

Stream 10. Marketing and Communication

Competitive paper

**From product placement in movies to movie placement in products: The Movie Placement
phenomenon and the moderating role of brand pervasiveness**

Eliane Karsaklian

Université Sorbonne, Paris, France

Email : eliane.karsaklian@univ-paris3.fr

Stream 10. Marketing and Communication
Competitive Paper

**From product placement in movies to movie placement in products: The Movie Placement
phenomenon and the moderating role of brand pervasiveness**

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the emergence of Movie Placement as a phenomenon taking over the traditional product placement as a marketing communication technique. Drawing on three conceptual models, the paper demonstrates the evolution from product placement to movie placement by analyzing two recent films: *The Internship* and *The Lego Movie*. Movie Placement is defined as the placement of a movie in a brand which acceptance from audience is based on brand pervasiveness.

INTRODUCTION

Responding to the need to break through advertising clutter in unique, effective and meaningful ways, advertisers are fuelling the growth in product placements. In the movies, the consumer is totally focused on what he/she sees. It is dark, loud and there are no other distractions. What is seen is easily memorized. Films such as *The Devil Wears Prada* and *Confessions of a Shopaholic* put the consumers in a dreamed environment of fashion and luxury brands. *The Invention of Lying* shows that Bud is to drink both with friends and when we are depressed and that Pizza Hut can play a sanctified role in peoples' lives. Efficiency of product placement has been researched for decades and the proven results led companies to invest the more in this marketing communication technique (d'Astous and Chartier, 2000; DeLorme and Reid 1999; Gupta and Gould 1997). This evolution transformed the market in such way that today we experience what we chose to call the Movie Placement Phenomenon. We define movie placement as the inclusion of a movie into a brand. Movie placement is neither product placement nor reverse product placement. It is the embeddedness of a film in a brand where the film embraces the brand and not the other way around. In other words, movie placement is an extreme salience of product placement, it is the pervasiveness of a brand in a film. In this study, we focus on two recent films which represent perfect examples of movie placement: *The Internship* launched in 2013 and *The Lego Movie*, launched in 2014. *The Internship* starred by Vince Vaughn and Owen Wilson was launched in June 2013 and it is all and exclusively about Google. It is a 119 minutes zoom into the Google's life with a \$58 million budget and \$91,972.764 box office. *The Lego Movie* was

launched in February 2014 with a \$60 million budget and \$444,765.392 box office. Here again, the company found the best way of showing the whole range of products, going from Duplos to Technic by just creating a story around them and having the well-known Will Ferrel starring it. It is a 100 minute-animation film featuring all types of characters that can be made out of Lego bricks including heroes like Batman, Harry Potter, among others. Thereby, the objective of this conceptual paper is twofold: a) to demonstrate that the increase of investments in product placement with more and more brands using the same type of communication leads to more competition in films. As a result, companies search for differentiation, which is coming up as movie placement; b) to introduce a conceptual framework drawn on brand pervasiveness to analyze acceptability of movie placement.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Product placement is the inclusion of a product, a brand name or the name of a firm in a movie or in a television program for promotional purposes. The objective of this communication strategy is to increase consumer awareness and hopefully have a positive impact on consumer preference and intention to buy (d'Astous and Chartier, 2000). Although definitions of product placement differ slightly across the literature, a generally accepted one from Karrh (1994) says: "a paid inclusion of branded products or brand identifiers, through audio and/or visual means within mass media programming," is most comprehensive. Research has generally found product placements to be acceptable to viewers. Despite criticism over the intensifying commercialization of Hollywood movies (Wasko, Phillips, and Purdie, 1993), product placement has continued to emerge as an influential medium of global reach, (Galician and Bourdeau, 2004). In film presentations, consumption conveys a contextual meaning for the embedded brands. More specifically, the brands or products that the characters consume on screen are forms of cinematic consumption symbolism (Holbrook & Grayson, 1986). Consumers learn to attach social meaning to brands through watching the interaction that takes place between characters, products, and specific brands. The physical interaction between a character and a branded product inherently facilitates the meaning transfer from one to the other. Furthermore, Character-Product Interaction (CPI) placements are necessarily integrated in a story and hence provide a placement with an actual 'place' (Kamleitner and Jyote 2013).

The Emergence of Product Placement

Gupta and Lord (1998), suggest three types of product placement: visual only, audio only, and combined audio-visual. The first one just presents a logo or any other stimuli able to identify a brand in the background, as for example Starbucks in *Sex and the City* or in *The Devil Wears Prada*. The name of the brand is not evoked but the logo is clearly shown. The second one implies that a character will name the brand in some moment, as *Forrest Gump* saying 'I drank 15 Dr. Pepper'. And the third type of product placement associates both; the brand is seen as the character mentions its name, for instance in *Confessions of a Shopaholic* when Becky fights another woman for a pair of Gucci boots, consumers see the products as she names the brand.

Product Placement as a standardized international communication strategy

Product placements travel across cultures in movies (Gould et al. 2000) and the process of meaning transfer of products and product placements is a cultural phenomenon (McCracken 1986; Russell 1998). Product placement is largely regarded as a standardized marketing strategy since media content and placed products are difficult to customize and remain identical across cultures (Nelson & Devanathan 2006). Karrh (1998) believes that placement effect might be mediated by some macro factors therefore cross-cultural research is essential. Lee et al. (2011), suggest product placement in films as an effective means to market brands on a global basis with a standardized strategy. Indeed, the media help audiences, especially in emerging markets, learn how to be global consumers through a process of consumer acculturation, where they acquire the knowledge, skills, and behaviors appropriate to consumer culture (Penaloza 1989). In addition, it is an effective way of preparing the markets to accept the arrival of a new brand. Global spending on movie placements rose 8.1% to \$1.66 billion in 2012, driven by faster growth in each of the leading regional markets, particularly China, which surpassed Japan as the world's second-largest film market during the year. Australia became the largest product placement market in the Asia-Pacific region in 2011, when spending increased by 11% to \$243 million. Growth has been fuelled by a relatively strong economy, robust gains in TV brand integration and relatively relaxed product placement regulations, in parallel with the global re-emergence of product placement, according to the PQ Media Global Product Placement Spending Forecast 2012-2016.

The Emergence of Movie Placement

Movie critics have expressed concern that brand placement jeopardizes the artistic integrity of movies. For example, Miller (1990) criticizes the motion picture industry not only for excessive brand plugs, but also for the movies themselves, which he claims are becoming just long advertisements. Karniouchina et al. (2011) suggest that, just as products go through a life cycle, so too do the instruments used to market them. When a new technique shows promise, innovators and early adopters expand its use and start perfecting its application, which lead to growth and increased effectiveness. In the case of product placement in the movies, it seems this happened before the 1990s. However, as a new marketing technique gains wider acceptance, lack of novelty may diminish its effectiveness and consumers may start showing resistance to persuasion. Despite of the high relevance of the researches conducted to date in this field, at our best knowledge no researchers have identified the evolution of this industry towards the emergence of a new phenomenon – the movie placement. Perhaps the proliferation of products placed in films as well as films about famous people and companies such as Jobs, or The Social Network have hidden the transformation of the communication technique called product placement into a new way of conveying messages about brands via films which we chose to call movie placement. In 2000, Gould et al. called product placement an emerging international promotional medium. Thirteen years later, movie placement in products is emerging and is represented in the research here presented by two recent films; *The Internship* and *The Lego Movie*.

A conceptual framework for Movie Placement

The underlying statement for movie placement is that with the proliferation of product placement, brands took more and more room in films in such way that they are now taking over the films and initiating the movie placement phenomenon. At our best knowledge, so far, the types of studies carried on in the marketing field about product placement analyzed increase of brand awareness, brand recognition, brand recall, ethical issues linked to product placement and acceptability from the consumer (for a complete review, see d'Astous and Chartier, 2010). Often these studies compare product placement to other marketing communication techniques such as TV advertisements. The

place of products in the films have been analyzed in terms of place, and type of cue - purely visual, purely audio and audio visual – and also in terms of the level of interaction with the character. However, no research has analyzed the role played by the products as actants in the plot. Our research aims at filling this gap by associating Greimas actantial model (1983) to the Three-Dimensional Construct of Product Placement (Russell, 1998) and The Integrative Framework (Balasubramanian et al., 2006). To do so, we study the movie placement phenomenon by analyzing two recent films; *The Internship* and *The Lego Movie*.

The three conceptual models used in this research

Three-Dimensional Construct of Product Placement

Russell (1998) states that a purely visual type of placement involves placing the brand in the background of a show in one of two ways: either through creative placement, which insinuates the brand into the film, such as with outdoor advertisements in street scenes; or through on-set placement, which positions the product on the film set itself, such as food brands placed in kitchen scenes. Russell refers to it as screen placement. Screen placement can have different degrees, depending on the number of appearances on the screen, the style of camera shot on the product, and so on. The second dimension is auditory or verbal. This type of placement refers to the brand being mentioned in a dialogue. There are also varying degrees of audio placement, depending on the context in which the product is mentioned, the frequency with which it is mentioned, and the emphasis placed on the product name (tone of the voice, place in the dialogue, character speaking at the time, etc.). This purely verbal type is labeled script placement. In some cases, the product becomes part of the plot, taking a major place in the story line or building the persona of a character. This type of placement, called plot placement, constitutes the third dimension of Russell's framework. It consists of any combination of visual and verbal components and can be conceived as the degree of connection between the product and the plot. A mere mention of the brand combined with a brief appearance of the product on the screen is considered low intensity. Plot placements which rely on both visual and audio information will produce higher levels of brand recall than pure screen or script placement. In our research the degree of intensity would relate to the degree of brand pervasiveness. We define

brand pervasiveness in a film as the extent of its salience throughout the film. A brand is deemed as been pervasive when its salience is extreme.

The Integrative Framework

Balasubramanian et al. (2006), propose a framework integrating three types of factors: execution factors, individual differences factors, processing type/context/setting factors and their combined effects on placement. It is a comprehensive model framework to plan, predict and evaluate the impact of product placement.

Greimas' Actantial Model

Greimas' (1983) Structural Semantics attempts a grand formalization of the narrative content by introducing the notion of "actant" (agents) that are central to the Greimasian approach to narrative. This author studied the role of all agents in a narrative, in relation to their contribution to the plot and came up with a typology that, since then, has been widely applied. Hence, the actantial model is composed of six actants and three axes: **The axis of desire**: includes a subject and an object. The subject is what is directed toward an object. For example, a fire-fighter is a subject aiming at saving people in a burning house, who are the objects; **The axis of power**: comprehends the helper and the opponent. The helper assists the subject in achieving the object of his desire, while the opponent aims to prevent him from reaching it. In our example, the helpers for the subject are everything that the fire-fighter can use to extinguish the fire and to save people: water, ladder, etc. The opponents are the fire itself, the wind and other elements preventing the fire-fighter from accomplishing his mission; **The axis of knowledge**: includes the sender and the receiver. The sender is the element requesting the action from the subject and the receiver is the element for which the quest is being undertaken. Continuing with our example, the sender is the fire station and the receivers are the people who were saved, their neighborhood, and the city where the house is located. We propose that the degree of salience and thus of pervasiveness of a brand is measured by the number of roles as an actant a brand plays in the film.

Analysis of Movie Placement according to Greimas' model.

The Internship

The Internship is a 2013 American comedy film directed by Shawn Levy, written by Vince Vaughn and Jared Stern, and produced by Vaughn and Levy. The film stars Vince Vaughn, Owen Wilson and Will Ferrell. The main location of the film is the Googleplex, the real-life headquarters of Google in California. Unlike films like *The Social Media* and *Jobs*, *The Internship* has no historical and/or biographical approach to Google. It is a feature-length promotion of Google as the best place to work at. It depicts the process young College students go through every summer when Google recruits 1,500 summer interns from a pool of 40,000 highly qualified candidates.

The plot

Billy (Vince Vaughn) and Nick (Owen Wilson) are salesmen whose careers have been torpedoed by the digital world. Trying to prove they are not obsolete, they defy the odds by taking their way into a coveted internship at Google, along with a battalion of brilliant college students. But, gaining entrance to this utopia is only half the battle. Now they must compete with a group of the nation's most elite, tech-savvy geniuses to prove that necessity really is the mother of re-invention. There are not really good and bad characters in the plot. Some are more controversial than others. But there are some who need to change to have a better life. Thanks to the challenge of coming up with a new app for Google, the characters team up and grow up thanks to the two experienced new comers. Not that they know anything about technology, but they know about life. Thus, by learning about interactions and relationships with them, the young candidates learn to team up and use their skills in technology to overcome the challenge and secure their jobs at Google. Very few scenes are shot outside Google campus, and the film is a big stroll across all the facilities employees benefit from. Working at Google becomes the best reward ever. The settings are bright, colorful, diverse and appealing.

Axis of knowledge

The **sender** is Google as the challenge is proposed by the company. It shows how open the company is by allowing so many diverse candidates to participate in the challenge but also how selective it is by recruiting only the few best ones. The **receiver** is Google, as the winners of the challenge will work for Google. It encourages excellence and competition. Only the best deserve to be part of Google's life.

Axis of desire

The six members of the team taken altogether are the **subject** of the plot. The subject wants to win the challenge which is the **object** of their desire. There is recession and unemployment in America, and thus, tough competition to get a decent job and Google is THE place to be. Google has proven being an unpaired actor in the technology market worldwide. You need to be sharp and cool. You do what you like, that is, playing with technology and what you are good at. There is a lot of pressure, but it is compensated by the wonderful facilities offered by Google to all its employees. As quoted by Nick (Owen Wilson) "Picture the greatest amusement park you've ever been to as a kid," "Now imagine nothing like it and a million times better."

Axis of power

The **opponents** are all the factors preventing the subject from reaching the object. There are external opponents and internal opponents. The internal opponents are characteristics inherent to each member of the team. First of all, Billy and Nick are much older than their team mates and unskilled at technology. Stuart suffers from **ostracism** as he spends all the time interacting with his smartphone, never looking at or addressing other people. Yo-yo suffers from **lack of autonomy** because of his mother's authoritative oppression. Neha has complex and feels rejected because of her ethnic origins and finally, Lyle, the team leader is a very **shy and insecure** person who should lead his team to victory but has no leadership skills. The external opponents are the competitors, mainly represented by Graham, the nasty, arrogant leader of their main competitor team, and Google itself, represented by Mr. Chetty, head of the internship program who openly displays his skepticism toward the subject's team since the very beginning of the competition. The **helpers** are Billy and Nick who thanks to their life experience bring together the other team members and overcome the main internal opponents, that is, ostracism, ethnic complexes, lack of autonomy, shyness and lack of leadership. Thanks to their approach to life, to accepting challenges, keeping a young spirit and knowledge of human nature Billy and Nick bridge the gap between themselves and the other members of their team by creating synergies. They make the kids think and work as a team, so that they can fully excel in what they are good at – technology – by using the skills they acquired at College. By doing so, the team (subject) overcomes the external opponents which are the other competitors and Google itself represented by

the skeptical Mr. Chetty. The film has been seen across countries and languages (domestic box office - \$ 44,672,764, international box office - \$49,000,000) both at the movies and through DVDs and Blue Rays (United States totalize \$10,130,580), not mentioning downloads from internet (the-numbers.com, September 2013).

The Lego Movie

The Lego Movie is a 2014 American–Australian computer animated film directed and co-written by Phil Lord and Chris Miller and distributed by Warner Bros Pictures, starring Will Ferrell. Based mainly on the Lego line of construction toys, the film tells the story of an ordinary Lego minifigure named Emmet prophesied to save the Lego universe from the tyrannical Lord Business. It was released theatrically on February 2014. The movie was a critical and commercial blockbuster, with many critics highlighting its visual style and humor. It earned more than \$252 million in North America and \$189 million internationally for a worldwide total of over \$441 million.

The plot

The wizard Vitruvius attempts to protect a superweapon called the "Kragle" from the evil Lord Business. He fails to do so and is blinded, but prophesies that a person called "the Special" will find the Piece of Resistance capable of stopping the Kragle. Eight and a half years later, an ordinary construction worker named Emmet Brickowski falls into a hole and finds the Piece of Resistance. Compelled to touch it, Emmet experiences vivid visions and passes out. Emmet finds himself in the real world, where the events of the story are being played out within the imagination of a young boy, Finn, on his father's Lego set. The father—revealed as "the Man Upstairs" and Finn's inspiration for Lord Business—chastises his son for ruining the set by creating hodgepodes of different characters and playsets. Finn tells his dad that Lego is for children, but his father proceeds to permanently glue the models to their original form. Realizing that Finn based his story's villain on him, the father has a change of heart and allows his son to play with his Lego.

Axis of knowledge

The prophesy states that a person named Emmet will find the piece of resistance and save the world. Thus the hero was indirectly sent by the wizard Vitruvius, the **sender**. The **receivers** are all the Lego

population benefitting from the end of the evil and damage created by Lord Business and their return to normal and safe life.

Axis of desire

The **subject** is thus Emmet, the hero who desires to reach the **object** which is the piece of resistance capable of stopping the Kragle from freezing people and cities.

Axis of power

The **opponent** is Lord Business and his super weapon Kragle (Krazy Glue) he uses to freeze the population, along with Bad Cop and his allies. The **helpers** are the Master Builders, capable of building anything they need without instruction manuals, along with other heroes like Batman.

The story finishes with a Happy End, when the father (Lord Business) understands that Lego bricks are meant to children to play with and not to freeze them with glue just to be admired as constructions built according to manual's instructions. Thanks to his son (Emmet), he understands that Lego bricks are produced to stimulate creativity to children who will build, dismantle and rebuild as many forms and as many times as they want and need to play in the stories they invent.

Except for the last minutes of the film where humans are seen, all the story is played by Lego minifigures in a scenario entirely created with Lego bricks. Thus, here again, Lego plays all the roles as actants in the plot as described by Greimas. It is a way of displaying the large array of bricks Lego offers to its consumers and of showing the infinite ways of combining them when playing. The message here is clear: we have an extremely large range of products. They are not created to be used only once. Children should keep playing with them and being creative by using as many bricks and styles as possible. And adults should not only allow them to do so but also play with them. With Lego bricks every child can create great stories and be a hero. There are no limits to imagination because there are no limits to what is possible to build with those bricks. There is no other product placements in this movie. The product and brand Lego are seen throughout the movie. There is not a single scene where there are no Lego bricks. Here again, it is a movie placement rather than a product placement. The brand is in the title and everywhere in the film. The brand is highly pervasive.

The proposed framework to analyze brand pervasiveness in movie placement and consequent acceptance

What makes the difference between product placement and movie placement is the level of brand pervasiveness. And the level of pervasiveness depends on how many actants of the plot are represented by the brand itself. Although both movies fit in the concept of movie placement the outcomes differ. *The Lego Movie* has positive feedback from viewers while *The Internship* has both positive and negative feedback. We believe that the main reason for this difference is the congruence between the Individual-Differences Factors and the strength of the link towards transformation which would also represent the level of tolerance to brand pervasiveness, as shown in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 around here

DISCUSSION

Movie placement is an extension of product placement in which brand salience makes it so pervasive that the brand becomes a real character embedded in the movie. In this research we drew on Russell's Three-Dimensional Framework, which articulates visual, verbal and plot placements. In the case of Movie Placement, the brand embraces all three dimensions and is omnipresent throughout the film. We demonstrated that Balasubramanian et al.'s (2006) framework's articulation of Executional Factors with Individual differences conditions viewers' responses to brand pervasiveness which will result in acceptance or rejection of the film based on the hierarchy of effects. Finally, thanks to Greimas' actantial model, we were able to measure the level of pervasiveness of the brand. In order to be seen and desired, products and brands should play a role in the plot. More often than not, they act as helpers. They support their characters, might they be good or bad, by sharing values with them and by being part of their personality. Subjects reach their objects thanks to helpers among which are the products and brands placed in the plot. But Greimas' model applies differently to *The Internship*. Google plays roles as all types of actants. Google is part of all three axis and plays six roles. It totally pervades the film. The film is within Google and not the other way around. The film is immersed in Googliness and if we tried to remove Google from one of the axis the plot would make no sense. The same applies to Lego. Interestingly, although both films were created to promote a specific company,

feedback about them were very different and even opposed. *The Internship* was strongly criticized as being a pure promotion for Google. It was rated 4.8 out of ten by the Tomatometer (34% liked it) and 3.3 out of 5 by the audience (53% liked it). The *Lego Movie* was rated 8.1 out of 10 by the Tomatometer (96% liked it) and 4.6 out of 5 by the audience (89% liked it) (Rottentomatoes.com). A plausible explanation for such a gap between both films can be the emotional attachment consumers have with LEGO. A film made with LEGO minifigures is cute, fun and reminds them their childhood. Thus the message 'buy as many LEGO products as your children want and let them play with them' is subtle to the consumers who are captivated by hedonic feelings. They just enjoy the story and have fun. The brand is subtly represented by the minifigures and the bricks which the animation was made out of. But when it comes to *The Internship*, the message is so explicit and so obvious because of the pervasiveness of the brand that consumers feel like being trapped in a movie theatre for a feature-length advertisement for Google. Unlike for LEGO, consumers' relationship with Google is utilitarian rather than hedonic (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). Thus, their view of the movie is much more objective and it is impossible to forget that the film is not about a story, it is about Google. The brand name is much stronger than all the cast members together.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Movie placement is a standardized communication technique and very appropriate for standardized products distributed across countries such as Google and Lego. The two films do not aim at persuading the audience about preferring their brands upon their competitors. Measures of efficiency in product placement would not apply here. Who wouldn't remember Google and Lego as brands? Who could possibly get confused between Google and Ask or between Lego and Playmobil? *The Internship* and *The Lego Movie* explain to the audience why they are so right in being loyal customers fascinated by their brands. It is a positive reinforcement to their already very good choices as consumers. Movie placement can be an expensive although powerful way of communicating internationally while benefitting from high levels of attention from consumers. Before anything else, companies should test the level of tolerance for brand pervasiveness by using the framework suggested in this paper and create their film accordingly. *The Internship* and *The Lego Movie* are presented in

this paper as two real examples of the positive and negative impact of brand pervasiveness in movie placement. Although the framework presented here is conceptual and was created and tested on two recent films, an empirical test would help to confirm its pertinence.

References

Balasubramanian, S.K., Karrh, J.A. and Patwardhan, H. (2006). "Audience responses do product placements: An integrative framework and future research agenda". *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 115-141.

D'Astous, A. and Chartier, F. (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.

Galician, M. L. and Bourdeau, P.G. (2004), "Embedding High- Involvement 'Heroic' Brand Images," in *Handbook of Product Placement in the Mass Media: New Strategies in Marketing Theory, Practice, Trends, and Ethics*, Mary-Lou Galician, ed., Binghamton, NY: Haworth, 15– 36.

Gould, S.J., Gupta, P.B. and Grabner-Krauter, S. (2000). "Product Placements in Movies: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Austrian, French and American Consumers' Attitudes Toward This Emerging, International Promotional Medium". *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 42-58.

Greimas, A-J. (1983), *Structural Semantics*, University of Nebraska Press

Gupta, P.B. and Lord, K.R. (1998). "Product Placement in Movies: the effect of prominence and mode on the audience recall". *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, Vol. 9, No 1, pp.47-59.

Holbrook, M.B. & Hirschman, E.C. (1982). "The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun". *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.9, No 2, pp. 132– 140.

Holbrook, M.B. and Grayson, M.W. (1986). "The Semiology of Cinematic Consumption: Symbolic Consumer Behavior in Out of Africa". *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 13, pp. 374-381.

<http://www.the-numbers.com/movie/Internship>

<http://www.rottentomatoes.com>

Kamleitner, B. and Jyote, A.K., (2013). "How using versus showing interaction between characters and products boosts product placement effectiveness". *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 32, No 4, pp. 633–653.

Karniouchina, A.V., Uslay, C. and Erenburg, G. (2011). "Do Marketing Media Have Life Cycles? The Case of Product Placement in Movies". *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 75, pp. 27–48

Karrh, J.A. 1998. "Brand Placement: A Review." *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, Vol. 20, no 2, p. 31–49.

Karrh, James (1994). "Effects of brand placements in motion pictures", in *Proceedings of the 1994 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising*, K. King (ed.), Athens, GA: Grady College of Journalism, pp. 90-96.

Lee, T., Sung, Y. and Choi, S.M. (2011). "Young adults' responses to product placement in movies and television shows: A comparative study of the United States and South Korea". *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol.30 No 3, pp. 479–507

McCracken, Grant (1986), "Culture and Consumption: A Theoretical Account of the Structure and Movement of the Cultural Meaning of Consumer Goods," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 3, pp. 71-84.

Miller, Mark C. (1990), *Seeing Through Movies*, New York: Pantheon Books.

Nelson, M.r. & Devanathan, N. (2006). "Brand placements Bollywood style". *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 5, No 3, pp. 211–221.

Nelson, M.R. and Deshpande, S. (2013). "The Prevalence of and Consumer Response to Foreign and Domestic Brand Placement in Bollywood Movies", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 1–15

Penaloza, Lisa N. (1989), "Immigrant Consumer Acculturation," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Thomas K. Srull, ed., Vol. 16, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, pp.110–18.

PQ Media (2010). Global Product Placement Spending Forecast 2012-2016.

Russell, Cristel Antonia (1998), "Toward a Framework of Product Placement: Theoretical Propositions," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Joseph W. Alba, and J. Wesley Hutchinson, ed., Provo, UT:Association for Consumer Research, pp. 357-362.

Wasko, J., Phillips, M., and Purdie, C. (1993). "Hollywood Meets Madison Avenue: The Commercialization of US Films". *Media, Culture and Society*, Vol. 15, pp. 271-293.

Figure 1 – Conceptual Framework to analyze Movie Placement



