THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PRODUCT PLACEMENT IN THAILAND

Nattharika Rittippant[*], Lalita Ruyaporn, Tanarat Hongpaisanvivat, Ploypailin Limrahaphan and Kornbongkoch Kasemweerakul

Management Technology Program
Sirindhorn International Institute of Technology Thammasat University
Pathumthani 12121, THAILAND
+66 (0) 2501-3505-20, Email: natthari@siit.tu.ac.th

Abstract

Advertisement is an art of transforming information from advertisers to customers. Product placement is a way to do advertising by placing product on the screen, in script and plot in the storyline in media that plays major role in advertising today. However, each of target customers has different perception in perceiving advertising messages. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to study customers' perception of product placement to match with effective ways to send message in order to help advertiser making wise decision on effectively designing their product placement styles and scripts in conveying their advertising messages. Researchers sample 303 students who watch at least one movie per month from English teaching programs of 10 universities in Bangkok and Metropolitan Area. Respondents watched movies (Transformer, Confessions of a Shopaholic) before questionnaires are done in which divided into three parts; the first part asked for personal information, second part asked for attitude toward product placement and intention to buy, and third part asked for students' Brain Dominance (Thinking Preferences) based on Herrmann Brain Dominance Instrument (HBDI). Data was analyzed by categorize respondents into each type of representation of product placement and observed which type of representation would be the most effective to which type of customers' Thinking Preference. The findings showed and revealed Quadrant A will have intention to buy by using logo presentation and script placement, Quadrant C will have intention to buy by using actual product used and plot connection. Visual imagery type of representation and negative attitude toward product placement cannot yet be concluded but may further analyze if other factors come to consideration

Keywords: Product placement, Whole Brain, Thinking Preference, Movie, Thailand

1. INTRODUCTION

The advertisement purpose is to send a message to customers for product acknowledgement. Therefore, if customers receive the same message as advertiser wish to send, such advertising is effective and worth for investment. However, customers have an opportunity to physically avoid television advertising by leaving the room or engaging in other activities such as reading or talking, and also electronically avoid commercials by changing channels with the easy press of a button (Siddarth and Amitava, 1998). Consequently, many advertisers have to look for other innovative ways to advertise their products in order to capture their target customers' attention using various types of advertising.

As the matter of fact, advertising is considered as an investment. Before throwing a huge amount of money into any advertisement, the companies must think thoroughly and know

their target customers. Additionally, advertisers should also wisely decide on ways to send messages to match with customer perception to increase performance of the advertisements. Since each of target customers have different perception in perceiving advertising messages, the study of customer types and preferences should be helpful for advertisers in making wise decision on effectively designing their product placement types and scripts in conveying their advertising messages.

1.1 Objective

The objective of this research is to observe which types of product placement will be effective to which type of customer's perception and preference. Understanding the different types of Thinking Preferences and how they react to types of representation of product placement.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Product Placement

Product placement is also known as a product brand placement or brand placement (Turcotte, 1995; Babina and Carder, 1996). It is an alternative advertising technique which uses to create the benefit for the company whose product is being placed in media in term of financial benefit, for some promotional or other considerations such as increase in the brand awareness (Gupta and Gould, 1997).

Product placement defined as the practice of including a brand name, product, package, sign, or other trademark merchandise (d'Astous and Chartier, 2000; Steortz, 1987) within a motion picture, television show or other media vehicles such as music video (Steortz, 1987). It aims to increase brand recognition and point of purchase.

2.1.1 Types of Product Placement

According to Gupta and Lord (1998), product placement are proposed as a two-dimensional approach to categorize different types of product placements that influence a customer's recall or brand awareness. The first category is the types of representation and the second category is the level of prominence.

Types of representation means the form in which the product placement is manifested in the media, and can be classified into three primary types which are visual placement, auditory placement or verbal and plot connection (Gupta and Lord, 1998; Russell, 2002).

Visual placement is known as screen placement. It refers to how the brand is appeared on the screen, involves demonstration of a product, brand, or visual brand identifier without any message or sound. These could be logos, billboards or any kind of products that is presented in the course of the production. Its appearance may have different level depending on the number of appearances appear, the duration of the appearances, shooting angle and so on.

Script placement is also called auditory placement. It refers to how the brand product is mentioned in a dialogue in audio form, without showing the product on the screen. There are varies degree depending on the contexts in which the brands are mentioned, the frequencies of the brands are mentioned, the emphasis on the brand name through the tone of the voice, placement in the speaking, and character speaking at the time.

Plot connection refers to the brand that plays a role in the storyline whether there is a low or high level of contribution. Whereas, lower plot connection does not contribute much to the story such as taking the major place in the storyline or building the person's character. This is a mere mention of the brand or a brief appearance of the product on the screen. Higher plot connections constitute a major thematic element (Holbrook and Grayson, 1996).

Types of representation have been various categorized by many writers based on their points of view. As Gupta et al. (1998), Russell (2002) stated that product placement can be categorized into three primary types which are visual placement, script placement, and plot connection, Nuangthong (2007) has added other four types of representation under the visual placement including visual imagery, actual product used, logo/insignia presentation and advertisement forms.

Firstly, visual imagery form is when a product appears within a movie. Secondly, actual product used form is when a product being used by an actor or actress in a movie (Christ, 2004). Thirdly, logo/insignia presentation is when a corporate logo, insignia, trademark or other identifying feature is shown. Lastly, an advertisement forms, such as a billboard or television commercial is placed in a scene as 'ambiance' in the background.

2.2 Whole Brain Thinking Model

Ned Herrmann developed the whole brain model in 1995 which has been used to measure degree of dominance in four thinking structures of human brain. Whole Brain Thinking is the ability for individuals to act outside of their own preferred Thinking Preference (Brian, 2011). Ned Herrmann cluster human brain into four different parts by incorporating the theory of *Triune Brain* (Paul, 1990) into *Left Brain/Right Brain theory* (Roger, 1970; Springer and Deutch, 1985).

. The Whole Brain model divided human brain into four equal quadrants, and labeled by using first four letters of alphabet to indicate A as an upper left quadrant, B as a lower left quadrant, C as a lower right quadrant, and D as an upper right quadrant. The letters A and D represent the cerebral system, and the letters B and C represent the limbic system (Herrmann, 1996; Brian, 2011).

Quadrant A refers to Analyzer who deals with logical, analytical, fact based, and quantitative. Analyzer tends to think logically, analyze facts and process numbers. People in this group will perform logic thinking to do problem solving and have realistic thinking.

Quadrant B refers to Organizer who deals with organization, sequential thinking, planning and detail. Organizer tends to make everything goes smoothly and perfectly based on their plans. People in this group also like to get things done on time. They are detail oriented and does not use emotion to make a decision. They tend to avoid risks and do everything conservatively.

Quadrant C refers to Personalizer who deals with kinesthetic, emotional, feelings based and interpersonal skills. Personalizer tends to be people-oriented and tender. People in this group always care others' feeling and looks to other people's values. They will be a friendly, trusting and empathetic person.

Quadrant D refers to Visualizer who deals with intuitive thinking, integration, synthesizing, and a holistic approach. Visualizer tends to be able to see the big picture and try to solve problem based on their instinct. People in this group preference are visionary and imaginative. They like changing, challenging and risk taking; dislikes any forms of rules and regulations.

Each of human being has different brain dominance. Moreover, most people tend to have at least one dominant or preferred quadrant based on whole brain model. There are no better or worse among each of dominance quadrants. Eventually, each of the dominance quadrants will express Thinking Preference in that person. These will lead to different perception and perceive message from product placement differently.

2.2.1 Herrmann Brain Dominance Instrument (HBDI)

Herrmann Brain Dominance Instrument (HBDI) is an instrument which capable of measuring the degree of preference between each of the four individual thinking structures (quadrants) and each of the four-paired structures (modes). HBDI is the only assessment based on the metaphor of how our brain actually works. It is only used to determine thinking styles and preference rather than the psychology of personality or behavior

3. HYPOTHESIS

Types of representation classified into 6 types base on their placement which are logo presentation, script placement, visual imagery, advertisement forms, actual product used and plot connection (Russell, 2002). Thinking Preferences divided into four main types by the quadrants model including Quadrant A (Analyzer), Quadrant B (Organizer), Quadrant C (Personalizer), and Quadrant D (Visualizer) (Herrmann, 1998).

When respondents watch Medias, they would or would not influence by product placement depend on the type of representation with their perception based on each Thinking Preferences. Respondents would have different attitude toward product placement and intention to buy.

Quadrant A and B Thinking Preference are facts based and detail oriented. Therefore, if product placement occurs in movie, then they will notice that it is an advertisement which could lead to negative attitude.

H1: Quadrant A and B Thinking Preference will have negative attitude toward product placement more than other quadrants.

Logo presentation presents brand in movies which represent customer engagement experience and make each brand become socialize. Therefore, Quadrant C which represents feeling based and giving importance to social esteem will have intention to buy from brand sociality.

H2: Quadrant C will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using logo presentation type of representation.

Quadrant A Thinking Preference analyze facts and logic. Therefore, if actor/actress speaks about performance or characteristic of product, Quadrant A will have intention to buy.

H3: Quadrant A will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using script placement (spoken) type of representation.

Quadrant C Thinking Preference is feeling based and people oriented. When actor/actress uses the product, that brand of product will become more socialize. Quadrant C will feel positive toward those products.

H4: Quadrant C will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using actual product used type of representation.

Quadrant D Thinking Preference is holistic and imaginative; therefore, placing product in movie (visual imagery) will influence Quadrant D.

H5: Quadrant D will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using visual imagery type of representation.

Quadrant C Thinking Preference is interpersonal, feeling based and people oriented. When a product becomes a part of the movie, they will feel positive toward those products.

H6: Quadrant C will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using plot connection type of representation.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Respondent

The respondents in the sample group for this research were 350 university students from 10 English programs. These universities are located in Bangkok and metropolitan area. The sample group watches same movies and responds to the questionnaires. The target respondents were teenagers (18-25 year old) who watch at least one movie per month. Teenagers are the ones who are willing to try new things and mainly concern about their social acceptance. This group is likely to be influenced by advertisements seen in movies.

4.2 Movie

Researchers previewed and selected two movies (Transformer, Confessions of a Shopaholic). The movies were condensed and viewed as trailer. Each movie contains 10-11 product placements that categorized into five types of representation of product placement. These two sample movies did not employ traditional advertisement forms of representation.

4.3 Questionnaire

Before conducting last part of questionnaire, researchers created short version of HBDI from the original HBDI. In order to validate the condensed HBDI, researchers follow these procedures. First, researchers launched 50 copies of original HBDI to 50 respondents. Few days later, researchers launched another 50 copies of condensed HBDI to the same group of respondents. The result shows significant matching between two versions (100.00 %).

The questionnaire divided into three main parts.

Part I: First part of questionnaire, respondents' background including gender, age and occupation are asked to separate respondents demographically and to validate target respondents.

Part II: Second part of questionnaire, attitude toward product placement and intention to buy with 5 types of representation were measured using 5-point likert scale (5=strongly agreed, 1=strongly disagreed).

Part III: Third part of questionnaire contains various brands from both movies and feint in order to validate the questionnaire.

Part IV: The last part of questionnaire allows respondents to fill out condensed HBDI to classified respondents into four types of Thinking Preferences.

5. RESULTS

Researchers screened out invalid questionnaires that were caused by different age range from the target and incomplete questionnaires. At the end, there are 303 usable questionnaires.

5.1 The Analysis of Personal Data

Most respondents, representing 63.7 percent of the total sample were female as shown in Table 1. Majority of respondents studies in the senior bachelor's degree, 97.4 percent ages between 18-24 years old.

Table 1 General information of respondent
N=303

General information	Frequency	Percent

Sex:	Male	110	36.3
	Female	193	63.7
Education:	Freshman	33	10.9
	Sophomore	58	19.1
	Junior	59	19.5
	Senior	137	45.2
	Graduate	14	4.6
	PH.D.	2	0.7
Income:	Less than 10,000	177	58.4
	10,001-20,000	93	30.7
	20,001-30,000	27	8.9
	30,001-40,000	5	1.7
	40,001-50,000	1	0.3
	More than 50,000	0	0
Frequency:	0	0	0
	1	104	34.3
	2	113	37.3
	3	49	16.2
	4	37	12.2

5.2 Brain Dominance

Respondent categorized by their Thinking Preference into 4 different brain dominance groups which are Analyzer, Organizer, Personalizer, and Visualizer from total responses. Table 2 shows the number and ratio of each group. Quadrant A, B, C, D represents Analyzer, Organizer, Personalizer, and Visualizer respectively. Quadrant A consists of 93 respondents accounting for 30.7 percent. Quadrant B consists of 58 respondents accounting for 19.1 percent. Quadrant C consists of 68 respondents accounting for 30.7 percent. Quadrant D consists of 84 respondents accounting for 27.7 percent.

Table 2: Number and ratio of respondent in each brain dominance

Brain Dominance	N	Ratio
Quadrant A	93	30.70%
Quadrant B	58	19.10%
Quadrant C	68	22.50%
Quadrant D	84	27.70%

5.3 Analysis of Attitudes and Intention to Buy

In order to test the significant differences between each group, researchers applied a one-way ANOVA to analyze collected data which divided into 6 aspects; negative attitude toward product placement, logo presentation, script placement, actual product used, visual imagery, and plot connection. Post hoc test was also conducted in the case of 6 or more subgroups. The result of the analysis presented in tables below.

Table 3: One-way ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attitude	Between Groups	18.448	3	6.149	6.535	0.00
	Within Groups	281.373	299	0.941		
Logo Presentation	Between Groups	42.424	3	14.141	17.854	0.00
	Within Groups	236.830	299	0.792		
Script Placement	Between Groups	335.535	3	111.845	203.549	0.00
	Within Groups	164.293	299	0.549		
Actual Product Used	Between Groups	295.287	3	98.429	199.673	0.00
	Within Groups	147.392	299	0.493		
Visual Imagery	Between Groups	0.726	3	0.242	0.196	0.899
	Within Groups	369.987	299	1.237		
Plot Connection	Between Groups	283.464	3	94.488	215.439	0.00
	Within Groups	131.137	299	0.439		

Table 4: One-way ANOVA (Post Hoc)

Dependent Variable	Quadrant I	Quadrant II	Mean Difference (I-II)	Std. Error	P-value	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Attitude	A	B	-.638*	0.162	0.002	-1.09	-0.18
		D	-.432*	0.146	0.034	-0.84	-0.02
	B	D	0.132	0.173	0.901	0.62	-0.19
		C	0.206	0.166	0.671	0.67	0.84
	C	A	.507*	0.155	0.014	0.07	0.94
		D	0.074	0.158	0.974	-0.37	0.52
Logo Presentation	A	B	-0.069	0.149	0.975	-0.49	0.35
		D	0.345	0.134	0.087	-0.03	0.72
	B	C	-.637*	0.159	0.001	-1.08	-0.36
		D	0.414	0.152	0.061	-0.01	-0.26
	C	A	.706*	0.142	0	0.31	1.11
		D	1.051*	0.145	0	0.64	1.46
Script Placement	A	B	2.049*	0.124	0	1.7	2.4
		D	2.474*	0.112	0	2.16	2.79
	B	C	0.12	0.132	0.846	-0.25	0.49
		D	.426*	0.127	0.011	0.07	0.78
	C	A	-2.168*	0.118	0	-2.5	-1.84
		D	0.306	0.121	0.096	-0.03	0.65
Actual Product Used	A	B	-0.119	0.117	0.796	-0.45	0.21
		D	-1.229*	0.106	0	-1.53	-0.93
	B	C	-2.388*	0.125	0	-2.74	-2.04
		D	-1.110*	0.12	0	-1.45	-0.77

	C	A	2.507*	0.112	0	2.19	2.82
		D	1.278*	0.115	0	0.96	1.6
Plot Connection	A	B	0.172	0.111	0.494	-0.14	0.48
		D	-1.016*	0.1	0	-1.3	-0.74
	B	C	-2.531*	0.118	0	-2.86	-2.2
		D	-1.188*	0.113	0	-1.51	-0.87
	C	A	2.360*	0.106	0	2.06	2.66
		D	1.344*	0.108	0	1.04	1.65

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 levels.

5.3.1 Attitude Toward Product Placement

H1 suggested that customer with Quadrant A and B Brain Dominance will have negative attitude toward product placement more than other quadrants. In addition, Post hoc comparisons using Scheffe Multiple Comparisons was used in order to test the differences between each Brain Dominance since there were 4 quadrants which able to identify the negative attitude toward product placement on Brain Dominance. In Table 3 showed that at the level of $p<0.05$, there was a significant effect between negative attitude at the $p<.05$ level on Brain Dominances (F=6.535, p=0.000), from the Post hoc results indicated that Quadrant A was significantly different with Quadrant B (p=0.002); Quadrant A and Quadrant C (p=0.014); Quadrant A and Quadrant D (p=0.034). The mean of Quadrant A, B, C, and D are 2.26, 2.89, 2.76, and 2.69 respectively. Therefore, every Quadrant shows average relationship with negative attitude toward product placement. This indicated that H2 is rejected. However, negative attitude is an emotional-based and subjective to individual, Thus, H2 cannot yet be concluded since our respondents have less experience with product itself but may further accept if other factors come to consideration such as customers' interest and situation-based environment.

5.3.2 Logo Presentation

H2 suggested that Quadrant C will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using logo presentation type of representation. Post hoc comparisons using Scheffe Multiple Comparisons was used in order to test the differences between each Brain Dominance to identify intention to buy by using logo presentation type of representation on Brain Dominance. In Table 3 showed that at the level of $p<0.05$, there was a significant effect between intention to buy at the $p<.05$ level on Brain Dominances (f=17.854, p=0.000), from the Post hoc results indicated that Quadrant A was significantly different with Quadrant C (p=0.00); Quadrant B and Quadrant C (p=0.001); Quadrant C and Quadrant D (p=0.00). The mean of Quadrant A, B, C, and D are 3.00, 3.07, 3.71 and 2.65 respectively. Therefore, Quadrant C with mean value equal to 3.71 shows significantly high relationship with logo presentation.

5.3.3 Script Placement

H3 suggested that Quadrant A will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using script placement type of representation. Post hoc comparisons using Scheffe Multiple Comparisons was used in order to test the differences between each Brain Dominance to identify intention to buy by using script placement type of representation on Brain Dominance. In Table 3 showed that at the level of $p<0.05$, there was a significant effect between intention to buy at the $p<.05$ level on Brain Dominances (f=203.539, p=0.000), from the Post hoc results indicated that Quadrant A was significantly different with

Quadrant B (p=0.00); Quadrant A and Quadrant C (p=0.00); Quadrant A and Quadrant D (p=0.00); Quadrant B and Quadrant D (p=0.011). The mean of Quadrant A, B, C, and D are 4.46, 2.41, 2.29, and 1.99 respectively. Therefore, Quadrant A with mean value equal to 4.46 shows significantly high relationship with script placement.

5.3.4 Actual Product Used

H4 suggested that Quadrant C will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using actual product used type of representation. Post hoc comparisons using Scheffe Multiple Comparisons was used in order to test the differences between each Brain Dominance to identify intention to buy by using actual product used type of representation on Brain Dominance. In Table 3 showed that at the level of $p<0.05$, there was a significant effect between intention to buy at the $p<.05$ level on Brain Dominances (f=199.673, p=0.000), from the Post hoc results indicated that Quadrant A was significantly different with Quadrant C (p=0.00); Quadrant A and Quadrant D (p=0.00); Quadrant B and Quadrant C (p=0.00); Quadrant B and Quadrant D (p=0.00); Quadrant D and Quadrant C (p=0.00). The mean of Quadrant A, B, C, and D are 2.14, 2.26, 4.65, and 3.37 respectively. Therefore, Quadrant C with mean value equal to 4.65 shows significantly high relationship with actual product used.

5.3.5 Visual Imagery

H5 suggested that customer with Quadrant D Brain Dominance will have intention to buy using visual imagery more than other quadrants. In addition, Post hoc comparisons using Scheffe Multiple Comparisons was used in order to test the differences between each Brain Dominance since there were 4 quadrants which able to identify intention to buy by using visual imagery type of representation on Brain Dominance. In Table 3 showed that at the level of $p<0.05$, there was a significant effect between negative attitude at the $p<.05$ level on Brain Dominances (f=0.196, p=0.899). Therefore, every Quadrant shows average relationship with visual imagery. This indicated that H5 is rejected. H5 cannot yet be concluded but may further accept if other factors come to consideration such as customers' interest or brand familiarity.

5.3.6 Plot Connection

H6 suggested that Quadrant C will have intention to buy more than other quadrants by using plot connection type of representation. Post hoc comparisons using Scheffe Multiple Comparisons was used in order to test the differences between each Brain Dominance to identify intention to buy by using plot connection type of representation on Brain Dominance. In Table 3 showed that at the level of $p<0.05$, there was a significant effect between intention to buy at the $p<.05$ level on Brain Dominances (f=215.439, p=0.000), from the Post hoc results indicated that Quadrant A was significantly different with Quadrant C (p=0.00); Quadrant A and Quadrant D (p=0.00); Quadrant B and Quadrant C (p=0.00); Quadrant B and Quadrant D (p=0.00); Quadrant C and Quadrant D (p=0.00). The mean of Quadrant A, B, C, and D are 2.26, 2.09, 4.62, and 3.27 respectively. Therefore, Quadrant C with mean value equal to 4.62 shows significantly high relationship with plot connection.

6. CONCLUSION

In this study, new approach to determine the effectiveness of product placement has been implemented by the study of customer's Whole Brain Thinking Preference. Researchers determined the attitude toward various types of representation of product

placement and intention to buy with types of customers based on their Whole Brain Thinking Preference.

The practical implications of this study are several. It is valuable to advertisers for segmentation of the market. The advertisers can use various types of representation of product placement to attract particular types of customers. To be effective, the advertisers should carefully study their target customers before conducting advertising.

Due to the limitation of this study, further research should be conducted to determine any possible factors related to this study such as customers' interest, brand familiarity, and customer experience with product. Moreover, further research should be conducted in different environment to determine any drawbacks that have not been implemented in this study.

7. REFERENCES

Babina, L.A. and Carder, S. T. (1996), Viewers' Recognition of Brands Placed Within a film, International Journal of Advertising, Vol.15, No.2, pp. 140.

Brian, T.O. (2011), The effects of brain dominance on student performance, satisfaction, and strategies with graduate online health and wellness majors, pp. 16.

Christ, P. (2004). Product Placement Promotions: A Multi-Sensory Experience.

d'Astous, Alain and Chartier, Francis (2000), A study of factors affecting consumer evaluations and memory of product placements in movies, Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, Vol.22, No.2, pp. 31-40

Gupta, P.B. and Gould S.J. (1997), Consumers' perceptions on the ethics and acceptability of product placements in movies: product category and individual differences, Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, Vol.19, No.1, pp. 37 - 48.

Gupta, P.B. and Lord, K.R. (1998), Product placement in movies: The effect of prominence and mode on audience recall, Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, Vol.20, No.1, pp. 47-59.

Herrmann, W.E. (1996), The whole brain business book, McGraw-Hill, NY

Herrmann, W.E. (1998), The Creative Brain, Brain Books, NJ

Holbrook, M.B. and Grayson, M.W. (1996), The Semiology of Cinematic Consumption: Symbolic Consumer Behavior in Out of Africa, Journal of Consumer Research, December, pp. 374-381.

MacLean, Paul D (1990), The triune brain in evolution: role in paleocerebral functions, New York, Plenum Press.

Nuangthong, N. (2007), A study of the effectiveness of product placements in American movies on Thai audiences

Roger W.S. (1985), Science & moral priority: merging mind, brain, and human values, Praeger, Pennsylvania

Russell, C.A. (2002), Investigating the Effectiveness of Product Placements in Television Shows: The Role of Modality and Plot Connection Congruence on Brand Memory and Attitude, Journal of Consumer Research, Vol.29, pp. 306-318.

Siddarth, S. and Chattopadhyay, A. (1998), A Study of the Determinants of Channel Switching during Commercials, Marketing Science, Vol.17, No.2, pp.124.

Springer J. and Deutch G. (1985), Left Brain/right Brain, W.H. Freeman and Company, NY

Steortz, E.M. (1987), The Cost Efficiency and Communication Effect Associated with Brand Name Exposure within Motion Pictures, Unpublished master's thesis, West Virginia University, Morgantown.

Turcotte, S.A. (1995), The feature film product placement industry, Master's thesis, University of Texas, Austin, TX