Brand placement repetition in a fictional text

Brand placement repetition in a fictional text

Yana R. Avramova
Corresponding author
University of Antwerp
Faculty of Applied Economics, Marketing department
Prinsstraat 13
2000 Antwerp
Belgium
Tel: +32 3 265 44 88
Fax: +32 3 265 47 99
Yana.Avramova@uantwerpen.be

Patrick De Pelsmacker
University of Antwerp & Ghent University
Faculty of Applied Economics, Marketing department
Prinsstraat 13
2000 Antwerp
Belgium
Tel: +32 3 265 40 22
Fax: +32 3 265 47 99
patrick.depelsmacker@uantwerpen.be

Nathalie Dens
University of Antwerp & Antwerp Management School
Faculty of Applied Economics, Marketing department
Prinsstraat 13
2000 Antwerp
Belgium
Tel: +32 3 265 49 66
Fax: +32 3 265 47 99
nathalie.dens@uantwerpen.be

Yana R. Avramova (Ph.D., University of Tilburg) is doctoral researcher at the University of Antwerp, Faculty of Applied Economics, Marketing Department. Her research focuses on brand placement effectiveness in print and audiovisual media.

Patrick De Pelsmacker (Ph.D., Ghent University) is full professor of marketing at the University of Antwerp, Faculty of Applied Economics, Marketing Department and at Ghent University,

Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Marketing Department. His research interests include advertising effectiveness, advertising in new media, consumer behaviour, branding and ethical marketing.

Nathalie Dens (Ph.D., University of Antwerp) is associate professor of marketing at the University of Antwerp, Faculty of Applied Economics, Marketing Department. Her research focuses on advertising effectiveness for different marketing communication formats and branding strategies.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the University of Antwerp Research Council.

Brand placement repetition in a fictional text

This paper investigates the effect of brand name repetition on brand attitude in the context of a fictional text. Furthermore, it tests the moderating impact of brand familiarity, narrative transportation, and individual differences in need for cognition (NFC). Participants in an experiment read the full text of a real short-story, which featured the target brand. Brand name repetition and brand familiarity were systematically manipulated. The results show that brand name repetition affects attitude towards an unfamiliar brand and readers' narrative transportation and need for cognition moderate this effect: Attitude towards the brand improves with repetition only when both transportation and NFC are relatively high. No effects were found for the familiar brand.

Keywords: brand placement, brand attitude, fiction, narrative transportation, brand familiarity, need for cognition

Brand placement – the (paid) inclusion of brand identifiers in editorial content – has a long history in movies and television. Most research to date has accordingly investigated placement effectiveness in these media (e.g., Dens et al. 2012; Gupta and Lord 1998; Homer 2009; Matthes and Naderer 2015; Redker, Gibson, and Zimmerman 2013; Russell, 2002), although studies on other platforms, such as computer games (e.g., Cauberghe and De Pelsmacker 2010), song lyrics (e.g., Van Vaerenbergh et al. 2011), and music videos (Schemer et al. 2008), have been recently accumulating. In contrast, our knowledge on placement effects in another major medium – books – is still extremely limited, despite the fact that brands have permeated works of literature for many decades. Across literary genres, branded products are frequently used by writers to create a natural setting, a historical and social context, to increase verisimilitude, or to aid characterization (Brennan and McCalman 2011; Karrh 1998). Friedman (1985) studied brand name usage in

American bestsellers published between 1946 and 1975 and found that brand names were more than 500% more prevalent in the 1970s than in the 1940s, with the steepest increase in the last decade of that period. He called for research on the impact of emerging 'sponsored word-of-author advertising' on consumers and other scholars have since appealed for work on books as promotional platforms, voicing the need to advance current theories of brand placement effects which focus on audiovisual media (see Bhatnagar et al. 2004; Brennan 2008; Brennan and McCalman 2011).

From a practical perspective, brand placement in books is likely to be more and more tempting for advertisers, as they are seeking alternative communication outlets in light of the growing placement clutter in audiovisual media (Alter, 2014; Atkinson 2003). The stakes are high for book publishers as well, as they search for new sources of revenue and struggle with the consequences of online retailers and book digitalization (Jacobs 2012; see also Arnold, 2001). Finally, authors themselves seem to recognize the marketing potential of books, and some have seized the opportunity to weave brands into their narrative (often, for an attractive compensation; see Alter, 2014; Flood, 2014). For instance, Fay Weldon's novel 'The Bulgari Connection' (2001) was commissioned by the renowned jewellery designer, and Carole Matthew's novel 'The Sweetest Taboo" (2004) was sponsored by Ford. More recent examples include Hillary Carlip's e-book 'Find Me I'm Yours' (2014), which features (and defends the safety of) the artificial sweetener Sweet'N'Low, and William Boyd's short-story "The Vanishing Game", published as an interactive e-book and commissioned by Land Rover.

In sum, gaining insight into the specific factors that enhance placement effectiveness in the context of fiction is essential for both theory and practice. And yet, to our knowledge, only three empirical papers have so far investigated brand placement effects within fictional

narratives. Specifically, Brennan (2008) studied whether brand recall will be enhanced if a brand name in a novel is fragmented (e.g., Pep_ _, instead of Pepsi), and found that mild brand name fragmentation enhanced recall relative to both complete presentation and severe fragmentation. Bhatnagar and Wan (2011) demonstrated that readers' immersion into the story moderated the impact of perceived self-character similarity on brand attitudes: When immersion was induced, a dissimilar protagonist was associated with higher brand evaluations than a similar protagonist. Finally, Olsen and Lanseng (2012) explored the role of placement plot connection and showed that under high (induced) involvement, highly plot-integrated brands were evaluated more positively than lowly plot-integrated brands.

Extending this work, the present research examines the impact of other key variables, which seem especially pertinent to the context of written narrative, on brand attitudes. First of all, we study the impact of *brand name repetition*. Although it is very (and increasingly) common that brands appear repeatedly within a literary work (Friedman 1985), no research has so far looked at the attitudinal effects of such repeated exposure. Moreover, we test whether the effects of repetition vary as a function of whether the placed brand is familiar or unfamiliar. *Brand familiarity* has been shown to moderate the influence of repetition on brand attitude in traditional advertising (Campbell and Keller 2003), as well as other placement effects in audiovisual media (e.g., Mau, Silberer, and Constien 2008). The present research is the first to experimentally manipulate both placement repetition and brand familiarity and test their attitudinal effects within the context of a fictional text. Our rationale for focusing on brand attitude, rather than on brand memory (which has received more attention in prior placement studies), is based on evidence that 1) (explicit) memory of a placed brand has been shown to be a poor predictor of brand attitude (e.g., Matthes, Schemer, and Wirth 2007; Redker et al. 2013; Russell 2002; Van Reijmersdal

2009) and 2) brand attitude is an important determinant of purchase behaviour (e.g., Fischbein and Ajzen, 1974; Spears and Singh 2004). In light of the growing interest in what makes placements more persuasive, rather than just more memorable, other researchers have also called for more empirical work on the impact of placements on brand attitude, especially with regard to unfamiliar brands (e.g., Brennan 2008; Shin and Kim 2011).

In the present research, we propose that whereas attitudes towards familiar brands will not be swayed by exposure to (repeated) placements, attitudes towards unfamiliar brands will be affected. Moreover, the direction and magnitude of this effect will be determined by variables that may guide processing of placements in a fictional work, namely the level of readers' narrative transportation and need for cognition (NFC). Specifically, we argue that readers' attitude towards the unfamiliar brand will be enhanced when both transportation and NFC are relatively high. Notably, a key methodological contribution of our work is that, while earlier studies on brand placement in written narratives employed either a three-page excerpt from a novel (Olsen and Lanseng 2012), or a magazine travel article (Bhatnagar and Wan 2011), the experiment reported in the current paper used the full text of an existing short-story, further enhancing the ecological validity and practical implications of our findings.

Theoretical background and hypotheses development

Brand placement repetition

The attitudinal impact of placement repetition has been explored in several studies on audiovisual media. Interestingly, while one study showed that higher brand name repetition in song lyrics was associated with more positive brand attitudes (Van Vaerenbergh et al., 2011), two studies within audiovisual media indicate that the direction of repetition effects may depend on how placements

are processed. Employing a movie and a TV program, Homer (2009) showed that repetition (3 vs. 1 exposure) of a subtly placed brand did not affect brand attitudes, whereas repetition of a prominent placement decreased them. This pattern corroborates work demonstrating that subtle placements are processed in a more shallow manner, while prominent placements tend to elicit greater elaboration. Presumably, deeper processing is more likely to activate *persuasion knowledge* (Friestad and Wright 1994) – thoughts and beliefs that make consumers prone to recognize or interpret a message as a persuasive attempt – which may lead to counterarguing and thus result in negative brand evaluations (Dens et al. 2012; Russell 2002; Van Reijmersdal 2009; see also Shiv, Edell, and Payne 1997).

In another study, Matthes and colleagues (2007) explored the effects of repetition on responses to an unfamiliar brand placed in a TV magazine. Repetition positively affected brand attitudes of viewers who were highly involved and had low persuasion knowledge, but decreased brand attitudes of viewers who were lowly involved in the program and who had high persuasion knowledge. In addition, brand recall and brand attitudes were strongly and negatively related in the latter group (indicating deeper placement elaboration), yet completely unrelated in the former group. This pattern is consistent with evidence that subtle placements, albeit less memorable, may implicitly enhance brand attitudes (e.g., Redker et al. 2013; Russell 2002; Van Reijmersdal 2009).

In sum, past studies have documented divergent effects of brand name repetition on brand attitudes, yet their findings are not necessarily directly comparable, given that they come from different media, and they employed different experimental designs and different moderators. Moreover, their implications for the context of fiction are not always straightforward: For instance, it is difficult to predict whether a brand featured in a book would ‘behave’ like a subtle

or a prominent placement (cf. Homer, 2009). Similarly, involvement with a TV program (cf. Matthes et al. 2007) may be qualitatively different from transportation into a written narrative (Green et al. 2008; Hakemulder, 2011; Tukachinsky, 2014), and coming across a brand name in a book might raise less suspicion (and thus, tactic-related thoughts) than encountering it on screen (Friedman 1985; Jacobs 2012). Thus, an empirical investigation of placement repetition effects in the context of written fiction seems not only justified, but also desirable (see Bhatnagar et al. 2004).

On the other hand, if we zoom out of the specific context, these findings converge in one crucial respect, that is *how* a placement is processed is an important determinant of placement repetition effects on brand attitudes. Therefore, the present study embarks to investigate the (interactive) impact of three key variables that have been shown to affect consumers' processing style and to be especially pertinent to the context of written narratives, namely brand familiarity, (state) narrative transportation, and (chronic) need for cognition, and the downstream consequences for brand attitudes.

Brand familiarity

Empirical evidence regarding the role of brand familiarity in placement effectiveness has been mixed. For instance, Wei, Fischer, and Main (2008) found that sponsor disclosure decreased attitudes towards an unfamiliar brand featured in a college radio program, but did not affect or even enhanced attitudes towards a familiar brand. In contrast, Mau et al. (2008) showed that attitudes towards a highly familiar brand were negatively affected, whereas attitudes towards an unfamiliar brand were enhanced upon exposure to the brands within a video game. In a study on the attitudinal effects of film placements, Verhellen, Dens, and De Pelsmacker (2015)

demonstrated that placement prominence and plot connection interact to affect unfamiliar brands, but exert no effect on familiar brands.

Moreover, to our knowledge, no work exists on the interactive effects of placement repetition and brand familiarity on brand attitudes. The only study that has manipulated both variables in a placement context has tested their impact on brand memory, using an excerpt from a marketing textbook. Specifically, Brennan and McCalman (2011) found that repetition enhanced recall and recognition of a familiar, but not an unfamiliar, brand. However, given that recall is not a reliable predictor of attitude (e.g., Matthes, et al. 2007; Redker et al, 2013; Van Reijmersdal 2009), and that a textbook is different from a literary text in many respects, testing the role of brand familiarity in repeated placement effects on brand attitudes in the context of fiction is crucial (see Brennan and McCalman 2011).

Interestingly, brand familiarity has been shown to moderate *advertising repetition effects* (Cambell and Keller 2003; see also Calder and Sternthal 1980). Specifically, using TV and internet ads, Campbell and Keller (2003) demonstrated that advertising wearout occurs sooner for unfamiliar than for familiar brands. They argued that, although novel stimuli activate a learning goal and thereby trigger deeper processing than familiar stimuli (Britton and Tesser 1982; Sujan 1985), they are not linked to any knowledge in memory that consumers could actually elaborate on. The available cognitive resources can thus be used to consider tactic inappropriateness and generate counterarguments to the message (see also Shiv et al. 1997). Conversely, familiar brands activate existing brand knowledge and attitudes and thus provide sufficient material for elaboration, thereby preventing consumers from counterarguing the ad claims. In line with this account, Campbell and Keller (2003) found a curvilinear relationship between repetition and

attitudes for unfamiliar brands (i.e., attitudes increased from 1 to 2 repetitions, but then decreased at 3 repetitions), but no shift in attitudes toward familiar brands.

It is reasonable to expect that brand familiarity would similarly influence the *level of elaboration* in a brand placement context, such that a familiar (vs. unfamiliar) brand encountered in a fictional text will be processed less extensively. Since familiar brands can be readily linked to stored knowledge in memory, readers would be less likely to extract new brand information from the story; rather, they will draw on their pre-existing attitudes when evaluating the brand and the narrative content will not have an impact on brand attitudes (see also Kamleitner and Jyote 2013; Mau et al. 2008).

H1: Brand name repetition will not affect attitudes towards a placed *familiar* brand.

When it comes to *unfamiliar* brands, however, our predictions are more nuanced. Specifically, under certain conditions (which we discuss in detail below) placed unfamiliar brands could benefit from deeper processing and repeated exposure, unlike brands featured in repeated ads. Our rationale is as follows: First, in contrast to traditional advertisements, brand placements are integrated in editorial content, which could provide rich elaboration material. In other words, unlike participants in Campbell and Keller's (2003) studies, who supposedly had no information to elaborate on other than the (repeating) ad itself, consumers exposed to product placements might actually process an unfamiliar brand in relation to the narrative context in which it appears (Karrh McKee, and Pardun 2003). Since no prior knowledge is activated in the case of unfamiliar brands, the context will have a strong impact on attitudes (Finn and Roediger III 2013; Kamleitner and Jyote 2013; Mau et al. 2008). That is, in line with associative network theory (Collins and Loftus 1975; Keller 1993), associations elicited by the story would create new 'nodes' in the brand's associative network (Dens and De Pelsmacker 2010; Verhellen et al.

2015). Through a process of spreading activation, context-related affect and cognitions will thereby be transferred to the brand. Put differently, the story characters, plot, and setting will imbue meaning in an otherwise 'empty' brand name (McCracken 1989; Redker et al. 2013; Russell 2002). Finally, in contrast to repeatedly seeing or hearing the same ad, each incidence of a brand that is 'repeatedly' featured within a narrative is *de facto* different, as it appears *in the course of a story*. Thus, every time an unfamiliar brand is mentioned within the text, a new opportunity arises for readers to link it to different elements of the story, creating a richer set of (positive) associations that could ultimately enhance brand attitude.

Notably, inherent to our processing account is an important boundary condition: It implies that the effect of repetition on attitudes towards unfamiliar brands should critically depend on both the *type* and *degree* of elaboration that readers engage in. That is, processing of the placed brand *with relation to the story*, and the resulting meaning transfer from the story to the brand, would require that readers are sufficiently absorbed in the story, and sufficiently motivated to process the unfamiliar brand, in the first place; otherwise, such a transfer would be less likely. Therefore, the present research investigates the moderating role of narrative transportation and need for cognition. On the one hand, studies on narrative persuasion suggest that (high) *narrative transportation* facilitates *narrative* (vs. *analytical*) elaboration of story content, which in turn drives attitude change (i.e., development of story-consistent attitudes; e.g., Green and Brock 2000). On the other hand, dispositional differences in *need for cognition* reflect the relative propensity to engage in extensive and effortful elaboration (Cacioppo and Petty 1982), which might be especially relevant in the context of fictional works. We thus propose that both of these variables will be crucial in predicting the *direction* and *magnitude* of brand placement repetition effects in written narratives.

Narrative transportation

Research in communication has long demonstrated that narratives are a powerful persuasion tool (e.g., Dal Cin et al. 2007; Green and Brock 2000; Prentice, Gerrig, and Bailis 1997). Evidence suggests that narrative processing, which underlies narrative persuasion, is fundamentally different from processing of non-narrative (rhetoric) forms of argumentation. According to the transportation-imagery model (Green and Brock 2000, 2002; Slater and Rouner 2002; Van Laer et al. 2014), narratives persuade via *narrative transportation* – a state of absorption in the fictional world that involves attentional, cognitive, and emotional responses, vivid mental imagery, and suspension of disbelief (Green and Brock,2000, 2002; Prentice et al. 1997). Since transportation fosters *narrative elaboration*, rich imagery and thoughts are continuously generated that focus on the storyline, rather than on the persuasion-relevant issue (Green, Garst, and Brock 2004). As a result, information contained in (or implied by) the narrative is not critically scrutinized and counterarguing is reduced, making attitude change more likely (Green and Brock 2000; Slater and Rouner 2002). In contrast, low transportation may elicit *analytical elaboration*: Readers may become more alert to potential persuasive attempts, more critical of the content, and thus more likely to generate counterarguments and resist attitude change (see Tukachinsky 2012).

In the context of the present research, these findings imply that narrative transportation may influence processing of and responses to brand placements within a literary narrative. As described earlier, unfamiliar brands typically trigger more extensive elaboration than familiar brands (Campbell and Keller 2003; Sujan 1985). We suggest that when elaboration is *narrative-based*, an unfamiliar brand will be interpreted with relation to the content in which it appears. Given that narrative transportation elicits story-related affect and cognitions and thwarts

counterarguing (e.g., Green and Brock 2002; Green, Garst, and Brock 2004), highly transported readers should be more likely to engage in such *narrative-based processing* of the placed brand. In addition, since this type of processing tends to consume attentional, cognitive, and emotional resources (Green and Brock 2000; Mazzocco et al. 2010; Slater and Rouner 2002), it is less likely that the persuasive nature of the placement and tactic inappropriateness will be contemplated. Based on the idea that repeated exposure offers additional opportunities for associating the unfamiliar brand with the story context, we predict that attitudes of highly-transported readers will be enhanced as repetition increases.

In contrast, we expect that lowly-transported readers will be more likely to engage in *analytical processing*. Therefore, a placement for an unfamiliar brand will not be as readily linked to the content of the story; instead, it will be processed in a context-independent manner (see also Matthes et al. 2011). As a result, higher repetition will increase the chance that an alerted reader considers the placement as inappropriate, thereby decreasing brand attitudes.

H2: The effect of placement repetition on attitudes towards unfamiliar brands will be moderated by narrative transportation, such that:

H2a: Increasing repetition will positively affect brand attitudes of more highly transported readers.

H2b: Increasing repetition will negatively affect brand attitudes of more lowly transported readers.

Finally, we expect no moderating effect of narrative transportation for familiar brands: Due to their potential to directly activate existing associations in consumers' memory, their connection to the story will be weaker. Hence, narrative transportation will not affect how a familiar brand is processed and will therefore not sway brand attitudes either way.

H3: Repetition and transportation will not interact to affect attitudes towards a familiar brand.

Our predictions about the effects of repetition on attitudes towards the unfamiliar brand rest on the fundamental assumption that readers are *motivated* to process the brand placement in the first place. That is, for narrative transportation to exert an impact, be that positive or negative, a certain amount of elaboration is required. However, it has been shown that people differ in their *need for cognition* (NFC) – a personality trait that reflects one's chronic tendency to engage in and enjoy effortful cognitive activities (Cacioppo and Petty 1982). We therefore posit that NFC will further moderate the (interactive) effects of brand name repetition and narrative transportation on brand attitude.

Need for cognition

Need for cognition has been established as a consistent moderator of *rhetorical persuasion* effects (see e.g., Cacioppo et al. 1996; Petty et al. 2009). The classic finding is that those high (vs. low) in NFC are more strongly affected by the quality of arguments in persuasive communication due to their propensity to scrutinize the message more carefully. Evidence regarding the effects of NFC in the context of *narrative persuasion*, however, has been inconsistent. While some studies have failed to find an effect of NFC on narrative persuasion (e.g., Green and Brock 2000; Wheeler et al. 1999), suggesting that elaboration level does not drive persuasion, other work has documented moderation effects (Green et al. 2008; Owen and Riggs 2012; Thompson and Haddock 2012; Zwarun and Hall 2012). For instance, Green et al. (2008) compared narrative persuasion effects across media and found that low NFC individuals were more transported into film (supposedly a less demanding medium), whereas high NFC individuals were more transported by the written version of the same narrative (which supposedly

requires more mental effort). Furthermore, Thompson and Haddock (2012) showed that high (vs. low) NFC readers were more persuaded by a narrative appeal.

Based on these findings, we propose that NFC will play a moderating role in the context of brand placement effects in fiction. Specifically, high NFC will be associated with deeper scrutiny of the narrative content (Wheeler et al. 1999), yet cognitive effort will be invested differently by highly and lowly transported readers: As discussed above, highly transported readers will be more likely to engage in *narrative elaboration*, embedding the unfamiliar brand in the story context and thereby creating a richer associative network and more positive attitudes with increasing repetition. Lowly transported readers, on the other hand, will be more likely to process the brand *analytically*, whereby high repetition will trigger irritation and tactic-inappropriateness thoughts, resulting in more negative brand attitudes (see Homer 2009). Since high NFC will elicit more *extensive* processing in all cases, it will *amplify* both the beneficial effects of high transportation, as well as the detrimental effects of low transportation. In contrast, we expect that – due to their propensity to exert less mental effort and to process information in a more superficial manner – low NFC readers will be less prone to engage in either narrative, or analytical elaboration of brand-related information. As a consequence, narrative transportation (or, the lack thereof) will exert a weaker (or no) moderating effect on the relationship between placement repetition and brand attitudes under low NFC.

H4: The interaction effect between transportation and placement repetition on attitudes towards an unfamiliar brand (H2) will be stronger for individuals who score higher on NFC than for those who score lower on NFC.

A graphical representation of the hypothesized three-way interaction for the unfamiliar brand can be found in Figure 1.

Figure 1 near here

Finally, we predict that need for cognition will not moderate the relationship between repetition and transportation in the case of placements for *familiar* brands. More specifically, we do not expect NFC to influence elaboration of familiar brands, as brand-related associations are likely to be highly accessible for both high and low NFC readers. Thus, we posit that familiar brands will be processed less extensively with increasing repetition irrespective of NFC level. As a consequence, and as hypothesized above, narrative transportation will not moderate the effects of repetition on attitudes towards familiar brands (H2). Hence, NFC will not have an impact on brand attitudes.

H5: Need for cognition will not interact with transportation and repetition to affect attitudes towards a familiar brand.

Method

Study design and experimental manipulations

We conducted an experiment, where we systematically manipulated *brand name repetition* (i.e., the number of times a target brand is mentioned) and *brand familiarity* (i.e., whether the target brand is familiar or unfamiliar) within a fictional narrative. The resulting design was a 3(repetition: 2, 6, 11) x 2(brand familiarity: familiar, unfamiliar) full-factorial between-subjects experiment. In addition, we measured readers' narrative transportation and need for cognition.

We used the short-story 'Checkmate' (1988) by bestselling British author Jeffrey Archer as stimulus material. Besides the literary merit of Archer's fiction, this particular story was

selected for practical reasons as well. Specifically, the text was not too long, so it was feasible that study participants read the full story, rather than just an excerpt from it (cf. Olsen and Lanseng 2011). At the same time, the text was long enough to permit multiple (up to 11) placements to be inserted. The characters in the original story were depicted as drinking alcohol on several occasions, allowing us to integrate an alcoholic beverage as our target product (vodka) quite seamlessly. The original text (in English) was translated into Dutch (2,545 words) by a professional translator. The author of the story was not disclosed to participants, but the title of the story was included. This (first) part of the study was presented as research on readers' perceptions of literature. The narrator in the story – a chess club captain – recounts the events of an evening at the chess club, where he meets a very attractive young woman. When the tournament is over, he invites her at his place for a quick drink and a game of chess. They play several games, as the narrator doubles his bet after each match, while the woman agrees to take off another piece of clothing every time she loses a game. After a series of losses, just as many drinks, and suspense at its peak, the woman unexpectedly beats the narrator with flying colors, takes his money and leaves. Although the narrator has a couple of drinks himself (one at the bar and one at home), in the course of the evening he keeps pouring drinks for the young woman. We used a brand of vodka as our target product placement.

Brand familiarity was manipulated by inserting either a familiar or an unfamiliar brand of vodka in the text. Based on a pretest (n =15), we selected a brand that students were highly familiar with (*Eristoff*®; M = 3.87, SD = .74; on a 5-pont Likert scale, ranging from *not at all familiar* to *very familiar*). Another pretest (n=53) helped us identify an unfamiliar brand (*Posolskaya*®; it was not available on the Belgian market and 92.5 % of respondents indicated they did not know the brand on the item "Do you know the brand Posolskaya?", Yes/No).

Brand name repetition was manipulated by inserting the (familiar or unfamiliar) brand name 2, 6, or 11 times within the story. Our choice of repetition levels was based on past work in audiovisual media, where frequency ranged between 1 and 13 exposures (e.g., Homer 2009; Matthes et al. 2007; Van Vaerenbergh et al. 2011), as well as on practical considerations. Specifically, we aimed to compare the impact of a relatively low repetition rate (2 mentions being the minimum), a relatively high repetition rate (11 being the maximum number of placements we could insert in the story without disrupting the flow or significantly changing the plot), and what represents moderate repetition in this context (6 mentions).

In the 2 repetition condition, the brand was mentioned once in the beginning (on p.2 of the story, as printed in our A5 booklet, appearing after 680 words), and once in the end (p.6, after 2,203 words). These two placements appeared in all experimental conditions. In the 6 repetition condition, four additional placements were inserted at roughly equal intervals in-between the other two placements (resulting in approximately one brand mention per page). In the 11 repetition condition, five more placements were added to the six that were present in the moderate repetition version, such that the brand appeared eleven times in total (i.e., about two brand mentions per page).

Whenever some placements were ‘absent’ in the lower repetition conditions, we also took out any reference to alcohol and drinking. Our rationale was that references to concepts that are strongly related to the target brand (e.g., alcohol/ bottle/ pouring/ drinking) could activate the brand name in memory. Given that the brand name is mentioned at least once in the beginning, readers could spontaneously infer that whenever the woman gets ‘another drink’, or the narrator brings ‘the bottle’, it is the same brand that is referred to. In that way, we ensured that the product

category (or other cues) did not prime the brand name in memory and thus serve as an additional, subtle reminder.

Archer's original story mentioned two car brands, which were meaningfully related to the plot of the story. We decided to keep these brands in the text (in all conditions) in order to stay close to the original, and because the presence of these 'filler' brands also made the target brand less salient.

Participants and procedure

One hundred and fifty-two students at a Flemish university took part in the study (52.1% female, M_{age} = 19.65, SD_{age} = 1.78). Participants were randomly assigned to conditions. The study was administered as a pencil-and-paper survey during regular classes. The research was briefly introduced as 'a series of separate, unrelated studies, which includes a literature study, a consumer behavior study, and some personality questionnaires'. Participants received a booklet with the short-story, containing the manipulations and measures. Each 'part' of the experiment featured a different title, introduction, task instructions, and layout. Participants were asked to read the story (which took about 9 min on average) and answer the questions at their own pace, and were assured of their anonymity. They were also informed they could enter a sweepstake to win one of 3 bookstore vouchers (each worth 25 euro) if they were willing to leave their email address. Several weeks after the experiment, participants were carefully debriefed regarding the nature and purpose of the research via email.

Moderators and dependent variable

All constructs were measured on 7-point Likert or bipolar scales. *Narrative transportation* was based on Green and Brock's (2000) Narrative Transportation Scale (10 items, M = 4.30, SD = .82

Cronbach's α = .78). *Need for cognition* (NFC) was measured with the original 18-items of Cacioppo and Petty (1982) (*M* = 4.35, *SD* = .76; Cronbach's α = .87). Our key dependent variable, *brand attitude*, was measured with four 7-point bipolar scales (negative/positive, unattractive/attractive, don't like/like, low/high quality; *M* = 4.44, *SD* = 1.18; Cronbach's α = .94; see e.g., Dens et al. 2012; Homer 2009).

Control variables

After reading the short-story, participants reported their *attitude towards the female character* (7-point scale anchored by bad/good; unpleasant/pleasant; unattractive/attractive; unlikeable/likeable; *M* = 4.74, *SD* = .94, Cronbach's α = .78; e.g., Russell and Stern 2006). They subsequently rated *perceived fit* between the target brand and the female character (indicating their agreement with the following statements using a 7-point scale: [Target brand] fits her personality; [Target brand] fits her lifestyle; It's logical that she drinks [Target brand]; *M* = 4.54, *SD* = 1.25, Cronbach's α = .86; see Verhellen et al. 2015). We also measured participants' *product involvement* (7-point scale, For me, vodka… is unimportant/ important; means nothing/means a lot; doesn't matter/ matters a lot; *M* = 2.66, *SD* = 1.51; Cronbach's α = .93; e.g., Dens and De Pelsmacker 2010).

We treated these three variables as covariates in our analysis, since past research suggests that they may influence brand attitudes (e.g., Kamleitner and Jyote 2013; Russell and Stern 2006; Schemer et al. 2008; Van Vaerenbergh et al. 2011). We focused on the female character because she is the primary user of the target brand. Finally, as a manipulation check, we also measured *familiarity* with the target brand (7-point scale, ranging from not at all familiar – very familiar).

Results

To ensure that our brand familiarity manipulation was successful and that repetition did not in itself affect familiarity (thereby confounding our manipulation), we first conducted a 3(Repetition) X 2(Target Brand) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the target brand familiarity ratings. Only the main effect of the target brand was significant, $F(1,146) = 213.94$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .59$ (all other p's > .14). Comparison of the means confirmed that participants were more familiar with the brand Eristoff® ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 1.97$) than with the brand Posolskaya® ($M = 1.15$, $SD = .40$).

Our main analysis, using multiple regression, proceeded in several steps. First, we regressed brand attitude on all four predictors (repetition, brand familiarity, narrative transportation and need for cognition), their interactions, and the three covariates. Brand familiarity was coded 0 for the unfamiliar brand and 1 for the familiar brand. Since brand name repetition had 3-levels, we created two dummy variables to code for group membership (see below). The two continuous moderator variables were mean-centered, and the products of all predictor variables were computed to form the two-way, three-way, and 4-way interaction terms. Following the recommendations in the literature on testing interactions between multi-level categorical and continuous predictors (see Hayes 2012; West, Aiken, and Krull 1996), we first estimated the model setting the 2-repetition group as the reference group. Thus, the two dummy variables in the model coded the contrast between exposure to 11 vs. 2 repetitions (Dummy11-2) and the contrast between 6 vs. 2 repetitions (Dummy6-2). Next, we reversed the coding (by setting the 6-repetition group as the reference), so we could also compare the effects of exposure to 11 vs. 6 repetitions (Dummy 11-6). Finally, we recoded brand familiarity, such that the

familiar brand was coded as 0, and repeated the procedure described above to compare all levels of repetition in the familiar brand condition.

The model accounted for a significant amount of variance in brand attitude (R^2 = .51, $F(26, 125) = 5.09$, $p < .001$). Two of the covariates had a significant effect, namely higher product category involvement ($b = .219$, $t = 4.149$, $p < .001$) and higher perceived fit between the brand and the character ($b = .253$, $t = 3.82$, $p < .001$) were associated with more positive brand attitudes. Next, the results showed that none of the interactions were significant for the comparison between 11 vs. 6 or 6 vs. 2 repetitions for either of the two brands (all *p*'s > .15). Therefore, we only report further analyses on the effects of repetition with regard to the 11- vs. 2-repetition groups. Furthermore, the simple effect of brand familiarity was significant: The familiar brand was rated higher than the unfamiliar brand in all repetition conditions (all *b*'s > .75, *p*'s < .01).

Critically, the four-way interaction between repetition (Dummy 11-2), brand familiarity, narrative transportation, and NFC was significant ($b = -1.36$, $t = -2.18$, $p = .031$). As predicted, neither the simple effect of repetition (all *p*'s > .07), nor the two-way (repetition * narrative transportation) or three-way interactions (repetition * narrative transportation * NFC) were significant for the *familiar* brand (coded as 0; all *p*'s > .3), providing support for Hypotheses 1, 3 and 5, respectively. In contrast, and as expected, the three-way interaction between repetition (Dummy 11-2), narrative transportation, and NFC was significant for the *unfamiliar* brand (when this was coded as 0; $b = .81$, $t = 2.64$, $p = .009$).

To test our directional hypotheses regarding the interactive effects of brand name repetition, narrative transportation, and NFC on brand attitude towards the unfamiliar brand (i.e., H2a, H2b, and H4), we conducted a *spotlight analysis* (see Spiller et al. 2013;West et al. 1996),

examining the conditional effects of repetition across different levels of the two continuous moderators. Specifically, using the 'pick-a-point' option integrated in Model 3 of the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes 2012), we tested the effects of repetition at 1 standard deviation (*SD*) above and below the mean values of both narrative transportation and need for cognition for the unfamiliar brand (n = 78). Although identical results are obtained based on analyses of the full dataset, we opted for this approach for the sake of clarity and brevity in exposition. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 near here

First of all, our analysis revealed that the interaction between repetition (11 vs. 2) and narrative transportation was significant for participants who scored at the mean (b = .63, t = 2.44, p = .018) or 1*SD* above the mean on NFC (b = 1.17, t = 4.26, p < .001), but not for those who scored 1 *SD* below the mean (b = .09, p = .821), in line with our proposal regarding the amplifying effect of NFC in the case of an unfamiliar brand placement (H4).

To break down the two-way interaction between repetition and narrative transportation and thus test Hypotheses 2a and 2b, we used the same approach and tested the effects of repetition at low, medium, and high levels of narrative transportation *within* mean and high levels of NFC (i.e., the levels at which the two-way interaction was significant; the interaction was not significant for those low in NFC at any level of transportation, all p's > .36). At mean NFC, higher repetition (exposure to 11 vs. 2 brand mentions) was associated with more positive brand attitudes for highly transported participants (b = .90, t = 2.88, p = .005), but not for moderately or lowly-transported participants (b = .35, t = 1.61, p = .11, and b = -.20, t = -.65, p = .521,

respectively). Among high NFC participants, higher repetition had a positive impact on brand attitudes of highly-transported readers (b = 1.41, t = 3.82, p < .001), but not of moderately transported readers (b = .38, t = 1.31, p = .196). Repetition had a negative impact on attitudes of lowly-transported readers, but this effect did not reach conventional levels of significance (b = -.64, t = - 1.66, p = .103). An interaction plot based on the mean estimates is depicted in Figure 2.

Figure 2 near here

In sum, the results regarding the effects of repeated exposure to an *unfamiliar* brand support Hypothesis 2a (i.e., higher repetition enhances brand attitudes of more highly transported readers), but only provide directional support for Hypothesis 2b (i.e., higher repetition leads to lower brand attitudes at lower levels of narrative transportation). In addition, Hypothesis 4 was supported, as the interaction effect between repetition and narrative transportation was only significant for high NFC readers.

Discussion

The present research demonstrates that repeated exposure to a brand name in a fictional narrative can affect readers' brand attitudes, and further establishes important boundary conditions for this effect. Specifically, increased brand name repetition affected attitudes towards an *unfamiliar* brand, but did not influence evaluations of a familiar brand. Moreover, the degree to which readers were transported into the narrative moderated the impact of repetition, such that exposure to 11 (vs. 2) placements enhanced brand evaluations of *highly*, but not lowly, transported respondents. Finally, readers' need for cognition (NFC) further qualified these effects, as the

interaction between repetition and narrative transportation only emerged for people who were *moderate to high* in NFC.

Our work contributes to the extant literature on product placement in several important respects. First of all, it provides the first empirical evidence for the effects of brand name repetition on brand attitudes in the context of fiction and thus complements past work on placement repetition in audiovisual media (Homer 2009; Matthes et al. 2007; Van Vaerenbergh et al. 2011), as well as work on other placement effects in written text (Bhatnagar and Wan 2011; Brennan and McCalman 2008; Olsen and Lanseng 2012). Second, we show that brand familiarity is a key determinant of the impact of placement repetition on brand attitude. Notably, the pattern we observed diverges from the one documented in the domain of traditional advertising. Specifically, whereas Campbell and Keller (2003) found that advertising wearout occurred sooner for unfamiliar than for familiar brands, in the present study repetition had a *positive* impact on brand attitude for the *unfamiliar* brand, and no effect for the familiar brand. In our view, this discrepancy can be attributed to some fundamental differences in how repeated product placements (in fiction) are processed as compared to advertisements. In addition, our findings are consistent with studies in other media showing that attitudes towards unfamiliar brands are more likely to be affected by exposure to brand placement than attitudes towards familiar brands (Mau et al., 2008; see also Kamleitner and Jyote 2013; Verhellen et al., 2015).

A further contribution of the present study is that it is the first to empirically explore how narrative transportation moderates placement repetition effects. Past work has shown that reader *involvement* moderates the effects of plot connection on readers' brand attitudes (Olsen and Lanseng 2012). However, (high) involvement was manipulated by warning participants that they would have to answer detailed questions about the story later on. Hence, these instructions could

have also prompted more systematic processing of the text, higher attention to detail, or a stronger performance goal, rather than (only) increasing transportation. Similarly, *immersion* has been shown to moderate the effects of self-character similarity on readers' attitudes towards a brand placed in a mock magazine travel article (Bhatnagar and Wan 2011). However, also in this study, (high) immersion into the story was manipulated by instructing readers to 'try to understand what might be going through the writer's mind…what the writer is thinking and feeling during the trip' (p.49). It is thus likely that perspective-taking and/or empathy were actually unintendedly manipulated as well. Although perspective-taking and empathy are strongly related to transportation, past research suggests that these may reflect different types, aspects, or intensities of involvement, and thus differentially predict responses to a narrative (e.g., Murphy et al. 2011; Tal-Or and Cohen 2010; see Tukachinsky 2014, for an extensive discussion of different *types* of media involvement and their effects). In fact, transportation into a TV drama, rather than involvement with a specific character, has been shown to be the best predictor of cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral effects (Murphy et al. 2011), and transportation seems to be more coherent and unambiguous than the broad construct of involvement (Appel and Richter 2010).

Finally, our work advances current knowledge on brand placement effects by introducing an important personality variable, namely need for cognition. Although NFC has been widely studied in the fields of social psychology (see Petty et al. 2009, for an overview), consumer behavior (e.g., Haugtvedt et al. 1992; Martin et al. 2003), and narrative persuasion (e.g., Appel and Richter 2010; Green et al. 2008; Thompson and Haddock 2012), its impact on brand placement effectiveness had not yet been explored. The present findings show that the positive impact of repetition under high transportation only emerged for moderate and high NFC readers. It is critical to note that narrative transportation and NFC were not correlated in our sample (r =

.06, $p > .5$). Thus, it was the particular combination of moderate/high NFC, on the one hand, *and* high narrative transportation, on the other, that yielded the positive effect of repetition on brand attitude. This suggests that at least some degree of elaboration of the repeated brand name (as predicted by high NFC readers' chronic propensity to engage in deeper processing) may be necessary for transportation to exert its impact. This interpretation is in line with evidence showing that high (vs. low) NFC individuals, who typically engage in deeper processing, are more susceptible to subtle primes (e.g., Petty et al. 2008); more strongly affected by implicit (vs. explicit) conclusions in the context of advertising (Martin et al. 2003); and more effectively persuaded by narrative appeals (Thompson and Haddock 2012).

Managerial implications

The present research has a number of practical implications. First, it highlights the potential of an alternative promotional platform by demonstrating that placing *unfamiliar* (but not familiar) brands in fictional texts can be an effective means of creating a positive brand image – an outcome that has been under question (see Brennan, 2008; Shin and Kim, 2011). Concrete recommendations with regard to placement execution can also be derived from our results. Specifically, mentioning a brand name *repeatedly* seems to be a prerequisite for attitudinal effects to emerge. Although consumers would typically read the genres and authors they like, and would thus often be transported into a text they read for leisure (vs. under experimental instructions), a recent meta-analysis (Van Laer et al. 2014) identifies a number of *story* (e.g., identifiable characters, verisimilitude) and *consumer-related* (e.g., attention, transportability) antecedents of narrative transportation that could be taken into account (see also Martin et al. 2003).

Our findings with regard to the role of need for cognition are especially relevant here: Targeting readers high in NFC would be advisable when the brand is featured in a (potentially)

transporting text; lower transportation, however, may render placements ineffective, or may even backfire, with this audience. Past research has identified a plethora of demographic (e.g., education), cognitive (e.g., verbal reasoning skills), and personality factors (e.g., openness to experience) that correlate with (high) NFC (e.g., Cacioppo et al. 1996; Fleischhauer et al. 2010; Sadowski and Cogburn, 1997). Moreover, the types of media people prefer tend to be reliably associated with NFC (Cacioppo et al. 1996; Green et al. 2008), and entertainment *genre* preferences across media are related to a number of demographic and personality factors linked to NFC (Rentfrow, Goldberg, and Zilca 2011). Given that digital book publishers and retailers nowadays have unprecedented access to detailed consumer data (see Alter 2012), these insights into the relationships between text, placement execution, and reader-related variables can be used to optimize the effects of brand placement in fiction.

Admittedly, brand placement in books, albeit on the rise, is still not as common as in other media. This might be changing, however – due to strong market pressures, fast technological advances, and authors' and publishers' increasing receptivity to the practice (see Jacobs, 2012; Orden, 2011). Most notably, the rise of digital books (Alter, 2012; Author Earnings, 2015) allows for better segmentation and targeting by making book purchase history, genre preferences, and even the reading experience itself more measurable and predictable, and thus brand placement in books less risky. Major players in e-book publishing and retail, such as Amazon, Google, Barnes & Noble, and Apple can now track not only which books readers buy, but also how far they get into a book, how much time they spend reading it, and which passages they find most appealing (e.g., through interactive features such as text highlighting on Amazon's Kindle; Alter, 2012, 2014). When combined with rich demographic data (which these platforms can collect) , such analytics would provide valuable insights for publishers, authors, and marketers, helping them

assess a book's potential to engage, transport, and eventually persuade. In addition, digital books may allow writers to insert specific brand names after a work has been published – and thus after the audience profile and sale numbers are already known, or can be reliably predicted (Orden 2011). In fact, some publishers have started "piloting" books digitally before publishing a print version, collecting feedback from readers, and other have adopted computer gaming-like software which allows readers to customize the plot and characters (Alter, 2012). In light of these developments, it seems that the "infrastructure" already exists that could make brand placement in fiction a viable promotion strategy.

Limitations and future research

The present research has some limitations. First of all, we tested the impact of three specific levels of repetition (2, 6, and 11), but only found significant effects with respect to the 11- vs. 2-repetition comparison. Future research might manipulate repetition in fictional texts at different (and finer) intervals to establish more precisely the point at which attitudes shift, as well as the point at which wearout eventually occurs (see Cacioppo and Petty 1979; Nordhielm 2002). Studying the effects of brand placement in longer texts (e.g., novels) would provide a further test of our findings. Most probably, a higher number of repetitions would be necessary to produce similar effects (to the extent that "low" and "high" repetition are defined relative to the length of the text). Importantly, a novel, unlike a short-story, is typically read in portions (e.g., chapters), rather than in one sitting. Thus, the reading experience, and exposure to the brand, is spread over time (similar to watching episodes of a sitcom over several days or weeks). Whether the interactive effects of repetition, narrative transportation, and NFC replicate in such a context is an empirical question that merits further attention.

There is an aspect of our manipulation which could raise some concern, namely our decision to remove references to the product (vodka; including words like alcohol, drinking, bottle), along with the brand references, in the lower-repetition conditions. Although we took utmost care to make the story versions as similar as possible across the 3 repetition conditions, one could still argue that perceptions of the character may have been affected as a function of her drinking behaviour (i.e., being portrayed as drinking more in the higher repetition conditions). In fact, we controlled for attitude towards the character in all analyses, and a 3(repetition)x2(brand familiarity) ANOVA on this variable further confirmed that there were no differences across conditions ($F < 1$, *ns*.). Moreover, retaining generic product references in the text would have compromised our repetition manipulation in a more fundamental way, namely by making it difficult to disentangle the effects of brand name vs. product category repetition (given that the product category could prime an earlier presented brand name). Although our choice was deliberate, the impact of product (vs. brand) placement repetition and category salience is an intriguing and practice-relevant issue that future research should pursue (see also Kamleitner and Jyote, 2013).

A potential limitation of our study is that we only placed one product in the text, which scored rather low on product category involvement. Past research has shown that product category involvement moderates the influence of placement repetition in the context of repeated exposure to advergames (i.e., more negative attitudinal effects for high vs. low involvement products; Cauberghe and De Pelsmacker 2010), hence replicating our results using a high-involvement product would provide a fuller picture of these effects.

Furthermore, one could argue that alcohol is a special kind of product, as some research has shown that placements of ethically-charged products in film and TV programs are less

acceptable for consumers (Gupta and Gould 1997; Gould, Gupta, and Grabner-Kraüter 2000). The generality of these findings has been questioned, however, since recent work has indicated that (non-student) attitudes towards alcohol placements may be more neutral, and that such perceptions vary as a function of consumers' own age and a film's target audience (i.e., alcohol less acceptable in children- and youth-oriented movies; e.g., Sung, De Gregorio and Jung 2009). In any case, notwithstanding the ethical question of whether harmful products *should* feature in any type of entertainment content, it is a *fact* that alcohol is ubiquitous across media, and across the globe: from US prime-time TV programs (Russell and Russell 2009) and song lyrics (Christenson, Roberts, and Bjork 2012), to music videos in the UK, the US, and France (Cranwell et al. 2015; Primack et al., 2015; Russell et al. 2015). Critically, it has been found that specific *brand names* appear in 44% of the 70 most popular alcohol-related music videos in the US (Primack et al. 2015) and in 19% of the top 100 videos in France (Russell et al. 2015), with hard liquor being the most common type of alcohol.

Books are certainly no exception to this pattern. Friedman's (1985) content analysis of brand mentions in American bestsellers in the post-war period revealed that 'beer, wine, and liquors' represent the 4th most common product category. As a recent case in point, Bill Fitzhugh stroke a deal with Seagram, inserting references to their alcohol products in his novel 'Cross-dressing' in return for PR of his book (Fitzhugh, 2000). In fact, alcohol is a quintessential characteristic of many famous literary characters, most notably James Bond (Gaughran 2012). In a sense, then, the present study's findings – which concern the effects of placements for a product that features so strongly in popular culture – are both timely and relevant. Still, empirical work on the impact of exposure to (alcohol) placements in fiction on intentions to buy and consume the product, as well as on actual behaviour, is essential.

Although the present research provides evidence for the predicted interaction between brand name repetition and narrative transportation, future investigations might look closer at the mechanisms underlying these effects. We would speculate that high narrative transportation engendered the formation of associative links between the brand and the story context through eliciting *narrative* (vs. analytic) *elaboration* and reducing critical scrutiny of the story content (Green and Brock 2000; Slater and Rouner 2002). Since repeated exposure to the brand name permits more diverse and/or stronger links to be created, it facilitates meaning transfer from the highly engaging story context to the placed (unfamiliar) brand and thereby improves brand attitudes. This account is supported by our finding that the positive impact of transportation emerged only among moderate/high NFC readers, as discussed above. The positive attitude shift we observed is thus also less readily attributed to a mere exposure effect (cf. Matthes et al., 2007).

Notably, attitudes of low-transported participants were not significantly reduced at high (vs. low) repetition levels (cf. Matthes et al. 2007), which is consistent with two alternative explanations: On the one hand, unabsorbed readers may have engaged in more analytic processing (Tukachinsky 2012), which triggered tactic inappropriateness thoughts and trumped the (positive) effect of repetition (Homer 2009; Russell 2002). On the other hand, low transportation may have simply prevented readers from processing the placements, due to a lower interest in the story as a whole. Since we did not find a significant decrease in attitudes even at high NFC (and low transportation), the second scenario seems more plausible. Future research may attempt to disentangle these competing accounts by measuring potential mediating variables, such as story- and brand-related thoughts, persuasion knowledge activation, and irritation (wearout). However, measuring persuasion knowledge in a reliable way may be especially

challenging, given the wide variety of conceptualizations and operationalisations of this construct and the lack of a validated scale that would also allow comparing results across studies (see Ham, Nelson, and Das 2015). In addition, administering such measures along with brand attitude measures (within the same study), can be problematic (e.g., raise respondents' awareness and suspicion) or at least not as informative (e.g., responses on earlier measures biasing those on subsequent measures). Employing implicit measures and/or measuring potential mediators in a series of studies would hence be more promising in this specific context.

An interesting parallel can be drawn between our findings and recent work of Matthes et al. (2011) on the impact of individual differences in *field dependence-independence* (FDI) on brand placement effects in audiovisual media. These researchers manipulated the number of times a brand logo appeared in a TV program and measured participants' FDI – the propensity to separate or 'extract' an object from its surrounding visual field (Witkin 1950). Matthes et al. proposed that visual placements will be more salient (i.e., will 'pop up' more) for people who are relatively field-independent. In support of this idea, they demonstrated that (especially at high repetition levels – 15 brand appearances) field-dependence was associated with lower persuasion knowledge, and more positive brand attitudes. These findings indicate that the tendency to perceive specific elements (such as a branded product) as parts of a coherent whole could make brand placements 'blend' with the context more, thereby increasing brand liking. Applied to the present study, we would speculate that the effect of narrative transportation is conceptually similar to that of field-dependence: Highly transported readers were arguably more likely to perceive and interpret the placed brand in a context-dependent manner. The findings of Green et al. (2004), who showed that highly transported people tend to generate many story-related thoughts (vs. thoughts related to the persuasion issue), further support this conjecture. Future

research might look into whether transportation itself leads to more context-dependent processing and which elements of the story context are linked to the brand (e.g., characters, physical setting, plot), as well as whether the strength and stability of these links varies as a function of brand name repetition.

Although transportation has been conceptualized to entail attentional, cognitive, and emotional responses (Busselle and Bilandzic 2009; Green and Brock 2000), which of these factors is most crucial for brand placement effects still needs to be tested. Future research may also investigate the attitudinal impact of brand placements in other genres of written narratives. Although some studies suggest that readers may be equally persuaded by fact and fiction (e.g., Green and Brock 2002), other research has shown that genre expectations may affect the neurocognitive processes involved in reading the same text in a fictional (vs. factual) mode (Altmann et al. 2012), as well as higher order information-processing and memory for textual information (Zwaan 1994). An intriguing possibility is that – through shifting attentional focus and eliciting different processing styles – different types of texts may give rise to different brand placement effects.

References

Alter, A. 2012. Your e-book is reading you. *The Wall Street Journal*, July 19, http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304870304577490950051438304

Alter, A. 2014. E-Book Mingles Love and Product Placement. *The New York Times*, November 2, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/03/business/media/e-book-mingles-love-and-product-placement.html?_r=0

Altmann, U., I. Bohrn, O. Lubrich, W. Menninghaus, and A. Jacobs. 2012. Fact vs fiction--How paratextual information shapes our reading processes. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* 9, no. 1: 22-29.

Appel, M., and T. Richter. 2010. Transportation and need for affect in narrative persuasion: A mediated moderation model. *Media Psychology* 13, no. 2: 101-135.

Archer, J. 1988. *A Twist In The Tale*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Arnold, M. 2001. Making books: Placed products and their cost. *The New York Times*, September 13, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/13/books/making-books-placed-products-and-their-cost.html

Atkinson, C. 2003. Merger of advertising and content worries consumers. *Advertising Age*, January 6, http://adage.com/article/media/merger-advertising-content-worries-consumers/36541/

Berlyne, D. 1970. Novelty, complexity, and hedonic value. *Perception & Psychophysics* 8, no. 5: 279-286.

Bhatnagar, N., L. Aksoy, and S. A. Malkoc. 2004. Embedding brands within media content: The impact of message, media, and consumer characteristics on placement efficacy. In The psychology of media entertainment. Blurring the lines between entertainment and persuasion, ed.. L.J. Shrum, 99-116. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bhatnagar, N., and F. Wan. 2011. Is self-character similarity always beneficial? *Journal of Advertising* 40, no. 2: 39-50.

Brennan, I. 2008. Brand placement in novels: A test of the generation effect. *International Journal of Advertising* 27, no. 4: 495.

Brennan, I. and D. McCalman. 2011. Word-of-author advertising in textbooks: The role of brand familiarity and placement repetition on recall and recognition. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal* 15, no.1: 125-137.

Britton, B., and A. Tesser. 1982. Effects of prior knowledge on use of cognitive capacity in three complex cognitive tasks. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 21, no. 4: 421-436.

Busselle, R., and H. Bilandzic. 2009. Measuring narrative engagement. *Media Psychology* 12, no. 4: 321-347.

Cacioppo, J., and R. Petty. 1979. Effects of message repetition and position on cognitive response, recall, and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37, no. 1: 97-109.

Cacioppo, J., and R. Petty. 1982. The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 42, no. 1: 116-131.

Cacioppo, J., R. Petty, J. Feinstein, and W. Jarvis. 1996. Dispositional differences in cognitive motivation: The life and times of individuals varying in need for cognition. *Psychological Bulletin* 119, no. 2: 197-253. American Psychological Association (APA).

Calder, B., and B. Sternthal. 1980. Television commercial wearout: An information processing view. *Journal of Marketing Research* 17, no. 2: 173.

Campbell, M., and K. Keller. 2003. Brand familiarity and advertising repetition effects. *Journal of Consumer Research* 30, no. 2: 292-304.

Cauberghe, V., and P. De Pelsmacker. 2010. Advergames: The impact of brand prominence and game repetition on brand responses. *Journal of Advertising* 39, no. 1: 5-18.

Christenson, P., D. F. Roberts, and N. Bjork. 2012. Booze, drugs, and pop music: trends in

substance portrayals in the Billboard top 100—1968–2008. *Substance Use and Misuse* 47:121–129.

Collins, A., and E. Loftus. 1975. A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing. *Psychological Review* 82, no. 6: 407-428.

Cranwell, J., R. Murray, S. Lewis, J. Leonardi-Bee, M. Dockrell, and J. Britton. 2015. Adolescents' exposure to tobacco and alcohol content in YouTube music videos. *Addiction* 110, no. 4: 703–711.

Dal Cin, S., B. Gibson, M. Zanna, R. Shumate, and G. Fong. 2007. Smoking in movies, implicit associations of smoking with the self, and intentions to smoke. *Psychological Science* 18, no. 7: 559-563.

Dens, N., and P. De Pelsmacker. 2010. Advertising for extensions: moderating effects of extension type, advertising strategy, and product category involvement on extension evaluation. *Marketing Letters* 21, no. 2: 175-189.

Dens, N., P. De Pelsmacker, M. Wouters, and N. Purnawirawan. 2012. Do you like what you recognize? The effects of brand placement prominence and movie plot connection on brand attitude as mediated by recognition. *Journal of Advertising* 41, no.3: 35-53.

Finn, B., and H. Roediger III. 2013. Interfering effects of retrieval in learning new information. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 39, no. 6: 1665-1681.

Fishbein, M. and I. Ajzen. 1974. Attitudes towards objects as predictors of single and multiple behavioral criteria. *Psychological Review* 81, no. 1: 59-74.

Fitzhugh, B. 2000. To sell out takes a lot of bottle. *The Guardian*, November 6, http://www.theguardian.com/media/2000/nov/06/books.pressandpublishing

Fleischhauser, M., S. Enge, B. Brocke, J. Ullrich, and A. Strobel. 2010. Same or different? Clarifying the relationship of need for cognition to personality and intelligence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36, no. 1: 82-96.

Flood, A. 2014. The car's the star: William Boyd gets into Land Rover tie-in deal. *The Guardian*, November 13, http://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/nov/13/william-boyd-land-rover-product-placement

Friedman, M. 1985. The changing language of a consumer society: Brand name usage in popular american novels in the postwar era. *Journal of Consumer Research* 11, no. 4: 927.

Friestad, M., and P. Wright. 1994. The persuasion knowledge model: how people cope with persuasion attempts. *Journal of Consumer Research* 21, no. 1: 1-31.

Gaughran, D. 2012. Writers, James Bond, and the perils of product placement. *Huffington Post*, April 19, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/18/product-placement-books-james-bond_n_1435824.html

Green, M. C., J. Garst, and T.C. Brock. 2004. The Power of Fiction: Determinants and Boundaries. In *The Psychology of Entertainment Media*: *Blurring the Lines between Entertainment and Persuasion*, ed. L. J. Shrum, 161–76. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Green, M., and T. Brock. 2000. The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79, no. 5: 701-721.

Green, M. C., and T.C. Brock. 2002. In the mind's eye: Transportation-imagery model of narrative persuasion. In *Narrative impact: Social and cognitive foundation*, ed. M. C. Green, J. J. Strange, and T. C. Brock, 315-342. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Green, M., S. Kass, J. Carrey, B. Herzig, R. Feeney, and J. Sabini. 2008. Transportation across media: repeated exposure to print and film. *Media Psychology* 11, no. 4: 512-539.

Gupta P. B., S. J. Gould, and S. Grabner-Kräuter. 2000. Product placements in movies: a cross-cultural analysis of Austrian, French and American consumers' attitudes towards this emerging, international promotional medium. *Journal of Advertising* 29, no. 4: 41-57.

Gupta, P., and K. Lord. 1998. Product placement in movies: The effect of prominence and mode on audience recall. *Journal of Current Issues & Research In Advertising* 20, no. 1: 47-59.

Ham, C.D., M.R. Nelson, and S. Das. 2015. How to measure persuasion knowledge. *International Journal of Advertising* 34, no 1: 17-53.

Hakemulder, F. 2011. Ways to engage readers: relevance in the scientific study of literature. *Scientific Study of Literature* 1, no. 1: 144-152.

Haugtvedt, C., R. Petty, and J. Cacioppo. 1992. Need for cognition and advertising: Understanding the role of personality variables in consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 1, no. 3: 239-260.

Hayes, A. F. 2012. PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling [White paper]. http://www.afhayes.com/public/process2012.pdf

Homer, P. M. 2009. Product placements: The impact of placement type and repetition on attitude. *Journal of Advertising* 38, no 3: 21-31.

Jacobs, E. 2012. Hard sellers. *Financial Times*, May 18, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/85ce1ede-9aae-11e1-9c98-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3SrQlmy8C

Kamleitner, B., and A. K. Jyote. 2013. How using versus showing interaction between characters

and products boosts product placement effectiveness. *International Journal of Advertising* 32, no. 4: 633.

Karrh, J. 1998. Brand placement: A review. *Journal of Current Issues & Research In Advertising* 20, no. 2: 31-49.

Karrh, J. A., K. B. McKee, and C. J. Pardun. 2003. Practitioners' evolving views on product placement effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 43 no.2: 138-149.

Keller, K. 1993. Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing* 57, no. 1: 1-22.

Martin, B., B. Lang, and S. Wong. 2003. Conclusion explicitness in advertising: The moderating role of need for cognition (NFC) and argument quality (AQ) on persuasion. *Journal of Advertising* 32, no. 4: 57-66.

Matthes, J. and B. Naderer (2015). Product placement disclosures: Exploring the moderating effect of placement frequency on brand responses via persuasion knowledge. *International Journal of Advertising* 35, no.2: 185-199.

Matthes, J., C. Schemer, and W. Wirth. 2007. More than meets the eye: Investigating the hidden impact of brand placements in television magazines. *International Journal of Advertising* 26, no.4: 477-503.

Matthes, J., W. Wirth, C. Schemer, and A. Kissling. 2011. I see what you don't see. *Journal of Advertising* 40, no. 4: 85-100.

Mazzocco, P., M. Green, J. Sasota, and N. Jones. 2010. This story is not for everyone: Transportability and narrative persuasion. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 1, no. 4: 361-368.

Mau, G., G. Silberer, and C. Constien. 2008. Communicating brands playfully: Effects of in-

game advertising for familiar and unfamiliar brands, *International Journal of Advertising*, 27, no.5: 827-851.

McCracken, G. 1989. Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the endorsement process. *Journal of Consumer Research* 16, no. 3: 310.

Nordhielm, C. L. 2002. The influence of level of processing on advertising repetition effects. *Journal of Consumer Research 29*, no. 3: 371–382.

Olsen, L., and E. Lanseng. 2012. Brands in texts: Attitudinal effects of brand placements in narrative fiction. *Journal of Brand Management* 19, no. 8: 702-711.

Orden, E. 2011. This book brought to you by… *The Wall Street Journal*, April 26, http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704132204576285372092660548

Owen, B., and M. Riggs. 2012. Transportation, need for cognition, and affective disposition as factors in enjoyment of film narratives. *Scientific Study of Literature* 2, no. 1: 128-149.

Petty, R. E., P. Briñol, C. Loersch, and M.J. McCaslin. 2009. The need for cognition. In *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior*, ed. M. R. Leary and R. H. Hoyle, 318-329. New York: Guilford Press.

Petty, R., K. DeMarree, P. Briñol, J. Horcajo, and A. Strathman. 2008. Need for cognition can magnify or attenuate priming effects in social judgment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 34, no. 7: 900-912.

Prentice, D., R. Gerrig, and D. Bailis. 1997. What readers bring to the processing of fictional texts. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 4, no. 3: 416-420.

Primack, B. A., A. C. McClure, Z. Li, and J. D. Sargent. 2014. Receptivity to and Recall of Alcohol Brand Appearances in U.S. Popular Music and Alcohol-Related Behaviors. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 38, no. 6: 1737–1744.

Redker, C., B. Gibson, and I. Zimmerman. 2013. The effects of background product placement and movie genre on implicit brand attitudes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 35, 249-255.

Rentfrow, P. J., L. R., Goldberg, and R. Zilca. 2011. Listening, watching, and reading: The structure and correlates of entertainment preferences. *Journal of Personality* 79, no. 2: 223–257.

Richter, T., M. Appel, and F. Calio. 2014. Stories can influence the self-concept. *Social Influence* 9, no. 3: 172-188.

Russell, C. 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* 29, no. 3: 306-318.

Russell, C., V. Regnier-Denois, B. Chapoton, and D. Buhrau. 2015. Substance messages in music videos and youths' substance-related views and consumption: the role of connectedness. (Working paper)

Russell, C. A. and D. W. Russell. 2009. Alcohol Messages in Prime-Time Television Series. *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 43, no.1: 108–128.

Russell, C., and B. Stern. 2006. Consumers, characters, and products: a balance model of sitcom product placement effects. *Journal of Advertising* 35, no. 1: 7-21.

Sadowski, C. J., and H. E. Cogburn. 1997. Need for cognition in the Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Psychology* 131, no 3: 307-312.

Schemer, C., J. Matthes, W. Wirth, and S. Textor. 2008. Does "passing the Courvoisier" always pay off? Positive and negative evaluative conditioning effects of brand placements in music videos. *Psychology and Marketing* 25, no. 10: 923-943.

Shin, D., and J. Kim. 2011. Alcohol Product Placements and the Third-Person Effect. *Television & New Media* 12, no. 5: 412-440.

Shiv, B., J. Edell, and J. Payne. 1997. Factors affecting the impact of negatively and positively framed ad messages. *Journal of Consumer Research* 24, no. 3: 285-294.

Slater, M., and D. Rouner. 2002. Entertainment-education and elaboration likelihood: understanding the processing of narrative persuasion. *Communication Theory* 12, no. 2: 173-191.

Spears, N. and S. N. Singh. 2004. Measuring attitude toward the brand and purchase intentions. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising* 26, no.2: 53-66.

Spiller, S., G. Fitzsimons, J. Lynch, and G. McClelland. 2013. Spotlights, Floodlights, and The Magic Number Zero: Simple Effects Tests In Moderated Regression. *Journal of Marketing Research* 50, no. 2: 277-288.

Sujan, M. 1985. Consumer knowledge: Effects on evaluation strategies mediating consumer judgments. *Journal of Consumer Research* 12, no. 1:31.

Sung, Y., F. de Gregorio, and J. Jung. 2009. Non-Student Consumer Attitudes towards Product Placement. *International Journal of Advertising* 28, no. 2: 257-285.

Tal-Or, N., and J. Cohen. 2010. Understanding audience involvement: Conceptualizing and manipulating identification and transportation. *Poetics* 38, no. 4: 402-418.

Thompson, R., and G. Haddock. 2012. Sometimes stories sell: When are narrative appeals most likely to work?. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 42, no. 1: 92-102.

Tukachinsky, R. 2012. Processing mode and actor-character congruency as moderators of narratives' effects on viewers' attitudes. PhD diss., University of Arizona.

Tukachinsky, R. 2014. Experimental manipulation of psychological involvement with media.

Communication Methods and Measures 8, no. 1: 1-33.

Van Laer, T., K. de Ruyter, L. Visconti, and M. Wetzels. 2014. The extended transportation-imagery model: A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of consumers' narrative transportation. *Journal of Consumer Research* 40, no. 5: 797-817.

Van Reijmersdal, E. 2009. Brand placement prominence: good for memory! Bad for attitudes? *Journal of Advertising Research* 49, no. 2: 151.

Van Vaerenbergh, Y., D. Van de Sompel, N. Van Loock, and I. Vermeir. 2011. The impact of brand name placement in song lyrics on brand attitudes: does the attitude toward the artist matter? In *Advances in advertising research : Breaking new grounds in theory and practice*, ed. Shintaro Okazaki, 2:21–33. Gabler Verlag.

Verhellen, Y., N. Dens, and P. De Pelsmacker. 2015. Do I know you? How brand familiarity and perceived fit affect consumers attitudes towards brands placed in movies. *Marketing Letters*, DOI 10.1007/s11002-015-9347-0

Wei, M., E. Fischer, and K. Main. 2008. An examination of the effects of activating persuasion knowledge on consumer response to brands engaging in covert marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 27, no. 1: 34-44.

Weldon, F. 2001. *The Bulgari Connection*, Atlantic Press, London.

West, S., L. Aiken, and J. Krull. 1996. Experimental personality designs: Analyzing categorical by continuous variable interactions. *Journal of Personality* 64, no. 1: 1-48.

Wheeler, C., M. Green, and T. Brock. 1999. Fictional narratives change beliefs: Replications of Prentice, Gerrig, and Bailis (1997) with mixed corroboration. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 6, no. 1: 136-141.

Witkin, H. 1950. Individual differences in ease of perception of embedded figures. *Journal of*

personality 19, no. 1: 1-15.

Zwaan, R. 1994. Effect of genre expectations on text comprehension. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 20, no. 4: 920-933.

Zwarun, L., and A. Hall. 2012. Narrative persuasion, transportation, and the role of need for cognition in online viewing of fantastical films. *Media Psychology* 15, no. 3: 327-355.

Table 1. Conditional effect of Repetition on Brand Attitudes towards Posolskaya® (unfamiliar brand) at low (-1SD), mean, and high (+1SD) values of Narrative Transportation (NT) and Need for cognition (NFC)

NFC	**NT**	**B**	**Std. Err.**	**t**	**p**
Low	Low	.239	.452	.529	.599
Low	Mean	.315	.344	.916	.363
Low	High	.391	.506	.773	.443
Mean	Low	-.203	.315	-.646	.521
Mean	Mean	.349	.218	1.605	.113
Mean	High	.902	.313	2.879	.005
High	Low	-.646	.390	-1.656	.103
High	Mean	.382	.293	1.3062	.196
High	High	1.412	.370	3.816	< .001

Note: Coefficients in the table are unstandardized regression coefficients.

List of Figures

Figure 1: Conceptual model of the interaction between placement repetition, narrative transportation, and need for cognition on attitude towards the *unfamiliar* brand

Figure 2. Interaction between repetition and narrative transportation on attitude towards the *unfamiliar* brand at (a) *mean* and (b) *high* (+1 SD) levels of NFC