viewers had a positive influence to the placements. This is the first indication that “being a fan” results in different opinions and outcomes regarding brand perceptions and purchase intentions (explored later in the study).

Fantasy Brands

A fantasy brand is defined as a brand that is non-existent in the real world and is used in artistic or entertainment productions (i.e. paintings, books, comics, movies, TV, video games, etc). It is stated that the brand is usually developed either because corporations were unwilling to license their brand names for fictional use (usually when the brand name is used in a negative light) or the content creator did not want to feature real brands in their production. The process of creating a product is either called brand precession since the virtual brand precedes the real brand, or as reverse product placement (Muzellec 400).

According to a previously conducted study. There are three main attributes that influence perception of a fantasy brand. The first attribute is “attitude towards a television program had a positive influence on attitude towards a fictional service brand”. For example, a fan of *The Simpsons* is more likely to have a positive attitude towards Duff Beer than someone who is unfamiliar with the show. Secondly, perceived quality of a fictional service has a positive influence on attitude towards a fictional service brand. For example, Oceanic Airlines in the show *Lost* usually crashes and therefore has low perceived quality, and negative attitudes toward the brand.

Lastly, “identification with a fictional service brand has a positive influence on attitude towards a fictional service brand”. Self connection “indicates strength through activation of the person’s identity system and contained items capturing the degree to which the relationship delivered on centrally held identity themes, or helped express real and collective selves” (Aaker 408).

Therefore if one is connected with a main character in a television show they are more likely to have a positive attitude towards a product that character uses. All three of these attributes combined are said to have influence on purchase habits: “attitudes towards a fictional service brand has a positive influence on purchase intention of a fictional service brand”. The degree of explanation for the attitude of the fictional brand was moderate compared to the high positive impact of the studies other hypotheses. This study implies that “perception is more important than reality” (Duncan 412). Successful brands can be built without a physical product or service. It is suggested at the end of the study that companies “could be much more proactive by creating, embedding protecting fictional brands with a view to future defictionalisation” (Muzellec 410).

Marketers have suggested that reverse product placement could be a way to launch brands at significantly lower costs than creating new brands from first principles (Edery 24). Literature also suggests that the success of the launch of one of these products depends on brand awareness and positive brand associations.

In a study conducted, participants were highly emotive when discussing fantasy brands compared to when discussing traditional brands. Additionally their connection could be summarized as connection to another world, emotional connections, and connection to self and others. The participants did not consider purchasing products from films, TV shows, or games that they had not watched (Reading 158).

Sometimes people only consider product placement or fantasy brands to be products that come from television or films. However research states: “well-designed placements in games are more effective than placements on television or in films because, in a game’s immersive environment, players can interact with the products they see” (Edery 24). While many consider placing brands in games, many forget the idea of placing fictional brands in games and launching them into the real world.

“Why spend tens or hundreds of millions of dollars fighting mature competitors for mindshare and shelf space in the physical world when you can launch a new offering in an uncluttered fictional one?” (Edery 24).

Brands could launch in a virtual world to see the demographic they should target, popularity, and to creatively reach potential consumers. This phenomenon has begun to be tested in recent years. For example, American Apparel clothing launched a line of jeans that appears in Second Life before launching them in the real world. Research states that “those who seriously and thoughtfully exploit the potential of advertising and product creation in games will find themselves rewarded with lower costs for market entry and ideally, enhanced customer relationships... and promises to be more fun than say, your umpteenth focus group” (Edery 24).

Post-modernism is explained to contrast modern ideas that there is only one reality: “Post-modernity is a depthless world of simulation, where images bear no discernable relationship to external reality and where artifice of, in the words of the post-modern rock group U2, in ‘even better than the real thing’” (Brown 2).

Post-modernism can be seen in both fantasy brands also called “reverse product placement” and merchandising. Merchandising refers to a form of brand licensing when products are recreations of objects that exist in a film attaching a brand from a film or show to a physical product (ex: a Minion for NBCUniversal’s Minions). A new manifestation of brands is titled “brand precession” and is defined as “being developed without origin or reality it may initially exists only in virtual worlds and may be incapable of ever existing in the real, physical world” (Muzellec 2). The literature goes on to indicate four orders of brand precession.

The first order relates to brands that exist in virtual world but can exist in the real physical world such as Central Perk or “Duff Beer” from *The Simpsons*. The second order pertains to brands and

products that exist in the virtual world but cannot fully exist in the real world as they do in the virtual world. An example is *Harry Potter's* "Bertie Botts Every Flavor Beans" because certain properties can exist, but the "magical" aspects cannot. Third order products initially exist in the virtual world and can relate to a range of products in both the virtual and physical world.

Examples include Jimmy Buffet's song Margaritaville where he discusses a lifestyle that is then translated to a number of restaurants and frozen products. Fourth order products cannot exist in the physical world. An example of this is a virtual brand in Second Life, where an avatar "Aimee Weber" created a fashion line *Preen*. The creator of the avatar generated \$140,666 in sales that were converted in second life currency, which can be used for virtual products or be exchanged for real US dollars. Aimee Weber is the first avatar with a trademark for virtual services (Muzellec 2-8).

The first three orders have economic impact when they are licensed, trademarked, or brought into the real world. The fourth order generates profits without a physical product. The literature indicated that with the launch of Sony PlayStation Home and the virtual worlds Second Life, Habbo Hotel, and Club Penguin that this type of marketing would become more common. It was suggested that when shelf space is so sought after, that brands should consider launching in the virtual space to build connections. The paper suggested it was "necessary that consumers feel a connection to the virtual brand in order for the brand to succeed" (Muzellec 9).

Agencies have already begun to try to capitalize on this phenomenon. Omni Consumer Products is US-based agency that has begun to license and commercialize fictional brands such as Sex Panther cologne from *Anchorman*, Tru Blood from *True Blood* and Duff beer from *The*

Simpsons. Agencies should also begin to capitalize on virtual worlds and fourth-order products (Muzellec 10).

Theory/Hypothesis

My initial hypothesis was that all subjects would have a better perception of fantasy brands than real brands. I believed subjects would be more inclined to buy a product that was launched in the fantasy world first because they would feel more of a connection with the brand and felt less “intruded on”. Based on my secondary research I noticed that there was a large opportunity for products to be launched where there was unlimited “shelf space” and less competition. Because of the changing media landscape with TiVo and On Demand, I assumed that consumers were especially receptive to product placement and would be annoyed by the increasing amount of products appearing in shows and movies. Therefore my first set of hypotheses are:

H₁: All subjects have a better perception of fantasy brands than real brands.

H₂: All subjects are more likely to purchase fantasy brands than real brands.

After I conducted my focus group (See Appendix A) I quickly changed my hypothesis. I believed that most subjects would have negative perceptions of product placement based on the nature of the responses. I also believed that some students would have positive perceptions of fantasy brands, and some would have negative perceptions. As a whole, I believed people would prefer Fantasy Brands to Product Placement. Therefore my next hypothesis after my qualitative research is:

H₃: Students have negative perceptions of Product Placement, and some have negative perceptions of fantasy brands.

Finally, after I conducted my experiment I changed my theory one final time to incorporate different fan levels. I assumed that fans of a show would be more receptive to fantasy brands and more likely to purchase it. Additionally, I received lot of negative feedback regarding product placement in my focus group and assumed most students would have similar negative perceptions.

H₄: Students that are fans of a show have a better perception of fantasy brands than of product placement.

H₅: Students that are fans of a show are more likely to purchase a fantasy brand

H₆: Students that are not fans of a show are more likely to purchase a product placement

Methodology

Testing was conducted in two phases. Phase I was a qualitative study conducted in the form of a focus group. Phase II was an experiment conducted in a laboratory setting.

To complete Phase I, I chose to conduct a focus group for qualitative research amongst a group of eight undergraduate students of varied majors. The focus group lasted about thirty minutes and I had a scripted moderator guide to gain as much information as possible for my key questions. I used these responses to inform my experiment and to tailor my initial hypothesis.

Hypothesis testing was completed in a laboratory setting with 175 respondents. The experiment was tested in an online survey on Qualtrics. The experiment was designed so there were two different randomized surveys. Survey #1 was my “fantasy” block surveys. Students were told the

brands they were rating were “fantasy brands” before they were available for purchase. Survey #2 was a “real” block survey. This survey told students that they were rating brands that were created in real life and placed into the show or film by an advertiser. Both blocks included two different examples. The two brands used were Stay Puft Marshmallows from the movie *Ghost Busters* and Central Perk from the show *Friends*. I assumed more students would be familiar and “fans” of *Friends* than of *Ghostbusters* so I thought they were two valid examples to use and compare. Subjects of the study were tested with both blocks being either “real” or “fantasy”. If undergraduates were told *Central Perk* was a real brand used as product placement, they were also told *Stay Puft Marshmallows* were real as well. (See Survey in Appendix B)

The goal of this experiment was to see if students had different subliminal preferences and to see if students preferred fantasy brands to product placement.

Findings:

H₁: All subjects have a better perception of fantasy brands than real brands.

H₂: All subjects are more likely to purchase fantasy brands than real brands.

Qualitative:

In the focus group when asked: “If you do not want to purchase fantasy brands, what are the possible reasons” a student responded “a fantasy brand could be cheap and not credible. I think there is a perception of quality issue. Additionally, unless I like the show or movie I really don’t care”. When I asked the group how their purchasing habits changed when a product created in a television show or movie became available to purchase another subject stated: “Depends how much I like the show or movie, “It’s probably cheap unless its already a big brand like a Star

Wars collectors item”. This is when I first started to discover there could be a perception of quality issue with fantasy brands and that I should tailor my hypothesis to reflect the perception of quality and “level of fandom”. When asked what would drive purchase subjects responded that they would only purchase if they were a die-hard fan, unless the product was a neat innovation (perhaps a second or third order type of product discussed in related literature).

H₃: Students have negative perceptions of product placement, and some have negative perceptions of fantasy brands.

Qualitative:

After my focus group, I tailored my hypothesis to reflect the negative perceptions of both fantasy brands and product placement that were expressed. When asked about perception of product placement in TV shows and movies students had comments such as “it is annoying”, “It depends how blatantly obvious it is”, and “I accept it because I am used to it”. None of the seven subjects appeared to have a better perception of a product after a placement than they had before. Even more importantly, none of them thought it drove their conscious purchase behavior. Additionally most of the feedback I received was half positive and half negative towards fantasy brands. In the concluding remarks many agreed they would purchase clothing if it was sponsored or licensed through a quality brand name such as *One Tree Hill's* Clothes over Bros being launched through J-Crew, or a Krabby-Patty from *Sponge Bob Square Pants* through In-N-Out burger. Some of the additional products students would want to purchase were innovations that could not exist in the modern world (second order) such as chocolate frogs from *Harry Potter*.

H₄: Students that are fans of a show have a better perception of fantasy brands than of product placement.

H₅: Students that are fans of a show are more likely to purchase a fantasy brand

H₆: Students that are not fans of a show are more likely to purchase a product placement

Qualitative:

At this point, my qualitative research has informed my first 3 hypotheses. The changes in my theory were a result of my findings in my quantitative research. However, the final findings are in line with all of the information and insights that were drawn from the focus group.

Experiment:

Unfortunately, the results did not turn out quite how I wanted them to. The experiment indicated that students preferred a product placement for Stay Puft Marshmallows and the fantasy brand of Central Perk- two opposite answers. This did not make sense to me at first, how could people prefer product placement for one product, and a fantasy brand for the other? I had to dive deeper into the numbers to see what was going on.

I decided to test the marginal interaction between fictional and real brands and fan “status” of the brand (see **Figure 1 & Figure 2** below). Additionally, there was a wording issue with my survey. My wording was not parallel; I tested “familiarity level” with *Ghostbusters*, and “fan level” for *Friends*. This is something to keep in mind when reading the results. I believe that if both had been “familiarity” more people would have been familiar with *Friends*, and if testing “fan” level, the level of fandom would be lower for *Ghostbusters*. This suggestion is because

more people were familiar with the brand “Central Perk” than “Stay Puft Marshmallows” which was a question I tested. For the case of this study we are going to treat it as if the wording is parallel and call levels of familiarity/fandom “Fan Levels”.

Stay Puft:

I tested the fan status of the film *Ghostbusters*, not the fan status of the product, Stay Puft Marshmallows. The conditional effect for being a fan and wanting to purchase Stay Puft Marshmallows at a 3.0955 fan level (on a 0-10 scale) is -0.6494. The stated “fan” level is one standard deviation below the average thus we will call these “Level One” fans. Since the effect is negative, this indicates that lower levels of fandom prefer to purchase the real brand.

Additionally, since the significance level is .0538, the results are significant at the $\alpha = .06$ level. People who are not fans of *Ghostbusters* significantly prefer to purchase a “real brand” opposed to a “fantasy brand” version of Stay Puft marshmallows.

The average fan level for *Ghostbusters* was 6.1657 on an eleven point scale (“Level 2” fans. The resulting effect is -.2792, which indicates a less pronounced preference for the real brand than the “Level 1” fans. The p-value does not indicate significance. Lastly, “Level 3” fans (one standard deviation above, or 9.2360 on a eleven point scale) had an effect of +0.0910. Since this number is positive, it indicates a slight preference towards purchasing the “fantasy brand” version of the product opposed to the real brand. The p-level was not significant. This information indicates that those who are fans prefer to purchase a “fantasy brand” and those who are not fans prefer a “real brand”.

Figure 1:

Ghost Busters Fan	Effect	P
3.0955	-.6494	.0538
6.1657	-.2792	.2382
9.2360	.0910	.7845

Central Perk:

I tested the fan status of the show *Friends*, opposed to the fan/familiarity status of Central Perk. The conditional effect for being a fan and wanting to purchase a coffee from Central Perk at a 1.5707 fan level (on a 0-10 scale) is -.0020. The stated “fan” level is one standard deviation below the average thus we will call these “Level One” fans. Since the effect is a small negative number, this indicates that lower levels of fandom slightly prefer to purchase the real brand. People who are not fans of *Friends* marginally prefer to purchase a “real brand” opposed to a “fantasy brand” version of a Central Perk coffee.

The average fan level for *Friends* was 5.3943 on an eleven point scale (“Level 2” fans. The resulting effect is .3441, which indicates these fans prefer the fantasy brand to the real brand. The p-value does not indicate significance. Lastly, “Level 3” fans (one standard deviation above, or 9.2178 on a eleven point scale) had a strong positive effect of +0.6903. Since this is a large positive number, it indicates a strong preference towards purchasing the “fantasy brand” version of the product opposed to the real brand. In additional the p-level is .0508 and is significant at an alpha=.06 level. This information indicates that those who are fans prefer to purchase a “fantasy brand” and those who are not fans prefer a “real brand”.

Figure 2:

Friends Fan	Effect	p
1.5707	-.0020	.9954
5.3943	.3441	.1647
9.2178	.6903	.0508

Comparison:

If you are a huge fan, you will prefer a fantasy brand. This seems to make sense combining the qualitative and quantitative information.

As I had predicted, students were more likely to be familiar with Central Perk than with Stay Puft Marshmallows. Central Perk had an average familiarity level of 6.2 on an eleven point scale, where Stay Puft marshmallows only had a level of 3.5 awareness. Since people are more likely to be familiar with Central Perk, it makes sense that there would be a significant positive reaction for fans wanting to purchase a Coffee from a “fantasy brand”.

Subjects that weren't fans didn't see the “quality” in the fantasy brand- as suggested in my qualitative research.

Conclusions:

There is a market for fantasy brands- it is for those who are fans or identify strongly with a show/movie. Those who do not identify with the show or movie prefer a real and reliable brand. Product placement and fantasy brands are likely to become more popular in the coming years, especially with the changing media landscape. Fantasy Brands need to continue to be explored in

depth to discover exactly who the specific market is. The market will vary among different groups. For example *One Tree Hill* fans are likely to be very different than *Ghostbusters* fans. If certain products are targeted (example, a clothing line for young business professionals), they could be launched in a show or movie with a similar demographic. Fans of *Ghostbusters* are likely to be an older demographic perhaps people P34-54. Launching an “anti-aging cream” that is a fantasy brand would resonate well in that movie with that target demographic. If there was a product placement for a similar product, that demographic may be annoyed since they are the primarily “fans”. Maybe if a young professionals clothing line was placed, something not targeting the primary “fan” base, they would be interested in purchasing the product.

Future Research:

In the future I could conduct research to see if there is a difference between perceptions by gender or other demographics. Additionally researchers should continue to dive deeper into the different levels of fantasy brands to see which order is most appealing to drive purchase. I believe that second and third order fantasy brands would capture more interest based on my current findings. Additionally, I began to test psychological reactance in my survey to see if there was an effect on people’s opinions as they related to the brand. This data could be analyzed further in a future study. This is a subject that will become more prominent as more advertisements try to reach people daily, and more companies fight for mind-space. As agencies get more creative with their campaigns, academics should continue to try to discover new insights about these two prominent forms of advertising.

Appendix A: Moderator Guide with Student Responses

Honors Thesis
Moderator Guide
Fantasy Brands & Product Placement

Research Objectives:

- Explore current awareness of Product Placement
- Explore current awareness of Fantasy Brands
- Explore opinions of Product Placement
- Explore opinions of Fantasy Brands
- Explore interest/willingness to purchase Fantasy Brands vs Product Placement
-

Opening Questions:

- Students
 - Tell us your name, major, and a little about yourself and your favorite forms of media for personal entertainment (newspaper, TV, radio, movies etc)
 - Patch Mahoney - Physiology- internet
 - Maddie Gilbreath – Family Studies- Netflix
 - Megan Howard- Management - Netflix
 - Sam Griffen- Economics -Television
 - Jerry-Physiology –HBO Go
 - Kaylie- Accounting- Netflix
 - Sara Delaney- Accounting BuzzFeed

Introductory Questions:

- Have you noticed any product placements in TV shows or movies?
 - The students had noticed a few product placements in TV shows and movies including in Jurassic World, different cars in Transformers, Beats Pills in music videos, and specific phones being featured.
- A fantasy brand is a brand that exists in fiction. Can you name any Fantasy Brands?
 - The only fantasy brand anyone could think of off the top of their head was the “Pear” brand featured in Drake and Josh. A student indicated “I know they’re there but they’re harder to collect off the top of my head”.
- Some examples of Fantasy Brands include Bernie Botts Every Flavored Beans from Harry Potter, Stay Puft Marshmallows from Ghost Busters, and Central Perk from Friends. What comes to mind when you hear the words Fantasy Brands?
 - After prompting students indicated that they knew All the Harry Potter Candys, Butter Beer in Harry Potter, the Nimbus 2000 in Harry Potter, and Scooby Snacks. Another student indicated, “After those examples I can still only think of Harry Potter brands”.
- Name any fantasy brands you wish you could purchase.
 - Subjects wished they could purchase the Chocolate Frogs from Harry Potter, Stark Iron Man stuff, a Batmobile, and Krabby Patties. Another student then indicated that Krabby patties were available in the gummy form. The original student stated that they wanted an “Actual Krabby Patty”
- What is your perception of Product Placement in TV Shows or Movies?

- Subjects indicated “it is annoying”, “I think it is funny”, “It depends how blatantly obvious it is”, “I accept it because I am used to it” and “I think that in Waynesworld where they keep going it is really funny, that is what I think of when I think of Product Placement”.

Transition Questions:

- ALOFT resorts launched in an online world “Second Life” before they did in person. What are your thoughts on this?
 - Subjects wondered “Did it work”, “are there measurable results”, “interesting strategy”, “Interested to see results”, and “What kind of people play second life”.
- Does it change your purchasing habits when a product is placed well in a movie/television show? In what ways?
 - Subjects indicated it does not influence them to make a purchase. The only incident where they thought it could drive a purchase was if someone “casually had on an apple watch where it was not too obvious, I may think it looks nice and want to purchase one”
- When watching television what factors makes an advertisement stick out to you?
 - Some trigger words were funny, scenic, ones that make an impact (smoking), statistics, good soundtrack, emotional pull, Budweiser drink responsibly commercials, deeper messages, and storyline.
- Would you purchase a fantasy brand item from a show/movie you have not seen?
 - No, absolutely not unless its really cool

Key Questions:

- How do your purchasing habits change when a product created in a television show or movie becomes available to purchase?
 - Students stated “Depends how much I like the show or movie, “It’s probably kind of crappy it’s probably cheap unless its already a big brand like a star wars collectors item”, “I’m a huge breaking bad fan, some things you can buy from the show, but I am not inclined to shop their products”, “When I was younger I bought all the Harry Potter candies but now I wouldn’t because I know they’re all disgusting”.
- Tell us about a time where an advertisement changed your opinion on a brand or product.
 - “Some chicken company- showed how they slaughtered them and I never wanted to eat there again”, “Super Size Me”, “Go Pro made me want to go live my life”, “When proceeds go to charities”, and “Documentaries in general have changed my purchasing habits”.
- With Tivo many people fast-forward through commercials. Do you see fantasy brands and product placements more frequently in recent years?
 - Subjects indicated they noticed this a lot in technology with the type of laptops that are used. Another subject indicated that this was a hard question and they did not notice this when they were younger.
- If you purchase fantasy brands, what are the possible reasons?
 - Subjects indicated if they were a die hard fan, thought the product was more useful than the current “Real way”, the product was a neat innovation, or if it was not on the market then they would be more inclined to make a purchase.
- If you do not want to purchase fantasy brands, what are the possible reasons?

- Subjects indicated they thought the fantasy brands could be cheap, not credible, or that they did not care enough.

Ending Questions:

- Is there anything else you would like to add?
 - If there was a franchise such as a clothing brand through J-Crew or a Krabby Patty through In-N-Out they would be more inclined to purchase the product.

Appendix B: Product Placement vs Fantasy Brands Experiment Survey:

q0 The questions in the next survey are about how you perceive different types of advertisements - there are no right or wrong answers, we are just interested in how people think about these topics. Read each statement carefully and answer the questions that follow accordingly.

q1 Stay Puft Marshmallows are a fictional brand created specifically for the Ghost Busters movie. We call this a "fantasy brand"

q2 How familiar are you with the movie franchise Ghostbusters?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

q3 How familiar you are with "Stay Puft" Marshmallows from Ghostbusters?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

q4 How likely are you to purchase Stay Puft Marshmallows over a competitive brand of Marshmallows? (Assume same price)

- Very Unlikely (1)
- Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- Undecided (4)
- Somewhat Likely (5)
- Likely (6)
- Very Likely (7)

q5 Central Perk is a fictional brand created specifically for the television show Friends. For a limited time this "fantasy brand" was replicated in real life.

q6 How familiar are you with Central Perk?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

q7 Rate how much do you consider yourself a Friends fan?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

q8 How likely are you to purchase a coffee at Central Perk over a generic Coffee Shop? (Assume same price and travel is not an issue)

- Very Unlikely (1)
- Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- Undecided (4)
- Somewhat Likely (5)
- Likely (6)
- Very Likely (7)

q9 Stay Puft Marshmallows is a brand created that purchased advertising placement in the Ghostbusters movie. We call this "product placement".

q10 How familiar are you with the movie franchise Ghostbusters?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

q11 How familiar you are with "Stay Puft" Marshmallows from Ghostbusters?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

q12 How likely are you to purchase Stay Puft Marshmallows over a competitive brand of Marshmallows? (Assume same price)

- Very Unlikely (1)
- Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- Undecided (4)
- Somewhat Likely (5)
- Likely (6)
- Very Likely (7)

q13 Central Perk is also a service that purchased product placement in the television show Friends.

q14 How familiar are you with Central Perk?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

q15 Rate how much do you consider yourself a Friends fan?

- 0 (0)
- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)
- 8 (8)
- 9 (9)
- 10 (10)

q16 How likely are you to purchase a coffee at Central Perk over a generic Coffee Shop?
(Assume same price and travel is not an issue)

- Very Unlikely (1)
- Unlikely (2)
- Somewhat Unlikely (3)
- Undecided (4)
- Somewhat Likely (5)
- Likely (6)
- Very Likely (7)

q17 The following statements concern your general attitudes. Read each statement and please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Regulations trigger a sense of resistance in me. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I find contradicting others stimulating. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When something is prohibited, I usually think "That's exactly what I am going to do". (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The thought of being dependent on others aggravates me. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I consider advice from others to be an intrusion. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

q18 The following statements concern your general attitudes. Read each statement and please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I become frustrated when I am unable to make free and independent decisions (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It irritates me when someone points out things which are obvious to me. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I become angry when my freedom of choice is restricted. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Advice and recommendations usually induce me to do just the opposite. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am content only when I am acting of my own free will. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

q19 The following statements concern your general attitudes. Read each statement and please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
I resist the attempts of others to influence me. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It makes me angry when another person is held up as a role model for me to follow. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When someone forces me to do something, I feel like doing the opposite. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It disappoints me to see others submitting to standards and rules. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q34 Thank you for your help today! Just a few final demographic questions.

mood How would you describe your mood right now?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	8 (8)	9 (9)
VERY BAD:VERY GOOD (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

eng Is English your first language?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

male Please indicate your gender:

- Male (1)
- Female (0)
- Other/Decline to State (3) _____

age Please indicate your age:

- 18 (18)
- 19 (19)
- 20 (20)
- 21 (21)
- 22 (22)
- 23 (23)
- 24 (24)

etc.

Works Cited

- Aaker, J., Fournier, S. & Brasel, A. (2004) When good brands go bad. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(June),1-16
- Brown, S. (1995). *Postmodern Marketing*. London, Routledge.
- Buss, Dale D. (1998), "Making your mark in movie and TV," *Nation's Business*, 28 (December).
- Cowley, Elizabeth and Barron, Chris (2008) When Product Placement Goes Wrong: The Effects of Program Liking and Placement Prominence, *Journal of Advertising*, 37:1,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/JOA0091-3367370107>
- Duncan, T. & Moriarity, S.E. (1998) A communication-based marketing model for managing relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 1-13
- Ederly, D. (2006) Reverse product placement in virtual worlds. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(1), 24.
- Morton, Cynthia. and Friedman, Meredith. "I Saw it in the Movies": Exploring the Link between Product Placement Beliefs and Reported Usage Behavior, *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 24:2, 33-40,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10641734.2002.10505133>
- Muzellec, Laurent. and Kanitz, Christopher. and Lynn, Theodore. (2013) Fancy a coffee with Friends in 'Central Perk'? *International Journal of Advertising*, 32:3, 399-417
- Muzellec, L. and Lynn, T., 2010. There is No Spoon: Towards a Framework for the Classification of Virtual Brands and Management of Brand Precession. *Social Science Research Network* [online], IN Press. Available from SSRN:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=1407452>

“New Trends in Product Placement.” *Strategic Computing and Communications Technology*

(n.d.): n. pag. Web.

Reading, A. and Jenkins, R. 2015. Transportation to a World of Fantasy: Consumer Experiences of Fictional Brands Becoming Real, *Journal of Promotional Communications*, 3 (1), 154-

173