The Integration of Sponsorship into Corporate Marketing Plans:

An Examination of One Collegiate Athletic Program's Sponsors

by

Glenda J. Alvarado, M.A.

A Dissertation

In

MASS COMMUNICATIONS

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved

Todd Chambers, Chairperson

Coy Callison

John Miller

Michael Parkinson

Fred Hartmeister
Dean of the Graduate School

May, 2009

Copyright 2009, Glenda J. Alvarado

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, George, for his continued faith in my abilities, and my sons, Andrew and Gage, who continue to teach me new things.

This dissertation serves as a tribute to my paternal grandmother, who instilled in me the importance of education, and my parents who gave me a chance to follow my dreams.

Acknowledgements

I have to thank Dr. Todd Chambers for being a part of this process from beginning to end – without his encouragement and support I would not have entered or completed this doctoral program.

Dr. Coy Callison, your frequent reality checks and brutal honesty stemmed from your desire to see me progress and achieve – I have learned a lot from you.

Dr. Michael Parkinson, three words "Ask Dr. P." You always found an answer. Your unwavering dedication to the graduate program has endeared you to more people than you can imagine.

Dr. John Miller, your ability to ask questions that bring new insights has added a new perspective to much of my work.

D. Judi Henry, your gracious introductions of athletic department personnel have led to both my thesis and dissertation.

Thank you to the Graduate Research Grant Committee for funding to pay for printing and postage of the postcards used in this study.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Sport sponsorships are an integration of advertising and public relations that make up an exchange relationship between a business or corporation and sporting entity. A variety of research studies have investigated various aspects of the reasons surrounding sponsorship investment, consumer views of sponsorship and sponsor involvement with national and international event. Little investigation has taken part on a lesser level, looking at the abundance of small to mid-size sponsors who, together, may have a greater impact on sport sponsorship than their larger counterparts.

This study investigates the motivations, methods of evaluation, instances of leveraging and activation and overall satisfaction of sponsors that support a collegiate athletic program at a university in the southwestern United States. One unique aspect of this research is the effort to combine information from in-depth interviews with the quantitative analysis of a questionnaire. Additionally, the breadth of the types of businesses that comprise the population of this study allow for an unusual look into the sponsorship decisions made at a variety of levels.

Findings suggest that similarities exist between companies of all sizes when it comes to sport sponsorship. Motivations are the same for locally operated companies as they are for national and international companies. Most businesses expect to receive similar benefits for their investments and few expect to make changes in the future. As marketing and advertising communication continues to become more complicated and expensive, sponsorship remains a way to connect with consumers in a positive manner in situations that induce support for a participating brand or company.

List of Tables

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Sport sponsorships are representative of an exchange relationship between sports organizations and corporations or other intermediaries; a relationship that has been based on the principles of maximizing results and minimizing risks (Copeland, Frisby & McCarville, 1996). For sports organizations, the benefit has been that the financial burden of ownership and operations was lessened, while for sponsorship participants, recognition and feelings of goodwill by consumers can be generated (Alvarado, 2006). Sponsorship can be viewed as the integration of advertising and public relations in that the sponsorship has been designed to project a positive image on a particular audience (Amis, Slack & Berrett, 1999; Rifon, Choi, Trimble & Li, 2004) and influence consumer perceptions (Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Dean, 1999). Gilbert (1998) suggested that sponsorship was a link between public relations, sales promotions and advertising and that the strength of the linkage was one that should be exploited. Much of the literature available on sponsorship involves anecdotal information and case studies, making generalizations about sponsoring difficult (Crompton 2004b). The sponsorship process, from adoption to cessation, presents many unique opportunities for research, especially in the context of specific events and circumstances (Bennett, Cunningham & Dees, 2006). This dissertation examined the sponsorship process with an in-depth analysis athletic sponsors from a major National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I university. Specifically, this study used a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods to evaluate the perceptions among sponsors of a university's athletic program.

One of the most frequently cited definitions of sponsorship in sport marketing literature was coined by Meenaghan (1991): "an investment, in cash or in kind, in an activity, person or event, in return for access to the exploitable commercial potential associated with that activity, person or event" (p. 36). According to Sandler and Shani (1989), Tripoldi (2001) and Dolphin (2003), the term sponsorship had been loosely defined by different organizations and has continued to describe a wide range of types and levels of support. Tripoldi (2001) developed the following working definition to be applied specifically to sports sponsorship:

> The provision of assistance by a commercial organisation (sic) (sponsor), in cash or kind, to a sports property (sponsee), in exchange for the rights to be associated with that sports property for the purpose of gaining commercial and economic advantage. (p. 97)

In general, researchers have agreed that sponsorship is an agreement where a sponsor provides some form of aid to a beneficiary enabling the pursuit of an activity, which in turn provides the sponsor with benefits of association (Abratt & Grobler, 1989). Abratt and Grobler (1989) wrote that sports sponsorships could offer economical exposure and/or associate a brand or company with a specific event, providing high visibility, especially if the event had national or international appeal. Additionally, sponsorship is a flexible medium with many leveraging opportunities that can be exploited, making sponsorship a unique way to reach beyond traditional advertising clutter to differentiate a brand or company (Copeland et al., 1996). Thwaites (1995) reported that advantages associated with sports sponsorships included the ability to transcend cultural barriers and associated television coverage that could provide year-round family entertainment.

Sponsorship has become a popular avenue for companies to reach target audiences and reinforce brand awareness. Continued audience fragmentation led marketers to search for different ways to present messages to consumers (Meenaghan & O'Sullivan, 2001). Advertising agencies and marketing departments are leading the push to find new and innovative ways to achieve brand recognition and drive purchasing habits, even more so as the economy weakened toward the end of the first decade in the twenty-first century. Increasingly, sponsorship and product placement have become ways for businesses to place their brands in positions that are hard to ignore. Arens (2005) reported that sports sponsorships accounted for more than 60% of all sponsorship spending, translating to almost $9 billion being spent with sporting organizations by corporations. IEG, a sponsorship research organization, reported that North American companies planned to spend $16.97 billion on sponsorships in 2009, an increase of 2.2% in an economy where budgets are being cut to the bone (Klayman, 2009).

Historically, sponsorships have been directed toward sport because of its flexibility. According to Quester and Thompson (2001), sport is a vehicle that enables media exposure and attracts audiences that span multiple demographic segments. The authors advised that arts sponsorships are viewed as being inaccessible and that arts events attract less media coverage than do sports, making arts sponsorships unappealing to commercial sponsors seeking wide audience exposure. Verity (2002) attributed much of the growth of sports sponsorships to increased leisure time and to interest in a wider variety of sports and sporting events, along with the growing media coverage of these sponsored events.

Sponsorships provide a way for companies to tap into the loyalty of attendees; in many cases it is unlikely that consumers in general, or attendees of a particular event, will have strong feelings about a product or sponsor. Consumers do, however, have a passion about the event or sports team with which they are affiliated (Madrigal, 2000). Loyalty to the sponsored team or event is predicted, by Madrigal (2000), to increase the appreciation of a consumer toward the sponsor. Sponsorship creates a link in the consumer's mind between the brand and an event or organization that the target consumer values (Crimmins, & Horn, 1996). McDaniel (1999) examined whether consumers possess schemas that influence their reactions to advertising that leverages sport sponsorships and found that consumers may have memory-based expectations as to brands and sponsorship, as well as expectations of where sponsorships should appear. Verity (2002) wrote that if consumers cannot make sense of the link between the sponsoring company and the product it supports, they see the sponsor as "buying endorsements" (p 163). Sponsorships are most successful when both the sponsor and the venue or organizations realize the benefits of the association. Both entities are inclined to continue relationships when consumers are aware of and appreciate the link between them.

When deciding to enter into sponsorship agreements, competition and industry trends play a major role in the decision-making process. Berrett and Slack (1999) showed that there are distinct influences that play a part in sponsorship activities. These influences included initiatives adopted by competitors, attempts to prevent competitors from entering a particular sponsorship category, occupational training of decision makers, and the influence of personal networks. Sponsorship is often incorporated into the sales promotions, advertising, and public relations departments of companies. Companies where sponsorship is delegated to sales-driven advertising and promotion departments often overlook the non-commercial public relations aspects of sponsorship. Conversely, managers within public relations departments gravitate toward sponsorship programs that generate and maintain goodwill and company image (Berrett & Slack, 1999). Berrett and Slack (1999) stressed that sponsorships should be seen as strategic in nature and that there are advertising, promotions and public relations aspects that should be taken into consideration before entering into a sponsorship agreement.

Amis et al. (1999) reported that sponsorships should be a part of a bundle of marketing and communications activities to reach a position of competitive advantage. Results from an experiment conducted by Quester and Thompson (2001) showed that sponsorship success was directly related to the degree that sponsors were willing to leverage their sponsorship investment with additional expenditures on advertising and promotions. Additionally, once a sponsorship venue has been selected, there appears to be no set way for corporations to assess accurately the success of their sponsorships. Intentions behind sponsorships can be as varied as the number of different sponsorships available. Currently, the intention of the sponsoring corporation can be the only measure of success or failure of each sponsorship. Case studies by Amis et al. (1999) showed corporations that had a purpose in mind when initiating sponsorship agreements perceived its sponsorships to be more successful than those that were contracted based on a whim or owner preference for, or attachment to, an event. Having purpose for the sponsorship allows for measurement and corporations can ensure that their goals are being met. Most corporations have a set goal when assessing general advertising effectiveness and many of these measurements have been adapted for use with sponsorships; however, literature has not revealed any direct methods for evaluation of a sponsorship's success.

Amis et al. (1999) discovered that an assessment of what constituted a success or failure of a sponsorship was left to the company involved and varied widely. The authors found that sponsorships identified as being successful achieved that success by making a long-standing commitment to whatever was being sponsored and incorporating this sponsorship into the company's strategic thinking. Stotlar (2004) concurred that effectiveness of a sponsorship should be judged on whether the specific marketing objectives of the corporation were met. Shanklin and Kuzma (1992) blamed failed sponsorships on sponsors who neglected to plan properly, did not choose an appropriate event or venue, and were unable or chose not to integrate their sponsorship into other marketing programs. McDaniel (1999) suggested that sponsors should conduct market research to understand the target audience's brand and event schemas prior to investing in a sponsorship and agreed that integrating advertising aids in leveraging benefits of the sponsorship. Crimmins and Horn (1996) found that companies that spend additional dollars to communicate their sponsorships to consumers reported a strong positive persuasion link with their brands. In addition to the investment to the sponsorship itself, Verity (2002) and Meenaghan (2001a) estimated that at least that amount is spent on promoting or leveraging the sponsorship in other ways, including the purchase of traditional media to support the promotion.

Advertising and promotion, important ties to the success of sponsorships, often go beyond the actual site of the sponsorship as the sponsor can utilize broadcast and print media associated with the event (Nicholls & Roslow, 1994). Some sponsorship agreements make the sponsor's products available for purchase, oftentimes excluding other items from the same category – for example, Pepsi products would not be available for purchase at an event or venue sponsored by Coca-Cola. Internal (the sponsorship itself) and external (associated advertising) exposure allow a sponsor to reach two different audiences, and the external audience may well be the main reason for participation in sponsoring an event (Nicholls & Roslow, 1994). Additional awareness and continuity is afforded by advertising and promotion that tie into a sponsorship. Perceptions of sport consumers and non-consumers alike are continuously heightened with each exposure as the link between the brand and sporting organization is reiterated.

Walliser (2003) concluded his meta-analysis with the realization that conceptually separating sponsorship from other communication and promotional techniques is increasingly difficult. His suggestion that analyses of how sponsorship is integrated into corporations' strategic marketing plans is one that is explored in this dissertation. Walliser (2003) acknowledged that corporations clearly recognized that the impact of a sponsorship was increased when it was used in conjunction with other elements and that sponsorship could be viewed as a "multi-functional communication tool whose benefit is greatest when used as one element of an integrated communication strategy" (p. 19). As will become apparent in the literature review, many researchers have attempted to assess the effectiveness of various sponsorship activities; however, research is lacking in the areas of how sponsorships are integrated into an overall marketing plan, as well as what methods of evaluation are used to determine whether the sponsorship successfully meets marketing objectives.

In the competitive marketplace of the 21st Century, sponsorship opportunities are significantly greater than the resources of interested sponsors (O'Reilly & Madill, 2007). This leaves both sponsors and properties searching for ways to maximize their associations, both seeking to get the most of what the other has to offer. For sponsors, the key is to align themselves with an entity that can attract their target consumers and allow them the opportunity to strengthen their presence in the marketplace. For sporting organizations seeking sponsorship dollars, the goal is to find a partner that can provide resources for the organizations to continue with their program and maintain their relationships with sponsor-partners so that sponsorship agreements can continue to be viable revenue streams.

Scope of this Study

This study used a combination of in-depth interviews and web-based surveys in an attempt to determine the extent to which businesses that sponsor a collegiate athletic program include sponsorship in their overall marketing plans. It examined reasons why corporations enter into sponsorship agreements, how they integrate these agreements into existing marketing plans and what methods of evaluation are utilized to determine the success of the sponsorship. For the most part, sports organizations have lacked insight regarding the ways in which corporations select, integrate and evaluate sponsorships, even though the organization recognized the need and value of sponsorship association (Tomasini, Frye & Stotlar, 2004). Also lacking investigation is how sponsorship evaluations influence decisions to renew or discontinue sponsorship involvement

(Copeland et al., 1996), as well as how the relationship between a sponsor and property plays in to such decisions. Therefore, this dissertation evaluated the perceptions of sponsors about their relationship with a sport property and the effectiveness of the sponsorship.

Contributions of this dissertation appear to be many and varied. The contribution to the field of literature is two-fold; this dissertation made use of a combined analysis method and collegiate sponsorship is a research field that is under-developed research. Furthermore, findings from this study should enhance the exchange process between sports organizations and sponsors, improving the ability to produce and maintain successful partnerships. Advertisers may be able to discern that budget investments made in sports sponsorships and associated advertising and promotions pay off with enhanced name recognition and come to expect measurable returns from consumers of the athletic team or event being sponsored. Sports organizations may benefit in that they will have concrete evidence that association with a team or event does influence opinions of the sponsoring organization or company. Organizations may also be able to identify ways to assist businesses in making the most of their sponsorship investments, which could translate into increased sales or additional sponsorship opportunities. In addition, both advertisers and sports entities may find that there are many mutually beneficial relationships that are yet to be discovered.

Chapter II reviewed sports sponsorships and specifically addressed integration practices and the importance of leveraging activities. The review examined professional and collegiate examples and analyzed the methods behind entering into sponsorship agreements and criteria used to measure their successes. An overview of theory, as it applies to consumer perceptions of sponsorship and may be used as a possible explanation for success of sponsorships and the nature of the association between a property[1] and its sponsors, is included. Much sponsorship literature has focused on national and international events and sponsors; however, Mack (1999) believed that sponsorships had the potential to benefit small businesses that sponsored local or regional events.

In consideration of Mack's beliefs, this study began by gathering information from comparably large successful corporate sponsors in a qualitative manner and then sought to discover whether the same tactics were employed by businesses of lesser stature using a quantitative method. The implications for collegiate athletic marketers may be that their hometown businesses may provide bountiful opportunities for revenue generation and successful event production. A review of the sponsorship-selling process provided suggestions for developing successful and mutually beneficial sponsor/property relationships.

Research questions and hypotheses are identified in Chapter III. Previous research relating to the posed propositions is reviewed. Theoretical support for the presented research objectives is also provided. The included propositions sought to expand the knowledge presented in the literature review and legitimize connections made by the author during the secondary research process.

Chapter IV outlined the overall research methods used in this study. A combined qualitative and quantitative method is presented and explained. References to similar

[1] The term property is used throughout the dissertation to represent a unique, commercially exploitable entity. Other terms used in sponsorship literature include rights-holder, sponsee, team, athlete, event, etc.

studies provide support for this methodological approach. As there were two steps taken to completely answer the questions posed by this research, each step has been fully explained in separate sections. The procedures that were performed for each method are presented and explained. Measures used for evaluation of the research questions and hypotheses are outlined.

Results from both the qualitative and quantitative elements are presented in Chapter V. Thematic commonalities discovered during the interview process are put forth, rationalized and placed in perspective relative to this and previous research. An analytical report of data collected through a web-based survey utilized information produced from SPSS for Mac.

The sixth and final chapter concluded the dissertation with a discussion of findings, limitations and directions for future research. The opportunity to make comparisons with previous research on various levels provided a basis for generalization and led to recommendation of avenues for future research.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Sports sponsorship, as we know it, can be traced back to the 1950s when President Eisenhower asked Mutual of Omaha and Union Oil to sponsor a physical fitness program (Shannon, 1999). The 1970s brought another sponsorship boost when cigarette advertising was banned on television and radio by the U.S. government. Sponsorship of auto racing and tennis by cigarette manufacturers kept the brands in front of spectators and event television audiences (Shannon, 1999). With his successful marketing of the 1984 Olympics in Los Angeles, Peter Uberoff has been credited with kicking off the formality of large-scale sponsorship. Uberoff was able to generate a profit for the city of Los Angeles by financing the Games through corporate sponsorships rather than through public funding. The organizing committee accrued a surplus of more $215 million, 40% of which the US Olympic Committee received for development of future US teams (Lawson, 1985). The Olympic Games continue to be a benefactor of corporate sponsorship on a global level.

The model for sponsorship activity, as described by Verity (2002), was that sponsorship builds brand recognition, which leads to top-of-mind awareness and positive attitude toward the brand, which leads to brand preference, which, in turn, leads to repeat purchase and brand loyalty. She claimed that sponsorship was designed to gain additional attention for a brand by associating with a property that enjoys a “high level of interest, involvement and credibility for the brand’s key target groups” (p. 163). Verity (2002) emphasized “additional” because sponsorship, in most instances, cannot substitute for other marketing and communications activities. Senior Vice President for brand management of Visa Europe, Joe Clift, understood that companies have different reasons for entering sponsorships but claimed that, as an industry, sponsoring corporations needed to measure the success of their association and fully integrate sponsorship activities within the company's business (Is sponsorship, 2006).

Sports leagues, along with colleges and universities, originally relied on event gate revenues to maintain financial solvency. Income from television and other media sources contributed substantially to revenue streams, but traditional advertising sales no longer generated enough revenue to support a professional franchise (Bruno, 2001). *Forbes* magazine reported the 1997 revenue breakdown for the four major professional sports (National Hockey League, National Basketball Association, National Football League, Major League Basketball) as 39% media; 38% gate; 16% stadium and 7% other (Ozanian, 1998). It can be expected that, as new stadiums have been constructed and corporate association with sporting entities has continued to flourish, sponsorship has become a substantial stream of revenue upon which the sport industry now relies. Sports sponsorships and stadium-naming deals have become a primary source of revenue for teams at many levels, with these arrangements paying for everything from player contracts to stadium maintenance (Swartz, 2002). Harvey (2001) claimed that sponsored events, with a combination of sponsorship dollars and ticket sales, generated more total dollars than media advertising combined.

An explosion of stadium construction occurred in the 1990s. This building frenzy was buoyed by the perceived need to maximize revenues generated through naming deals, parking, concessions and luxury suites (Brown, Nagel, McEvoy & Rascher, 2004).

Revenue sharing and salary-cap plans in the NFL encouraged franchises to find alternative income sources that were not subject to the leagues' restrictions. New stadiums and sponsorship deals were found to be a way for teams to pay up-front bonuses that are theoretically spread over an extended period of time, avoiding salary cap excesses in the year that the big dollar deals are signed (Brown et al., 2004). Teams without access to increased income from a new facility may not have the resources to attract and retain top players under the rules of the league, pushing the search for new stadiums to be built or teams to relocate. Some new stadiums have been constructed with the assistance of public subsidies, but many have relied on corporate contributions for at least part of the funding, according to Brown et al. (2004).

Copeland et al. (1996) claimed that the rise of corporate spending on sport sponsorships that began in the early 1990s could be credited to several sport attributes, other than new stadium construction. First, the ability to reach specific target groups in a cost-effective manner positions the sponsoring corporation outside of traditional advertising clutter; followed by opportunity for a company to align itself with positive characteristics of a sport event or successful athletes. Third, because of the flexibility of sports sponsorship, leveraging opportunities such as licensing, merchandising and cross promotions were available. Finally, the excitement and emotional attachments generated among sport consumers rendered these consumers prime targets for product-based messages and other marketing tactics.

The audience for advertising can be defined as viewers and non-viewers of the advertisements. For sponsorship, the audiences are less determinable and are typically comprised of multiple branches: event participants, spectators and those who view the event thorough associated media coverage. In addition, a desired outcome of participation in sponsorships is the ability to communicate with target groups in both active and passive forms. Verity (2002) explained that passive exposure comes in the form of related media coverage, creating opportunities to build awareness of the sponsorship association. Active exposure takes place on-site and can be targeted to carry specific brand and product messages. This type of exposure is not constrained by the format of traditional media coverage.

Marshall and Cook (1992) discovered that motor sports, football, horse racing and athletics were the most heavily sponsored sports in the United Kingdom. These sports drew the largest on-site audiences and the widest media coverage, as well as had the largest potential for publicity. In the U.S., baseball and basketball would be included as sports that attract heavy sponsorship. Sponsorship areas have become increasingly competitive and “minority sports” and local events offer alternatives that can readily fit into imaginative marketing plans (Marshall & Cook, 2002).

Ben Wells of Redmandarin, a European sports sponsorship agency, said, “The value (of sponsorship) is in developing a relationship in customers’ minds with the property you have sponsored” (Reid, 2005, para 10). Sponsored properties run the gamut from pee wee and little leagues to professional sporting team stadiums, local artists’ showings to world-travelling exhibitions of artifacts. Gardner and Shuman (1987) felt that sponsorships were oftentimes used as a cost-effective method to establish or clarify consumer perceptions of products and services with affluent consumers who were hard to reach with traditional advertising methods.

Additionally, sport marketers have realized that there is more to a sponsorship than convincing a business to have its name on a sign in a stadium. Many properties believe that they are selling against other properties when, in actuality, they are competing against other elements of the marketing mix (Doonar, 2004). It is imperative that a sports marketer be able to convince a corporation that spending a certain number of dollars sponsoring an event or team is worth more than spending that same amount on advertising or public relations efforts.

Sneath, Finney and Close (2005) pointed out that not all sponsors receive benefits from their association with a property and that not all sponsorship activities reach their desired outcomes. Corporations have different motivations for participating in sponsorships and sports marketers must be prepared to tailor packages to the specific needs of potential sponsors (Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006). Komoroski and Biemond (1996) reported that, rather than traditional corporate sales and sponsorships, "corporate partnerships" should be established.[2] The partnerships focused on using the sport property as a conduit through which to build potential sponsors' marketing programs and providing the tools needed to make the association as successful as possible. Marketers in sports organizations have found that they need to develop strategies for attracting sponsorship revenue and gain greater understanding of why corporations chose to enter sponsorship agreements (Berrett & Slack, 2001).

---

[2] The organizing committee has gone so far as to ban the term "sponsorship," preferring "partnership" as the term used for brands and corporations it will associate with in the 2012 Olympic Games (Kemp, 2007).

Sponsorship versus Advertising

Sponsorship had been viewed by some as a less expensive form of advertising because of their shared characteristics and principles (Hastings, 1984). Harvey (2001) wrote that marketers saw sponsorship as being different from advertising, but that there has been no general consensus on how it differs and, therefore, how sponsorship can be measured differently than advertising. Hastings (1984) reviewed marketing objectives and audience characteristics to reveal distinct differences between sponsorship and traditional advertising practices. He noted that the benefit of sponsorship to a property was relatively obvious – influx of cash or goods. For the sponsoring corporation, benefits are less obvious and somewhat uncertain.

Cliffe and Motion (2005) claimed that advertising emphasized awareness and image when building a brand and that sponsorship had the ability to create an experience that may give a brand meaning and affiliation. Strategic leveraging of a sponsorship provided a platform "from which unique bases of added value can be developed" (Cliffe & Motion, 2005, p. 1075). Nichols, Roslow and Dublish (1999) described sponsorship as "place-based marketing" (p. 365). They felt that sports events supported the use of promotional activities that could emphasize brand awareness and even motivate consumers to prefer or purchase a particular brand.

According to Hastings (1984), sponsorship benefits included increased brand/product awareness, often through the associated media coverage, and positive messages about the sponsor promoted through imagery. Hastings (1984) equated these benefits with the fundamental objectives of advertising: generation of awareness and promotion of the brand or product. He found that the differences in awareness rested in the fact that advertising was typically identified, leading the audience to expect or even seek out the content. Sponsorship can be viewed peripherally and the persuasive connotation can be overlooked. Additionally, the media have sought advertising but event sponsors were sometimes deliberately avoided during an event's media coverage (Hastings, 1984).

Although often compared with advertising, sponsorship differs in that the sponsor does not control the medium or the content of the message being disseminated. The sponsors' message has been embedded in the nature and characteristics of the entity being sponsored (Cornwell, Relyea, Irwin & Maignan, 2000). Meenaghan (1991) warned that newcomers to sponsorship expected the sponsorship to act like advertising, failing to leverage the commitment and capitalize on the association. Hastings (1984) maintained that an advertising message was explicitly stated and presented; the message in a sponsorship was implicit, intangible and out of the control of the sponsoring company. In concurrence, Walliser (2003) purported that advertising and sponsorships were increasingly considered complementary elements of an integrated campaign in that they shared the objectives of creating awareness and promoting an image. He stated that advertising messages were typically more direct, explicit and could be controlled; however, sponsorships could penetrate communication barriers and allowed for seemingly unlimited audience targeting possibilities.

Kennen (2007) cautioned that differences between sponsorship and advertising included tax liabilities. According to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), an organization receiving an "insubstantial" benefit from monies it had provided is deemed to be providing sponsorship. For example, "This event is brought to you by ABC

Incorporated," or a small logo representing the association would be considered sponsorship. Once an organization receives benefits amounting to more than the aforementioned recognition, the money provided could be considered advertising and both donor and recipient needed to be aware of tax limitations associated with the transaction (Kennen, 2007).

Cornwell, Weeks and Roy (2005) acknowledged that sponsorship and advertising were related: sponsorship involved a fee, paid in advance, for future potential outcomes; advertising involves a fee, mostly paid after the fact, for controlled communication. Sponsorship requires promotional spending over and above the sponsorship fee, one of the most valuable options being advertising. According to Gillis (2005), in advertising, a company buys blank space from a media agency with detailed analysis and the ability to compare costs and choose what to say about the product or brand in the purchased space. In sponsorship, a company is buying an association between its own brand and another (that of the individual, team event or sport). The delivered message is influenced by, or even contained in, the medium. Additionally, there is no rate card or benchmark on which to make comparisons in sponsorship (Gillis, 2005).

Walliser (2003) felt that sponsorship and advertising overlapped when sponsors used billboards and similar signage at events. The same overlap may occur when broadcast elements are included in sponsorship packages. Broadcast messages are used by sponsors to increase the impact of their sponsorship and achieve a stronger impact on targeted consumers. Walliser (2003) warned that competitors could take advantage of media coverage surrounding an event to place advertising that may be misinterpreted by consumers as sponsorship. Ultimately, Hastings (1984) determined that sponsorship did have distinct characteristic that differentiate it from advertising, the most prominent differences being that evaluation methods have not been established for sponsorship and that sponsorship was not merely a cheap form of advertising and should be treated as an integral part of a corporation's marketing strategy.

Sponsorship has become a sophisticated brand awareness activity that has been woven into marketing strategies and is working its way into long-term corporate plans (Roberts, 2006) and capable of much more than advertising (Marshall & Cook, 1992). Opportunities for corporate hospitality and public relations exercises, increased sales leads and personal contact with potential clients are some of the benefits that corporate sponsors can hope to achieve with a well-planned and -executed sponsorship program, according to Marshall and Cook (1992).

Continuing the search to gain market share and reach beyond the clutter of traditional advertising and the fast-growing sponsorship category, Hackley and Tiwsakul (2006) have used the term "embedded marketing" in reference to promotions that were contained within various entertainment vehicles, including movies, games and sporting events. Embedded marketing, according to Hackley and Tiwsakul (2006), is moving beyond product placement, celebrity endorsement and sponsorship. The authors felt that marketers were moving toward "experiential consumption" of products and brands as media cost structures changed and consumers continued to disdain traditional advertising.

Motivations for Entering Sponsorship Agreements

Sponsorship has evolved from a small-scale activity to a global industry understood to be a valuable communications instrument that is considered a commercial investment (Walliser, 2003). With roots in philanthropy, sponsorship has developed into a mutually beneficial promotional activity where the relationship in the association is the key to success (Abratt & Grobler, 1989; Armstrong, 1988). Sponsorship opportunities stem from a wide variety of properties including organizations, awards, individuals, buildings and events. Possible sponsorship outlets exist all over the world with sports and sporting events making up a large portion of the sponsor-seeking community. In addition, non-profits and governmental organizations successfully use sponsorships to develop and implement public awareness, educational and social marketing programs (O'Reilly & Madill, 2007). Sponsorship has expanded from a basic promotion technique to a sophisticated marketing tool that includes numerous accompanying activities (Cornwell, 1995). Research in the area of sponsorship effectiveness, such as this one, has benefits that are extremely wide-reaching.

Objectives

Meenaghan (1991) described several stages of sponsorship goals and participation. The first level was characterized by a donor giving money for a sponsorship with which to gain attention without any specific goals or selection criteria. The next stage was more structured in that the sponsorship is more selective and entered into with specific goals and expectations of some kind of return on investment. In the final stage, the sponsoring business or corporation was actively involved in the sponsorship. Cornwell and Maignan (1998) maintained that firms progressing to the final stage of sponsorship involvement had specific sponsorship goals, coordinated their marketing programs and had sophisticated management systems tied to the sponsorship.

Traditionally, the most important sponsorship objectives have been enhancing image and creating awareness for brands and companies (Walliser, 2003). Copeland et al.

(1996) reported that sponsor objectives depend on a wide variety of factors, including the nature of the sponsorship. They noted that social and environmental sponsors sought to demonstrate social responsibility; Drees (1991) claimed that arts sponsors are motivated by hospitality opportunities. Hospitality opportunities are rarely mentioned in sponsorship literature but cannot be over-looked as an important component of sponsorship agreements. Gilbert (1988) felt that sponsored events could achieve a wide range of promotional goals, including “directly influencing a chosen target audience by personal contact with potential clients” (p. 8). Cornwell (1995) claimed that some companies used sponsorship as a channel for product distribution. According to Quester et al. (1998), manufacturing organizations sought media coverage and publicity opportunities though their sponsorships; service sponsors were hoping to improve employee morale. Owners of fast food franchises use sport sponsorships to draw attention to their businesses in local market areas (Cousens & Slack, 1996).

Komoroski and Biemond (1996) added that sports sponsorships were established to gain an advantage over competitors, identify themselves with a particular market segment, achieve sales objectives, and alter or reinforce public perceptions of the company. In a survey of sponsorship professionals, Roberts (2006) reported that 88% of the respondents had set clear objectives before entering into a sponsorships but that there were many and varied reasons for participation. Sponsors that were located within close proximity to the property that they are sponsoring were most likely seeking enhanced public relations opportunities (Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005). Successful clubs, according to Chadwick and Thwaites (2005), attracted sponsors seeking benefits of association and positive image transfer. The authors also found gender bias in sponsoring corporations in that males were responsible for the allocation of resources and selected outlets that matched personal preferences.

Alexandris, Tsaousi and James (2007) listed the following outcomes sought by sponsors: increased sales and market share, image enhancement, brand recognition, community involvement, sampling opportunities, brand loyalty and brand awareness. Walliser (2003) reported that French researcher Piquet distinguished three types of sponsorship strategies, the first being composed of "exposure-seekers" for whom sponsorship was seen as a form of advertising. The second group strived to be closely associated with the event and integrated the sponsorship into other communications activities. The third group embraced the sponsorship; this group played an active role in the event and fully integrated the sponsorship into the company's strategic marketing plan.

Abratt and Grobler (1989) surveyed 40 South African corporations involved in sports sponsorship. They found that the most important reason for entering into a sponsorship agreement was promotional activity, followed by social responsibility. Respondents felt that it was important to project a favorable image and that sponsorships allowed them to have a presence throughout the community. Abratt and Grobler also discovered that multiple marketing techniques were involved in the sponsorship. Public relations or publicity was the most important marketing element, followed by advertising and sales promotions. Personal selling was viewed as the least important element. The researchers were surprised to find that a majority of the sponsoring corporations in the study claimed that they had a set procedure for evaluating the success of their sponsorships. Seventeen such procedures were listed by respondents, the most frequently mentioned one being media exposure that was garnered.

Selection

Before entering into sponsorships, businesses would be well-served by measuring their target audiences' perceptions of an event. If the property's image is consistent with the image the sponsor wishes to project, the sponsorship is more likely to be able to achieve corporate objectives (Gwinner & Eaton, 1999). Similarly, if the property is aware of how its customers view them, the property is then able to approach potential supporters with knowledge of how the event's image may be used to complement or enhance the sponsors' image. Gwinner and Eaton (1999) believed that properties with highly respected images may be able to parlay this attraction into sponsorships with premiums attached.

Competition and industry trends play a part in sponsorship decisions. Berrett and Slack (1999) showed that there were distinct influences that played a part in sponsorship activities. Corporations that felt they were proactive in sponsorships took deliberate action to prevent rivals from taking advantage of a potential property. A manager of sports marketing and sales at one of the companies interviewed for their study stated that his firm attempted to secure a competitive advantage through sponsorship, and that his company would "remain proactive in their efforts to be an industry leader" (p. 123). Another manager stated that his company "felt obliged to take advantage of a sponsorship opportunity because they were afraid to allow the opposition to gain and upper hand" (p. 123). This can evolve into an expensive game of one-upmanship, and Berrett and Slack (1999) reported that such competition can result in financial losses for corporations;

additionally, input of influential executives or investors who are connected both formally and informally with other organizations can influence sponsorship decisions. There are certain mimetic pressures wherein an organization enters into a sponsorship agreement because another firm that it has modeled itself after has developed an association. Gerrard (1999) felt that the mimicry occurred both within and across sports products. As with taking a defensive stance, copying other corporations' practices can lead to disaster if there is no accurate and unbiased assessment of the potential effectiveness of a sponsorship.

Corporate association with sporting events may be that a company produces products that are associated with a particular sport or event, such as Spalding and tennis, or the company image is one that matches the image of the sport or event, such as Buick and golf (Marshall & Cook, 1992). Thømøe, Olson and Bronn (2002) found that sponsorship opportunities were often presented based on personal associations between the sponsor object and management at the potential sponsor. This resulted in sponsorship agreements that were not included in the corporation's marketing strategy and/or budget considerations. The actual sponsorship may have fulfilled marketing objectives; however, the personal nature of the agreement could preclude integration into the corporate plan or lead to a reluctance to spend resources on its evaluation (Thømøe et al., 2002). Thwaites (1995) wrote that sponsorships that were established because of a personal agenda were not altogether ineffective. He did, however, feel that personal motives were disconnected from corporate conduct, resulting in an unprofessional approach that did a disservice to the company and to sponsorship vehicles in general.

Sponsorships for the purpose of having a corporate name on something or "because it's the right thing to do" were rarely beneficial to the sponsoring corporation. Berrett and Slack (1999) stressed that sponsorships should be seen as strategic in nature and that there are many considerations to be taken into account before entering into an agreement. Crimmins and Horn (1996) outlined several points that should be considered. Knowing what will be attained by sponsoring a team or event was the first of six steps they recommend; thus, assuring that the audience involved was to whom communication was intended was essential. Second, establishing a connection between the sponsored property and a companies' marketing objective ensured that the right message was reaching the right audience. Next, the audience should be made aware of the sponsorship as early as possible to maximize the benefits of the association and allow fans to develop a link in their minds between a brand and its sponsorship. This step has become known as activation. The fifth step was defining what the sponsorship meant to the sponsoring entity's target audience, ensuring that the audience knew why the connection was important. Finally, one well-thought-out and executed sponsorship that fans identified and correctly associated with was infinitely more valuable than multiple sponsorships that were unnoticed, unremembered or meaningless (Crimmins & Horn, 1996).

Chadwick and Thwaites (2005) found that, many times, sponsorship agreements were entered into very close to the beginning of the sporting season. The authors stated that timing played a significant role in the ability of corporations' to establish objectives and identify the benefits of the sponsorship. They also noted that many last-minute sponsors were attracted to sponsoring opportunities for the sole reason of being associated with the property, resulting in the sponsorship relationship being one of social interaction rather than a strategic marketing tool. Gwinner (1997) cautioned that event image and frequency of the event are strong considerations that should be placed before eyeing the financial commitment involved with a sponsorship. Exclusive sponsorships with a popular or well-regarded event that occurs on a regular basis would "maximize the image-transfer potential of the sponsorship purchase" (Gwinner, 1997, p. 155).

For businesses that were part of franchise operations, Cousens and Slack (1996) identified three approaches to decision making when it came to sponsorships. At the first level, franchise owners were the ultimate decision-makers, deciding for themselves in what sponsorships they would participate. Joint decision-making between franchise groups in a geographic area was identified as an approach to deciding on sponsorship agreements, as were all decisions coming from the main corporation. In some instances, franchisees could submit requests to corporate offices for approval; in other instances, the franchise owners had no input whatsoever in the sponsorship decision-making process.

Benefits

Meenaghan (2001b) stated that a sponsor's investment in an activity generated an effect of goodwill among activity fans. The intensity of fan involvement provided a framework against which the measures of perceptions of benefit and consumer response could be measured. Meenaghan (2001a) described three levels of goodwill that could be generated by sponsorship. Generic level goodwill was generated when commercial sponsorship was seen as delivering a benefit to society. It was deemed as being a good idea, but it did not touch the consumer in a deep or meaningful way. Category level goodwill was felt with consumer disposition toward a particular category (e.g., sports or arts) and was most prevalent with sponsoring of social causes. Individual activity level of goodwill occurred when there was a perceived benefit and related appreciation. This was most prevalent when the sponsorship benefits an activity in which the consumer was involved. Goodwill effects were strongest at this level because they were driven by the involvement level of the consumer or fan – intimate involvement with a sport, team or event generated a high level of goodwill and gratitude toward a sponsor (Meenaghan, 2001a).

Marshall and Cook (1992) reported that, in a survey of U.K. corporations, those that participated in sports sponsorships tended to have, on average, a higher level of profitability and more overall personnel than corporations that did not participate in sponsorships. Hansen, Halling and Christensen (2006) believed that sponsorships provided a bond between employees and customers and other external parties. The sponsor was seen as having personal contact with the sporting organization.

Koenderman (2000) reported a clear link between peoples' passions (music, arts, sports, etc.) and their reactions to sponsorship; the stronger the passion, the higher the likelihood of using the sponsoring brand. He wrote that consumable categories such as fast food and soft drinks were more sensitive to sponsorship-driven adoption than were low consumer-interest categories such as telecommunications and financial services. The latter categories required additional spending on leveraging and activation activities to elicit change.

Sponsorship offered small and/or local business an opportunity to gain identity through partnering with local events (Mack, 1999). Much literature has focused on national or international corporations participating in national or international sponsorships; however, local and regional businesses gain many of the same benefits by participating in sports sponsorships on a scale that is in line with their less-impressive budgets. Mack (1999) felt that sponsorships offered opportunities for small businesses to gain in areas of community relations, marketing objectives and employee relations. She felt that many employees of these small businesses were actually involved in the events being sponsored, often with the support and encouragement of management. In fact, Mack (1999) found that employee participation was a valued part of sponsorship opportunities when surveying small businesses. According to Mahoney and Howard (2001), a benefit of owning a small business associated with a local event was the ability to reach a distinct target market. Events that could obtain strong loyalty from fans on a consistent basis were able to match attendees with target markets of advertisers and sponsors (Mahoney & Howard, 2001). The authors felt that these types of match-ups generated a steady flow of income that enabled these grassroots sporting organizations to be successful over the long run. Furthermore, a series of committed small businesses may actually bring more benefits to a property than a larger national sponsor.

Brand Equity

Marber, Wellen and Posluszny (2005) defined a brand as the "name, term, symbol, sign or combination intended to identify or differentiate" (p. 162) an advertiser from its competitors. Brand equity is the assets and liabilities that are linked to the brand. Marketing decision-makers are charged with the responsibility of enhancing brand equity though their marketing efforts. Many businesses are turning to sponsorship activities to establish and maintain this equity and keep their product or service in the forefronts of consumers' minds. Gilbert (1988) claimed that companies could increase their brand awareness among a mass audience by associating with sports events because of the on-site and potential media exposure. Nardone and See (2007) reported that marketers often limited their evaluation of sponsorship to increased awareness of the brand. The authors suggested that traditional advertising that made reference to a sponsorship could add synergy that made the advertisements more powerful and gave the sponsorship more impact. Sports professionals felt that building equity was the most important sponsorship objective (Roberts, 2006). The "extensive creative canvas provided by the right sponsorship enables…significant brand equity among precisely targeted groups" (Roberts, 2006, p. 23).

According to Cliffe and Motion (2005), sponsorship has the potential for brands to create strong brand image and brand personality associations by giving consumers an opportunity to "experience" the brand. These experiences can lead to brand affiliation and loyalty. Inferred association occurred when a brand became linked with another entity and consumers inferred that the brand shared attributes of that entity (Keller, 1993). In the case of sponsorship, credibility, attitude, excitement and related attributes afforded a sporting event become linked to the sponsoring brand. Keller (1993) suggested that corporations leverage this association, playing up the favorable and unique characteristics of the property that were advantageous to the brand. Ruth and Simonin (2003) believed that attitudes could be transferred from event to brand and should also be expected to transfer from brand to event, creating positive brand associations and attitudes towards both sponsor and event. Musante, Milne and McDonald (1999) concluded that a "good personality match may serve both awareness and image functions as a contribution to brand equity" (p. 45).

Roy and Cornwell (2003) discovered that brand equity may have an influence on the perceived connection between a sponsor and a property. The authors felt that this finding was important because sponsors with low brand equity who entered a sponsorship agreement seeking to increase brand awareness may be disappointed. Using a sponsorship as a vehicle with which to build a brand that had low brand equity required the use of additional marketing communications (Roy & Cornwell, 2003). This phenomenon should not be lost on properties seeking sponsors. Properties should strive to offer low-equity brands added value in their sponsorship negations (high visibility signage, audio and video announcements, etc.) to secure their partnerships and enable them to be accepted into the schemas of patrons, as suggested by Roy and Cornwell (2003). For a brand to gain equity with a consumer, the consumer must be familiar with the brand and develop memory associations that distinguish it from competitors. Developing brand equity in sponsorship results from targeting properties with audiences that have similar characteristics to the sponsoring organizations' target markets claimed Roy and Cornwell (2005).

Low recognition rates for a majority of FIFA World Cup Sponsors in 2006 led many corporations to reevaluate their associations with sports (Kilby & Wardle, 2006). Marketers had believed that spectators' passion for soccer would translate into positive customer engagements, according to Kilby and Wardle (2006). Companies had forgotten who the real audience was and have focused on demographic information generated by television ratings rather than finding ways to activate sponsorships and develop meaningful associations with fans. Kilby and Wardle wrote that understanding distinct fan profiles allowed marketers to target strategically their sponsorships and cut through marketing clutter.

Coordination and Integration of Sponsorship

Potential sponsors should link with events that have identified fans that hold the most promising prospects of becoming customers of the company (Alexandris et al., 2007). Data collection leading to profiling of sport consumers from different sports helps to identify fans with the best potential. Properties can aid in this process by developing a core event that attracts and maintains a devoted fan base, according to Alexandris et al. (2007), "sports that have more involved fans provide better business opportunities for potential sponsors" (p. 138). Integration of sponsorships with other marketing components created a synergistic effect that was more powerful than any element could generate on its own (Grimes & Meenaghan, 1998; Tripodi, 2001).

Marketing Mix

Dolphin (2003) suggested that sponsorship was an element of the marketing mix that could introduce a brand to a global market or enhance its image in a local market. This versatility sets sponsorship apart from traditional marketing tools. Burton (2003) encouraged marketers to agree before entering a sponsorship deal about the role a sponsorship would play in the marketing mix. Sponsorship was experiential marketing and the place it played in the corporate strategy should be clearly established.

Wilkinson (1993) wrote that corporate sponsorship in the 1960s and 1970s was part of a philanthropic movement and that associations were based on personal interests that were rarely part of any type of marketing plan. As corporate expenditures on sponsorships have grown, greater accountability for this type of spending had been demanded. More than two decades ago, Gilbert (1988) claimed that sponsorship could be a valuable part of a marketing plan but that the sponsorship should planned for and fully integrated into the overall marketing strategy. The premise of integrated marketing communications (IMC) is that all marketing activities are coordinated to project the same image and convey a common message (Nowak & Phelps, 1994). Intuitively, sponsorship activities should be more effective when they are coordinated with a corporations' other marketing, advertising and promotional activities, and Walliser (2003) reported that sponsorships integrated with other communication tools resulted in increased awareness reports. Pitts (1998) recommended using a mix of advertising tools in conjunction with sponsorship to increase name recognition. Despite the fact that involvement in sponsorships continues to increase, many corporations have failed to achieve all the benefits available from the association. Rationale for involvement has not always been based on commercial logic and evaluation and rigorous measures applied to other marketing activities were oftentimes ignored or forgotten (Meenaghan, 1983).

Gerrard (1999) felt that although sports sponsorship amounted to only about 4% of total advertising expenditures, it was not insignificant, either in terms of the revenue it provided properties or the opportunities it presented as a communications medium. Lapin (1987) wrote that the initial sponsorship fee was just the beginning of the association. He suggested that support in the form of promotions, additional advertising, incentives, sampling and community activities be implemented. Furthermore, internal merchandising for the event can foster favorable relationships with retailers, customers, government officials, sales staff and other employees. Roberts (2006) found that sponsorship professionals effectively integrated sponsorships into advertising and public relations activities, but efforts at integration into areas of driving sales and direct marketing were less advanced. A majority (88%) of the respondents in Roberts' study believed that greater levels of integration would help sponsorship achieve its objectives.

According to Walliser (2003), the application of relationship marketing concepts "may be used to specify the links between the sponsorship company, its internal and external audiences, the sponsored activities, the media, the intermediaries…" (p. 20). He claimed this network approach benefited corporations by addressing the complexities inherent to sponsorship successes. For a company to gain full value from its sponsorship, effort must be placed on using the sponsorship as a promotional tool before, during and after the event (Miles, 1987). Activation of the sponsorship, described by IEG as "getting customers to do something" (Steinberg, 2005, p. B2), could make a critical difference in one sponsorship standing out above another. Miloch and Lambrecht (2006) reported that mean recognition rates for sponsors who activated their sponsorships by providing a souvenir item was twice as high as sponsors who did not participate in an activation activity. IEG (2004; 2005) claimed that more than 80% of sponsors reported some kind of spending in an effort to activate their sponsorships.

Many studies have shown that use of sponsorship as an integral part of a marketing or advertising mix has helped to build brand awareness and increased a sponsor's brand image with sport consumers. Events were often chosen because of the overlap between the target market of a brand and the actual audience of the event (Cornwell, Weeks & Roy, 2005). Advertising and sponsorships have been created to increase brand preference, which translated to sales and profits for corporations involved.

Sports sponsorships add the dimension of fan identification and loyalty to the sponsored property, theoretically elevating the sponsoring corporation in the mind of the consumer.

Property Personnel

Chadwick and Thwaites (2005) reported that corporations with soccer sponsorships showed a distinct lack of creativity in their leveraging activities and received no assistance from the clubs they sponsored. Berrett and Slack (2001) felt that many sporting organizations lacked the personnel and/or know-how to generate successful sponsor partnerships and used crude tactics to encourage investments. The authors argued that some sport organizations lacked strategic direction or suffered from environmental or situational constraints and were therefore continually seeking funds with little regard for establishing relationships or ensuring the satisfaction of the sponsoring companies. Sporting organizations with poor revenue generation have traditionally blamed on-field performance and tried to correct the problem with coaching or personnel changes. The end result has been that marketers were forced to focus on short-term tactics to generate sales and have failed to realize that sponsors were interested in associations for more than just a team's performance record (Gladden & Milne, 1999). This has been especially true of grassroots organizations that may have been staffed by volunteers and plagued by high employee turnover, as is the case in many minor league sporting associations. Stotlar (1999) wrote that some sponsors felt that properties sometimes assumed that sponsorship interest was based more on interest in or attraction to the event rather than the benefits of using the event as a marketing vehicle. Properties often failed to pay attention to sponsors' needs and viewed sponsors' budgets and being unlimited. In Stotlar's (1999) study, sponsors rated properties low on being able to provide feedback and "service after the sale."

Sponsoring Company Personnel

Corporate sponsorships are generally associated with top-level decision makers. Shanklin and Kuzma (1992) found that, in *Fortune* 1000 companies, CEO's, company presidents, and vice presidents were involved in the sponsorship decision-making processes. The authors also found that respondents in their study were unsure how to classify sponsorship within their companies' marketing structures. Shankin and Kuzma (1992) believed that, to be effective, sponsorship should be incorporated into both advertising and public relations divisions, even though, for many companies, sponsorship has been viewed as a unique and individual discipline. The authors predicted that sponsorship would evolve into a separate marketing activity with its own staff and department.

Roberts (2006) found that 56% of sponsorship professionals reported having experience in event management and 40% had worked in brand management. Advertising and public relations were other reported employment backgrounds. Roberts (2006) felt that there was a growing group of sponsorship professionals with brand management backgrounds, indicating that corporations were recognizing that sponsorship had the potential to create and develop brand equity. Chadwick and Thwaites (2005) blamed some of the disconnect between soccer clubs and their sponsors on the fact that senior managers signed sponsorship contracts and participated in the fun activities, such as attending the events, but junior employees were charged with implementation and leveraging decisions. In many cases, restrictions in contracts frustrated employees who had no part in the design or decision making but were expected to make the program work.

Thømøe, et al. (2002) discovered that, within an organization, marketing had the leading responsibility for sponsorship decisions. Marketers in the study felt that their sponsorships were well coordinated, included sponsored objects in other marketing activities, and communicated through other corporate initiatives. Additionally, it was reported that sponsorship results were not assessed because of budget limitations as well as a general lack of interest and ability to evaluate the effectiveness of these sponsorship programs. This seems naïve considering the huge sums of money that are invested in various sponsorship agreements and the leveraging activities that go along win them. No recognized or widely accepted way to assess sponsorship performance could be a major reason for neglecting evaluation.

A survey of U.S., Canadian and Australian corporations with sponsorship records revealed that although a company's communications goals and strategic business objectives were considered when sports sponsorships opportunities are presented, these considerations seemed "haphazard and unaccountable" (Burton, Quester & Farrelly, 1998, p. 2). Corporations with sponsorship experience were likely to delegate responsibilities to middle managers performing an operational role, rather than a strategic one. North American companies use sports marketers to secure rights and maximize benefits of sponsorships; senior management served the same purpose in Australian organizations. Burton et al., (1998) found a lack of measures in the area of sponsorship decision making; many decisions were based on intuition or previous experiences of the decision makers, oftentimes defaulting to the track record of the person presenting the sponsorship package. Properties have been known to hire persons with corporate connections and political savvy to market sponsorships in an effort to convince managers that the investment would be worthwhile (Burton et al., 1998)

In a review of sponsorship research, Cornwell and Maignan (1998) found that the responsibility for sponsorship decisions rested with the nature of the sponsorship. A sponsorship involving the arts was considered to be a function of public relations; sports sponsorships were deemed more important and involved marketing decision makers. Additionally, sports sponsorships were viewed as a budgeted item, sometimes allocated based on a percentage of sales, but community and cultural sponsorship support was more likely to be considered philanthropic and decided upon on an ad hoc basis.

Chadwick and Thwaites (2005) proposed a number of action points for sponsorship decision-makers; the most important being that sponsorships do not work independently, they need to be "proactively managed" (p. 337). Next, not to allow the glamour of the association to over-take the purpose of the sponsorship; the property has an obligation to hold up its end of the deal and marketers need to be able to manage this relationship. Sponsors pay for their rights and should be treated as customers; properties need the sponsors just as much as, if not more, than the sponsor needs the property and should be treated accordingly. Another important caveat was that sponsorship decisions should not be made on the basis of a "favorite" team or even the team with the best record or coach. The best long-term deal will be one that is strategic, leveraged and achieves the objectives of the sponsoring organization (Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005).

Integration

Hickman, Lawrence and Ward (2005) believed that sports sponsorship played an important role in increasing corporate image and brand awareness when the sponsorship was incorporated into the marketing mix through an IMC strategy. Additionally, the authors thought that sponsorship could function as a managerial tool that could be used to motivate internal customers in a positive manner. Hickman et al. (2005) felt that sponsorship could be used as a means to increase employee morale and enhance corporate culture throughout an organization. The authors did note that it was rare to find internal motivations being given as a primary reason for participating in sports sponsorships.

Thwaites (1995) stated that much sponsorship research has highlighted the absence of a structured and systematic approach for effectively integrating a sponsorship into an organization’s strategic plan. Irwin and Asimakopoulos (1992) offered six steps to conceptualizing the key stages in the sponsorship management process. Their premise was to establish criteria before sponsorship opportunities presented themselves.

1) Review the current marketing plan and objectives to ensure that the proposed sponsorship would be acceptable under budget considerations and that appropriate personnel were in place to oversee the sponsored activity.
2) Set objectives based on the needs of either the corporation as an entity or the product or brand; objectives can be prioritized to assist the evaluation process. This step is invaluable to an organization that receives multiple sponsorship requests.

3) Establish evaluation criteria based on each element or piece of the sponsorship package. Some elements may not be strictly applicable to corporate strategies and can be weighted or omitted from the evaluation process.

4) Screen and select sponsorship proposals using a comparative analysis of the corporate sponsorship criteria and the proposed sponsorship's ability to fulfill the objectives.

5) Implement the sponsorship; take full advantage of leveraging opportunities to achieve full activation of the sponsor/property association.

6) Evaluate how well the sponsorship met the prescribed objectives.

Consideration of the corporate marketing plan during initial sponsorship planning allowed for far more integration of sponsorships into overall marketing mixes, reported Farrelly, Quester and Burton (1997). However, the authors found that there was still a strong need for managers to become educated about the role of sponsorships within a corporate marketing mix. Specifically, Farrelly et al. (1997) encouraged corporations to apply deliberate and strategic planning of sponsorship integration into marketing plans, allowing achievement of corporate objectives.

Wilkinson (1993) developed a model that encouraged sponsors to evaluate how well sponsorship opportunities met a company's defined marketing objectives and enabled post-selection evaluation. The goal of the event-selection model was to reduce the subjectivity in decision making and enhance full corporate commitment to the sponsorships from the initial point of agreement. Wilkinson (1993) predicted that his model and associated assessment materials would allow a corporation to develop objectives and select appropriate sponsorships based on pre-agreed assessment criteria.

Leveraging and Activation

In an unprecedented negotiation, the Women's Tennis Association (WTA) secured a sponsorship arrangement with Sara Lee's Sanex™ that included a requirement that the sponsor spend $40 million, over and above the rights fee, on advertising and promotions that raised awareness of the WTA/Sanex™ association (Lough & Irwin, 2001). Leveraging has long been an expected part of sponsorship deals but often on an unspoken level. The contractual obligation on the part of the sponsoring corporation to generate awareness for the partnership demonstrates the understanding of the need to go beyond the event site to ensure that full benefits are received from the sponsorship partnership.

According to Poole (2002), sponsorship activation was something that could never be taken for granted. He claimed that the sports industry was full of poorly activated sponsorships where participants did not have a true understanding of the assets or potential. Sponsorship deals signed by people who understood only one element of the agreement, or internal pressure that sapped resources, were sometimes to blame for ineffective programs. Poole (2002) praised sponsors that brought revenue, marketing and evaluation to their sponsorship agreements and felt that diligent investors added to the benefits of all sponsors linked to a property. He also noted that a successfully activated sponsorship was one that was likely to be renewed and not be vulnerable to a competitor undermining the association. Chadwick and Thwaites (2005) suggested that sponsorships should be actively managed and that close associations between the sponsor and property should be cultured to attain greater long-term benefits. Additionally, the authors suggested that value-added activities were an important feature of sponsorship programs. Sponsorship strategies that allowed fans to interact directly with the sponsor's brand created opportunities for consumers to have an active role in making memorable associations with that brand (Cimperman, 2007).

Cimperman (2007) defined activation as the leveraging of sponsorship assets to drive consumer behavior. He claimed that activation was one of the best ways to generate a measurable return on investment for sponsorships and allowed corporations to rely on something other than media impressions to gauge consumer responses. Cimperman (2007) believed that the key was to execute programs that reached beyond the event, venue or media covering the event. The author outlined four key ways to create impact beyond stadium signs and seating. The initial step was to secure a sponsorship package that allowed the use of a team mark, especially on the product itself; this sets sponsors apart on store shelves and gives consumers a way to differentiate between competing brands. The second step would be that of creating positive energy within the stadium through creative on-site interaction areas. The up-beat positive energy that surrounds an event is the perfect environment to introduce fans to a brand or product message. Development of grassroots or community relations programs that go beyond the scope of the season or event extends the extent to which consumers can experience the sponsorship. Finally, use media outlets that were already associated with the property to reinforce the corporate connection. Advertising schedules and a presence on the property's website strengthened the connection in consumers' minds of the shared values between a sponsor, fans and potential customers. Cimperman (2007) felt that activation of a sponsorship was the responsibility of the sponsor and the property and by working together, both organizations could make the most of their association. Additionally, the importance of sponsorship activation and leveraging activities cannot be overlooked as valuable brand enhancement opportunities. Keller (1993) claimed that any activity that afforded consumers a chance to "experience a brand" had the potential to elevate the brand in a consumer's view.

Evaluation

One of the most difficult tasks associated with sponsorship has been the ability to observe tangible results that are directly attributable to the sponsorship program (Harvey, 2001). Meenaghan (1991) listed five main strategies for assessing sponsorship effectiveness: media exposure, levels of sponsorship awareness by spectators, product sales, spectator feedback and cost-benefit analyses. Defining these concepts and applying measurement strategies has remained out of the reach of many sponsoring organizations. Alexandris et al. (2007) concurred, adding that behavioral constructs, such as purchase intention and word of mouth communications, are also worthy of assessment. Furthermore, Amis et al. (1999) believed that sponsoring organizations gain indirect benefits that are even more difficult to quantify.

According to Gardner and Shuman (1987), more than 50% of sponsors do not evaluate their sponsorships and Berrett and Slack (1995) found that sponsors were not clear on the benefits that they had received. Berrett and Slack (1995) also reported that evaluation was sporadic and approached with little regard when actually conducted. Bennett (1999) claimed that evaluation was eschewed because of the costs and uncertainties involved in the evaluation process as well as a general lack of meaningful criteria for evaluation. Quester (1997) reported that only 50% of companies evaluated sponsorship outcomes and Crompton (2004b) was discouraged to find that many corporations spent less than 1% of their overall budget on sponsorship evaluation. Additionally, marketers have criticized the advertising measures that were being used to evaluate sponsorships, feeling that the effectiveness of sponsorship activation was not being accurately presented (Choi, Stotlar & Park, 2006).

Bennett (1999) claimed that results of sponsorships have been typically measured in terms of "awareness levels achieved; attitudes created or altered; prompted and unprompted brand or company name recall; the extents of television, radio and press coverage and CPM prospects" (p. 295). Media exposure or press coverage computations only indicated the extent of the event publicity rather than awareness of a sponsorship. Common advertising evaluations did not take into consideration, or differentiate between, the value of a sponsorship and the accompanying advertising and a similar campaign with non-sponsorship components (Miyazaki & Morgan, 2001). Using an event-study analysis technique, commonly utilized in the field of finance, Miyazaki and Morgan (2001) were able to discover that that corporations participating in sponsorship of the 1996 Olympic Games were seen by the investment marketplace as having positive associations.

Keller (1993) viewed sponsorship as a vehicle with which to place "frequent and prominent (brand) mentions" (p. 10). Nardone and See (2007) acknowledged brand impact was an important step in evaluating sponsorship effectiveness. The authors claimed that marketers were managing both the brand itself and the sponsorship. Additionally, measuring impact on sales has been possible using a method called economic modeling, according to Nardone and See (2007). The statistical model overlays all sponsorship activities and ties them to sales so that marketers have the ability to measure the impact of all the elements of a sponsorship. Nardone and See (2007) pointed out that it was also necessary to measure activation activities. Spending over and above the sponsorship is imperative to the complete sponsorship success, and tracking any and all activities associated with a sponsorship ensures that a corporation's marketing plan is being executed correctly and the company is gaining full benefit from its sponsorship investment.

Crompton (2004b) believed that sponsorship objectives related to sales that would be made in the future. The general premise of the association was not to generate immediate sales. The author felt that sales increases were the ultimate goal of sponsorship, and, for this reason, evaluations should be made at several stages during the sponsorship agreement. The initial stage simply assessed an individual's awareness of a product or brand. Evaluation then continued through to the adoption process. Through utilization of this process, Crompton (2004b) surmised that sponsorship could be considered successful when consumers progressed from one stage to the next in the adoption process, even if no direct sales occurred.

Abratt and Grobler (1989) lamented the fact that many sponsorship evaluations are conducted using traditional advertising measures. Because sponsorship consists of a unique combination of advertising and public relations components, it has been considered naïve to utilize the same measurement scales (Fitch, 1986). For example, 20 exposures of a company's logo on a court-side banner appearing during a basketball broadcast has a vastly different impact than 20 television commercials appearing during the same time period. Simple exposure is not a reliable measure unless the intent of the sponsorship was to gain 20 on-screen views. Marshall and Cook (1992) found that many sponsors who did evaluate their sponsorships used measures such as media impressions, television ratings and print coverage. Farrelly et al. (1997) and Abratt and Grobler (1989) supported the development and adoption of sponsorship-specific measurements. The need for evaluation and interest in effective measurement tools and models that can be applied to sponsorship has increased in recent years (O'Reilly & Madill, 2007). Factors influencing this attitude change are due, in part, to increased sponsorship clutter, increased investment outlay and the growing acceptance of sponsorship as a viable and valuable element in an integrated marketing plan (O'Reilly & Madill, 2007).

Crompton (2004b) wrote that sponsors who were aware of the differences in sponsorships and advertising typically expected media exposure to be worth at least three to six times the cost of the sponsorship, when using media impressions as an evaluative tool. He also noted that this evaluation took place at the channel position in the communication process and that there was no guarantee that the message had reached the receiver. Crompton (2004b) reported that as many as 70% of corporations participating in sponsorship used media impressions as a primary means of evaluation, around 40% used awareness/image measures, and only 7% considered changes in sales volume.

One of the main reasons for media equivalencies being used as a measurement tool is that it is a widely understood method of assessment. Media impressions are also relatively easy to collect and present the appearance of statistically quantifiable evaluations. This type of measurement can also be made without interfering with the event itself or requiring the manpower (or intrusion) that would be needed to conduct on-site evaluations with attendees (Crompton, 2004b). Because media exposure is only one aspect of sports sponsorship and does not accurately assess the full outcome of a sponsorship, Abratt and Grobler (1989) developed the following evaluation sequence:

1) Set objectives. Evaluation is not possible if there is nothing against which to measure.
2) Assign one person to evaluate the success of the sponsorship. This person should understand the multiple aspects of the sponsorship.
3) Determine which marketing elements are involved. Objectives can be established around each element.
4) Identify gaps in the marketing mix. Each element should have a specific and measurable objective.
5) Determine the time period for evaluation. A benchmark should be established if results are to be measured over an extended period of time.
6) Select an appropriate measurement technique.
7) Compare the results with the objectives that were set. If performance meets or exceeds the goals, the sponsorship can be deemed successful. If objectives are not met, the objectives and measurement techniques should be reviewed and re-stated, if necessary, before determining the outcome of the sponsorship. (pp. 359-361).

McAllister and Ferrell (2002) developed a six-step evaluation model that includes many of the same elements. Giles Morgan (2006), head of sports marketing and sponsorship at HSBC, wrote that his company measured sponsorships against six criteria:

"the brand's resonance within the sport, the generation of awareness in specific regions, the use of sponsorship as a platform for business, tie-ins with global CSR activity, engagement of staff and geo-political relationships" (p. 36).

Often, corporations' choices seem to be irrational and largely based on emotional experiences, leading Martensen, Gronholdt, Bendtsen and Jensen (2007) to develop a model of event effectiveness. These authors' model was developed from literature regarding sponsorship, advertising, consumer behavior and neuropsychological theory. The model follows routes similar to those proposed in the Elaboration Likelihood Model developed by Petty and Cacioppo (1986). A central brand-related route and peripheral event-related route are ways that consumers link variables and create buying intentions. Martensen et al. (2007) were able to validate and successfully apply their model for effectiveness of event marketing at a golf tournament in Denmark. The authors claimed that their model structure was "a very good explanation of how the event affects brand attitude and buying intention among the event participants" (p. 297).

Assessment Methods

One of the major challenges faced by both sponsor and property has been the ability to measure the success of the association. Category exclusivity and audience coverage are small portions of Olympic sponsorship packages that can be measured (Turner, 2005). In a study of U.S. Olympic Festival sponsors, Kuzma, Shanklin and McCally (1992) discovered that sponsors who claimed the most satisfaction with their sponsorship involvement reported setting realistic marketing and communication objectives. The authors also found that strategies were developed to combine the sponsorship with traditional advertising and promotional methods in an effort to create synergy. With accountability becoming an important factor in integrated marketing programs, sponsorship and event marketing remain without an empirically tested and agreed upon method of measuring success (Turner, 2005).

Clark et al. (2002) performed a study to determine the profitability and return to shareholders involved with corporations that sponsor sporting stadiums. Their study of 49 corporate stadium sponsors found that stock prices tended to rise at the time of announcing their stadium deal, but that many other variables played a significant part in the perceived success or failure of each sponsorship. Nicholls and Roslow (1994) outlined several measures to gauge the effectiveness of being associated with sporting events. They cited a *Wall Street Journal* article that stated that John Hancock Financial Investment Services measured the effectiveness of its college bowl sponsorship by the amount of news coverage it received before and after the event. Other event sponsors compared sales figures in the weeks surrounding the sponsored event.

In a study by Amis et al. (1999), an assessment of what constituted a success or failure of a sponsorship was left to the company involved. The authors found that sponsorships identified as being successful achieved that success by making a long-standing commitment to whatever was being sponsored and incorporating this into their strategic thinking. Stotlar (2004) concurred that effectiveness of a sponsorship should be judged on whether the specific marketing objectives of the corporation were met. Shanklin and Kuzma (1992) blamed failed sponsorships on sponsors that neglected to plan properly, did not choose an appropriate event or venue, and were unable or chose not to integrate their sponsorship into other marketing programs. McDaniel (1999) suggested that sponsors should conduct market research to understand the target audience's brand and event schemas prior to investing in a sponsorship, and agreed that integrating advertising aided in leveraging benefits of the sponsorship. Crimmins and Horn (1996) found that companies that spent additional dollars to communicate their sponsorships to consumers reported a strong positive persuasion link with their brands.

According to Walliser (2003), many researchers have focused on measuring the awareness effects of sponsorship, with findings often conflicting because of the large number of factors that influence sponsorship awareness. Recall or association studies were the most common methods for assessing awareness. Walliser (1994) categorized five factors that had an influence over recall: conditions of exposure, product, message and target characteristics, and sponsorship integrations. Evidence has shown that recall increases as a function of duration of exposure, prior brand awareness, message length and design, demographic composition of the audience, as well as spectator interest with and in the sponsored activity (Alvarado, 2006; Cornwell et al., 2000; Meir et al., 1997; Quester, 1997; Moore et al., 1999). Koschler and Merz (1995) go so far as claiming that stand-alone sponsorship activities were poor vehicles for generating brand awareness, even when the sponsorship was longstanding.

Hansen and Scotwin (1995) developed a model for measuring sponsorship effects. They stated that measuring these effects could be complex as there were many factors that can influence the visibility and effectiveness of each sponsorship. Sports sponsorships can take many forms. The content of a sponsorship may be limited to a brand name, it may include the brand name and a brief message or slogan, or it could be broad enough to be aimed at modifying the image of the sponsoring company (Hansen & Scotwin, 1995). Four different levels of sponsorship effects were outlined by Hansen and

Scotwin (1995): exposure, attention, cognition and behavior. Cornwell et al. (2005) outlined three measurements of sponsorship outcomes or effectiveness that coincided with Hansen and Scotwin's effects; cognitive outcomes, affective outcomes and behavioral outcomes. Each measurement will be briefly discussed below.

Advertising or sponsorship exposure is commonly considered to be the presentation of an advertisement or sponsorship to an audience. Measures of exposure are generally provided by a syndicated service. This service records the number of times a sponsor is observed on a television screen or mentioned in a broadcast. Each exposure is measured in terms of seconds and the estimated number of viewers for that broadcast. This information is usually reserved for major events such as the Olympic Games or Super Bowl, where exposure can be large and sponsors are concerned with the cost per exposure of their, usually substantial, investment.

Attention is measured in terms of brand or company awareness. Asking subjects to remember what they have seen or heard at an event from memory is known as unaided recall. Aided recall studies include the mention of an advertiser category or product to elicit sponsor names from respondents. When a stimulus, such as a company name or slogan, is included to prompt memories, it is considered a test of recognition. Recall and recognition studies are the primarily accepted methods of assessing the level of attention a sponsor receives. These measures are known by most major sponsors and many examples of these measures have been published (Hansen & Scotwin, 1995). Aided and unaided recalls are the primary types of measurements made, with aided recall usually reaching the most significant levels of sponsor identification. Pre- and post-exposure awareness studies are often used to determine the effects of a particular sporting event on a sponsor's corporate image and product recognition (Abratt & Grobler, 1989). Sponsor name awareness and sponsor association are also important indicators of sponsorship effectiveness (Meenaghan, 2001b).

Cornwell et al. (2005) reported that cognitive outcomes were typically focused on awareness. Awareness of the association between sponsor and event was the most basic outcome that could be achieved through sponsorship. Cognition effects occur when there was an association between the sponsor and sponsored. This connection could include close associations, such as sporting equipment and a player, or image associations where a sponsor has been aligned with a sport because of the type of audience that was typically attracted to that sport, for example, NAPA Auto and NASCAR. Complex messages are limited in this context and are typically restricted to simple brand names or slogans.

Behavior (or purchase) effects are typically measured by direct sales or product usage; sponsors simply measure or track sales that can be directly attributed to the sponsorship. Sophisticated tracking methods can be implemented to assess sales trends and purchase patterns. On a smaller scale, sponsors may simply ask how a customer found out about their products or services. Behavioral outcomes are the most desired effect of sponsorship. Actual purchase or association with a sponsor because of their sponsorship activity is an optimal effect.

Affective outcomes, as described by Cornwell et al. (2005) are simply measured by the liking or preference of a sponsor. Affective outcomes are most important when the goal of a sponsor is brand recognition rather than direct purchases. There is a potential for negative effects when a brand associates itself with a team or event that is not popular or well-liked.

There appears to be no set way for corporations to assess accurately the success of their sponsorships. Intentions behind sponsorships are almost as varied as the number of sponsorships available and the intention of the sponsor can be the only measure of success or failure. Case studies by Amis et al. (1999) showed that having a purpose in mind when initiating sponsorship agreements was more successful than those that were contracted based on a whim or owner preference for or attachment to an event. Having a purpose behind the sponsorship allowed measurement to occur and corporations to ensure that their goals were being met.

Most corporations have a set goal when assessing general advertising effectiveness and many of these measurements have been adapted for use with sponsorships. Miyazaki and Morgan (2001) focused on measurement techniques used by the financial industry, rather than advertising and marketing, to assess the value of event sponsorship. They looked at stock valuations after an event (the Olympic Games) to assess the value of the sponsorship as measured by actual marketplace value. Clark et al. (2002) monitored changes in stock prices that occurred when a corporation announced a stadium-naming deal. They found that increases were related to the size of the corporate sponsor, contract length, winning percentage of the involved team and ties to the community or area where the sponsorship is located. Calderon-Martinez, Mas-Ruiz and Nicolau-Gonzalbez (2005) conducted a study to determine whether there was a difference between commercial sponsorships (a contract with direct compensation or benefits, including sport sponsorships) and philanthropic sponsorships (a sponsorship with no expected direct benefits other than social recognition). The authors determined that companies' market values showed an increase when they supported events through commercial sponsorship but not in philanthropic sponsorship instances.

Another angle by which to view the effects of sponsorships is to examine the relationship between sponsorship and employee morale (Hickman, Lawrence & Ward, 2005). Sport sponsorship can be a successful form of internal communication and increase employee morale, which can motivate customer service. In addition, Hickman et al. (2005) found that sports sponsorships could create a bond between employees and customers through identification with the sponsored entity.

Consumer Recognition of Sponsorship

Bennett (1999) found that sponsorship was a powerful device for communicating with spectators at sporting events and appeared to be effective in enhancing brand/company awareness, along with creating perceptions of use and desirability of the sponsoring firms' products. Season-ticket holders, who were more frequently exposed to sponsors' messages, had the highest level of recall and identification with their products. Amis et al. (1999) found that customer value tended to have long-term advantage when a sponsorship was integrated with the rest of a corporation's marketing mix. Increased brand equity and perceived customer value was realized when a corporation was able to differentiate itself from its competitors and recognized that a sponsorship was a valuable resource that was worth cultivating and developing. An article from the *St. Petersburg Times* echoed this sentiment with regard to Raymond James Financial, the sponsoring corporation of Raymond James Stadium, the venue of the 2001 Super Bowl. Raymond James Financial recognized that securing the stadiums' naming rights would set it apart from other brokerage houses and used the Super Bowl and publicity surrounding it to "educate people about what Raymond James does" (Parks, 2000). A regional telephone company based in Arkansas realized the same value when Alltel Stadium was the home of Super Bowl XXXIX in Jacksonville, Florida. Ulman (2005) reported that Alltel was ready to renew its deal with the Jacksonville Stadium, even though the current contract did not expire until 2006. Frank O'Mara of Alltel was quoted as saying, "We've always seen ourselves as a big player (in the regional cellular phone network), but now the rest of the country sees it" (Ulman, 2005, para 5).

Swedish telecommunications corporation Ericsson, Inc. was virtually unknown when it entered into a $20 million dollar naming-rights agreement with the Carolina Panthers in 1995. Crompton and Howard (2003) cited market research that showed recognition of the Ericsson name grew from no public presence prior to 1995 to being recognized by 50% of adults in the Carolinas and 44% of adults nationally in 1998, just three years after signing the naming-rights agreement.

Nielsen Sports, a division of The Nielsen Company which uses a digital recognition program to identify logos, reported that the top five sponsors of Coors Field received 2.4 billion total impressions during Game 2 of the 2007 World Series (Sass, 2007). Sponsors in Fenway Park received just 79.1 million impressions during a single game using the same measurement system. Coors Field takes advantage of home plate and dugout areas to display signage, natural attention points for both live and television spectators (Sass, 2007). Sass (2007) wrote that Nielsen will launch the service as part of the Nielsen Sponsorship Scorecard in March 2008.

Having a corporate name in the stadium holding the Super Bowl and being a sponsor of that event may be worth more to an organization than could have ever have been anticipated. As the spectacle surrounding the event and the advertising that is within the program itself continues to grow, the number of impressions received by each consumer also continues to grow. McAllister (1999) believed that the media have given so much attention and legitimacy to the advertising in the Super Bowl that consumers cannot help but see it as a form of entertainment. By constantly previewing and replaying the sponsors and the amount they spent on air time and production, consumers develop positive links, as described previously by McDaniel (1999) and Verity (2002), between the sponsoring brand and the sporting event that many hold sacred. McAllister (1999) also mentioned that many companies run teaser spots on television, in print and on the Internet, long before the day of the game. In essence, there is advertising telling viewers to look for the advertising that is forthcoming, further strengthening the value of the message, and therefore the link between the brand and sponsorship, in the consumer's mind.

Examples of Success

IEG compiled a report on sponsorship leveraging activities in 2000. They included successful examples from sports, arts, entertainment and charitable entities. For example, Nabisco, Inc. inked sponsorship deals with USA Cycling, Major League Baseball, an N'Sync concert tour and Blues Clues children's tour. The company's activation activities included autograph-signing parties, customized packaging, sampling opportunities and joint promotions between company brands.

A second example dealt with the automobile industry. The Ohio Ford Dealers Association negotiated with the Cleveland Indians to be able to include the team logo and the field in their corporate marketing programs. The Ford dealers also gained signage and the right to display a vehicle in the stadium. Ford was trying to activate fan's affinity for the team by using team imagery and likenesses. A year-to-year sales increase of 9.9% indicated that the association was spending its marketing budget in the right place.

Other examples ranged from the airline industry to the food business. Southwest Airlines uses multiple sponsorships to tap into consumer passions for their sports teams and also to create excitement among its employees and to thank customers. Southwest's manager of sports marketing claimed that selling promotions internally has helped the airline to maximize its sponsorship investments. Earthgrains Bakery sponsors more than 40 events each year, which gives the company an opportunity to liven its packaging and entice consumers to purchase its products. Many promotions featured free or discounted event tickets. The bakery also supports a variety of children's museums, concerts, festivals, water parks and zoos. Corporate executives believed these associations help position Earthgrains as a local company with strong ties to the community. Earthgrains incorporated retailers into its event sponsorships whenever possible.

From a property standpoint, the Tampa Bay Buccaneers organization sets aside a percentage of rights fees to devote to leveraging deals and marketing activations for its sponsors. The team's director of marketing claimed that the strategy has been working well and sponsors have been encouraged by the unanticipated benefits they have received. The fees have been used for education programs, public events and even charitable events that are only open to sponsors and their clients.

Sponsorship Theories

Walliser (2003) found that many theoretical and conceptual frameworks have been applied to sponsorship, although none has received enough empirical support to be deemed a leading or established theory. Espoused theories have touched on how sponsorships are perceived by consumers; congruence and schema theories as well as the Elaboration Likelihood Model are but a few. The exchange relationship between a property and its sponsors has been addressed by the Agency Theory. These four theories and how they correlate with the sponsorship experience will be briefly addressed.

Schema and Congruency Theories

Schema theory can be used to explain how consumers process the association between a sponsor and an event, along with how that connection leads to positive responses toward the sponsoring organization (Roy & Cornwell, 2003). According to Fiske (1982), a schema is “an active organization of past experiences, which must always be supposed to be operating in any well-adapted organic response” (p. 600). Consumers process sponsorships by comparing the message and peripheral cues with existing knowledge stored in the form of a schema (McDaniel, 1995). Using the pre-stored schemas, consumers assimilate new information into existing knowledge, create new knowledge structures and schemas for new information, or disregard the information and exclude it from existing schema formations (Roy & Cornwell, 2003)

Schemas, according to Mandler (1982), are “representations of experience that guide action perception and thought….New encounters are evaluated against existing schemas, and the interaction between an event and a schema determines the perception, understanding and organization of our environment” (p. 3). Congruence, in abstract terms, can be defined as a similarity between objects. Rifon et al. (2004) stated that congruence has been used to indicate consumer perceptions of similarities in advertising and marketing literature. In sponsorship research, congruence had been used to explain the direct or indirect relevance of the sponsor and event. Gwinner (1997) defined direct relevance as the connection that occurs when the sponsor's product is seen within an event, and indirect relevance as when consumers match their own values with those of the sponsor and event. In sport sponsorship, congruence is the match, fit or relatedness between the sponsor and event or team (Cornwell et al., 2005).

Mandler (1982) theorized that schema congruity may influence the nature of information processing and, therefore, product evaluations. In simple terms, how sports consumers view the connection between the sponsor and sponsored may depend on previous exposure to and involvement with that sponsor. Misra and Beatty (1990) and Schaefer (1992) used schema theory to focus on consumer perceptions of the association between celebrity endorsers and brands in advertising. Musante et al. (1999) felt that consumers possessed schemas that were related to sponsorship in that the sponsor and associated sport became salient and developed congruency in the minds of the exposed consumers. These schemas are used to make judgments on the appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of a sponsor/property pairing. McDaniel (1995) extended that events function like celebrity endorsers in that they hold meaning for consumers and can be transferred to the sponsor. He used this association to apply schema-triggered effects to research in sponsorship advertising. Consumers' familiarity with sponsors and the level of connection they perceive between a sponsorship and an advertiser may contribute to their abilities to recall correctly that association when asked. Additionally, schema and congruence may serve as an explanation as to why respondents report supporting or buying products from sponsors that support an athletic program. Musante et al. (1999) suggested that the more congruent that a consumer found the fit between a sponsor and a property, the more effective the image-enhancing influence of the association was generated. The authors recommended that selection of an appropriate sponsorship was an opportunity to transfer the image from a property to a brand. It should be noted that this transfer can have both positive and negative consequences.

Meyers-Levy and Tybout (1989) cited research in psychology and consumer behavior that provided insight regarding how the level of congruity (or incongruity) between products and associated category schemas effect evaluation. Associations that had either moderately congruent or moderately incongruent schemas produced the most favorable evaluations. Cornwell et al. (2005) reported that congruence theory suggests that storage in memory and retrieval of information are influenced by relatedness or similarity between sponsor and event that seems appropriate and is easily remembered. When pairing these two views, it would appear that a well-regarded product could bring credibility to a lesser known event or entity, and vice versa. In addition, when that pairing is either obvious, such as with Nike or Michael Jordan and the NBA, or more subtle or dissimilar, such as with Pacific Life Insurance and college football, connections are made and maintained. Congruence effects may be effective when complementary products engage in joint marketing, e.g., Coca-Cola and Bacardi (Ruth & Simonin, 2003). The perceived fit between brands adds to consumer's evaluations of the partnership. The same effects are believed by Ruth and Simonin (2003) to be present in sponsorship.

Rosengren and Dahlen (2006) suggested that memory cues play a part in matching slogans and brands; when consumers cannot make the link between a brand and its logo or slogan, no memory cues are activated. Having varied executions of the brand/slogan, such as are available with sponsorship, can build on the memory networks of consumers. Additionally, the availability of visual and auditory presentation of a brand/slogan reinforces the constructive process of memory, leading to higher brand recall (Rosengren & Dahlen, 2006).

Elaboration Likelihood Model

According to Hansen et al. (2006), audience members rarely consider the medium through which the sponsorship was conveyed. The audience members were focused on the purpose of their attendance, whatever that may be. Processing the sponsor message was subtle and usually unconscious, similar to the peripheral information processing claimed by Petty and Cacioppo (1986). Hansen et al. (2006) believed that the emotional responses that were frequently associated with sporting events contributed to how sponsorship information was processed. Positive information toward both the event and sponsorship organization was found to be the best pairing for sponsorship awareness. Gwinner (1997) believed that sponsorships operated along a peripheral route based on the indirect nature of a sponsor's promotional message and general limitations of complex information exchange.

In addition to emotion, relatedness, or the fit between a property and its sponsor, can cue consumers as to a sponsorship. Wakefield, Becker-Olsen and Cornwell (2007) claimed that when two objects that belong to a given category (such as Gatorade and basketball) were linked by sponsorship, consumers would categorize them simultaneously and be able to relate the sponsor to the event. In this instance, a person's schema is tied to the processing of the association. Wakefield et al. suggested that marketers with unrelated or not-so-prominent products and services need to be explained to the audience to generate memory cues. Gwinner (1997) felt that low-involvement sponsors largely relied on event image for impact on consumer's attitudes toward their brand. Changes occurred along peripheral routes based on the sponsor's association with its surroundings. Findings in the Wakefield et al. (2007) study pointed to the fact that awareness did build up over time and, as expected, prominent sponsors were better-recognized than their lower-tiered counterparts.

Agency Theory

O'Reilly and Madill (2007) found agency theory to be a straightforward and clear framework from which they developed an evaluation process. Farrelly and Quester (2003) claimed that the agency theory framework had not been applied in the context of a sponsor/property relationship, but that the circumstances surrounding the association may be explained through application of the theory. In further studies, O'Reilly and Madill (2007) felt that the theory clearly applied to the symbiotic relationship that existed between properties and sponsors.

Agency theory can be applied in many situations where there is an exchange relationship: obviously advertising agencies and their clients, but employer/employee, supplier/distributor and, in the context of this study, sponsor and property. As any theory, agency theory has its supporters and opponents, but, as pointed out by Bergen, Dutta and Walker (1992), the theory proves to be most useful in situations where the core principals of the theory are present. With sponsorship, these factors are that there is a contractual relationship wherein both parties have a stake in the outcome and that evaluation on the part of both sides can be difficult to control, observe and measure (Bergen et al., 1992). Bahli and Rivard (2003) applied the theory where the agent (sponsored organization or event) acted on behalf of the promotional interests of the principal (the sponsoring corporation). The sponsor engaged the property to act on their behalf. Logan (2000) believed that agency theory explained that corporations enter into sponsorship agreements because of the benefits of specialized targeting to consumers and the ability to allow a property to share the responsibility for attracting those consumers.

O'Reilly and Madill (2007) applied the agency theory framework to sponsorship in an effort to evaluate a sponsor's investment in a property and the ensuing ability to achieve promotional objectives, as well as the ability of the sponsored property to perform successfully their intended activity. The theory infers that both parties have their own motives for their association but that their goals are not always congruent. Sappington (1991) pointed out that the principal cannot fully monitor the actions of the agent and how sponsors choose to exploit their association. Conversely, the agent cannot trust that its investment will be used as intended, leading to risk-sharing that has potential costs to both sides. In addition, Copeland et al. (1996) noted that sponsors have no guarantee that an event will be executed in a quality fashion, plus even a quality event can be harmed by any number of external factors.

The theoretical framework of Agency Theory was developed by O'Reilly and Madill (2007) and was based on the implicit objectives of both the sponsor and the property. The following assumptions must be understood for the model to be applied in a sponsorship context:

1. Self-interest on both parties is the assumed motivation behind the sponsorship agreement.
2. The property functions with incomplete knowledge about what the sponsor is going to do with its promotional opportunities and the

> environments in which they will be presented. In contrast, the sponsor operates with open understanding of the duties of the property (O'Reilly & Madill, 2007, p. 8).

This framework was viewed by O'Reilly and Madill (2007) to be applicable to sponsorship based on the premise that each sponsorship agreement was unique and individual and it was up to the sponsors to ensure that they receive the promotional benefits promised in the contract, and that the property, in return for resources, carried out its intended task. Full evaluation of all contract elements (both written and unwritten or implied) requires information from both points of view. The possibility of intermediaries on both sides of the sponsorship process was one that should not be overlooked as it further compounded the principal-agent relationship (O'Reilly & Madill, 2007). Farrelly and Quester (2003) believed that outsourcing has led to relationships between corporations and marketing specialists. As these relationships are researched and explored, agency theory may be used to explain the ties that bind these two entities.

Collegiate Sponsorships

Corporate sponsors have become interested in college sports, whether to reach students, alumni or fans (Chipps, 2007). Tomasini et al. (2004) wrote that sponsorship revenue at the collegiate level has not increased at the same rate as sponsorship dollars in the professional sport industry, but IEG reported that North-American-based corporations were expected to spend $515 million on collegiate sport programs and events in 2007. In turn, collegiate properties have developed a more sophisticated approach to sponsorship by creating special packages and engaging third-party promoters to peddle their offerings (Chipps, 2007). Shannon (1999) suggested that collegiate athletics provided a fan base with intense interest and loyalty to the programs. He claimed that fan loyalty tended to transfer to the products and companies that supported collegiate programs. Shannon (1999) pointed to Coca-Cola as a corporation that has recognized the benefits of being associated with collegiate athletics. Coca-Cola purchases scoreboard signage at a multitude of venues.

Waddell (1998) claimed that inexperience and manpower issues have led many colleges to go through third parties to market venue signage and sponsorships. The third party receives a commission on each package that is sold. Conversely, athletic programs have seen the success that has been achieved by sponsorship-marketing companies and some are moving these operations back in-house as contracts expire. Specialized sponsorship and marketing departments are becoming a standard feature of collegiate athletic programs across the country. Commonly outsourced operations include production and broadcasting of coaches' shows and call-in programs, game broadcasts and associated advertising, as well as sponsorships, venue and program advertising, and in some cases, maintenance of websites and other web-based programs (Burden & Li, 2005). According to Burden and Li (2005), the competitiveness of collegiate athletics and pressure to be fiscally sufficient had made outsourcing a popular choice for inexperienced athletic departments.

Newton (1999) reported that state universities needed outside funding for athletics to offer more scholarships and enable wider recruiting efforts. She reported successful efforts by the University of North Texas and Texas Christian University to obtain national sponsorship dollars that have aided in the increase of both success and visibility of their programs. In addition, Muret (2000) reported that corporations gain through the "value of association" (p. 4) when they align themselves with college sport programs. Many sponsors consider their contributions to college athletics as a way to give back to the communities in which they are located. Carefully orchestrated marketing plans can turn a corporate sponsorship into a long-term relationship that effectively benefits both the athletic department and corporate sponsor in terms of value and business development (Tomasini et al., 2004).

According to Lee (2000), operating expenses in successful collegiate athletic departments at any level have grown at such a rate that fewer than 45% of them operate in the black. Tomasini et al. (2004) reported that approximately 85% of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I athletic programs operated with an annual budget deficit. Increasing pressure has been placed on these departments to raise funds through sponsorship and related events. In turn, corporations have turned to college athletics to reach those highly vested fans for increased sales, brand awareness and image enhancement (Covell, 2001). Universities in NCAA Division I-A hold a competitive advantage over smaller programs, in part because of national media coverage and strong sports programs (Tomasini et al., 2004). Soliciting and maintaining corporate sponsorships in lesser programs has proven more difficult (Sneath, Hoch, Kennett & Erdman, 2000). Corporate encroachment into college athletics has led many college presidents into turmoil over the academic mission for which most universities were established. There has been sentiment within academia that "pursuit of athletic profits to fuel the pursuit of victories and sponsors' objectives is contrary to the operation of an athletic program within the mission of higher education" (Covell, 2001, p. 245). A former University of Michigan president linked sponsorship and the commercialization of collegiate sports to low academic performance and graduation rates of student athletes and an increase in the number of NCAA rules violations (Zhang, Won & Pastore, 2005).

Harvard and other Ivy League schools were among the first to embrace commercialism in athletics. This led to the construction of huge stadiums and allegations of illegal recruiting, player payoffs and slush funds. The establishment of a formal commission in the 1940s dealt with the commercialism and returned the Ivy League schools to their educational focus. Harvard currently maintains 41 athletic programs for more than 1,500 student-athletes with no commercially related financial aid (Covell, 2001). Athletic department revenues are funded by ticket sales, concessions and licensed merchandise sales. Sponsorships are limited to advertising on schedule cards, ticket backs, programs, and television and radio broadcasts. When soliciting advertising, Harvard officials make it clear that businesses will not be official sponsors of their athletic program (Covell, 2001). Like most other athletic programs, Harvard advocates donor programs. Donations from individuals in exchange for better seating or parking are very much a part of Harvard's revenue generation plan, but it is made clear that there will be no corporate influence on the athletic program.

McAllister (1998) presented many strong arguments against commercialization of collegiate sports. His focus was primarily on the 1996 Tostitos Fiesta Bowl. McAllister (1998) viewed all benefits going to the sponsor, with the average college student receiving very little from the association. The author frowned upon the focus given to football programs, especially those who "siphon[ed] money from the university" (p. 277). McAllister's fear was that sponsorship would move from football to other collegiate sports with promotional characteristics. Increased ticket prices, limited ticket availability, overwhelming amounts of advertising and lack of integrity were some of the pitfalls mentioned by McAllister (1998).

Tulane president Scott Cowan wrote that the presidents of the University of Michigan and Ohio State University had refused to allow corporate sponsorship of their annual high-profile football game (Cowan, 2005). He agreed this was a bold decision by these officials and noted that presidents at institutions of higher learning should take a more active part in the decision when it comes to commercial endorsement of athletic departments; the public image of universities was too often hinged on the success and actions of its sports teams and the visibility of athletics over academics. Cowan (2005) also stated that the NCAA has created a new strategic goal that embodied the principals, values and goals required to maintain an emphasis on education. In response to its president's directive, Stanford University emptied its football stadium and basketball arena of corporate advertising (Ganeshananthan, 2000). It was a two-year process that removed about 50 corporate sponsors from visibility in its facilities. Ganeshananthan (2000) reported that small concessions would be allowed for university events and organizations (such as the ABC television network) that reported on events. Uniform sponsorships remained in place as they were considered to be less obtrusive and some teams would not have uniforms without that support (Ganeshananthan, 2000). Cutler (1999) believed that corporate sponsorships were a "necessary evil" for college athletics and that opponents must recognize that benefits associated with sponsorship programs far outweighed the negative influences.

It should be noted that the NCAA added State Farm Insurance as a corporate sponsor in 2005. NCAA representatives praised State Farm for its long-time support of intercollegiate athletics and academics (State Farm inks, 2005). State Farm representatives reported that the company supported education and athletics at 91 regional colleges and universities in addition to the newly signed national contract. The NCAA also has a corporate contract with Coca-Cola that was negotiated in 2002. PepsiCo was not able to extend their contract after Coca-Cola presented a proposal that included a full activation plan that presented ways to integrate multiple NCAA programs and work toward improving the overall association (Poole, 2002). PepsiCo attempted to match the investment dollars proposed by Coca-Cola, but the fully activated and integrated plan was the determining factor in the cola beverage-sponsor switch.

Pitts and Slattery (2004) examined "changes in sponsor awareness levels and purchase intent of season ticket holders over a period of time with repeated exposure to sponsor advertising" (p. 45). The study found that awareness of the sponsors did increase from the beginning of the season, but recognition of the actual sponsoring companies varied widely; the recognition for well-known public companies was significantly higher than that of local and lesser-known entities. Turco (1996) found that season-ticket holders to a collegiate basketball program improved their accuracy of sponsor recognition by 20% over the course of the season. Turco (1996) concluded that season-ticket holders' attitudes toward companies that financially support "their team" may be more positive.

Corporate naming rights are considered the "norm" in professional sports and have become popular in college settings. The next wave of corporate branding appears to be coming in the form of high schools (Molnar, 2002) and city buildings (Modeen, 2002). Throughout the country, hospitals, parks, libraries, performing arts centers, theaters, convention centers, fairgrounds, shopping malls, just about any structure that can hold a sign, are available for sponsorship for the right amount. Even the team itself can take on a corporate moniker. The New York Red Bulls were purchased and branded for more than $100 million. Bosman (2006) reported that the Green Bay Packers were named after the Indian Packing Company that gave Curly Lambeau $500 for the team to purchase uniforms and equipment. Anderson (2006) wrote that 1930s basketball teams carried sponsors names and in 2003 the NFL's Chicago Bears became "Bears football presented by BankOne" after a multi-million dollar deal was signed. Chris Smith of the Marketing Arm, a company that specializes in sports and events marketing, claimed that, eventually, the inventory of things to sell runs out and the team name is the only remaining item of value (Anderson, 2006). However, Smith did feel that sponsors understood the emotional attachment that fans have with the teams that they love, and that corporate encroachment into the naming of teams has a large potential for strong negative reactions, making the progression to corporately named teams one that will be slow and cautious.

Sponsorship Selling Process

The level of sponsorship that is undertaken can have an influence on the recognition of consumers (Cornwell et al., 2005). Sponsorships can take a variety of forms – title sponsor, presenting sponsor, in-kind sponsorship, and exclusivity agreements, along with sponsorships with and without special rights or privileges. Sponsorship can be classified by amount of money contributed and how strongly the advertiser and property are tied together (Mason & Cochetel, 2006). Title or anchor-level sponsorships command higher price tags and deliver high levels of visibility as well as integration within an event. Less expensive, lower-level sponsorships provide less visibility and require the sponsor to work harder at showing association between the brand and the event (Wakefield et al., 2007). Each type of sponsorship will provide different opportunities for businesses to put their message in front of a consumer, and each sponsorship will generate different reactions within each consumer. Corporations that are able to claim that they are suppliers to a property often gain the implied benefit that their product was selected over that of a competitor (Shanklin & Kuzma, 1992).

In most cases, there are limitations that restrict the complexity of messages that can be communicated by a sponsorship. Technical limits including size and duration of exposure usually mean that only brief messages will be effective and/or allowed by the entity being sponsored. Sponsorships in collegiate athletics may include: public address announcements, complimentary tickets, facility signage, souvenir program advertisements, ticket-back advertisements, coupon distribution, on-air broadcast mentions, booster club memberships and hospitality privileges (Cutler, 1999). Some universities use sponsorships to promote tail-gating activities, holiday tournaments, and even special practice sessions such as “Midnight Madness,” claimed Cutler (1999).

Lardinoit and Derbaix (2001) defined two forms of sponsorship. Field sponsorship, defined as “the placement of sponsored messages, usually involving a name or logo on sports equipment and billboards located around the arena” (p. 168). And, television sponsorships that included announcements outside the traditional commercial breaks “whereby an advertiser associates its name or trade name with a program or its promotion” (p. 169). Sponsor use of one or the other, or a combination of these sponsorships, leads to differing levels of recall and recognition. Alvarado (2007b) reviewed sponsorship combinations to determine whether integration within the sponsorship itself led to higher recall by consumers. She found that sponsors that had multiple elements of sponsorship were the most frequently recalled, but whether or not the elements were integrated within the sponsorship seemed to have no influence.

Sporting entities have a dual obligation in that they are responsible for producing a unique marketing platform with which to attract corporate sponsors, as well as an entertainment platform by which to attract viewers and consumers (Jowdy & McDonald, 2002; Thorne, Wright & Jones, 2001). Competition for sponsorship dollars is fierce with major professional sports leagues and large events leading the fray. For minor leagues, lesser events and collegiate sports to successfully compete, these smaller operations must focus on "building relationships and educating corporate partners on product/sponsorship attributes through 'eduselling'" (Jowdy & McDonald, 2002, p. 248). Without education, corporations were able to view sponsorships as business-to-business relationships rather than a form of relationship marketing (Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005).

Properties that failed to build strategic relationships often saw sponsorship in terms of short-term revenue generators and failed to see the purpose of cultivating relationships with their sponsors. Sponsors signing short-term contracts that were not renewed were found to be a fault of the property (Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005). Properties that behaved as if they were the customers bullied and seduced corporations into signing contracts that were tipped against the sponsor, foregoing any semblance of a partnership. Chadwick and Thwaites (2005) claimed that, under these circumstances, corporations were happy to sign short-term contracts and were just as happy to opt out of renewal when the time came. The authors also felt that absence of creativity and feelings of partnership have led to corporations approaching sponsorship as a series of short-term contracts rather than a long-term strategic communication vehicle worthy of leveraging and association with other marketing activities. Chadwick and Thwaites (2005) concluded that properties needed to "embrace the notions of marketing orientation, commitment, acquisition and retention, and generation of a long-term value of a sponsorship deal" (p. 337). Stotlar (1999) reported that some corporations considered minor leagues and collegiate sports to be more family friendly than their larger counterparts, leaving the door open for relationship building. Lachowetz, Sutton, McDonald, Warnick and Clark (2002) believed that it was to the benefit of sports organizations to establish a sales program that continually supported and educated a sponsor for the entirety of a contract.

Eduselling is a nine-step process that was developed as a framework to assist with retention of corporate customers (Sutton, Lachowetz & Clark, 2000). Lachowetz (2001) tested the concept on 29 National Basketball League teams and discovered that teams that took an interest in educating and assisting corporate partners had a high retention rate of those customers. He also found that strong relationships with corporate partners rendered sponsorship agreements less susceptible to the fluctuations of a team's on-court success.

The eduselling process is begun with targeting a prospect and progresses to an on-going partnership; ending the relationship should be a matter of mutual agreement only if one side or another had found that their needs are no longer complementary (Lachowetz, Sutton & McDonald, 2000). Continuing to work on the partnership helped preclude disappointment on both sides. Once a corporation had been made a partner, it was in the best interests of the property to continue to keep the partnership strong by regularly involving the sponsor in all aspects of the sponsorship execution and working closely to identify and avoid any problems or conflicts (Lachowetz et al., 2000).

Lachowetz (2001) described the nine steps of the eduselling process as follows: (1) identifying and targeting a prospect; (2) highlighting the benefits of the sponsorship association; (3) determining the best way to consummate the partnership; (4) allowing prospects to experience the product; (5) presenting a plan for sponsorship activation; (6) asking for the sale; (7) closing the sale; (8) maintaining after-market contact; and (9) evaluation and feedback. According to Sutton et al. (2000), the key to effective eduselling was recognizing the benefits to each potential sponsor and education on how it can best be achieved. Furthermore, Jowdy & McDonald (2002) recommended that sports properties focused on keeping the sponsor involved after the agreement had been signed. Regular reports on attendance, media exposures and additional leveraging opportunities let sponsors know that their business was important and their support was appreciated. These approaches may strengthen sponsor loyalty and lead to increased commitments in the future (Jowdy & McDonald, 2002).

Morgan (2006) stated that sponsorship was not a one-size-fits-all package and should not be an isolated marketing element. Successful sponsorship selection included purchasing or negotiating a package of premiums and benefits commensurate of the investment being tendered (Kuzma, Shanklin & McCally, 1992). Possible benefits associated with sports sponsorship packages included on-site signage, rights to use the property's logo, VIP parking and event passes, program advertisements, audio and video announcements, access to the facilities outside of regular event usage, as well as access to coaches and players. The list is seemingly endless and savvy businesses should be able to negotiate a package that specifically fits their marketing needs. Custom packaging is a benefit that should be made available to all sponsors. Rarely are two businesses going to have exactly the same marketing objectives and sporting organizations would be well-served in determining the needs of their corporate targets before presenting a proposal. Nardone and See (2007) recommended that negotiation time was when sponsors should set their objectives and their measurement programs. Early in the relationship, both parties could agree on the components and monitoring could be established; expectations on each side should be clearly documented.

Additionally, Miloch and Lambrecht (2006) suggested that sport organizations would benefit from providing suggestions for activation to potential sponsors. Enhanced public relations efforts, internal communications, hospitality tie-ins and traditional advertising were forms of activation mentioned by the authors. Activation tactics were especially important in grassroots and niche events where pre-existing signage had the potential to devalue sponsorship packages (Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006). Komoroski and Biemond (1996) wrote that many sport organizations assumed that sponsors attended or watched events, therefore conducting their own evaluations. Sending clients regular evaluations benefits both parties and may serve as a tool to justify the sponsorship relationship. The authors also stressed that documentation showing that each element of the sponsorship agreement has been carried out as described in the contract prevents allegations of breach of contract and, on a positive note, offers tangible evidence of sponsorship elements that are sometimes hard to visualize. Miloch and Lambrecht (2006) concurred, suggesting that properties go one step further and make recommendations in the year-end evaluation that includes ideas on how to improve and expand the partnership.

Furthermore, sports marketers must be aware of limitations and shortcomings that may be present in their environments (Berrett & Slack, 2001). Development and implementation of long-term plans to enhance the offerings of the sports property can go a long way to adding to the desirability of a sponsorship association. Developing additional media exposure or building participation bases were just two areas listed by Berrett and Slack as being ways to achieve long-term sponsor partnership successes. Gwinner and Swanson (2003) suggested that properties should develop fan profiles to enable sponsors to tailor their marketing efforts more effectively. Properties seeking corporate sponsorship should be able to provide potential sponsors with information about the "size and strength of the consumer base or target market that will be reached through that sponsorship relationship" (Lough & Irwin, 2001, p. 204). Bennett, Cunningham and Dees (2006) claimed that advertising campaigns that promoted an event were essential to both the success of the event and of the sponsors. For tennis fans, television was found by Bennett et al. (2006) to be the most effective communications medium for information about the event. Properties should be aware of the most efficient advertising vehicles with which to reach their fan bases. It has also been suggested that sport marketers concentrate less on quantity and more on quality; having fewer sponsors who spend more sponsorship dollars allows a property to serve its corporate partners in a better fashion (Cornwell et al., 2000; Scott, 2006).

Threats to Sponsorship Success

Clutter

Recognition suffers when consumers are overwhelmed by the clutter of sponsorship messages. The presence of a large number of sponsors or advertisers at an event resulted in promotional clutter that impaired the visibility of all sponsors and resulted in lowered awareness levels of consumers (Cornwell et al., 2000). Cornwell et al. (2000) believed that sponsorship clutter was a growing problem and that properties needed to ensure sufficient visibility for each corporate partner and assist with keeping competition from other supporters to a minimum. Findings of a SponsorClick study showed that sponsorship was indeed feeling the effects of clutter. If six or more brands were visible at an event, television viewers failed to recall any of the sponsors whatsoever (Reid, 2005).

Brands in a cluttered environment have to compete with each other for consumer's attention. Cornwell et al. (2000) predicted that sponsorship environments were likely to succumb to the same clutter problems that currently plague traditional advertising outlets if properties did not take control of the medium. Clutter in all areas has created confusion for consumers and a different brand within the same category may be confused for the actual advertiser. Additionally, Rosengran and Dahlen (2006) believed that the use of a slogan (as many sponsors use as a part of on-site signage) may be ineffective when viewed in a cluttered environment. Mismatched associations may be made when consumers are presented with slogans from highly competitive categories or new and unfamiliar brands.

Ambush Marketing

As sponsorships continue to build brand awareness and customers develop strong links with a brand and sponsored event, competitors will push the envelope to gain their own associations. McAuley and Sutton (1999) wrote that "official" sponsorships were undermined by creative use of athletes and teams that countered the corporate association. Ambush Marketing, as this technique has been called, is the practice of one company attempting to weaken or attack a competitor's paid association by confusing consumers as to who is the real sponsor. Crompton (2004a) believed that sponsorship ambushing first appeared at the 1984 Olympic Games, when Kodak sponsored the ABC broadcast of the Games and the U.S. track team. Kodak's aim was to undermine Fuji, a primary competitor and official sponsor of the Olympic Games. McAuley and Sutton (1999) claimed that ambush marketing has become an accepted consequence of sport sponsorship and Roberts (2006) found that 32% of surveyed sport sponsorship professionals would "definitely consider" using an ambush technique. Another 29% of the surveyed group answered "maybe" to the questions. According to McAuley and Sutton (1999), ambush marketing was legal under the parameters of advertising law and the value of current sponsorships was jeopardized by the practice. Johar, Pham and Wakefield (2006) claimed that ambush marketing was likely to be effective when there was high plausibility that the ambusher would be associated with the property.

McAuley and Sutton (1999) identified seven categories of ambush marketing. Some of the most frequently conducted ambush techniques included direct attempts at confusing the public about legitimate associations by using commercial time surrounding an event, and sponsoring a telecast, individual or team, rather than the entire contest or league. Additionally, contests or sweepstakes associated with a particular event were commonly conducted by competing companies that played name games with the actual events, using the term "The Big Game" rather than the Super Bowl, for example. Corporations are legally allowed to purchase tickets to an event and then use the name of the event when advertising the prize to be won. In fact, truth in advertising and consumer fraud laws may compel the usage of an event's proper name, encouraging corporations to play off an event's popularity rather than directly undermining a competitor (McAuley & Sutton, 1999).

Television advertising sponsorship is also a common method of undermining an event sponsorship. Additional advertising may be purchased on a market-by-market basis, circumventing any network contract that may offer exclusivity. Sponsoring an individual or team within the league or conference that is sponsored by a competing brand has become a common practice by national brands. Finally, on-site promotional events and advertising serve to undermine the strength of relationships between legitimate sponsors and the sponsored property. McAuley and Sutton (1999) reported that less frequently used ambush marketing strategies included marketing charitable donations to a competitor's cause and placing congratulatory advertisements recognizing event winners and/or organizers.

Planning to usurp a competitor's sponsorship is not always an economic savings over the full rights fee. Crompton (2004a) reported that prime-time advertising, promotional tie-ins and a well-planned effort were needed to create confusion in consumers' minds and weaken the position of an official sponsor. Such a performance typically comes at a significant cost to the ambushing corporation. Ambush strategies have become more complex and expensive, and it was unlikely that sponsors will ever be fully protected from ambushing, claimed Crompton (2004a). He wrote that a key to limiting the effectiveness of ambushing was to emphasize leveraging the sponsorship association and limiting the opportunities for competition to undermine a corporation's position. Johar et al. (2006) reported that sponsor misidentification can be lessened by "additional media exposure (leveraging) to the event-sponsor association" (p. 195).

Sponsorship Withdrawal

Many sponsorship agreements have been entered into when economic conditions for the sponsor were leaning in a positive direction. Naturally, when the economy takes a downturn, sponsors may choose to withdraw from sponsorship associations or decline to renew agreements (Mason & Cochetel, 2006). Sponsors that drop sponsorships are often still associated with events. Mason and Cochetel (2006) conducted a study to see whether consumers' opinions changed after sponsors withdrew. The researchers found that surfing enthusiasts maintained a high level of awareness after a competition sponsor had been absent for two years. Mason and Cochetel (2006) claimed that the residual awareness of the previous sponsor had negative effects on the awareness levels and benefits that the new sponsor should have been receiving. The authors suggested that both property and sponsor needed to be aware that replacing a long-time sponsor might require specific promotional activities for the new sponsor to gain recognition. Consumers did not seem to lose the values they had gained toward the initial sponsor; however, transferring event "ownership" to another title sponsor was a prospect that required more leveraging and frequent repetition. Mason and Cochetel (2006) reported that the image and values of the new sponsor did show some permutation throughout the event and that continued assimilation was expected over time.

Summary

Sponsorship should be considered as a growing element of a fully integrated marketing campaign. From the boss's favorite team to a highly scrutinized global brand-building association, sponsorship continues to be added to the sporting landscape. Sports marketers at all levels have come to view corporate sponsors as business partners and, as such, are striving to work together in an effort to build business for the sponsor and the sport.

The reviewed research has shown that establishing core objectives when selecting a sponsorship opportunity and fully integrating that sponsorship into the strategic plan of a corporation are the keys to a successful association. Methods of sponsorship evaluation have been based on many of the premises of traditional advertising measures and may not be truly representative of the outcomes obtained from a sponsorship. Additionally, the relationship that exists between a property and the businesses that participate in sponsorship of that property have not been clearly investigated.

Sponsorship is a wide-reaching marketing element for which collegiate sports are in competition with a wide variety of outlets that rely on sponsor-provided sources of revenue. "Eduselling" has been described as a method of marketing sponsorships to potential corporate partners. The eduselling process may be a viable method for collegiate programs to adopt, considering the complexity of their audiences and fan base. This process could allow properties to assist sponsors with ways to leverage and activate their sponsorship associations, enabling sponsors to get the most from their investments and properties to receive continued or increased support.

This study attempts to explore several of these areas, ranging from selection to evaluation. The ways that sponsors integrated sponsorship into existing marketing agendas, and the ways that a sponsorship was promoted outside of the associated activity are included in this investigation. Additionally, participants are asked how a property might work with them to enhance the sponsorship experience. Relationships between property and sponsors will be examined in an effort to determine if the tenets of agency theory do actually pervade the sponsorship association.

CHAPTER III

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The literature review reveals several gaps in sponsorship research exist. Suggestions on how to succeed in sponsorship endeavors have been explored by many, but use of these procedures at the collegiate level have not been thoroughly covered. Traditional marketing and advertising plans include methods of assessment; however, this area is often neglected in sponsorship negotiations. An actual definition of what a sponsorship is has not been clearly established outside of generalizations, and the sponsors themselves have not been asked to clarify their sponsorship associations.

According to Farrelly et al., (1997) and Hickman et al., (2005), integration of sponsorships into existing marketing plans was essential in ensuring that a sponsorship could be viewed as being successful. Additionally, taking advantage of opportunities to leverage sponsorships could be used in an effort to gain the most benefit from the positive associations that sporting consumers make between the sponsor and activity being sponsored; however, information on how sponsors achieve these goals has not been fully explored. Furthermore, the relationships between a property and its sponsors is one that can certainly be beneficial to both parties involved, although neither party has much control over how the other performs. The strength of the property/sponsor relationship is also an area that has not been explored.

Research Questions

Most published research does not explore sponsorship at a local or regional level; national and international sponsorship events and associations attract the bulk of research attention (Mack, 1999). Collegiate sponsorships may be entered into by businesses with a proximity to (Alvarado, 2007a), or affinity for, a particular institution. Additionally, Martin (n.d.) determined that the length of a commitment that a sponsorship agreement required could be a deciding factor in businesses' decisions to participate in sponsorship activities. To extend the research in these areas, evaluations were conducted using the market area in which a sponsor operated, as well as average length of sponsorship commitments that sponsors make, to determine the presence of distinguishing factors.

According to Sandler and Shani (1989) and Tripoldi (2001), definitions of sponsorship vary widely, and a clear understanding of the concept has not been established. With this in mind, the initial driving questions were as follows:

RQ1: How is sponsorship defined by the sponsoring organization?

RQ2: What elements do sponsors feel are most often included in sponsorship?

Quester and Thompson (2001) discovered that motivating factors ranged from image enhancement and product promotion to community support and use as an alternative to conventional advertising. Because of the variety of reasons given for sponsorship participation, another main question guided this study as follows:

RQ3: What motivations led to signing a sponsorship agreement?

Answers to these initial questions allow a definition and list of objectives for the sponsorship to be established. As reported earlier, Irwin and Asimakopoulos (1992) and Wilkinson (1993) wrote that establishing objectives was key to being able to assess the success or failure of a sponsorship. This leads to the following research question:

RQ4: What methods of assessment are used?

Quester and Thompson (2001) discovered that a company that was willing to engage in promotional activities over and above the sponsorship investment was able to achieve the objectives established for their association. Other companies that were less aggressive garnered awareness but failed to reach the levels of the sponsor that maximized its association. Activation of the sponsorship or personal involvement between sponsor and attendees has also been proposed as a method of endearing the audience to a sponsor. As Miloch and Lambrecht (2006) reported, recognition of sponsors that activated their sponsorships was more than double that of those who elected to forego this activity. With these results in mind, the following research question guided the research:

RQ5: What methods of sponsorship leveraging or activation are used?

Copeland et al. (1996) conducted a study of Canadian corporate sporting sponsors using in-depth interviews. The authors developed a profile of sponsors investing in excess of $50,000 Cdn annually. In an effort to compare some of the previous study's findings to this population, the following research questions were investigated:

RQ6: In what types of sponsorship does the company currently participate?

RQ7: How involved is the company with its sports sponsorships?

RQ8: Under what conditions are sponsorship agreements terminated?

As the importance of sponsorships has becomes more apparent, relationship development between property and sponsor is needed to sustain the partnership. Agency theory professed that the agent/property relationship was a tenuous one in which neither party has total control (O'Reilly & Madill, 2007). In an effort to examine several aspects of this theory and establish the importance of the connection between sponsor and property, the following question guided the research:

RQ9: Following agency theory, does each sponsorship consist of a unique composition of elements?

Eduselling is the concept, developed by Lachowetz and colleagues (2000; 2001; 2002), of a property taking the time and effort to make sponsorship part of a strategic relationship that results in high retention levels for the property but also provides benefits to its supporters. The idea was for a partnership to be formed and the property to educate sponsors on ways to remain actively involved in the sponsorship process, which in turn strengthened sponsor loyalty and made the sponsorship itself more successful. The first step of the eduselling process involves selecting sponsors that are open to the prospect of becoming a partner rather than just an isolated supporter. In an effort to determine if current sponsors would be open to this type of process, the final research question investigated:

RQ10: Do sponsors desire to have a close relationship with property representatives?

Hypotheses

O'Reilly and Madill (2007) applied the framework of agency theory to sports sponsorship based on the supposition that neither the sponsor nor the property had complete control over the association but that there was an inferred agreement that both sides would perform successfully. However, Roberts (2006) reported that sponsorship, for many sophisticated corporations, had developed into a brand awareness activity that was incorporated into long-term plans and monitored to ensure that the association continued to meet a company's objectives. As a combination of these two points of view, the first hypothesis was extended:

H1: There will be a difference, based on the proximity of the businesses' marketing area to the university, in the feeling of responsibility for contract fulfillment.

The research questions explored how and what sponsors think about their sponsorship investments. The remaining hypotheses address relationships between these variables:

H2: Sponsors that spend money to leverage or activate their sponsorships will claim to benefit from the sponsoring relationship more than sponsors that do not.

H3: The level of integration of sponsorship into a marketing plan will be lower for sponsors that conduct business exclusively within close proximity to the university than those with a wider area of commerce.

H4: Businesses that believe evaluation is important are likely to increase sponsorship spending.

CHAPTER IV

Method

Patton (1999) noted that qualitative and quantitative data could be combined to clarify complementary aspects of the same situation. This dissertation combined qualitative and quantitative research methods in an effort to fully answer research questions and test hypotheses about collegiate sports sponsorship. Leedy and Ormrod (2005) provided a simple distinction between quantitative and qualitative research methods: quantitative methods are applied to establish relationships and confirm theories; qualitative methods are applied to "seek a better understanding of complex situations" (p. 95). Meenaghan (1999) lamented the structured surveying of corporations engaged in sponsorship activities. His suggestion that a less-structured qualitative approach be used to fully explore the decision-making process in sponsorship is one that has been embraced in this study. In-depth interviews were used to add insight to findings generated from quantitative method.

Location

The university where this study took place is located in an isolated region compared to other cities in its NCAA conference (Gustafson, 2005). In many states, this city would be one of the more populous, but it is not one of the "major" cities in its state. The location is unique in that, unlike many other towns that are home to colleges and universities, the student population accounts for only about 10% of the city's inhabitants. Sponsors, therefore, reach a large portion of the general population with their messages, and students are not the primary audience where sponsorships are observable (Gustafson, 2005).

At the time of this study, the university's athletic marketing department reported that 207 businesses were sponsors of sports programs. Four major sporting facilities are located on campus; tennis and softball facilities are a short distance away. Basketball and volleyball was previously played in a facility that was owned by the city; however, a new facility, supported by a large corporate contribution, was constructed in the late 1990s. The football stadium was recently renovated with a new bank of club suites and media boxes being added. Furthermore, it has been estimated that the athletic department contributes $5-7 million each weekend to the local economy via revenue from home sporting events (Montalvo, 2008).

Combined Investigations

Combining qualitative and quantitative data can prove to be synergistic. However, according to Patton (1999), procedures for using the two together were still beginning to emerge. Connidis (1983) stated that the combined-method approach has generally been accepted in the field of sociological research, and Devers and Frankel (2000) wrote that combining qualitative and quantitative information was becoming popular in health care research. A delicate balance of disciplined and creative interpretation can yield a result that is more balanced than what can be achieved by using either method alone (Patton, 1999). Furthermore, Eisenhardt (1989) claimed that qualitative evidence could provide understanding of complex relationships and suggest the development of theory, and quantitative evidence could corroborate the findings and provide a check to ensure that the researcher's interpretations are correct.

According to Patton (1999), a "qualitative researcher has an obligation to be methodical in reporting sufficient details of data collection and the process of analysis to permit others to judge the quality of the resulting product" (p. 1191). Additionally, because the researcher is the instrument through which the information will be gathered, it is important for the report to contain information about the researcher, including any knowledge, training or expertise he or she may have that contributes to the research study. In this instance, the researcher has been involved in the advertising industry on both the buying and selling sides of the marketing media process. The researcher has had the opportunity to review, purchase and reject a variety of sports sponsorship opportunities as part of her professional career. She was familiar with the terminology and should have credibility with interviewees based on her shared understanding of their profession. For some, this may present an issue of bias or predisposition; however, Patton (1999) claimed that a certain amount of familiarity was required to be able to generate insight and understand the connotations of the information presented.

The conflict between qualitative and quantitative research methods has been rooted in the long-standing debate over how best to study and understand the world (Patton, 1999). Kuhn (1970) argued that quantitative findings were preferable to qualitative ones and that the predictive qualities of quantitative data were deeply valued. Patton (1999) countered by arguing that the age-old bias of hard data versus soft data was diminishing and that scientists should be able to recognize that there were situations that leant themselves to qualitative methods. For some researchers, numbers are seen as being precise and accurate, even when the measurements used to gather the information may have been unreliable or invalid. Qualitative research is not anti-numbers; it is about the philosophical belief that includes naturalistic inquiry, inductive analysis and holistic thinking. Patton (1999) advocated the combining of multiple research methods in an effort to use the strengths of each in a dual approach to research and evaluation.

Procedures

Selecting appropriate cases for a multiple-case design is not usually based on statistical representation of the population but instead is based on selecting cases with known features or characteristics that enable the researcher to undertake detailed exploration of the phenomenon being studied (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). The number of cases selected is influenced by a multitude of factors, and there is no precise guide to the number of cases required (Perry, 1998). This type of sampling is termed as purposive sampling (Patton, 1987). Many approaches can be used for purposive sampling, but the general premise is that the sample is "information rich" and provides the greatest insight into the research questions (Devers & Frankel, 2000). In this dissertation, the selection of three interview subjects was made after consultation with the athletic marketing department and discussion about which sponsors could provide the greatest amount of information on the subject of sports sponsorship. Quester and Thompson (2001) used a similar number of interview subjects; the selection of subjects was based on the differences in each company's approach to a sponsorship situation. Additionally, the selected corporations had been identified by consumers as being sponsors of the athletic program in a previous study (Alvarado, 2006). Previous research studies (see for example: Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005; Evans, James & Tomes, 1996; Farrelly & Quester, 2003; and, Quester & Thompson, 2001) have employed similar techniques.

Data Collection – Interviews

The athletic marketing department provided contact information for the selected interview subjects. The suggested contact person was telephoned and a script used as a guide to ensure the same information was provided to each contact (see Appendix A). The general format for the script included an introduction, an invitation to participate, an overview of the requirements of participation, information regarding anonymity, contact information for further questions and an outline of the expected benefits from participating. When it was not possible to meet the participant personally, a suitable time for a telephone interview was arranged. Each participant was forwarded a consent form and basic interview questions prior to participating in the interview (see Appendix B and Appendix C, respectively). The consent form reiterated the purpose of the study, outlined the expectations of participating, noted the obligations of the researcher in regard to data confidentially, provided contact information, stated that participation was voluntary and requested that the interview be audio taped. Prior to the start of each interview, the researcher ensured the participant had approved and signed the consent form. All interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed by the researcher. Each interview lasted for an average of 43 minutes, the shortest was 32 minutes and the longest was 57 minutes. The interviews were conducted on weekday mornings during the month of May.

Based on the assurance that no company or individual would be identified by name, the corporations involved have been referred to by an alphabetical designation throughout the results chapter. Company A was a telecommunications corporation that operated at an international level, both with sponsorship and business activities. The interview was conducted with representatives who are charged with monitoring sponsorship programs throughout the southwestern United States. The company viewed sponsorship as a way to gain media exposure and maintain top-of-mind-awareness levels with consumers. Company A claimed that sponsorship was “a form of advertising that involved consumer engagement…. something we can’t get with other forms of advertising.”

Company B was an insurance corporation that participated in sponsorship at a variety of levels: local, region, state, and national. The interview was conducted with a person in charge of sponsorship contracts on a statewide level. Company B used sponsorship as a way to gather information from consumers. Regulation of the insurance industry does not allow for many differences in rates for certain services, so this company sought to produce positive associations with the corporate name to influence buying decisions. The company used sport sponsorship as a way to connect with women, the primary decision makers of insurance purchases. The insurance company had discovered that “women are the ones who take the time to fill out surveys and answer questions… they are there with the men and we can take advantage of that.” The company used this information to purchase marketing opportunities that positioned it to be able to collect information from people in attendance.

Company C was a regional supermarket chain that is headquartered in the city being researched. The interview was conducted with the marketing manager of the organization. This company was in the middle of a contract that had been signed many years previously. A company leader who was interested in making a contribution to the university that would benefit the community signed the contract. At the time of the agreement, the company was not seeking recognition for the support that was provided.

Changes in leadership have led the current administration to regret that decision. The marketing manager stated that some changes had been made although more consideration would need to be given before an investment of that magnitude was made again.

Analysis – Interviews

An analysis of the findings in this study was done through the detection of themes and commonalities visible in the transcribed interviews. Reviewed literature and personal experience allowed the researcher to identify commonly reported information about sports sponsorship, as well as recognize items that had yet to be fully explored. The resulting information was used to clarify sponsors' positions with regard to sponsorship activities and open areas of discussion for future research. Information gained from the interview process is presented at the beginning of applicable research questions and hypotheses.

Data Collection – Surveys

The second phase of data collection depended on a survey methodology. A total of 207 businesses comprised the sponsoring organizations of the university's athletic program, accounting for every sport except one. This activity is not necessarily unique from the other sports and did not provide sponsor information. Removing the three sponsors that participated in the interview process left 204 sponsors to be contacted for participation in a survey. The survey was developed by using a selection of questions that have been asked by IEG on its annual sponsorship survey. Additionally, questions used in studies conducted by Copeland et al. (1996), Irwin and Asimakopoulos (1992) Miloch and Lambrech (2006), Quester and Thompson (2001), Sandler and Shani (1989), and Tripoldi (2001), as well as questions that would allow categories to be established for analyses were included in the survey instrument. Prior to dissemination, committee members, athletic department personnel and two business owners who were not sponsors of the athletic program, but participated in sponsorship of other events, reviewed the questionnaire. The questionnaire was found to be rather long but easily understood by those who viewed the instrument.

The survey was conducted on-line for those with e-mail addresses (153 sponsors) and on paper for sponsors (51 sponsors) who only had mailing addresses on record (Appendices G and I). As suggested by Smee and Brennan (2000), a hyperlink in the e-mail opened to a web-based questionnaire. The cited authors' study found this to be the most efficient way to encourage participation in instances where the questionnaire is long or demands written responses, as was the case in this dissertation. Paper questionnaires were mailed with a personally signed cover letter that included the aforementioned trademarked logo, along with the web-address for any respondents that preferred to respond electronically. The combination of e-mail and postal survey constituted a census of sponsors of this athletic program.

Sponsors who were not interviewed in the qualitative research process (204 sponsors) were mailed a postcard that was developed by a professional designer (Appendix D) notifying them of upcoming contact with regards to the survey. The front of the postcard displayed student-athletes with a mixture of race and gender. The use of a professional-looking postcard featuring a mix of athletes and sports was intended to convey the credibility and importance of the study, as well as highlight the fact that there are many sports available for sponsorship at the university, and all of them are worthy of attention. The back included a message letting sponsors know that the athletic department appreciated their support and that they would be receiving an invitation to participate in a survey about their sponsorship. Each postcard included an athletic logo and was hand addressed to the person believed to be in charge of sponsorship at each business. Additionally, individual postage stamps were used instead of pre-printed indicia or automated postage processes. Kaplowitz, Hadlock, and Levine (2004) concluded that a postcard notifying respondents they would be receiving an e-mail invitation to participate in a survey was the most cost-effective method of generating a satisfactory response rate. Other methods shown to increase response rates in include personalization, identification of a sponsoring organization and incentives (Sheehan, & McMillan, 1999). Incentives were not able to be offered for this study; however, the participation of the athletic department was shown through the usage of a trademarked logo and inclusion of the departments name in the return address. The cards were mailed on a Saturday with the anticipation of a Tuesday delivery. Six postcards were returned for incorrect addresses. The addresses were corrected and additional cards were mailed.

The following Wednesday, businesses that did not have e-mail addresses ($N = 51$) were sent hard copies of the questionnaire. Each envelope was hand addressed and included postage stamps. A cover letter accompanied the questionnaire and included instructions for completing the study using the Internet. A postage-paid envelope was included for the return of the completed questionnaire. A total of eight postal mail questionnaires were completed and returned; an impartial third party entered the results into the web-based survey, allowing for all data to be in the same format. Data entry by a third party prevented inadvertent, and early, interpretations to be made and allowed responses to be viewed collectively once the data collection period ended.

On the Thursday after the postcards were mailed, businesses with e-mail addresses were sent an e-mail invitation to participate in the study. The message included a hyperlink that would take each participant to a web-based survey. Eight messages were returned; two were "out of office" responses, the other six were for incorrect addresses. Phone calls were made to respondents with incorrect e-mail addresses letting the individuals know that the information on file was not current. The prospects were reminded about the postcard that had been mailed and asked if they would be willing to provide a valid e-mail address and agree to complete the survey. One business owner declined, saying that this was the first year of his business participating in sponsorships with the university's athletic program and that he had not had an opportunity to evaluate the performance. The businesses that provided corrected e-mail addresses were resent the e-mail invitation to participate.

Ten days after the study had been opened for responses, a follow-up postcard (Appendix J) thanked sponsors for their participation and encouraged survey completion if they had not already done so. The postcard was similar to the original but included a time-sensitive message on the front reminding prospective participants that a response was requested. The copy on the reverse of the card reminded sponsors that information provided could be used to improve the program and gave the web address for electronic participation. Approximately one week later (16 days after the original e-mail invitation), a reminder e-mail message was sent to prospective participants, acknowledging that their time was valuable but requesting that they take the time to participate in the study. Return messages were received from four sponsors noting that they had completed the questionnaire. Each sponsor was personally thanked by a follow-up e-mail. Every effort was made to garner the highest response rate possible.

By the end of July, 64 questionnaires had been received, 38 of which were fully completed. In an effort to increase the number of complete applications, further contact was made by phone approximately six weeks after the initial mailings. Sponsors who only were on file with a postal mail address and who had not responded, were telephoned and asked if they would be willing to participate in the web-based study. E-mail addresses were collected and a personalized e-mail message with a hyperlink to the survey web site was sent. Three incomplete questionnaire respondents could be identified based on their responses to open-ended questions. These sponsors were contacted by phone, thanked for their attempt and asked if they would be willing to return to the website and fully complete the questionnaire. E-mail addresses were confirmed and a thank you message, including a hyperlink, was sent. Sponsors who, by the nature of their businesses, could be identified as having not completed the survey were also contacted by phone. Additionally, a final attempt was made by e-mail, reminding sponsors of the importance of their association with the university and the importance of survey completion to the researcher. These final solicitations generated 47 additional responses, 29 of which were fully completed questionnaires. The final count was 111, with 67 fully completed and 44 at various stages of completion.

All responses have been included in analyses. However, because of the time differences that occurred between solicitations, comparisons were made to ensure that answers were not affected. Appendices K.1 and K.2 identify the variables that were found to be affected. Analyses of research questions and hypotheses tests were conducted on an individual basis for these elements. Results have been reported with acknowledgement of the time delay.

Analysis - Surveys

Data from the web-based survey was downloaded into SPSS for evaluation. Collected information was housed on a university server prior to being exported to Excel. A visual evaluation for discrepancies was conducted while the file was in an Excel format. It was then converted to SPSS 16.0 For Mac for analyses. Analyses were conducted with the most robust statistics available for use with this data set; however, the relatively small sample did not always allow for the most stringent statistically analyses. When examining relationships between categorical data containing expected cell counts of less than five, a Cramer's V statistic was used to adjust the chi square significance by factoring out sample size. The V determines associations between variables base on possible variations. The strength of the association is presented from 0 to 1, with 1.0 representing the strongest association. Explanations of findings are presented in the results chapter. Quantitative results are preceded by interview testimony where appropriate.

Measures

As is standard in quantitative research, concepts must be defined and measures operationalised so that they may be observed. Devers (1999) described this element of quantitative research to be an absorbing and pre-occupying process that ideally should occur before gathering data. Patton (1999) wrote that definitions and measurements in qualitative research are sometimes developed during the data-collection process. Many of the concepts that were explored through this study have been debated and articulated in previous research and are overviewed here. However, in light of the combined methods being used for this research, as noted by Patton (1999), leeway needs to be given for adaptation and clarification of the study's measures should they arise during the qualitative portion of the study. Anomalies developing during the research process provide a fertile ground for future research and such consequences will be covered in a later chapter.

Independent Variables.

Independent measures for this study included the type, size and location of sponsoring businesses. Respondents were asked what industry the business was in, and if business was conducted on a local, regional or national level (Copeland et al., 1996; Keshock, 2004; Mack, 1999; Wherley, 2003). The variety of industries involved in sports sponsorships at this university did not allow for categorization in this instance. This dissertation was focused on the athletic program of one university and was limited to narrower categorizations. Generalizations by industry would require a sample of multiple properties.

Sports sponsorships are purchased by many businesses, large and small. Some of these commitments are long term, and some are one-shot doses of support. Market area or scope of business activity and length of commitment were selected to serve as independent variables. These categories could be divided to allow for reasonable analyses, even though the number of subjects was limited.

To what extent respondents conducted business was originally asked at a four-category level – local, regional, national and international. National and international responses were subsequently combined. When considering only fully completed responses, the variable presented with the following business designations: 16 (23.9%) local, 26 (38.8%) regional and 25 (37.3%) national/international.

Length of commitment was determined by asking respondents to select an average length of time for sponsorship participation. Choices were: one season at a time, one year at a time, more than one year, but less than three, more than three years, but less than five, and more than five years at a time. This variable was reduced to three levels – less than one year, one year, and more than one year. Of completed responses, 27 claimed (40.9%) average commitments of less than one year, 21 (31.8%) one-year commitments, and 18 (27.3%) commitments averaging more than one year.

Dependent Variables.

Some dependent measures were established through the use of questions asking for ratings from 0-10, anchored with not at all important and very important, or not at all valuable and very valuable; others were open-ended to allow for expanded answers, which were then coded based on similarities. General questions about sponsorship were asked in the beginning of the survey, with questions more specific to the athletic program being asked toward the end.

Definitions

Sponsorship definition was established through an open-ended question asking respondents to offer a short explanation in their own words. One area found to be lacking in reviewed research was the opportunity for sponsors to define the parameters of this marketing element. Likewise, the components that made up the elements of sponsorship were asked using an open-ended format. These items were coded based on definitions given in previous research (see Meenaghan, 1991; Tripoldi, 2001) and a list of elements from the athletic marketing department that could be included in sponsorship packages.

Motivations

Quester and Thompson (2001) conducted in-depth interviews with sponsors and discovered that motivation factors behind sponsorship investment included: enhancement of corporate image, increased awareness of product/service in target markets, presentation of a strong corporate presence, creating a public perception of "giving something back," presentation of an image as a strong competitor, enhancement of trust among consumers, promotion of practical aspects of a product, positioning or repositioning in relation to corporate competitors, and product promotion that differs from conventional setting. Marshall and Cook (1992) included requests from organizations or individuals, benevolence, and the ability to cross the spectrum of media activities as reasons for entering into sponsorships. Other motivations for entering sponsorship agreements may be determined by the benefits received from the association with a property, such as potential media coverage, hospitality opportunities, access to a particular audience and creating a link between the brand and the property in the minds of consumers (Marshall & Cook, 1992). Motivations for sponsorship involvement were assessed through the use of a series of statements derived from the aforementioned reports of reasons for sponsorship participation. Respondents were asked to evaluate these statements on a scale of 0-10 (see Appendices G and I, questions 8, 9 and 21); anchored with totally agree/totally disagree and very important/not at all important (IEG, 2003-4; Marshall and Cook, 1992; Quester and Thompson, 2001; Wherley, 2003).

Evaluation and/or Assessment

A variety of methods of assessment are available to evaluate sponsorship success (see for example: Gardner & Shuman, 1987; Meenaghan, 1991; and Quester, 1997). Sponsors were asked to indicate if their businesses used a series of assessment methods. Positive responses were totaled to form a single "assessment" variable, ranging in value from zero to nine. The new variable was generated from the following selections: customer awareness, media exposure, dealer/trade feedback, attendance at event, match with target market, involvement off the field, improved corporate image, market share, branding and sales figures.

Sponsors who do elect to, and budget to, conduct evaluation of sponsorship effectiveness have a variety of methods from which to choose. Sales comparisons, consumer surveys of recall, recognition and purchase intention, and media exposure were reported to be the most popular methods of evaluation by Marshall and Cook (1992). Whether or not respondents evaluated the effectiveness of sponsorship was measured by the responses that were given to a list that consisted of the above-mentioned scenarios. An open "other" category was included to ensure that all options had been considered. Additionally, respondents were asked whether or not their sponsorship agreements meet company objectives, requiring answers on a 0-10 scale, anchored by totally agree/totally disagree.

Activation and Leveraging

Sponsorship leveraging and activation are terms that have been used interchangeably by some researchers and industry professionals. Contrary to common usage, each activity seems to consist of different, although related, activities. Leveraging activities are designed to create awareness of the sponsorship partnership; activation is designed to allow consumers to make the association through experiencing or through contact of the connection. For the purpose of this study, the activities were not divided.

Nardone and See (2007) noted activation activities that included mentioning the sponsorship on packaging and in traditional advertising messages, as well as promoting the association at the event. Thwaites (1995) discovered eight popular leveraging activities in his study of an English football league. These leveraging activities were: signs and banners (other than those directly associated with the sponsorship), hospitality, public relations, advertising the sponsorship, competitions, point-of-sale promotions, advertising the event, and direct mail.

Leveraging and activation are concepts that, theoretically, can add value to a sponsorship. Respondents were asked to indicate how often they made an investment to promote their sponsorship of the athletic program outside of the university's events. The responses of never, sometimes and always were viable for analyses. A list of marketing communication channels that could be used in addition to contracted sponsorship activities was compiled for further comparisons. Responses of "yes" to using public relations, internal communications, traditional advertising, hospitality, direct marketing, Internet tie-ins, business to business communication and on-site sampling were coded as a one. Positive responses were added together resulting in a composite leveraging/activation variable for each business. This variable was considered to be a determinant of the strength of the relationship between activities outside of the sponsored venue and perceived success of the sponsorship association. The value of this composite score ranged from one to seven.

Integration

Farrelly et al. (1997) measured the level of integration according to the order of importance given to related factors such as how much the sponsorship fit with the corporate plan or contributed to the corporate image. Active support of sports sponsorship through other forms of marketing communication (advertising, public relations, consumer, trade and sales promotions, direct marketing) were considered by Copeland et al. (1996) to be integration of sponsorships. Any way that the sponsorship is tied in to other marketing activities has been classified as *integration* and can be assessed using the same measures used for activation and leveraging as well as responses to statements about how the sponsorship "fits" with corporate plans and matches with the company's image (Farrelly et al., 1997).

Levels of Sponsorship

In their annual sponsorship survey, IEG (2004; 2005) assessed the extent to which businesses participated in sponsorship activities. Employee interaction with sponsorship activities and type of support given to sport properties can offer insight into the strength of the association between a sponsor and the sponsored property. In an effort to discover more information on how support was provided, respondents were asked to identify the types of sports sponsorships participated in, what type of support was offered and average length of sponsorship contracts signed. To gauge the current climate for sponsorship in the surveyed area, respondents were asked to estimate how their support has changed over the previous few years, as well as if changes were expected in the future.

Sponsor/Property Relationships

The eduselling process, as established by Lachowetz and colleagues (2000; 2001; 2002), centers on developing a relationship between a property and its sponsors. In contrast, agency theory is based on the premise that neither party has any control over the performance of the other. To understand how these concepts relate in a collegiate athletic sponsorship setting, respondents were asked to respond to statements about fairness and equitability of the association (Copeland et al., 1996), outsourcing of sponsorship marketing (Waddell, 1998) and fulfillment of written and unwritten elements of sponsorship contracts (O'Reilly & Madill, 2007).

Reliability and Validity

The measures in this dissertation have been established in previous research and used in multiple studies. The survey instrument contained questions that have been posed to sponsors in multiple situations in the past. The interviews were conducted with persons that were in control of sponsorship decision-making and/or controlled content in some fashion. A pilot test would have been an optimal way to ensure that the instrument was appropriate, however, an audience such as the one used in this dissertation would be difficult to secure.

Description of Sample

Three sponsors participated in in-depth interviews; the remaining 204 participants were recruited for a web-based survey through a combination of postal-mail, e-mail and telephone contact. Fully completed questionnaires (*n* = 67) accounted for 60.4% of the responses; a completion rate of 32.8%. The overall response rate, 111 responses out of a possible 204 sponsors, was 54.4%. According to Heerwegh, Vanhove, Matthijs and

Loosveldt (2005), this response rate is within expected parameters. Some participants delayed providing and/or completing the questionnaire, creating a time difference of about six weeks between groups of respondents. Due to the possibility of differences based on the two different time periods, comparison-of-means tests were used to determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between the two groups of respondents based upon survey participation time. Overall, there were only statistically significant differences for 17 of the 157 variables. These differences, for just 10 percent of the variables, are found in Tables K.1 and K.2, in the appendix.

CHAPTER V

Results

This chapter provides information related to answers to the research questions and the statistical tests for each hypothesis. Overall these findings were based on personal interviews and a web-based survey. Information was gathered in different waves between May and September of 2008. All sponsors for an athletic program at a large, public, southwestern university were considered as the population for this study. A census of the 207 sponsors was used to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses.

Description of the Sample

Interview Participants.

As presented earlier, sponsors that participated in the interview process were selected under advisement of the athletic department and varied by industry, organizational structure and involvement with sponsorship of the athletic program. A total of three businesses participated in the interview process. These businesses are referred to with an alphabetical designation throughout the remainder of this dissertation.

Survey Participants.

A total of 111 responses were received from 204 sponsors, 67 questionnaires were fully completed. Of total respondents, the majority (44.1%, n = 49) reported their business operated on a regional basis, defined as doing business within (city) and the surrounding communities; national businesses made up the second largest group of respondents (27.0%, n = 30), defined as doing businesses with customers all over the United States. Local businesses made up the next group (19.8%, n = 22), defined as businesses that only do business in the immediate (city) area. The remainder (9.0%, n = 10) considered their businesses to be international, doing business around the world.

Some sponsors had prominent marketing communications campaigns that would make the business recognizable to sporting event attendees; others were low-key and were not highly visible in the community. Supporters represented a variety of industries and respondents were asked to categorize the industry in which they operated. The table (Table 1) below details the industry and area of operations reported by respondents.

Table 1.
Industry List and Marketing Area of Athletic Program Sponsors

	Marketing Area				
	Local	Regional	National	International	Total
Industry					
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	5	6	3	0	14
Food & Beverage	8	7	5	1	21
Automotive & Related Services	3	6	3	1	13
Media & Information Services	1	10	9	1	21
Medical & Health Services	0	9	0	1	10
Apparel & Fashion	1	1	3	0	5
Retail Sales	2	0	0	1	3
Entertainment & Travel	2	1	4	0	7
Printing Services	0	3	0	1	4
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	5	2	1	8
Miscellaneous*	0	1	1	3	5

Note: *Businesses in this category recorded only one response per industry.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: Sponsorship Definition

The first research question sought to gain information on how sponsors defined sponsorship. Respondents were asked, “In your own words, please offer a definition of sports sponsorship.” Some sponsors used the space to explain about the association their companies’ had with the athletic program, but the majority (n = 69) offered definitions that centered on common themes and could be coded into five specific categories. Common threads that were present in the written descriptions and made sense for the research study determined categories.

Descriptive Analysis.

From the definitions provided by respondents, making a donation, be it monetary or of goods and services, was the most often included description of sponsorship (26.4%, n = 19), examples included: “time, equipment and supplies donated at no charge or the donor’s cost; provide financial incentives or donations to provide enhanced student experience while at (university); helping the team with either a financial or in-kind donation.” Being able to tap into the audience or be associated with the university and athletic program was reported by 15 (20.8%) sponsors as was recognition that sponsorship was a two-way transaction or that some form of exchange or partnership was involved in the sponsorship process. Examples of these statements included: “to have your name in front of sporting events; the ability to expose and reinforce your company’s name and product to as many potential qualified buyers as possible; a monetary or material payment or donation in exchange for advertising or pr recognition; supporting a sports team to increase the visibility of the product or service you are offering.”

Advertising (16.7%, $n = 12$) and providing support for the university and athletic program (15.3%, $n = 11$) were the fourth and fifth most common definition categories that sponsors mentioned. Some examples from the advertising category consisted of: "Advertising (including TV, radio, print) for all major sports at (university); sports sponsorship with media elements; we support the athletic department through advertising and showing our willingness to be a corporate sponsor." The category of providing support for the university and athletic program included the following examples: "supporting student athletes and the values reflected in athletic competition; support of a sports event or team; support of education and active lifestyles." Additionally, four respondents mentioned advertising as being a secondary element of a sponsorship definition.

Statistical Analysis.

Effect of market area and length of commitment

Analysis of definitions provided by sponsors showed that responses were not affected by the area in which business was conducted, *Cramer's* $V(72) = .22$, $p > .05$. When comparing sponsors making different length commitments, the provided definitions were found to have been influenced by the term of commitment (*Cramer's* $V(72) = .38$, $p < .05$); a moderate strength relationship was revealed. Of respondents citing donation as a definition of sponsorship, 71.4% ($n = 10$) made short term commitments, i.e. less than one year. Sponsors citing advertising as a sponsorship definition were evenly spread throughout the levels of commitment. Of sponsors reporting an exchange or partnership as a definition, 60.0% ($n = 9$) reported average lengths of commitment as being for one year. Definitions as given by market area and commitment level have been displayed in Table 2.

Table 2.

Respondents' definitions by market area and length of commitment

	Market Area		
Definition	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Donation	3	8	8
Advertising	5	4	3
Connect/Associate	4	4	7
Support	2	7	2
Exchange/Partner	3	6	6
	Length of Commitment		
	< One Year	One Year	> One Year
Donation	10	2	2
Advertising	4	4	4
Connect/Associate	6	1	7
Support	3	4	1
Exchange/Partner	4	9	2

Cramer's $V(72) = 0.22$, $p > .05$, Market Area.
Cramer's $V(72) = 0.38$, $p < .05$, Length of Commitment.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: Elements of Sponsorship

The second research question sought an explanation of the elements that sponsors thought should be included with each sponsorship package. An open-ended question asked, "What elements do you believe are, or should be, part of a sponsorship agreement?" Respondents (*n* = 65) reported a total of 13 different elements that were expected in a sponsorship agreement. These elements were grouped according to known sponsorship elements that had been provided by the athletic department as well as items that were specifically mentioned by respondents as something that should be included in a sponsorship agreement. Further investigation into the elements used in sponsorship was conducted through the use of a list of elements from which respondents selected the items that applied in their particular situations.

Descriptive Analysis.

Open-ended question

The most frequently mentioned element of sponsorship was various forms of advertising components (*n* = 21, 18.9%). This category included some of the following examples: "banners, announcements, big screen tags; logo visual, name mentions; in-game promotions, radio/TV spots, name/logo visibility during and on-site." Someway for the sponsor to be identified and/or acknowledged by the athletic program was the next most frequently mentioned element with 17 (15.3%) respondent mentions, such as: "name recognition; recognition of sponsoring party; mention of sponsor." Having clear instructions for both parties was mentioned by 15 (13.5%) sponsors; tickets and/or parking privileges were mentioned 13 (11.7%) times. Examples of comments included in these categories were: "clear understanding of what is expected from each party; it should be very clear what each party is responsible for and what each party will receive in return for sponsorship; event tickets; tickets." Mutual benefits for both parties was mentioned eight (7.2%) times ("as long as the rules are followed and both parties are satisfied;" and "positive gain for both entities" were examples in this category) and inclusion in special events was reported six (5.4%) times, such as; "special invitations," and "special event participation." The ability to use the athletic logo and being an exclusive sponsor within a category were each noted by five (4.5%) respondents. Three (2.7%) sponsors would like to see the university patronize their businesses, and, three (2.7%) respondents claimed they wanted to be sure that they received value from their investment as a sponsor of the athletic program. Being able to benefit the community and university, professionalism and the opportunity to provide samples rounded out the elements with two (1.8%) mentions apiece. Examples from the last few categories included: "patronage from the athletic department; value for dollars; product exclusivity; tangible returns; and opportunity to hand out samples to the fans."

Selection question

In addition to being able to list sponsorship elements, respondents were presented with a list of elements that may or may not have been included in each sponsors' agreement. Respondents were instructed to select the elements that were included in their particular package. A total of 18 elements were presented as possible options; however, two choices, apparel and equipment, were not claimed by any respondents as being included in their sponsorship agreements.

Printed materials were the most frequently reported element with 46.3% (n = 31) of sponsors claiming receipt. Radio mentions were reported as being received by 28 (41.8%) sponsors; on-site promotions were claimed by 25 (37.3%) sponsors and on-site displays closely followed with 23 (34.3%) mentions. Exposure in print media received 20 (29.9%) mentions, and posters/banners was mentioned 18 (26.9%) times. Contact with fans and coaches are each elements that were reported by 16 (23.9%) respondents. Logo or name mentions on television as an included element received 13 (19.4%) mentions. Player contact was reported as a sponsorship element by 11 (9.9%) respondents, and five (7.5%) mentions were given to each of off-site promotions and joint promotions with other sponsors. Tickets were an element that was reported four (6.0%) times, and exposure on the JumboTron was claimed as an inclusion by three (4.5%) respondents. Awards and off-site displays rounded out the elements that may have been included in a sponsorship agreement with one (1.5%) mention each. The percentage total is more than 100 because some sponsors reported receiving multiple elements as part of their package.

Statistical Analysis.

Effect of market area and length of commitment

Individual analyses of each of the 16 possible sponsorship elements, as illustrated in Table 3, revealed that no particular elements that were presented as options in this dissertation were found to have been influenced by the market area in which businesses operated. Additional investigation looking at length of commitment did reveal moderate strength statistical differences in two areas: sponsors receiving television exposure, *Cramer's V*(66) = 0.37, $p < .05$, and those receiving radio mentions, *Cramer's V*(66) = 0.37, $p < .05$, differed base on the market areas of sponsors. Of sponsors who get corporate logos displayed on television, 53.8% ($n = 7$) make long term commitments to sponsorship (sponsorships that average more than one year in length), one sponsor making a commitment of less than one year reported receiving logo recognition on television, and five (38.5%) sponsors committing to sponsorship for one year at a time reported being able to have corporate logos displayed on television. Additionally, of sponsors receiving radio mentions as part of their sponsorship packages, 46.4% (*n* = 13) made long-term commitments to sponsorship. One quarter (25.0%, *n* = 7) of the sponsors receiving radio mentions made average commitments of one year, and 28.6% (*n* = 8) of sponsors receiving radio mentions made sponsorship commitments of less than one year.

Table 3.

Respondents' reports of elements received in sponsorship packages by market area and length of commitment

	Market Area						
	Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
Element	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	*Cramer's V*
Posters/Banners	9	7	20	6	20	5	.215
Printed Materials	6	10	18	8	12	13	.260
On-Site Promotions	9	7	16	10	17	8	.095
Off-Site Promotions	16	0	24	2	22	3	.174
On-Site Displays	12	4	15	11	17	8	.145
Off-Site Displays	16	0	26	0	24	1	.160
Awards	16	0	26	0	24	1	.160
Promos w/ Other Spons	16	0	24	2	22	3	.174
Contact w/ Coaches	13	3	20	6	19	7	.074
Contact w/ Players	15	1	21	5	20	5	.154
Contact w/ Fans	13	3	20	6	18	7	.084
Logos on TV	13	3	21	5	20	5	.013
Logos in Print	9	7	20	6	18	7	.176
Radio Mentions	9	7	17	9	13	12	.120
Tickets	15	1	25	1	23	2	.007
JumboTron	15	1	24	2	25	0	.169

	Length of Commitment						
	< One Year		One Year		> One Year		
Element	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	*Cramer's V*
Posters/Banners	22	5	14	7	12	6	.164
Printed Materials	15	12	12	9	8	10	.106
On-Site Promotions	15	12	14	7	12	6	.113
Off-Site Promotions	27	0	18	3	16	2	.243
On-Site Displays	19	8	11	10	13	5	.184
Off-Site Displays	27	0	20	1	18	0	.182
Awards	27	0	21	0	17	1	.203
Promos w/ Other Spons	25	2	20	1	16	2	.092
Contact w/ Coaches	22	5	17	4	11	7	.205
Contact w/ Players	25	2	18	3	12	6	.285
Contact w/ Fans	23	4	15	6	12	6	.188
Logos on TV	26	1	16	5	11	7	.365*
Logos in Print	21	6	14	7	12	6	.121
Radio Mentions	19	8	14	7	5	13	.371*
Tickets	25	2	20	1	17	1	.049
JumboTron	25	2	20	1	18	0	.144

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3: Motivations for Entering Sponsorship Agreements

Research question three sought to uncover the motivations for entering into sponsorship agreements. This research question was answered through the interview process as well as through the use of a series of statements that respondents were asked to rate.

Interview Analysis.

During the interview process, each sponsor reported different reasons for sponsorship participation. For Companies A and B, the sponsorship association with the athletic department was to build brand image and business sales. Company C viewed the sponsorship as a form of public relations.

Company A selected sponsorships based on the exposure that could be received for its brand. Sponsorship agreements included multiple opportunities for the company logo to be presented to both on-site and off-site (through media exposure) audiences. This company had a process in place to identify elements of the sponsorship agreement and ensure that the objectives of the company were met.

Company B looked for sponsorship opportunities that enabled access to participants. This company wanted to develop associations with individuals. The insurance industry is highly regulated, and this company wanted to be able to generate positive contact with prospective customers as well as validate the choices of existing customers. Sponsorship was seen as a away for the company to have a presence in a friendly environment in which potential customers could be approached. The main goal was to generate future sales rather than immediate success.

Company C's involvement matched the creed of the corporation. Community service was a part of company policy, and every effort was taken to become fully integrated into the activities of the community. Company C prided itself on being a community partner and sponsorship activities gave it an avenue to be visible throughout the community at a variety of levels. The company's philosophy was values-based and the corporation "knows that its success is based on support of the communities in which it operates." The well being of the university and expectations of the community governed the thought process involved in accepting the sponsorship agreement. Supporting the community is "not an obligation it's a privilege."

Statistical Analysis.

Sponsors were presented with a series of statements giving reasons as to why they may have entered into a sponsorship agreement and benefits that may be associated with sponsorship. Sponsors were asked to rate 20 statements (see Appendices G and I, questions 8 and 9), measured on an 11-point scale (0-10), anchored by not important at all and very important. An additional 22 statements (see Appendices G and I, question 21) presented objectives that might be achieved from the sponsorship association. These statements used the same scale, anchored with totally disagree and totally agree.

Time-delayed variables

Of the statements used to determine motivation, "fit" of the sponsorship within marketing plans, cross promotional opportunities and reach target market of consumer, had previously been determined to be influenced by the time difference in reporting. Responses to these three statements were evaluated based on their time of collection. Each statement was analyzed to determine if there was a relationship between agreement with the given statement and the market area of a company as well as the average length of time that a company committed to sponsorship. A review of the associated means showed that respondents in the earlier group had means that were lower than the respondents in the second time period; however there was no association with market area or sponsorship commitment. No statistical significance was discovered as shown in the table below (Table 4).

Table 4.

Motivation for Sponsorship Agreement with Time Consideration

		Market Area						
		Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Statement	Time†							
Fit	1	6.58^{A}	2.94	6.86^{A}	3.14	5.69^{A}	3.12	0.40
	2	8.14^{A}	2.69	8.67^{A}	1.23	8.12^{A}	2.55	1.34
Promo	1	6.33^{A}	3.37	6.67^{A}	3.01	5.85^{A}	3.85	0.26
	2	7.71^{A}	2.75	8.67^{A}	1.23	8.12^{A}	2.55	1.64
Target	1	6.75^{A}	3.96	8.33^{A}	2.90	7.92^{A}	3.17	0.90
	2	8.29^{A}	3.15	9.25^{A}	0.97	9.44^{A}	0.97	1.78
		Length of Commitment						
		< One Year		One Year		> One Year		
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Fit	1	6.70^{A}	3.60	6.20^{A}	2.65	7.91^{A}	2.55	1.00
	2	7.87^{A}	2.64	8.82^{A}	1.25	8.44^{A}	1.88	0.62
Promo	1	6.00^{A}	3.55	5.67^{A}	3.60	7.82^{A}	2.04	1.54
	2	8.20^{A}	1.86	7.00^{A}	2.76	7.56^{A}	2.30	0.89
Target	1	7.55^{A}	3.43	6.87^{A}	3.83	9.55^{A}	0.69	1.42
	2	9.53^{A}	0.92	9.00^{A}	1.41	8.67^{A}	2.60	0.85

† Time 1 = Original Data Collection, Time 2 = Additional Collection.
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Effect of market area

Analyses of statements expressing reasons for entering into sponsorship revealed that having the opportunity to allow people to sample products was the only item that was influenced by market area, $F\ (2, 81) = 34.36$, $p < .05$. A review of the associated means revealed a difference in respondents' views of being able to provide samples. Local businesses were most likely to desire this benefit ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 2.80$), followed by businesses operating on a national/international level ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 3.58$,), and those conducting business on a regional basis ($M = 3.06$, $SD = 2.90$). On a scale of 0-10, means that are close to five show that interest in sampling is somewhat of a neutral option. The table below (Table 5) offers additional insight into levels of interest in other motivation factors for into entering sponsorship agreements.

Table 5.

Motivation for Sponsorship Agreement by Market Area

	Market Area						
	Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Statement							
Only Biz in Category	3.41^{A}	0.78	6.69^{A}	3.53	8.10^{A}	2.82	1.97
Increase Awareness	8.26^{A}	3.12	8.71^{A}	2.40	8.80^{A}	2.46	0.28
Signage	7.42^{A}	3.22	7.49^{A}	3.31	7.57^{A}	3.28	0.01
Sampling Opportunity	4.95^{A}	7.80	3.06^{B}	2.90	4.90^{A}	3.58	3.49
Purchasing Opportunity	5.16^{A}	3.52	4.54^{A}	3.49	4.20^{A}	3.75	0.42
Able to Measure Results	7.05^{A}	2.66	6.31^{A}	3.09	7.23^{A}	3.54	0.75
On-going Effort	6.95^{A}	2.92	7.37^{A}	2.47	7.10^{A}	3.26	0.15

Receive Media Coverage	7.63 ^{A}	2.97	7.83 ^{A}	2.75	7.67 ^{A}	2.87	0.40
Improve Cmty Relations	8.16 ^{A}	2.92	8.63 ^{A}	1.91	7.90 ^{A}	2.75	0.82
Improve Corp Image	6.79 ^{A}	2.59	7.76 ^{A}	2.48	7.79 ^{A}	2.42	1.22
Set Apart From Others	6.95 ^{A}	2.99	8.35 ^{A}	2.46	8.31 ^{A}	2.09	2.30
Recommendations	5.37 ^{A}	3.52	6.24 ^{A}	3.34	6.24 ^{A}	3.44	0.47
Give Back to Comm'ty	8.26 ^{A}	1.73	8.79 ^{A}	1.47	8.07 ^{A}	2.27	1.24
Interest/Concern Event	7.63 ^{A}	2.14	7.70 ^{A}	2.22	7.83 ^{A}	2.56	0.05
Employee Involvement	4.89 ^{A}	3.54	5.85 ^{A}	2.92	5.72 ^{A}	3.10	0.61
Status of Event	6.53 ^{A}	3.23	7.09 ^{A}	2.77	7.41 ^{A}	2.60	0.56
Tax Deduction	5.37 ^{A}	3.98	4.70 ^{A}	3.50	3.59 ^{A}	3.33	1.60
Incrs Emp. Productivity	3.44 ^{A}	3.03	3.69 ^{A}	3.33	3.46 ^{A}	3.08	0.05
Increase Sales	5.81 ^{A}	2.99	6.69 ^{A}	2.77	6.62 ^{A}	2.33	0.62
Gen. Media Coverage	5.06 ^{A}	3.59	6.58 ^{A}	3.43	6.42 ^{A}	2.44	1.31
Reach New Customers	5.88 ^{A}	3.54	7.54 ^{A}	2.73	7.54 ^{A}	2.10	2.27
Get Tickets	7.06 ^{A}	3.75	6.73 ^{A}	2.97	6.69 ^{A}	3.51	0.07
Entertain Customers	5.38 ^{A}	4.03	6.12 ^{A}	3.46	6.31 ^{A}	3.32	0.36
Viewed by Many	7.00 ^{A}	3.69	7.88 ^{A}	3.04	7.96 ^{A}	2.38	0.59
Thank Employees	5.00 ^{A}	3.93	4.96 ^{A}	2.88	5.19 ^{A}	3.95	0.03
Community Involvement	7.19 ^{A}	2.66	7.89 ^{A}	2.31	7.62 ^{A}	2.83	0.37
Support the University	8.75 ^{A}	1.98	9.07 ^{A}	1.17	8.54 ^{A}	1.56	0.82
Care About Athletes	8.06 ^{A}	2.35	8.26 ^{A}	1.81	7.31 ^{A}	3.21	1.00
Feel Good About Co.	7.38 ^{A}	2.75	7.59 ^{A}	2.49	7.73 ^{A}	2.16	0.11
Important Business	6.62 ^{A}	2.78	6.78 ^{A}	3.02	6.69 ^{A}	2.91	0.01
Right Thing to Do	7.81 ^{A}	2.97	8.63 ^{A}	1.17	7.15 ^{A}	3.13	2.10
Worthwhile Investment	7.69 ^{A}	2.50	8.33 ^{A}	1.47	7.19 ^{A}	2.65	1.76
Promote Products	5.81 ^{A}	3.27	7.19 ^{A}	2.80	7.15 ^{A}	2.66	1.38
Import. to Athletic Prog.	7.88 ^{A}	2.36	8.30 ^{A}	1.94	8.23 ^{A}	2.18	0.21
Increase Emp Morale	4.51 ^{A}	3.76	4.59 ^{A}	3.14	5.35 ^{A}	3.43	0.44
Affordable	5.75 ^{A}	2.46	6.15 ^{A}	2.71	5.62 ^{A}	2.71	0.28
Important to Owners	6.88 ^{A}	3.14	7.52 ^{A}	2.41	6.73 ^{A}	2.78	0.61

Edge Over Competitors	5.19^{A}	3.04	6.19^{A}	2.64	5.77^{A}	2.70	0.66
F'back From Customers	3.81^{A}	3.83	4.74^{A}	2.61	5.12^{A}	3.64	0.77
Benefits From Assoc.	7.81^{A}	2.07	7.58^{A}	1.68	7.73^{A}	2.13	0.08

All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Effect of length of commitment

Additional analyses revealed that being the only business in a category was influenced by length of commitment, F (2, 82) = 43.58, $p < .05$. Reviewing the associated means revealed a difference in perceptions about being the only business in a particular category occurred between companies that made commitments of less than one year (M = 6.69, SD = 3.32), those who committed to a sponsorship for one year at a time (M = 6.41, SD = 3.62), and those who made a commitment to sponsorship for more than one year at a time (M = 8.95, SD = 2.19). Bonferroni post hoc tests confirmed that businesses with longer commitments believed that it was more important to be the only sponsor in a particular category than did sponsors with commitments of one year or less than one year.

Furthermore, the status associated with an event was influenced by the length of commitment, F (2, 80) = 44.76, $p < .05$. The associated means showed that there was a difference in perceptions about the status associated with an event between sponsors who made commitments of less than one year (M = 7.37, SD = 2.72), those who committed for one year at a time (M = 5.69, SD = 3.15) and sponsors who made commitments of longer than one year (M = 8.45, SD = 1.67). Post hoc tests indicated that the difference fell between sponsors who made a sponsorship commitment of one year at a time and sponsors who committed to sponsorship for more than one year at a time, with the latter respondent more likely to find event status important. No differences were apparent between sponsors who made commitments of less than one year and respondents in the other two commitment levels.

The feeling that sponsorship increased employee productivity was found to be directly related to the length of commitment made to a sponsorship, $F\ (2, 67) = 32.35$, $p < .05$. Reviewing the means associated with the item confirmed that there were in fact differences in perceptions on how employee productivity was affected when categorized by a commitment of less than one year ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 3.08$), a commitment of one year ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 3.31$), and businesses that made commitments of more than one year at a time ($M = 2.11$, $SD = 2.47$). Bonferroni post hoc tests revealed differences when comparing sponsors who committed to sponsorship for less than one year or more than one year, with shorter-term sponsors more likely to believe that the sponsorship would lead to increased employee productivity. Sponsors making commitments of one year at a time were not different than sponsors committing for a longer or shorter amount of time.

Also significant when classifying respondents by length of commitment was the importance of the sponsorship to the company's owners, $F\ (2, 67) = 28.35$, $p < .05$. Reviewing the associated means solidified the differences between commitment levels of less than one year, one year and more than one year at a time ($M = 6.55$, $SD = 2.73$; $M = 8.38$, $SD = 1.45$; and $M = 6.22$, $SD = 3.12$, respectively). Post hoc evaluations showed that sponsors who made commitments of one year at a time perceived the sponsorship to be more valuable to their owners than did respondents who reported longer or shorter sponsorship commitments. Table 6 presents mean ratings for sponsorship motivations by average length of commitment.

Table 6.

Motivation for Sponsorship Agreement by Length of Commitment

Statement	< One Year M	< One Year SD	One Year M	One Year SD	> One Year M	> One Year SD	F
Only Biz in Category*	6.69^{A}	3.32	6.41^{A}	3.62	8.95^{B}	2.19	4.27
Increase Awareness	8.69^{A}	2.34	8.15^{A}	2.74	9.25^{A}	2.10	1.08
Signage	7.75^{A}	2.83	6.56^{A}	3.48	8.30^{A}	3.53	1.88
Sampling Opportunity	4.39^{A}	3.86	3.85^{A}	3.82	4.30^{A}	3.73	0.18
Purchasing Opportunity	4.81^{A}	3.43	3.89^{A}	3.76	5.25^{A}	3.49	0.94
Able to Measure Results	6.56^{A}	3.16	6.37^{A}	3.44	8.20^{A}	2.68	2.47
On-going Effort	6.56^{A}	2.98	7.37^{A}	3.02	8.00^{A}	2.45	1.77
Receive Media Coverage	7.53^{A}	2.55	7.37^{A}	2.24	8.80^{A}	2.35	1.83
Improve Cmty Relations	8.11^{A}	2.41	8.44^{A}	2.33	8.55^{A}	1.93	0.29
Improve Corporate Image	7.37^{A}	2.51	7.08^{A}	2.62	8.35^{A}	1.87	1.69
Set Apart From Others	7.83^{A}	2.57	7.62^{A}	2.53	8.75^{A}	2.36	1.28
Recommendations	6.91^{A}	3.35	5.54^{A}	3.30	5.40^{A}	3.35	1.86
Give Back to Comm'ty	8.37^{A}	1.75	8.38^{A}	1.79	8.50^{A}	2.19	0.03
Interest/Concern Event	7.63^{A}	2.60	7.12^{A}	2.29	8.70^{A}	1.34	2.86
Employee Involvement	5.49^{A}	3.45	5.15^{A}	3.09	6.30^{A}	2.52	0.79
Status of Event*	7.31^{A}	2.72	5.69^{AB}	3.15	8.45^{AC}	1.67	6.33
Tax Deduction	4.97^{A}	3.87	3.85^{A}	3.26	4.35^{A}	3.50	0.74
Incrs Emp. Productivity*	4.52^{A}	3.08	3.43^{AB}	3.31	2.11^{AC}	2.47	3.58
Increase Sales	6.86^{A}	2.92	6.24^{A}	2.61	6.06^{A}	2.26	0.61
Gen Media Coverage	6.48^{A}	3.14	5.90^{A}	2.98	5.94^{A}	3.46	0.30
Reach New Customers	7.69^{A}	2.95	6.48^{A}	2.60	7.06^{A}	2.67	1.18
Get Tickets	6.62^{A}	3.50	6.52^{A}	3.59	7.39^{A}	2.79	0.39

Entertain Customers	6.00^{A}	3.75	5.57^{A}	3.47	6.56^{A}	3.28	0.37
Viewed by Many	7.83^{A}	2.84	7.38^{A}	3.34	7.89^{A}	2.81	0.18
Thank Employees	5.34^{A}	3.36	5.33^{A}	3.73	4.56^{A}	3.50	0.33
Comm’ty Involvement	7.24^{A}	2.82	7.67^{A}	2.46	8.17^{A}	2.38	0.71
Support the University	8.59^{A}	1.55	9.24^{A}	1.18	8.67^{A}	1.85	1.21
Care About Athletes	7.59^{A}	2.80	8.38^{A}	1.96	7.89^{A}	2.65	0.60
Feel Good About Co.	7.28^{A}	2.70	8.24^{A}	1.81	7.33^{A}	2.54	1.10
Important Business	6.66^{A}	2.96	6.86^{A}	2.94	6.56^{A}	2.92	0.06
Right Thing to Do	7.24^{A}	3.08	8.76^{A}	1.90	7.89^{A}	2.63	2.10
Worthwhile Investment	7.34^{A}	2.42	8.52^{A}	1.81	7.61^{A}	2.33	1.78
Promote Products	6.83^{A}	3.03	6.90^{A}	2.81	7.00^{A}	2.89	0.02
Import to Athletic Prog.	7.83^{A}	2.16	8.57^{A}	1.91	8.28^{A}	2.32	0.77
Increase Emp. Morale	4.90^{A}	3.33	5.67^{A}	3.31	3.83^{A}	3.52	1.44
Affordable	6.07^{A}	2.95	6.05^{A}	2.09	5.50^{A}	2.66	0.30
Important to Owners*	6.55^{A}	2.73	8.38^{B}	1.75	6.22^{A}	3.12	4.23
Edge Over Competitors	5.03^{A}	3.22	6.29^{A}	2.24	6.44^{A}	2.33	1.98
F’back From Customers	4.72^{A}	3.44	4.86^{A}	3.53	4.44^{A}	3.07	0.92
Benefits From Assoc.	7.59^{A}	1.88	7.95^{A}	1.83	7.56^{A}	2.18	0.28

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

RESEARCH QUESTION 4: Methods of Assessment

The fourth research question sought to reveal the methods of assessment that were used by sponsors of the collegiate athletic program. The ability to assess the success or failure of any investment would seem to make good business sense. A company is not likely to continually give money to a fund that is not productive. Commonsense aside, performance of a sponsorship is not always scrutinized as closely as some other areas of marketing communication. This research question was answered by interviewees, and by asking survey respondents about the assessment methods that they used, as well as through a series of questions asking respondents to rate the importance of various analyses on the decision to renew a sponsorship agreement.

Interview Analysis.

Two of the personal interview participants relied on both internal and external assessment reports. Company A and Company B both made contract comparisons; A compared performance to the contract in place, B compared performances between contracts with similar entities. Assessment by Company C could be considered as being conducted before an agreement was signed; sponsorships must have a perceived value before participation would be agreed upon.

A division specifically responsible for sponsorships monitored activity for Company A. The division received regular audits from syndicated services as well as used on-site assessment when specific activities were scheduled. Assessment was a standard activity for this company with regard to all of its sponsorship commitments, in that properties are required to provide a “recap of each contract - how many events were held in a building, how the team did, how many people attended and such.” Company A acknowledged that sponsorship was “difficult within the industry to track.” It reported that media impressions, attendance and keeping track of what was done above and beyond the actual sponsorship allowed the company to gauge effectiveness of its sponsorship contracts.

Company B compared activity from sponsorships with similar commitments in other areas. For example, sponsorship success at this university was compared with sponsorship activities at other universities. The representative was very aware of differences between sponsorship commitments and future agreements may be based more on external factors than outcomes from the current contract in place. This company mentioned service it received from athletic department representatives as being influential in making contract decisions. This is an arbitrary assessment that is not related to the performance of the sponsorship itself.

Company C reported that no formal assessment was conducted. The company did participate in some sponsorship activities that were considered to be "part of the advertising budget, like some signs, but as far as ROI, I don't know that anyone has ever done that." Through a previous study on unaided recall of sponsorship participants, the company had been made aware that it was not receiving enough value from its investment, but claimed "if we don't think there is a value in some way, shape, fashion or form, we are not going to do it."

Descriptive Analysis.

Respondents participating in the survey were asked whether or not they utilized a variety of assessment methods. The most frequently claimed method of assessment was the usage of customer awareness. This method was reported as being used by 62 (77.5%) of respondents. Media exposure and improved image were the next most popular responses with 47 (58.8%) and 40 (50.0%) respondents, respectively. Event attendance followed closely with 37 (46.2%) businesses claiming to use this method of assessment to evaluate the success of their company's sponsorship. Thirty-one (38.8%) respondents claimed that target audience match was a method used to measure success. Trade/dealer feedback was reported by 16 (20.0%) respondents and 14 (17.5%) claimed that off-field involvement was used as a method of assessment. The use of branding as an assessment method was claimed by one (1.2%) business and nine (11.2%) sponsors responded that no methods of assessment were used by their businesses.

Statistical Analysis.

Effect of market area and length of commitment

Analyses of individual assessment methods did not reveal any statistically significant differences because of the affect of different market areas of participating corporations (local, regional or national/international). Likewise, choice of assessment method was not affected by average length of sponsorship commitment. An overview of assessment methods used by respondents categorized by market area and length of commitment is included in the table below (Table 7).

Table 7.

Respondents' reports of assessment methods by market area and length of commitment

	Market Area						
	Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
Element	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	*Cramer's V*
Customer Awareness	6	13	8	24	4	25	.169
Media Exposure	10	9	14	18	9	20	.171
Dealer/Trade Feedback	16	3	27	5	21	8	.143
Event Attendance	11	8	17	15	15	14	.048
Match w/ Target Market	15	4	18	14	16	13	.203
Off-Field Involvement	15	4	27	5	24	5	.055
Improved Image	12	7	12	20	16	13	.213
Market Share	15	4	27	5	22	7	.094
Sales Figures	11	8	22	10	16	13	.127

Do Not Evaluate	16	3	28	4	27	2	.111

	Length of Commitment						
	< One Year		One Year		> One Year		
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	*Cramer's V*
Customer Awareness	9	26	7	19	2	17	.161
Media Exposure	19	16	9	17	5	14	.242
Dealer/Trade Feedback	29	6	20	6	15	4	.066
Event Attendance	18	17	14	12	11	8	.051
Match w/ Target Market	20	15	18	8	11	8	.114
Off-Field Involvement	30	5	22	4	14	5	.130
Improved Image	17	18	15	11	8	11	.118
Market Share	28	7	23	3	13	6	.186
Sales Figures	22	13	17	9	10	9	.101
Do Not Evaluate	30	5	22	4	19	0	.199

Additionally, a constructed variable of combined assessment methods (explained earlier) was not found to have been influenced by market area or length of sponsorship commitment, as can be seen in Table 8. The lack of difference between categories indicates that each group used a similar number of methods of assessment to determine whether or not a sponsorship was considered to be successful.

Table 8.

Means for Assessment Composite by Market Area and Length of Commitment

Category	Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	ANOVA
Market Area				F (2, 74) = 0.60, $p > .05$
	Local	5.40 [A]	2.95	
	Regional	4.78 [A]	2.50	
	Nat/Int	4.49 [A]	2.86	
Length of Commitment				F (2, 73) = 0.29, $p > .05$
	< One Year	4.87 [A]	3.07	
	One Year	4.62 [A]	2.69	
	> One Year	5.25 [A]	2.24	

All comparisons are vertical across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

As a further determination of sponsorship assessment, respondents were asked how important a series of analyses were when considering to change or to renew a sports sponsorship agreement. A series of eight elements were presented with an 11-point scale, anchored with not at all important and very important. Two elements, internal feedback and television exposure, were analyzed independently of the others due to differences produced by time lag in reporting.

Time-delayed variables

Analyses, divided by time of collection, for internal feedback and television exposure produced mixed results. Internal feedback was found to be influenced by market area (F (2, 41) = 3.93, $p < .05$) with respondents who had completed the survey during the initial data collection process. A review of the associated means revealed a difference in views of using internal feedback by local, regional and national/international market areas (*M* = 5.64, *SD* = 3.01; *M* = 5.19, *SD* = 3.14; *M* = 7.83, *SD* = 2.08, respectively). Bonferroni post hoc tests revealed differences between respondents with regional and national/international market areas, with respondents in the larger market area finding internal feedback to be of higher importance. No differences were present between companies doing business in the local market area and those doing business further away from the university. Significant differences were not revealed for other variables in either time period; see Table 9 for means, by time period, for the associated items, affected by time of collection.

Table 9.

Means for Elements of Analyses with Time Consideration

		Market Area						
		Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Statement	Time†							
Internal Feedback	1*	5.64^{A}	3.01	5.19^{AB}	3.14	7.83^{AC}	2.08	3.39
	2	7.29^{A}	2.43	7.22^{A}	1.92	7.33^{A}	2.56	0.01
TV Exposure	1	4.27^{A}	2.89	3.76^{A}	3.70	4.00^{A}	4.05	0.08
	2	7.57^{A}	2.07	7.33^{A}	2.12	5.93^{A}	3.39	1.12

		Length of Commitment						
		< One Year		One Year	> One Year			
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Internal Feedback	1	5.18^{A}	3.13	5.93^{A}	3.15	7.64^{A}	2.25	2.36
	2	7.08^{A}	2.02	7.10^{A}	2.56	7.88^{A}	1.89	0.39
TV Exposure	1	3.82^{A}	3.63	3.47^{A}	3.04	5.18^{A}	3.89	0.82
	2	7.31^{A}	2.89	5.30^{A}	3.13	7.50^{A}	1.51	1.96

† Time 1 = Original Data Collection, Time 2 = Additional Collection.
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Analyses of the remaining six analyses statements, bounce backs, information from the athletic department, consumer research, print media analyses, syndicated research and attendance figures did not reveal significant differences for sponsors classified by market area or length of sponsorship commitment. The resulting means are reported in Table 10.

Table 10.

Means for Elements of Analyses by Market Area and Length of Commitment

	Market Area						
	Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Statement							
Bounce Backs	6.06^{A}	3.10	6.27^{A}	2.74	5.19^{A}	3.63	0.95
Info From A.D.	6.78^{A}	2.60	7.47^{A}	2.32	6.70^{A}	2.89	0.74
Company Research	5.17^{A}	3.24	3.93^{A}	3.21	4.59^{A}	3.53	0.80
Print Analyses	5.39^{A}	3.57	5.20^{A}	3.47	4.26^{A}	3.63	0.72
Syndicated Research	5.00^{A}	2.85	3.73^{A}	3.03	3.93^{A}	3.77	0.90

Attendance Figures	6.28 ^{A}	2.95	6.67 ^{A}	2.86	6.15 ^{A}	3.67	0.20

	Length of Commitment						
	< One Year		One Year		> One Year		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Bounce Backs	5.73 ^{A}	3.83	5.96 ^{A}	2.87	5.95 ^{A}	2.93	0.05
Info From A.D.	6.83 ^{A}	2.90	6.96 ^{A}	2.32	7.32 ^{A}	2.38	0.21
Company Research	4.57 ^{A}	3.36	4.32 ^{A}	3.53	4.74 ^{A}	3.07	0.09
Print Analyses	5.47 ^{A}	3.84	4.40 ^{A}	3.29	4.95 ^{A}	3.31	0.62
Syndicated Research	3.70 ^{A}	3.14	3.80 ^{A}	3.28	5.37 ^{A}	3.29	1.79
Attendance Figures	6.60 ^{A}	3.32	5.44 ^{A}	3.42	7.16 ^{A}	2.32	1.78

All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

RESEARCH QUESTION 5: Methods of Leveraging and Activation

Research question five was written in an attempt to uncover the methods of leveraging and activation used by participants. Quester and Thompson (2001) reported that companies that made investments over and above that of the sponsorship fee were able to achieve objectives that had been set for the sponsorship association. Sponsors were not directly asked about objectives, but the activities that were conducted to promote the sponsorship association were questioned.

Interview Analysis.

When asked about leveraging and/or activation, interview participants gave mixed responses. Companies A and B reported participation in activities that provided direct benefit to the corporation. Company A associated the sponsored brand in local markets, but, again, to the benefit of corporate income. Company C did little to directly connect themselves with the contributions made to the athletic program.

Company A scheduled activities associated with sporting events at different levels around the country. These events were not focused on the association with the property, but more with the sponsor themselves. The sponsorship provided the opportunity to expand other activities the company already had planned. Activities on the local level "sometimes incorporated team-marks" in an effort to encourage "consumer engagement," a way to provide customers with "something they can't get anywhere else;" examples given were the ability of customers to purchase ringtones of the school fight-song and cell-phone wallpaper featuring team logos.

Company B liked to take advantage of every opportunity to reach the sporting audience. Representatives were assigned to circulate during the game and throughout the parking lot making connections. Additionally, registration tables were set up for attendees to participate in giveaways and request information from the company. Company C claimed taking advantage of very few opportunities to promote its association with the athletic program.

Descriptive Analysis.

Survey respondents were asked how often money over and above the sponsorship fee was spent on promoting the sponsorship. A majority (58.0%, $n = 47$) reported that they *sometimes* spend money to promote the sponsorship. Only nine sponsors (11.1%) claimed to *always* promote their sponsorships, and 25 (30.9%) responded that they *never* spend money over and above the sponsorship fees to promote a businesses' association with a sponsored property.

When asked about specific channels that could be used to promote the sponsorship outside of the university's athletic events, public relations efforts was the most-often selected method. A total of 33 (48.5%) businesses claimed to use the tool to promote the sponsorship of the university athletic program. Internal promotion was reported as being used by 27 (39.7%) businesses, traditional forms of advertising was claimed as a method of marketing communication used by 21 (30.9%) respondents and sampling opportunities were reported by 17 (25.0%) sponsors. Hospitality events were identified by 12 (17.6%) businesses, while direct marketing received nine (13.2%) reports and business-to-business promotion was reported as being used by eight (11.8%) respondents. Internet closed out the methods of promoting sponsorship outside of athletic events by being reported five (7.4%) times. The usage of no external sponsorship promotion was claimed by 15 (21.7%) sponsors. Percentages add to more than 100 because some organizations participated in multiple forms of sponsorship promotion.

Statistical Analysis.

Effect of market area and length of commitment

Analyses of each of the eight elements presented to participants as possible marketing communications channels that were used to promote the sponsorship outside of athletic events produced only one statistically significant result, as can be seen in Table 11. Differences of moderate strength were revealed between commitment levels of sponsors that used hospitality events as a form of promotion, *Cramer's V*(68) = .34, $p < .05$. Of companies using hospitality events to promote the sponsorship location, half (n = 6) made long-term commitments. Hospitality, as a form of promotion, was used by five (41.7%) sponsors with average commitments of one year, and one sponsor, with average sponsorship commitment lengths of less than one year, reported using hospitality events to promote the association of their business with the athletic program. No other leveraging or activation elements were found to be effected by length of commitment, and market area did not influence any activities presented to respondents.

Table 11.

Respondents' reports of leveraging and activation activity usage by market area and length of commitment

	Market Area						
	Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
Element	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	*Cramer's V*
Public Relations	6	10	14	12	15	11	.159
Internal Communications	12	4	15	11	14	12	.170
Traditional Advertising	12	4	19	7	16	10	.130
Hospitality	15	1	23	3	18	8	.276
Direct Marketing	13	3	24	2	22	4	.134
Internet Tie-ins	14	2	26	0	23	3	.222
Business to Business	13	3	23	3	24	2	.131
On-Site Sampling	11	5	20	6	20	6	.080
No Activities	13	3	19	8	22	4	.156
	Length of Commitment						
	< One Year		One Year		> One Year		
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	*Cramer's V*
Public Relations	17	12	10	11	8	10	.126
Internal Communications	21	8	12	9	8	10	.235
Traditional Advertising	20	9	14	7	13	5	.045
Hospitality	28	1	16	5	12	6	.335*

Direct Marketing	26	3	18	3	15	3	.078
Internet Tie-ins	28	1	19	2	16	2	.131
Business to Business	27	2	17	4	16	2	.160
On-Site Sampling	24	5	14	7	13	5	.162
No Activities	20	9	19	2	15	3	.233

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.

Additionally, a constructed variable of combined leveraging and activation activities (explained earlier) was not found to be affected by market area or length of sponsorship commitment, as can be seen in Table 12. The lack of difference between categories indicated that each group used a similar number of activities to promote the sponsorship association outside of athletic events.

Table 12.

Means for Leveraging/Activation Composite by Market Area and Length of Commitment

Category	Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	ANOVA
Market Area				F (2, 67) = 0.50, $p > .05$
	Local	2.00^{A}	2.07	
	Regional	1.69^{A}	1.44	
	Nat/Int	2.15^{A}	1.67	
Length of Commitment				F (2, 67) = 2.65, $p > .05$
	< One Year	1.41^{A}	1.43	
	One Year	2.29^{A}	1.55	
	> One Year	2.39^{A}	2.00	

All comparisons are vertical across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Furthermore, when conducting analyses of respondents' reports of making investments over and above the initial sponsorship fee to promote the sponsorship, market area and length of commitment were found to have no influence on whether sponsors always, sometimes or never spend additional funds (*Cramer's V*(81) = 0.15, $p > .05$, and *Cramer's V*(80) = 0.24, $p > .05$, respectively). The lack of significant findings indicated that sponsors in each category did not have different reasoning. Table 13 provides associated information with regard to frequency of leveraging and activation spending as divided by market area and length of commitment.

Table 13.

Respondents' reports of additional spending by market area and length of commitment

	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Additional Spending			
Always	1	3	5
Sometimes	12	17	18
Never	6	13	6
	Length of Commitment		
	< One Year	One Year	> One Year
Always	1	4	4
Sometimes	19	18	10
Never	15	4	5

RESEARCH QUESTION 6: Types of Sponsorship

Research question six asked about types of causes and events that were sponsored by each business. Participants were presented with a list of five types of sponsorships and asked to select the ones in which they participated. Surprisingly, 14 respondents (12.6%) claimed that they did not participate in sports sponsorships. This may have been perceived by respondents as sports sponsorships other than one at the university used for this study and should be clarified or explained in future studies.[3]

Descriptive Analysis.

In general, sponsors of the collegiate athletic program also purchased sponsorships in other areas. Charitable sponsorships were the most frequently reported area of support with 69 (62.2%) businesses claiming such support. Educational sponsorships were claimed to have been purchased by 58 (52.3%) sponsors, and 36 (32.4%) sponsors reported supporting health-oriented initiatives as well as cultural causes and/or events. Percentages total more than 100 because some sponsors reported participation in multiple areas.

Statistical Analysis.

Effect of market area

Analyses of types of sponsorship by market area and length of commitment provided mixed results. As presented in Table 14, data analysis revealed that market area does not have an effect on business commitments to charitable sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 111) = 1.51$, $p > .05$, educational sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 111) = 4.09$, $p > .05$, or health

---

[3] Respondents claiming not to participate in sport sponsorships did indicate elements that were part of their sponsorship agreements with the athletic program. No respondents provided any indication that they were not currently involved with sponsorship of this university's athletic program.

sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 111) = 0.01$, $p > .05$. Market area did, however, have an effect on business commitments to cultural sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 111) = 6.50$, $p < .05$. Businesses with larger market areas were more likely to participate in cultural sponsorships. Of the respondents that claimed participation in cultural sponsorships, 13.9% ($n = 5$) were in the local market area, 33.3% ($n = 12$) were in the regional market area, and 52.8% ($n = 19$) were in national/international market areas.

Table 14.

Respondents' reports of sponsorship participation by market area

	Market Area		
Type of Sponsorship	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Charitable	16	21	15
Cultural*	5	12	19
Educational	15	21	22
Health-Oriented	7	16	13
Sport	21	41	35

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$

Effect of length of commitment

Furthermore, as can be seen in Table 15, data analyses revealed no effect by length of sponsorship commitment on charitable sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 90) = 1.11$, $p > .05$, educational sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 90) = 0.49$, $p > .05$, health sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 90) = 1.46$, $p > .05$, or cultural sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 90) = 1.76$, $p > .05$.

Table 15.

Respondents' reports of sponsorship participation by length of commitment

	Length of Commitment		
	< One Year	One Year	> One Year
Type of Sponsorship			
Charitable	23	20	12
Cultural	11	8	9
Educational	19	16	10
Health-Oriented	12	8	9
Sport	31	28	21

RESEARCH QUESTION 7: Corporate Involvement

The seventh research question asked about the extent of company involvement with its sports sponsorship. The types of commitment made by companies through sponsorship agreements could speak to the level of involvement with the sponsorship. Interview participants were asked how often employees became involved with sponsorships, and survey respondents were asked what type of support was routinely offered as part of a sponsorship program.

Interview Analysis.

Each company in the interview process reported different levels of involvement with sponsorship. Company C, with the closest proximity to the university, reported the most employee involvement. Companies A and B did not report direct involvement by employees, except under special circumstances.

Company A noted that its sponsorship included tickets and parking privileges that were used mostly by executives. Other company employees were not directly involved in the sponsorship unless there was a specific activity planned at an event. For the most part, “employees get involved in larger events” and sponsorships may be used “to host customers if there is interest.” The extent of involvement for Company A revolved around monitoring contracts to ensure fulfillment. Employee involvement in the sponsorship itself was minimal. The sponsorship contract included advertising elements but no exchange of goods or services. Company B’s representative claimed that he visited the campus for negotiations but did not typically participate in events. Area sales agents who had individual sponsorships with the athletic program were more likely to be involved in the day-to-day sporting activities. He claimed that representatives from the company gathered information for sales leads but did not necessarily assist the property under the guise of being part of a sponsorship agreement. Signage and identification in printed materials were part of the contract agreement, but no products were included.

Company C reported that employees were encouraged to dress in team colors and/or shirts on game days but cautioned that this applied to high school teams also, especially in the rural communities surrounding the university town. The company had access to tickets and suites for events in most of the sporting facilities, but many employees had individual seat licenses allowing priority purchases for events that were not sport related (mostly concerts or entertainers). Company C had been given unlimited access to conference facilities in one of the athletic arenas but rarely took advantage of the offer. Products from the supermarket may have been used at sporting facilities, but this was not as a result of the association with the athletic program. The representative claimed that "team members were encouraged to volunteer for individual causes," and that the company made allowances for employees to participate in community activities.

Descriptive Analysis.

Sponsors can show support of a program in a variety of different ways. Participants of the survey were presented with five types of sponsorship support and asked to indicate all forms of support that was provided by them as a part of the businesses' sponsorship commitments. Advertising support (signage or advertisement in a program) was the most frequently mentioned form of support with 63 (70.8%) of sponsors claiming such support. Barter or trade (product or services in exchange for some benefit) was the next most popular form of support claimed by 43 (48.3%) respondents. Direct financial support (cash donation) was reported by 37 (41.6%) of respondents, and goods and services (products or services as a donation) were the form of support provided by 29 (32.6%) of businesses. Finally, operational support (employees or equipment) has been provided by 12 (13.5%) sponsors. Percentages total more than 100 because some sponsors provided multiple forms of sponsorship support.

Statistical Analysis.

Effect of market area

Type of support provided by sponsors was not found to be influenced by the market area of the business. Direct financial support was not different for sponsors that operated in local, regional or national/international market areas, $\chi^2(2, N = 89) = 0.25, p > .05$. The same was true for advertising support, $\chi^2(2, N = 89) = 0.49, p > .05$, barter or trade, $\chi^2(2, N = 89) = 0.20, p > .05$, and support through provision of goods and services, $\chi^2(2, N = 89) = 0.72, p > .05$. Operational support did not provide enough cases per cell to be evaluated, as can be seen in Table 16. Analyses using adjustments for small cell sizes confirmed that no differences were present based on market area.

Table 16.

Respondents' reports of support provided by market area

	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Type of Support			
Financial	12	14	11
Advertising	13	28	22
Operational	1	4	7
Barter/Trade	7	16	13
Goods & Services	8	11	10

Effect of length of commitment

Businesses' choice of support for sponsorships was found to be influenced by length of commitment in one area. Direct financial support was not dependent on sponsors' commitments of less than one year, one year, or more than one year, $\chi^2(2, N = 89) = 0.33, p > .05$. Likewise, length of commitment had no effect on advertising support, $\chi^2(2, N = 89) = 0.19, p > .05$, and goods and services, $\chi^2(2, N = 89) = 0.90, p > .05$. Sponsors providing support through barter or trade, however, were found to be different based on length of support, $\chi^2(2, N = 89) = 10.15, p < .05$, with sponsors at the middle level of commitment length being most likely to provide goods or services in exchange for some type of benefit. Barter or trade support was provided by 34.9% ($n = 15$) of sponsors making a commitment of less than one year. Of sponsors committing to sponsorship for one year at a time, 48.8% (*n* = 21) claimed to provide support in the form of barter or trade. Businesses committing to sponsorship for more than one year at a time provided barter or trade support at a rate of 16.3% (*n* = 7). As shown in Table 17, there were not enough relevant cases per cell for operational support to be evaluated. Additional analyses to compensate for small cell sizes did not reveal any additional significant differences.

Table 17.

Respondents' reports of support provided by length of commitment

	Length of Commitment		
Type of Support	< One Year	One Year	> One Year
Financial	13	13	11
Advertising	29	17	17
Operational	5	4	3
Barter/Trade*	15	21	7
Goods & Services	13	10	6

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.

RESEARCH QUESTION 8: Termination of Sponsorship Agreements

The eighth research question asked about reasons for ending sponsorship agreements. Most contracts contain a provision for terminating the association early, but many continue until there is a reason for discontinuance. During the interview process, Participants were asked about reasons to discontinue a sponsorship association; survey participants were asked to select from a list of possible reasons for cancelation or non-renewal.

Interview Analysis.

None of the interviewed businesses indicated that its current sponsorship would likely be terminated. With the exception of Company C, the interview participants were pleased with the current agreements in place with the athletic marketing department. Interview subjects gave varying reasons that could possibly lead to a sponsorship agreement being terminated or not renewed.

Company A was concerned with the return on investment that was received from sponsorship agreements, along with being sure that commitments made by the property were fulfilled. Representatives at Company A were charged with ensuring that all considerations made in a sponsorship agreement were afforded. The interview participants believed that properties took care to ensure that all promises were kept because of the awareness that monitoring was taking place. Failure to fulfill the contract agreement was the top reason for cancellation or contract non-renewal by Company A.

Company B claimed that personal contact with the property was an important consideration when looking at sponsorship agreements and was more inclined to participate in sponsorship agreements that offered personalized service that was targeted to his business. The individual made reference to service received from other university athletic department marketing personnel. The flexibility of marketing personnel to work with this individual resulted in more money for another program. Not gaining enough exposure from the association was the main reason cited for termination.

Company C was openly frustrated with the sponsorship contract that was currently in place. The representative did expect that some form of sponsorship would continue, as the community expected it, but that the level would be far less significant than the current contract. This company generally continued sponsorship support of causes and events that positioned it as a good corporate citizen in the eyes of the community. Company C did not participate in sponsorships that did not offer the organization some perception of value.

Descriptive Analysis.

Survey respondents were asked to note reasons for ending a sponsorship, selecting from a list of eight items, with space to include additional responses not considered. Price increase was the only reason for termination that was provided in the open category. Little value or return on investment was the most frequently reported reason for termination of a sponsorship agreement with 71.2% (n = 57) of respondents reporting this option. Poor execution or performance by the sponsored property was cited by 61.2% (n = 49), as was budget cuts. Not being able to achieve objectives was reported by 40.0% (n = 32) of businesses as a reason to end a sponsorship. The next most frequently reported reason for sponsorship termination was conflict with organizers; 38.8% (n = 31) of respondents made this selection. Change of strategy was reported by 33.8% (n = 27) of sponsors and 28.8% (n = 23) of businesses claimed that they are simply not asked to continue with a sponsorship. Price increase of sponsorship packages was self-reported by 9.9% (n = 8) of participants.

Statistical Analysis.

Time-delayed variables

Three selections, as presented in Table 18, from the termination reason category were determined to be different between sponsors that responded to the survey early versus those who replied with later solicitation. Because of this, little value or return on investment, not achieving objectives and poor execution by the property organizers needed to be evaluated separately. Little value or return on investment reported as a reason for ending a sponsorship commitment by respondents in the first time period was the only variable that was found to be influenced by respondent categories, *Cramer's V*(81) = 0.15, p < .05. Length of commitment was found to have an effect on ROI, with sponsors making short (less than one year) commitments comprising 42.9% (*n* = 12) of those reporting this reason for ending sponsorship agreements. Businesses making long term (more than one year) commitments made up 35.7% (*n* = 10) of the group, and sponsors with one year average commitments made up the remaining 21.4% (*n* = 6).

Table 18.

Reasons for Sponsorship Cancellation with Time Consideration

		Market Area		
		Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Reason to End	Time†			
No Value/ROI	1	6	16	6
	2	6	9	14
Objectives	1	2	7	3
	2	4	6	10

Poor Execution	1	4	11	8
	2	6	8	12

		Length of Commitment		
		< One Year	One Year	> One Year
No Value/ROI	1*	12	6	10
	2	13	10	6
Objectives	1	4	3	5
	2	10	4	5
Poor Execution	1	9	7	7
	2	11	9	6

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$. † Time 1 = Original Data Collection, Time 2 = Additional Collection

Effect of market area and length of commitment

Corporations that had a different change in strategy were not found to differ based on commitment level, $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 2.14$, $p > .05$, or by market area, $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 0.70$, $p > .05$. Similarly, budget cuts were not viewed differently by sponsors based on commitment level, $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 3.96$, $p > .05$, or by market area, $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 2.14$, $p > .05$. Conflict between sponsor and property was not found to be different by commitment level or market area ($\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 0.05$, $p > .05$ and $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 3.30$, $p > .05$, respectively). Sponsors that were not asked to renew sponsorships were not affected by the length of commitment to sponsorships, $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 2.12$, $p > .05$, nor upon the area in which sales are conducted, $\chi^2(2, N = 80) = 0.17$, $p > .05$. Additional analyses to compensate for small cell sizes, as can be seen in the table below (Table 19), confirmed that no statistically significant differences were present in items presented in the questionnaire.

Table 19.

Respondents' reports of reasons to end sponsorship agreements by market area and length of commitment

	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Reason to End			
Different Strategy	5	11	11
Budget Cuts	14	17	18
Conflict w/ Organizer	4	14	13
Not Asked	5	10	8
Price Increase	2	3	3
	Length of Commitment		
	< One Year	One Year	> One Year
Different Strategy	12	8	7
Budget Cuts	23	18	8
Conflict w/ Organizer	14	10	7
Not Asked	11	9	3
Price Increase	1	4	2

RESEARCH QUESTION 9: Composition of Sponsorships

The very nature of sponsorships has made them unique marketing tools that a business could customize to fit its needs. Agency theory purported that these differences made the relationships between sponsors and properties one that has a tendency to be unstable. Before looking at the relationship between sponsor and property, it was necessary to establish that every sponsorship is indeed unique. The ninth research question asked if each sponsorship consisted of different combinations of elements. It was evident during the interview process, as well as through comparison of individual cases, that no two participants had the same combination of elements in their sponsorship packages.

Interview Analysis.

During the interview process, sponsors were asked what sponsorship elements were taken advantage of by the business. Signage was an element that was common to all three companies. Two interview participants held the naming rights to sporting facilities, allowing for additional exposure when events were broadcast and the location was announced.

Company A believed that it received exposure from having the company logo in various prominent positions in several sporting facilities. Additionally, as a sponsor with naming rights, the corporate moniker was repeated many times during game broadcasts. Executives used tickets and hospitality opportunities and the athletic brand was displayed in local retail outlets. The company actively monitored the elements of its contract to ensure that all benefits were received.

Company B was most interested in the ability to gather information from participants. Visibility of the company name was of value but being able to make contact with consumers was a priority. Company B was very cognizant of its own identity and where it stood in the eyes of the public. Being able to connect with an audience in a venue that might enable positive associations was definitely a situation that was to its advantage.

Company C was also in the position of being a naming sponsor, but the name was only visible to those inside (or viewing a broadcast of the inside) the facility. No signage of any kind was present on the outside of the building. This company felt that it had earned priority positioning in certain areas of the facility and stated that changes had been made in the past year giving more visibility and exclusivity to the corporate logo in one location. Additionally, the company had some feelings of animosity towards some of the coaching staff and felt under-appreciated when included in special events. Signage was present in other sporting facilities. This company was not fully aware of, and certainly not taking advantage of, the elements that could (or should) have been a part of its sponsorship agreement – "I don't know if there are things we are just not doing, or it's just not there."

Descriptive Analysis.

When looking at respondents' information on a case-by-case basis, no two businesses reported being involved in the same industry at the same level of market area or average commitment, with the same sponsorship elements. Additionally, each respondent had a somewhat different view of how sponsorship was defined, as well as the elements that were believed should be included. Further differences were evident when looking at assessment methods and reasons to terminate a sponsorship. The relatively small sample size precludes statistical analysis of this dataset. An overview of some of the differences between respondents, divided by sponsorship elements, is displayed in the tables below (Table 20).

Table 20.

Sample of uniqueness of sponsorship participants

Posters/Banners

	Market Area		
Type of Business	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	2	1	0
Food & Beverage	4	2	1
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	1
Media & Information Services	0	0	1
Medical & Health Services	1	0	1
Apparel & Fashion	0	1	1
Retail Sales	1	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	1	1
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	1	0	1
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Printed Materials

	Market Area		
Type of Business	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	2	2	1
Food & Beverage	6	1	1
Automotive & Related Services	1	1	1
Media & Information Services	1	0	2
Medical & Health Services	2	1	3
Apparel & Fashion	0	1	1
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	1	2
Printing Services	0	0	1
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	1	1	2

Miscellaneous*	0	0	2

On-Site Promotions

	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Type of Business			
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	1	0	0
Food & Beverage	3	3	3
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	1
Media & Information Services	0	2	1
Medical & Health Services	3	0	3
Apparel & Fashion	1	0	2
Retail Sales	1	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	1	1	1
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	1	0	1
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Off-Site Promotions

	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Type of Business			
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	1	0
Food & Beverage	0	1	2
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	0
Media & Information Services	0	0	0
Medical & Health Services	1	0	0
Apparel & Fashion	0	1	0
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	0
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	1	1
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

On-Site Displays

Type of Business	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	1	2	1
Food & Beverage	1	2	1
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	1
Media & Information Services	0	2	2
Medical & Health Services	2	0	2
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	0
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	1	1	1
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	2	0	2
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Off-Site Displays

Type of Business	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	0	0
Food & Beverage	0	0	1
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	0
Media & Information Services	0	0	0
Medical & Health Services	0	0	0
Apparel & Fashion	1	0	1
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	0
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	0	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Awards

Type of Business	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	0	0
Food & Beverage	0	0	0
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	1
Media & Information Services	0	0	0
Medical & Health Services	0	0	0
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	0
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	0
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	0	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Promotions with Other Sponsors

Type of Business	Market Area		
	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	0	0
Food & Beverage	0	1	1
Automotive & Related Services	0	1	1
Media & Information Services	0	0	0
Medical & Health Services	0	1	1
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	0
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	0
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	0	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Contact with Coaches

	Market Area		
Type of Business	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	1	0
Food & Beverage	1	1	2
Automotive & Related Services	1	2	1
Media & Information Services	0	1	1
Medical & Health Services	1	1	2
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	0
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	1	0	1
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	0	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Contact with Players

	Market Area		
Type of Business	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	1	0
Food & Beverage	1	1	1
Automotive & Related Services	0	1	1
Media & Information Services	0	0	1
Medical & Health Services	2	1	3
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	1
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	1
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	0	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Contact with Fans

	Market Area		
Type of Business	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	0	1
Food & Beverage	2	2	4
Automotive & Related Services	0	1	0
Media & Information Services	0	0	0
Medical & Health Services	1	1	2
Apparel & Fashion	1	0	1
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	0
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	2	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Logos on Television

	Market Area		
Type of Business	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	1	3	0
Food & Beverage	2	1	1
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	1
Media & Information Services	0	0	1
Medical & Health Services	0	1	1
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	1
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	0
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	1	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Logos with Print Media

	Market Area		
Type of Business	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	1	1	0
Food & Beverage	4	2	1
Automotive & Related Services	1	1	1
Media & Information Services	0	1	1
Medical & Health Services	0	1	1
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	0
Retail Sales	1	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	1	2
Printing Services	0	0	1
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	0	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

Radio Mentions

	Market Area		
Type of Business	Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	1	2	1
Food & Beverage	5	0	1
Automotive & Related Services	0	1	1
Media & Information Services	0	1	1
Medical & Health Services	2	1	3
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	1
Retail Sales	0	0	1
Entertainment & Travel	1	1	2
Printing Services	0	0	1
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	2	1
Miscellaneous*	0	0	1

Tickets

Type of Business	Market Area: Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	0	0
Food & Beverage	1	0	0
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	0
Media & Information Services	0	1	1
Medical & Health Services	0	1	1
Apparel & Fashion	0	0	0
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	0
Printing Services	0	0	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	0	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

JumboTron

Type of Business	Market Area: Local	Regional	Nat/Inter
Financial, Insurance & Real Estate	0	0	0
Food & Beverage	0	0	0
Automotive & Related Services	0	0	0
Media & Information Services	0	0	0
Medical & Health Services	0	0	0
Apparel & Fashion	1	0	0
Retail Sales	0	0	0
Entertainment & Travel	0	0	0
Printing Services	0	1	0
Agriculture, Energy & Service Industry	0	1	0
Miscellaneous*	0	0	0

*Businesses in this category recorded only one response per industry.

RESEARCH QUESTION 10: Closer Relationships

The final research question asked if sponsors would like to establish a closer relationship with the athletic department. Successful sponsorship programs have been established around the premise of a concept known as “eduselling.” A key to the success of this process was the development of a partnership between the sponsor and property. Interview participants were asked directly about the relationship, while survey respondents were asked the about having an outside company to coordinate sponsorship across sports and having the ability to develop a relationship with the Athletic Department.

Interview Analysis.

Sponsors that participated in the interview process claimed that they liked having a friendly relationship with the properties that they sponsor. None of the interviews subjects could claim that the relationship with the athletic marketing department of the university was one that could be considered *close*. Companies A and B were satisfied with the current conditions, but suggested that a third party might be a more efficient way for the university to generate sponsorship revenue. Company C needed to overcome current issues before a closer relationship could be established, but claimed that an outside party did not offer a better solution.

Company A felt that the current relationship that it had with the athletic department was satisfactory. The respondents worked with many properties and taking the time to develop intimate relationships with each property would have proved difficult. At the same time, this corporation is definitely on first-name basis with representatives at all the properties supported through sponsorship. The company had a marketing person who negotiated and approved all sponsorship contracts, even though the interviewees handled the day-to-day functions.

As noted earlier, Company B reported that a good relationship was important to making sponsorship decisions. This individual stated that more personalized and coordinated service from athletic department personnel would result in more money for the program. The representative was friendly with university designates but felt that the athletic department could take additional steps to garner the company's business. Another university in the state gained more sponsorship dollars because of the relationship and personal service that had been established by that property's marketing department. This individual suggested that the university in this study needed to better coordinate the marketing efforts of the sports programs. Company B claimed to be contacted by individual sports and would rather give one larger amount to be dispersed as needed among the participating activities. Company B felt that outside coordination would benefit this program based on the personalities involved.

Company C would definitely like to develop a closer relationship with the athletic department. The company felt neglected and mistreated and the sports program would definitely benefit by becoming more involved in the relationship. The representative claimed that the athletic marketing department was aware of the rift and some steps have been taken to repair the damage but that personnel issues remained. The company felt that certain parties were indifferent about the support it provided and were not likely to want to re-establish the relationship. This individual was open to contact from the athletic department, but noted that conversations were often tense or strained.

Descriptive Analysis.

The questionnaire asked respondents to rate two statements about relationships with the university's athletic department; both questions were on a scale of 0-10. The first question asked participants to rate the importance of "an outside company to coordinate sponsorship across a variety of (university) sports." The second relevant question asked about the value of the "opportunity to develop a working relationship with (university) athletic programs." The mean for the statement about an outside company was 4.08 (SD = 3.37), indicating that respondents did not consider the use of an outside company to be something that was of great importance. The mean for the statement about the opportunity to develop a relationship with the program was 8.13 (SD = 2.35), indicating that the prospect of partnering with the university's athletic program is one that is valuable to respondents.

Statistical Analysis.

Additional analyses of the statements produced mixed findings. When considering the first statement, outside coordination, it was found to be affected by the marketing area of responding companies (F (2, 67) = 3.19, p < .05). A review of the associated means showed that national/international companies (M = 5.23, SD = 3.51) rated the statement most positively. Businesses with local marketing areas were the next most positive (M = 4.22, SD = 3.09), and respondents with regional marketing area were least likely (M = 2.93, SD = 3.15) to feel that outside coordination was important. Bonferroni post hoc analyses revealed differences between the ratings of businesses that operate in market areas that are regional and national/international. No differences were present for businesses in the local marketing area in relation to the two other types of businesses.

Further analyses uncovered no significant differences by market area for respondents' ratings of the value of developing a relationship with the athletic program, $F_{(2, 67)} = 3.19$, $p > .05$. Additionally, the table below (Table 21) documents that no statistically significant differences were apparent between length of sponsorship commitment and either statement presented above.

Table 21.

Means for Sponsor/Property Relationships by Market Area and Length of Commitment

	Market Area						
	Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
Statement	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Outside Company*	4.22 ^{A}	3.15	2.93 ^{AB}	3.09	5.23 ^{AC}	3.51	3.37
Develop Relationship	7.69 ^{A}	2.87	8.04 ^{A}	2.49	8.50 ^{A}	1.84	0.62
	Length of Commitment						
	< One Year		One Year		> One Year		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Outside Company	7.57 ^{A}	2.41	8.43 ^{A}	2.04	8.67 ^{A}	2.52	1.45
Develop Relationship	4.59 ^{A}	3.26	3.88 ^{A}	3.41	3.56 ^{A}	3.59	0.58

All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

HYPOTHESIS 1: Responsibility for Contract Fulfillment

Agency Theory claimed that sponsors and properties have equal involvement in the area of contract fulfillment; however more sophisticated companies have been reported as taking additional steps to ensure that a sponsorship is successful. As a combination of these premises, the first hypothesis predicted that businesses in different market areas would have differing opinions on the level of responsibility required to ensure that the promises made in a sponsorship contract were fulfilled. This proposition was evaluated using respondents' ratings to the statements "audit of contract fulfillment" and "my company must monitor the sponsorship to ensure success."

Descriptive Analysis.

Survey respondents were asked to rate two questions with relationship to contract fulfillment. Both statements were rated on a scale of 0-10; the statement about an audit of contract fulfillment was anchored by not important at all and very important, and the statement about monitoring was anchored by totally disagree and totally agree. The first statement ("audit of contract fulfillment") received an overall mean rating of 6.00 (SD = 3.16) indicating that respondents had a slight tendency to feel that receiving audit information from the athletic marketing department was important. The second statement ("My company must monitor the sponsorship to ensure success") received an overall mean rating of 5.78 (SD = 3.60) indicating that respondents were rather neutral, but may slightly agree, about having to monitor sponsorships to ensure success.

Statistical Analysis.

Ratings from statements about having the opportunity to receive a contract audit and monitoring the sponsorship were analyzed in an effort to determine the relationship between these variables and the market area of sponsoring companies. The resulting ANOVA revealed no significant differences between the ability to receive a contract audit, F (2, 71) = .64, $p > .05$, or the need to monitor the sponsorship to ensure success, F (2, 67) = .27, $p > .05$, when comparisons were made by market area. The associated means, in Table 22, confirm that no differences were apparent when comparing businesses with local, regional or national/international marketing areas; although sponsors with larger market areas did report larger means. No support was found for H2 among this population.

Table 21.

Means for Sponsorship Responsibility by Market Area

Statement	Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	ANOVA
Audit Information				F (2, 71) = .64, $p > .05$
	Local	4.78^{A}	2.88	
	Regional	4.50^{A}	3.62	
	Nat/Int	5.50^{A}	3.67	
Monitor for Success				F (2, 67) = .27, $p > .05$
	Local	4.62^{A}	3.72	
	Regional	5.19^{A}	3.61	
	Nat/Int	5.42^{A}	3.10	

All comparisons are vertical across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

HYPOTHESIS 2: Leveraging and Activation Increase Benefits

The second hypothesis predicted that sponsors engaged in leveraging or activation activities would claim that sponsorship was more of a benefit to their businesses than sponsors that did not participate in these types of activities. To test this hypothesis, sponsors were asked about the fairness of the sponsor/property relationship, past and future spending, beliefs about past and future return on investment (ROI) and whether or not the company spends money over and above the sponsorship fee to promote the support it has provided. Additionally, sponsors were asked to rate questions about benefits received from the association with the athletic program and how worthwhile the investment in the athletic program was considered to be.

Descriptive Analysis.

The majority (54.3%, n = 44) of respondents felt that the relationship with the athletic department was fair and equitable when asked about who got more out of the sponsorship agreement. A greater benefit for the sports property was reported by 24 (29.6%) sponsors; 11 (13.6%) respondents claimed that they didn't know or were not sure who benefited more from the relationship. Only two (2.5%) sponsors reported that the benefits that they received for their business was more than what their company provided to the athletic program.

Respondents were asked how sponsorship spending for their company had changed in the past, as well as about how it was likely to change in the future. A similar question was asked about return on investment. A small majority (38.3%, n = 31) reported that spending over the past few years had remained the same. Almost the same number (37.0%, n = 30) reported that investment in sponsorship had increased over the past few years. A decrease in sponsorship spending was claimed by 12 (14.8%) sponsors, while eight (9.9%) did not know how spending levels had changed over the past few years. Asked about ROI, 33 (40.7%) businesses claimed that the return on investment had remained the same over the past few years. The same number of sponsors reported an increase in ROI as reported that ROI had decreased over the past few years (16%, n = 13). Just over a quarter of respondents (27.2%, n = 22) were not sure how ROI from sponsorship had performed in the past few years.

Future spending was expected to remain the same for a majority of respondents (40.7%, n = 33). One third of the responding businesses (33.3%, n = 27) claimed that sponsorship spending would increase in the next few years. Expected decreases in sponsorship spending was reported by ten (12.3%) respondents; 11 (13.6%) did not know what changes would occur with sponsorship spending in the next few years. The same number of sponsors (38.3%, n = 31) claimed that ROI would increase in the next few years as did those who thought it would remain the same. Less than 10% (n = 8) claimed that ROI would decrease in the next few years, and 11 (13.6%) did not know how ROI from sponsorship would be in the future. Information on past and future spending and feelings about return on investment are presented in Table 23.

Additionally, sponsors were asked “in addition to sponsorship fees, does your company spend money on promoting the sponsorship?” The majority (58.0%, n = 47) of respondents claimed that they *sometimes* spent additional money to promote the sponsorship. Almost one third (30.9%, n = 24) claimed that they *never* spend additional funds to promote the sponsorship. Only nine sponsors (11.1%) responded that they *always* spend additional money to promote the sponsorship.

When asked to rate level of agreement for the statements "my company benefits from being associated with (university) athletics" and "money spent on sponsoring (university) athletics is a worthwhile investment" on a scale of 0-10, the response was on the side of totally agree. Benefits of association rated an overall mean of 7.69 (*SD* = 1.93) and worthiness of investment earned an overall mean of 7.75 (*SD* = 2.25), indication that responding businesses have a positive view of their sponsorship associations with the athletic department.

Table 23.
Respondents' Report of Past Occurrences and Future Intentions

	Intentions			
Statement	Increase	Decrease	Stay Same	Don't Know
Spending				
Past	30	12	31	8
Future	27	10	33	11
ROI				
Past	13	13	33	22
Future	31	8	31	11

Statistical Analysis.

Analysis of the relationship between the equitability of the sponsorship relationship and additional spending to promote the sponsorship did not reveal any significant differences, *Cramer's V*(81) = .21, $p > .05$. Further analysis revealed a weak, but statistically significant, relationship between promotional spending and future ROI, *Cramer's V*(81) = .28, $p < .05$. Of sponsors who expect future ROI to increase, 71.0% (*n*

= 22) sometimes spend additional money to promote the sponsorship relationship; 19.4% (*n* = 6) always invest extra funds, and three (9.6%) sponsors who expect an increased ROI in the future never spend in addition to the sponsorship fees. There were no statistically significant differences between expected levels of spending in the future and sponsorship relationships, *Cramer's V*(81) = .22, p > .05. Information related to promotional spending is presented in the table below (Table 24).

Table 24.

Respondents' reports of value of relationship and future intentions

	Promotional Spending		
	Always	Sometimes	Never
Independent Variables			
Equitability		*Cramer's V*(81) = .21, p > .05	
Fair & Equitable	6	27	11
More for Business	0	0	2
More for Property	3	13	8
Don't Know	0	7	4
Future ROI		*Cramer's V*(81) = .28, p < .05*	
Increase	6	22	3
Decrease	1	4	3
Stay Same	1	15	15
Don't Know	1	6	4
Future Spending		*Cramer's V*(81) = .22, p > .05	
Increase	2	21	4
Decrease	1	4	5
Stay Same	5	16	12
Don't Know	1	6	4

---

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.

Evaluation of the relationship between the perceived importance of benefits received from the sponsorship association and incidences of additional spending did not produce significant differences (F (2, 65) = 1.80, $p > .05$). Continued analysis with levels of additional spending revealed a statistically significant relationship with sponsors' opinions of the worthiness of investing in the athletic program (F (2, 65) = 4.02, $p < .05$). As shown in Table 25, review of the associated means revealed that the highest agreement of worthiness was reported by sponsors that always (M = 9.12, SD = 1.13) promote a sponsorship relationship; followed by sponsors that sometimes (M = 7.98, SD = 1.93) promote the association and those that never (M = 5.23, SD = 3.51) invest additional funds to promote the sponsorship relationship. Bonferroni post hoc analysis confirmed that differences were between businesses that never spend money to promote a sponsorship rating worthiness of investment lower than respondents claiming to always make additional investments to demonstrate the sponsor/property association. Sponsors that sometimes invest additional funds were not found to be different from respondents who always or never promote the sponsorship. H2 was supported.

Table 25.

Means for Value of Association by Promotional Spending

	Promotional Spending						
	Always		Sometimes		Never		
Independent Variable	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Benefits of Association	7.75 ^{A}	1.91	8.00 ^{A}	1.80	7.00 ^{A}	2.11	1.80
Worthwhile Investment*	9.12 ^{AB}	1.13	7.98 ^{A}	1.93	6.75 ^{AC}	2.79	4.02

All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

HYPOTHESIS 3: Integration Increases as Market Area Increases

The third hypothesis predicted that integration of sponsorships into marketing plans would differ by a company's marketing area, with those closer in proximity to the university having less integration. To test this proposition, respondents were asked to rate four questions about how the sponsorship was used by the company. The questions asked about use of the sponsorship as a marketing tool, whether or not it replaced other marketing communications, if the sponsorship was highlighted in other activities, as well as how well it met the company's marketing objectives.

Descriptive Analysis.

Survey participants were asked a series of questions about the use of sponsorship as an element of marketing communications. Each question was rated on a scale from 0-10, anchored by totally disagree and totally agree. The first statement, "My company uses sponsorship as a marketing tool," received an overall mean rating of 6.91 (*SD* = 3.46), indicating that businesses tended to agree that sponsorship was used for marketing purposes. The next statement, "My company highlights the sponsorship in other marketing activities," received an overall mean rating of 4.28 (*SD* = 3.33). This rating indicated that respondents were somewhat neutral, but had a tendency not to highlight the fact that the company participated in sponsorship activities in other marketing initiatives. The third statement, "My sponsorship replaces other marketing activities," received an overall mean rating of 5.22 (*SD* = 3.67), indicating that respondents did not really agree or disagree with the statement. This rating made it difficult to determine whether or not respondents do use sponsorship in place of other marketing communications. The final statement, "The sponsorship meets marketing objectives of my company," received an overall mean rating of 5.87 (*SD* = 2.77). Again a somewhat neutral rating but leaning toward agreement that sponsorship meets a company's marketing objectives. The rather large standard deviations indicated a wide range of ratings given by respondents. None of the statements revealed strong support for integration of sponsorship into a marketing plan.

Statistical Analysis.

Data analyses of the statements about using sponsorship as a marketing communications vehicle revealed that the size market area had no influence on the level of sponsorship integration. None of the statements suggesting integration were affected by the size of the market in which respondents conducted business. The accompanying table (Table 26) presents the means associated with each statement by market area; although means appear to have a tendency to increase by market size for two statements, there is no consistency in the remaining statements and no statistically significant differences in any area. No support was found for H3.

Table 26.

Means for Sponsorship Integration Statements by Market Area

	Market Area						
	Local		Regional		Nat/Inter		
Statement	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Marketing Tool	6.00 ^{A}	4.05	6.67 ^{A}	3.40	7.73 ^{A}	3.07	1.37
Highlighted Elsewhere	3.94 ^{A}	3.59	4.07 ^{A}	3.03	4.69 ^{A}	3.56	0.33
Replaces Other Marketing	5.81 ^{A}	3.58	5.11 ^{A}	3.62	4.96 ^{A}	3.86	0.28
Meets Comp. Objectives	5.88 ^{A}	2.78	6.11 ^{A}	2.53	5.62 ^{A}	3.07	0.21

All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

HYPOTHESIS 4: Evaluation Importance Means Increased Spending

The final hypothesis predicted that businesses that felt evaluation was important would be likely to increase sponsorship spending. To test this hypothesis, the composite assessment variable (as described earlier) was used to make comparisons with sponsors' reports of future spending. Additional comparisons of future spending were made with statements about the importance of the ability to measure the success of a sponsorship as well as the availability of a post-event report.

Descriptive Analysis.

Sponsors were asked to rate two statements with regard to evaluation of sponsorship; both questions were measured on a scale of 0-10 anchored by not at all important and very important. The first question asked the importance of the "ability to measure results of sponsorship." The overall mean for this statement was 6.81 (*SD* = 3.16), indication that being able to measure sponsorship success was somewhat important to respondents. The next question asked about the importance of receiving a "post-event report," and received an overall mean rating of 5.53 (*SD* = 3.32). This rating indicated that a post-event report was neither important nor unimportant to participating sponsors, although the rating did favor the positive. As with integration, the standard deviations indicated a wide range of responses. The combined assessment variable had a mean of 3.69 (*SD* = 2.08), with possible number of evaluation tools being from zero to nine.

Statistical Analysis.

Data analysis on the importance of evaluation and statements about the ability to measure sponsorship success and the availability of a post-event report were not found to be influenced by future spending intentions. The table below (Table 27) shows that respondents who did not know how their sponsorship spending would change in the future reported using the most evaluation methods. Additionally, respondents who expected to decrease sponsorship spending in the future rated the importance of a post-event report as being somewhat important, whereas respondents in other categories were closer to neutral in their feelings about the importance of the report. For sponsors who did anticipate an increase in sponsorship spending, the rating given to the importance of being able to measure the success of a sponsorship was lower than other sponsors that responded to the question. No support was found for H4.

Table 27.

Means for Evaluation Importance by Future Intentions

	Future Intentions								
	Increase		Decrease		Stay Same		Don't Know		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	*F*
Variable									
Analysis Composite	4.72 ^{A}	2.88	4.97 ^{A}	2.38	4.45 ^{A}	2.75	6.28 ^{A}	2.46	1.07
Post-Event Report	5.16 ^{A}	3.08	7.50 ^{A}	1.77	5.10 ^{A}	3.59	6.22 ^{A}	3.80	1.36
Ability to Measure	6.11 ^{A}	3.06	7.10 ^{A}	2.96	7.36 ^{A}	3.23	7.00 ^{A}	3.07	0.83

All comparisons are horizontal across means using Bonferonni.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

CHAPTER VI

Discussion

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore the use of sports sponsorship as a part of the marketing programs of sponsors of a collegiate athletic program. The university serving as the support for this investigation is in an NCAA conference that includes seven states in the southwestern United States. This public university is located in the second largest city of those in the conference, and the student population accounts for approximately 10% of the city's inhabitants. The athletic program at this university reported that 207 businesses currently serve as sponsors.

This study involved a two-part investigation that consisted of three in-depth interviews and a web-based survey. An overall survey response rate of 54.4% produced 111 respondents with 67 fully completed questionnaires. Interview participants were involved in communications, insurance and retail grocery sales. Survey respondents conducted business in a wide range of industries including medical, entertainment, media, fashion, agriculture and automotive. Respondents reported market areas of local, regional, national and international scope. Involvement with sponsorship consisted of agreements ranging from one season at a time to more than five years at a time.

Questions posed to interview participants varied slightly from those asked of survey participants (see appendices C and G and I, respectively); therefore interview observations did not correspond with every hypothesis and research question. Additionally, qualitative studies do not typically lend themselves to hypotheses testing;

instead providing understand which may, in turn, be corroborated by quantitative evidence (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005).

For practitioners, one of the most relevant findings in this dissertation was that there were not a lot of differences between businesses that sponsor collegiate athletic programs. Corporations with national or international sales market areas had similar reasons for sponsoring as did businesses with local or regional sales areas. Methods of assessment were similar, and all businesses would like to work closer with the athletic marketing department to make the most of the sponsorship relationship. All sponsors viewed participation in sponsorship of a collegiate athletic program as being a worthwhile investment and realized that there was value in the association. This is good news for properties that are seeking to increase revenue through the use of a sponsorship program. The need to go after a "major name" may not be the best way to increase funding. Local and regional businesses are just as likely to be interested in supporting an event or program, and may even offer more income in the long run – there are far more local and regional business to tap than there are national/international corporations.

Athletic departments should note that local and regional businesses would like to form a relationship with the university's teams and reach out to those businesses when seeking revenue. For the most part, the most important areas of sponsorship for businesses was to generate awareness for their brand – something that a sport property can accomplish relatively inexpensively with signage and audio announcements. Additionally, the property and sponsor can work together to customize packages that allow both to benefit from the association.

For researchers, the findings in this study have brought together concepts that have been explored in varying circumstances. Sponsors of collegiate athletic programs are similar to sponsors of professional teams and national or international events. Investigation of applications that have been suggested in previous studies have confirmed results and shown that the status or level of a corporation does not make a difference in how sponsorship is perceived.

As for the advancement of theory, the finding that businesses felt that sponsorship was a vehicle with which to reach consumers and generate positive images fits with the Elaboration Likelihood Model of consumer views of sponsorship. The peripheral route to persuasion purported by Petty and Caccioppo (1986) is echoed by sponsors seeing audience recognition of their support and acknowledgement of their contributions given to the property. The connection between the sponsor and property is believed to lead to positive reinforcement of the brand or product being viewed in association with the sporting entity or event.

The other consumer-based theories that were mentioned, schema and congruency, suggest that certain expectations about where advertising is expected can be associated with the contention that businesses feel that sponsorship is the “right thing to do” and that sponsoring is a form of community support. Companies would not be interested in sponsorships in areas that do not attract viewers. Knowing that participants and spectators expect to see advertising messages at collegiate sporting events, whether or not they want to or enjoy it, reinforces the placement.

The fit of Agency Theory is not quite as apparent in this dissertation. The idea that the sponsorship has to be monitored was not found to be a belief of participants.

Additionally, the expectations of businesses participating in sponsorship at this collegiate property appeared to be minimal. Continued research in this area may serve to provide a better explanation for he willingness of a business to offer support to a property without making clear what return is to be received.

The initial research question asked survey respondents to provide a definition of sponsorship using their own words. In the past, researchers (see for example: Meenaghan, 1991: Tripoldi, 2001) had typically provided the definition for sponsorship around which a study was based. In this instance, the research question sought to gain an understanding of what actual participants considered the activity to be. Sponsor-provided definitions could be grouped into five distinct categories based on commonalties. Some form of donation, monetary or goods and services was the most-often included description of sponsorship. Comments about financial support, time and equipment donations were included in this classification. Meenaghan (1991) claimed this to be the first level of sponsorship – a donor giving money with no specific goals tied to the gift.

Association of the company name with the athletic program and partnership between the sponsors and the property both were the second most frequently reported concepts of the sponsorship definition. Comments such as being able to reinforce company name and supporting team to increase business visibility were common mentions in these categories. This coincides with the second level of sponsorship awareness as described by Meenaghan (1991) – recognition that a participating business can benefit through the association with a sports entity. Advertising, with comments about media elements and signage, made up the fourth category. The final category mentioned as a sponsorship definition was the idea of providing support to the university.

Comments in this category included statements referring to businesses desire to contribute to the athletic department, university and community. Additionally, advertising elements were mentioned as a secondary descriptive item in several instances. The definition that most accurately reflected those given in sport marketing research, as given by a national company in the agricultural/energy industry, was, “Providing monies to support the local teams in return for fan and media exposure to the sponsor's products or services.”

For the most part, responses pointed to elements that were consistent with a businesses’ level of participation. Statistical analyses revealed that definitions did not differ based on businesses’ market areas but were likely to be different based on the length of commitment that sponsors made to sponsorship. A majority of sponsors citing donation in their written description participated in sponsorship with an average commitment of less than one year at a time. According to Chadwick and Thwaites (2005), short-term commitments may be a symptom of last-minute solicitation and ever-changing personnel. A one-time donation may satisfy feelings of obligation and offer an easy way to change alliances within the community. This may also be the result of both parties lacking the sophistication to understand the value and benefits that are possible to achieve with a planned sponsorship agreement. Sponsors have been known to approach the idea of sponsorship as a series of short-term agreements instead of developing a relationship that could lead to benefits for both the sponsor and the property (Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005).

Based on the descriptions given by respondents, it seemed that sponsors had very differing opinions of what actually a sponsorship was. There appeared to be an opening for properties to educate businesses as to how its sponsorships could be used to increase awareness and act as more than a financial contribution to the program. Recent successes in the football program at this university will most likely lead to increased interest from potential sponsors. The athletic marketing department should capitalize on this opportunity by negotiating strategic contracts with advertisers that enable both to reap the benefits available through a sponsorship association.

The second research question involved specific elements that construed the sponsorship package. This question was answered through analysis of an open-ended question as well as responses to a list of possible options for participation. Written answers to the open ended question resulted in creation of 13 elements that were determined based on known available elements and respondent mentions of items believed to be important.

Advertising components (signage, logo placement, announcements) comprised the most-often mentioned elements. This seemed to make sense, as recognition for sponsors of any event was typically in the form of some type of visual or audio recognition. Additionally, signage is typically a relatively inexpensive item for a property to produce. Furthermore, less sophisticated organizations often solicit “field signs” in an effort to generate funding for their organizations, community leagues and high school teams, for instance.

Name recognition was the next most frequently mentioned sponsorship element. Respondents grouped in this category did not specify how acknowledgment should be made, other than comments such as “recognition of sponsoring party.” Logically much sponsor recognition comes in the form of advertising elements, especially signage. Other areas in which sponsors could be recognized are audio announcements and program listings, again at relatively little const to the property. Sponsors like to be thanked and/or recognized for their support, just like individuals.

Respondents claimed to want clear instruction for participation in sponsorship agreements. Contracts with expectations for both the sponsor and property may counteract problems espoused by agency theory whereby each party was unsure of what the other was doing. Specific mention of this element by 13.5% of respondents would seem to indicate that accountability was important to sponsorship participants. This response may be indicative of the fact that many sponsors were unsure of what exactly a sponsorship was supposed to consist of. In a local market, businesses are asked to "sponsor" many different events and causes. The university may be seen as a sophisticated entity and spelling out exactly what was being garnered with a sponsorship investment may offer assurance that the money was going to an appropriate source and that the business was actually receiving a benefit that was worthy of the money it had spent.

Tickets and parking privileges were the fourth most mentioned element. Many corporations were believed to participate in sponsorship for the ability to reward and/or entertain employees and clients (Komoroski & Biemond, 1996). Event tickets can be prized possessions for organizations in areas with popular sporting events, especially those that are regularly sold out or priced to the exclusion of some attendees. Tickets make ideal promotional items for drawing patrons into businesses. Businesses that participate in sponsorship may also receive priority in purchasing tickets or gaining entrance to post-season performances. Bowl games and NCAA tournaments offer businesses a great opportunity to reward both customers and employees for performances or loyalty. Company A mentioned that employees were rewarded for outstanding sales performances with trips to the Olympic Games.

Mutual benefit, the fifth most commonly mentioned element, may be related to the idea of clearly written expectations. Current economic conditions require businesses to ensure that investments are prudent and offer a return on the dollars spent. Sponsors were not interested in participating in an agreement where some form of benefit was not available to them for their commitment. Additionally, sponsors reported liking to be included in special events, being an exclusive partner within a category, and having rights to use the athletic logo (at this university, a licensed design that had recently been the subject of a lawsuit between the university and a local retailer). The athletic logo is widely recognized as a symbol for the university, even though the athletic marketing department controls the rights. The ability of a sponsor to connect this symbol with its business attracts supporters of the university who may not have an affinity for the athletic program, but give their support to all areas of the university. The connection between the popularity of a university and the successes of its athletic program is not an area debated in this study; however, many published reports attest to the positive attention that is afforded an institution with teams in receipt of winning seasons. As mentioned earlier, the current successes of the football program have brought a lot of recognition to the university and there undoubtedly will be a slew of advertisers who are looking to "grab on to the coat tails" of that success.

Additional elements that garnered mentions included reciprocated patronage by university personnel, value for investment, and the ability to provide samples to event audiences. Two respondents mentioned professionalism – this particular answer begets questions about incidents that may have generated this response. Future research may include an opportunity for respondents to elect to provide additional contact information allowing for additional discussion about answers that spark curiosity. Meenaghan (1999) suggested that interviews prior to traditional quantitative methods of research might elicit additional information; however, certain answers to open-ended questions included in this dissertation indicated that follow-up qualitative research may also produce interesting findings.

Statistical analyses conducted with regard to the second research question involved 16 elements that sponsors indicated were part of current sponsorship packages. As with the open-ended questions, advertising opportunities topped the list of most frequently included sponsorship elements, with inclusion in printed materials being the most-reported item. Television, radio and print exposure, along with banners and signage were elements that were part of the top seven most mentioned items. Again the ability for the name of the sponsor to be displayed appears to be a common inclusion for sponsorship elements. A report from the athletic marketing department on elements that sponsors receive confirmed that visual acknowledgements for sponsorship support were top elements that were part of sponsorship packages.

The focus on advertising elements sparked curiosity as to how sponsorship opportunities are being presented to potential investors. If sponsorship has been bought and sold as an advertising vehicle, then the ability to measure results should be a natural part of the evaluation process. Research by Harvey (2001) has lamented the lack of standards for evaluation of sponsorship achievements. Consistent reporting of sponsorship involvement centered on advertising elements indicates that some form of justification for investment must be present. This was an area where continued qualitative analysis may provide insight for researchers as well as practitioners. It may prove equally as valuable to include the marketers themselves in the research process.

Market area was found to have no influence on the type of elements that were included in sponsorship agreements. Comparison of elements by length of commitment revealed that sponsors making long term commitments, defined as being longer than one year, were more likely to receive radio and television recognition more than sponsors participating in sponsorship agreements of shorter terms. One reason for this finding might be that longer-term commitments involved larger investments, therefore participants received additional acknowledgement and may have had the opportunity to select sponsorship elements that allowed for audience exposure over and above what could be attained with the confines of the sporting venue.

Overall, respondents seemed to find that being recognized, either with advertising elements, or just overt acknowledgement, were the most important elements to receive as a part of sponsorship. This seems to be a small consideration when sports sponsorship investments run into the billions of dollars. Obviously, the larger the investment, the more a sponsor expects in return, and the amount of investment was not asked in this study, but for an average collegiate property, acknowledgement of the businesses contributing to their program seems like a relatively easy way to solicit and maintain sponsors.

Research question three sought to uncover reasons for entering into a sponsorship agreement. Cornwell and Maignen (1998) claimed that businesses developed as they became more involved with the sponsorship process. Sophisticated corporations developed special programs and had specific goals in mind when investing in sports sponsorships. This certainly seemed true of the businesses that participated in the in-depth interviews.

Company A, an international communications corporation, had personnel in place to monitor sponsorship performance and contract fulfillment. Sponsorship agreements were designed to produce media exposure and prime placement of the company logo. The more the company name was seen and/or heard, the better. Company B reported using sponsorship in an effort to associate with the event's audience. The representative mentioned that sporting sponsorships allowed the company to gather information from event attendees (especially women), enabling the generation of sales leads, or the opportunity to validate consumers who already purchased insurance from this source. This confirmed Crompton's (2004b) claim that future sales, generated from leads that were made possible through sponsorship associations, were important objectives for participating corporations.

The motivation for participation for Company C was for community relations purposes. This company was very involved in the community and prided itself on being involved in important events. The presence of this sponsor was "expected" at a sporting event at college level. Store employees were encouraged to wear team colors on game-days, perpetuating the support for the university. Company C made a substantial investment in the athletic program at a time when funding was being sought for a much-needed new facility. This company "stepped up to the plate" and provided the funding source without seeking recognition for the contribution that was made.

Survey participants were presented with a series of statements that gave reasons for entering into a sponsorship agreement, as well as statements about benefits that may have been received from the sponsorship association. Respondents were asked to rate the 42 statements on a scale of 0-10. Because three statements were found to have been affected by the time difference of collection they were analyzed separately. No statistically significant differences were found between statements about the "fit" of a sponsorship within a marketing plan, the availability of cross-promotions or the ability to reach targeted consumers when categorized by market area or average length of commitment when divided by time of collection.

Analysis of the remaining 39 statements revealed that market area did have an influence of the likelihood of businesses entering into sponsorship agreements in order to gain the opportunity to provide samples. The overall mean rating, although close to being neutral (5-6 on an 11-point scale), indicated that local business were most interested in providing samples. It is logical to assume that business in the local area would like to encourage sales through sampling opportunities, especially for businesses that are located close to the athletic facilities. Studies (see for example: Petty & Lindsey-Mullikin, 2006) have shown that sales of a particular product were likely to increase after a sample had been received. In this study, a small sample size did not provide enough cases to determine if there was a particular industry that was more likely to view samples as being desirable; however, it could be assumed that businesses from the food and beverage industry would be strong candidates for this opportunity. Vendors are encouraged to participate in events prior to home football games, with both sales and sampling opportunities available. It may be these particular sponsors that gave positive ratings to this item.

Length of commitment was found to exert an effect on four statements with regards to reasons for involvement or benefits received from sponsorship. Businesses making average commitments of longer than one year were most likely to find that being the only business in a particular category was an important motivation. Longer commitments typically involve larger investments and category exclusivity may be a benefit associated with such participation. Additionally, making a long-term commitment as an exclusive advertiser closes the door to competitors being able to participate in the same sponsorship. Furthermore, sponsors making long-term commitments were attracted by the status of the associated event. Again, making a long-term commitment ensures continued association with a property that has been successful or is well respected. In this instance, the reverse is also true, if the team starts to lose or loses favor, a sponsor is tied in for the length of the contract unless a specific clause for release is included.

Other statements that appeared to be influenced by length of commitment included the ability to increase employee productivity and the importance of the sponsorship to company owners. Sponsors participating in short-term sponsorship agreements gave employee productivity the highest rating. This mean rating was close to neutral for short-term sponsors but may have indicated that sponsorship agreements were signed based on the feelings of employees at the time the contract was offered. Perhaps a winning season had just occurred and good feelings abounded. This may also signify that employees wield some form of influence over the sponsorship associations made by a business. Companies investing for an average of one year at a time rated the importance of sponsorships to business owners most highly. This mean rating indicated high importance to this category of businesses. On the surface, there appeared to be no clear reason for this finding. This is another area where further questioning of respondents may produce insights that have not been considered before. There is also the possibility that this is a spurious finding and of no real consequence.

There were no outstanding differences for entering into a sponsorship agreement in just about any category. Businesses, large and small, appeared to enter sponsorship agreements with the same reasons in mind – both philanthropically- and profit-oriented ones. Items receiving the strongest agreement ratings (8+ on a scale of 0-10) included supporting the university and athletic program, as well as the ability to give back to the community. Creating brand awareness and improving company image also rated highly in each of the market areas that were examined.

Methods of assessment were the subject of inquiry in the fourth research question. Interview participants were directly asked about the assessments that were used to determine the success or failure of a sponsorship agreement. Company A reported that fulfillment of the contract was the main concern. Analyses of the performance of each element assisted the company with deciding whether or not a sponsorship should be continued. Interviewees reported that the sponsorship was constantly monitored, so any deviation from the original plan could be detected and corrected or changed. Company B reported that comparisons were made between sponsorships at this and other universities. The ability of each university to produce customer contact was a priority for this business. Additionally, service provided by marketing personnel of the athletic department played a determining factor in the assessment of the sponsorship contract.

Company C did not conduct any formal evaluation of its sponsorship contract. The company realized that it had not received the same level of recognition that had been achieved by other sponsors, but were not seeking recognition for its contribution when the original contract was signed. At the time of the sponsorship commitment, there were few elements put in place that provided overt association between the sponsor and property. And, although the facility name was familiar in the community, the company behind the name was not associated with the building in most peoples' minds. The representative for Company C believed that steps should be taken to assess the benefits that were being received from the association and exposure that was gained; however, this task was not currently being undertaken. Both the sponsor and the property could make some strides in the coming years by publicizing the commitment that the company has to the university. The afore-mentioned facility will soon be celebrating a 10-year anniversary, a perfect time to "re-dedicate" the facility and generate some positive exposure for both entities.

Survey participants were asked about their usage of a variety of assessment methods. Positive responses to nine forms of assessment were summed for a composite variable. Usage of the individual assessment items (customer awareness, media exposure, dealer/trade feedback, event attendance, match with target market, off-field involvement, improved image, market share and sales figures) were not found to be influenced by market area or by length of commitment. Furthermore, the combined assessment variable was not affected by either market area or average length of sponsorship commitment. The lack of significant differences between each variable suggested that sponsors use similar forms of assessment regardless of their situation. Consumer awareness was the response that was given most often as a method of assessment, and it stands to reason that this method of assessment would be widely used. It is easy for businesses to tell that a sponsorship is working when a customer tells them about seeing their name at an event. For local and short-term sponsors, this may be the only feedback that is received, and may actually be the goal of the sponsorship association.

Media exposure was frequently reported as being a method of assessment that was used by regional and national sponsors. For businesses that may not be located in the city of the university, media coverage may be a way for these businesses to see their participation for themselves. Additionally, larger companies sometimes subscribe to services that analyze media exposure. Some forms of sponsorship, the Olympic Games for example, generate a lot of media exposure for sponsors. Visibility in the media coverage associated with an event may reinforce exposure that is received while in attendance and this is a way for sponsors to receive double benefits.

Sponsors gain exposure with the internal audience, those attending the event, as well as external exposure, through associated radio or television coverage. The accessibility and coverage provided by media explains how people who have never attended an event were able to name sponsors within a facility (Alvarado, 2006). Additionally, Abratt and Grobler (1989) and Meenaghan (1991) listed media exposure as the number one method for sponsorship evaluation, even though Fitch (1986) had claimed that using this standard advertising measure created a false view of a sponsorships' actual viewing audience. Media exposure seemed to continue to be used as a method to measure sponsorship success, including usage by sponsors of a collegiate athletic program that does not generate as much media coverage as a would a professional or multi-national event.

Improved image and event attendance were two additional methods of assessment that were frequently mentioned. As with customer awareness, improved image may be something that was reported by consumers frequenting a business. Some forms of advertising are designed to add credibility to a brand or business, and by way of association, a company is elevated from a consumer's point of view when they become associated with a favorite team or event. Positive feelings from the event or activity are transferred to the sponsoring brand.

Records of attendance at most sporting events are easily available. Many events report attendance number over the announcement system during the event itself. If a business believed that each person in attendance saw, or at least had the opportunity to see, that a particular company was a sponsor, then objectives for that company may be met. As reported earlier, signage is frequently part of a sponsorship package and "as long as people see my name out there" may be the only way that participating sponsors have to gauge the effectiveness of their sponsorship. Sponsors making commitments of one year and less than one year favored attendance records for a method of assessment.

Continued investigation of evaluation methods was conducted with two variables that were analyzed by time of collection. Internal feedback and TV exposure had been found to be reported differently based on time of collection, requiring each time period to be analyzed independently of the others. Analysis revealed that respondents in the first time period were influenced by the market area in which they conducted business, when internal feedback was considered to be a method for assessing sponsorship success.

Sponsors operating at a national/international level were significantly more likely to view this measurement tool as being important than were businesses from local or regional markets. In some ways, this seems counter-intuitive seeing that it was earlier reported that employees at smaller companies were likely to influence decisions on sponsorship participation. It may be that national and international corporations rely on reports from employees that are close to the property for feedback with regards to the success of a sponsorship. It would seem that sponsorship by a national or international corporation that did not have the support of local employees would not be seen as effective or a worthwhile expense. Here again is an instance where further investigation using qualitative methods could prove insightful.

The remaining six elements of assessment that were presented to sponsors in statement form were not found to be significantly different when divided by market area or by length of commitment. An area of interest is the fact that in-house research, as well as syndicated research, was not view as being very important. It was expected that larger companies would utilize these forms of assessment, but, according to the means for each market area, both types of research are more important to businesses operating in a local market area. How often companies at this level receive these types of research would be an interesting follow-up question. Furthermore, Mack (1999) felt that small and/or local businesses did actually participate in sponsorships for the same reasons as larger counterparts do, therefore it stands to reason that the same methods of evaluation would also be used.

The next research question was posed to discover methods of leveraging and/or activation that are being used by sponsors. Cimperman (2007), Hickman et al. (2005)

and Quester and Thompson (2001) are among the many researchers that have claimed that leveraging and activation activities add to the value of a sponsorship and were necessary for the benefits of association with a property to be fully realized. Reports and case studies, as cited in the literature review, about sponsor activities confirmed that participants that invested money over and above that of the sponsorship fee felt that the sponsorship was successful in achieving the objectives that had been set. It could be argued that these additional activities may have been able to achieve the same objectives without the added expense of the sponsorship fee. That point is not debated in this study, nor is it a question that can really be answered because so few sponsorships act as lone forms of marketing communication.

Interview participants were asked about activities that were conducted to promote the sponsorship association. Companies A and B reported that the activities that each one engaged in was related more to how the company used the sponsorship to achieve its own objectives rather than in an effort to promote the association in place with the university. Company A conducted promotions across a variety of events; the sponsorship just provided the venue for this event to take place. In the case of Company A, the impact may in fact be in reverse, the university benefits from being associated with and having the support of a global brand. Amis et al. (1999) claimed that a competitive advantage could be achieved when sponsorship was bundled with other marketing activities. Company A took advantage of multiple opportunities to associate its brand with events and activities that created positive associations in the minds of consumers.

Company B used the sponsorship to gather information from attendees. Their intent was not to publicize the association, but to build business. This company would have liked to gather information from the audience at every event and expressed frustration about limitations that were present that restricted it from these activities when another sponsor was conducting on-site promotions.

Company C did not conduct any leveraging or activation activities; however, it would be well-served if able to take advantage of such a situation. The environment in which the sponsorship agreement was signed negated the need for acknowledgement and association with the property was intended to be low key. Perhaps it was thought that people would realize from the name of the facility that the involvement was there, but this has not happened. After almost 10 years, people in the community still do not make the connection between the facility and the company. It is uncertain whether or not the community would view this company any differently because of the association, as it is already intrinsically involved in the university and the community. Being able to promote the association at this point would allow the company to receive the recognition that it deserves.

With Company C, at the time the time the current contract was established, corporate culture deemed that recognition for the company's contribution was not necessary. The current environment has shown this to be a naïve view of the investment. The lack of opportunities included in the contract agreement frustrated current marketing personnel who were not sure how to modify the package. The representative noted that many changes would have to be made for the current sponsorship to continue at the same level, one of the biggest areas being in activities that promoted the association and gained the company more exposure for its investment. The company claimed to regularly participate with other businesses and organizations in the community to promote causes and events.

More than half of the survey respondents claimed that they sometimes made additional investments over and above the sponsorship fee to promote the association with the university. When presented with a list of options in which leveraging and activation may occur, respondents reported public relations efforts as being the most frequently used method. Internal promotion was the next most often mentioned method. Interestingly, both of these options possibly involved very little expenditure by a business. A press release in the newspaper or an announcement at a staff meeting or board meeting does not really cost anything. Promotion through traditional forms of advertising was the next most frequently reported response. Considering the earlier mentioned desire to be able to use the athletic logo, it stands to reason that inclusion of the logo in advertising materials may be beneficial for a sponsoring business. A small mention of supporting the athletic program, along with the use of the logo does not have to detract from the intended message of the advertisement and can be a subtle reminder of the association. Conversely sponsors may want to make a big splash about the association and publicize their business as being an "official" provider, or active supporter. This is an area where being an exclusive sponsor can pay big dividends, especially in setting one business apart from another.

Public relations and internal communications do not necessarily involve an expense for a sponsoring company; it is therefore possible that leveraging or activation can occur without an additional investment by a sponsor. Properties would be well served in communicating this finding to current and potential sponsors. This is an aspect of the eduselling concept that may help to endear a sponsor to a property.

Further analysis of the eight items presented to sponsors as ways to promote the sponsorship association produced one statistically significant finding. The use of hospitality as a form of sponsorship promotion was influenced by the average length of sponsorship commitment. Sponsors making commitments of one year or longer were significantly more likely to use hospitality to promote the sponsorship than were sponsors who participated in sponsorships for less than one year at a time. One possible explanation for this finding is that sponsors that have made a long-term commitment have had time to investigate the property and arrange events around the sponsorship. Sponsoring a sporting activity for one season at a time leaves a short window of opportunity for participation.

Additional investigation into methods of evaluation revealed no apparent differences. Perhaps sample size played a part in this lack of evidence, or it may be that sponsors do not evaluate the success of their sponsorships differently from one another. Amis et al. (1999) reported that the only true evaluation of a sponsorship’s success could be that it had met the objectives that the company had set for the sponsorship to achieve. Sponsors were not asked to provide the objectives that were in mind when the sponsorship agreement was entered into, so it may not be possible to point to an appropriate evaluation method. Here again, a study focused on qualitative data collection may reveal interesting information. The interview subjects in this dissertation certainly had different objectives in mind when considering the current contracts in place. For all interviewed corporations, it is certainly fair to say that the company's objectives at the time of signing the contract had been met.

The sixth research question asked about the types of events and causes that were sponsored by each business. Respondents were presented with five types of sponsorships and asked to indicate in which ones they participated. Surprisingly, 14 respondents claimed not to participate in sports sponsorship. It may mean that they do not participate in sports sponsorship outside of the commitment with the university or that the question was not clearly understood. Some type of clarification should be made in future research involving a question of this nature. No respondents indicated that they were not currently sponsoring the athletic program. Of sponsors reporting participation in other types of sponsorship, educational sponsorships received the most responses. This was closely followed by charitable sponsorships. Most sponsors reported being involved in sponsorship in more than one area.

When looking at influences on types of sponsorships supported, cultural sponsorships were the only area that was found to be affected. Cultural sponsorships were most-supported by businesses operating at a regional or national/international level. Only a small number of sponsors in the local market area reported an association with cultural causes. This difference may be feature of the types of businesses that support cultural events – it is reasonable to assume that businesses that are attracted to the audiences of sporting events may not find the audience at a cultural event to be as attractive. Logic suggests that different types of people attend each type of event and that simple demographics could put sporting events and cultural events at different ends of the spectrum.

The type of support that has been offered can be used to assess the level of involvement that a company has with its sponsorship. Research question seven sought to explore this association. A company providing resources other than just financial assistance may be viewed as being more committed to the association.

During the interview process, all three companies claimed that they were not intimately involved with the sponsorship. Personnel did not assist with event coordination, goods and services were not directly provided, and facilities were not shared. Company C did encourage employees to show support of the team by wearing school colors on game days, but this also applied to high schools for the stores in surrounding communities. For the most part, employees of each company did their own thing at sponsored events, and the event functioned under the direction of athletic department and/or university personnel.

Division by market area was not found to have an influence on the types of support offered to the sponsorship property. Advertising support was viewed as the most popular type of support given, however, this claim of advertising support as the most frequently offered support might be misleading. As mentioned earlier, sponsors often received signage as an acknowledgement of the donation that had been given or investment that had been made. Clarification of this question in future studies may result in different responses. It was uncertain how many supporters actually claimed to want to "buy a sign" to support the athletic program. A working knowledge of sponsorship programs and some sales pitches tells that some sponsorship is actually sold under the guise of buying a sign, but sponsorship, as defined by marketing researchers, is a much more complicated process. An interesting study may be the differences between what sponsorship actually is and what is simply signage. And, how do consumers perceive both? This may be an area that sets businesses apart, especially at the local level and with grassroots events.

Barter or trade was the only form of support that was found to be influenced by length of commitment. Sponsors making commitments of one year at a time reported significantly more support of this kind than did sponsors at higher or lower levels. Perhaps sponsors were trading for tickets and/or parking, maybe a club suite. Several automotive dealers provide vehicles for the use of the athletic department and the marketing department did not provide exact details of the arrangements.

The eighth research question asked about reasons for ending a sponsorship. For the interview participants, overall performance was the main reason for separation to occur. Company A continually monitored sponsorship contracts, so the organization was alerted when something was not being done and adjustments could be made. Company B compared the current sponsorship with similar sponsorships at other universities, noting differences in the way things were done. It was noted that similar interest and concern by this university's marketing personnel could result in additional sponsorship investment. This company did not really offer a reason for ending a sponsorship; moreover it recommended ways for the university to encourage the sponsor to increase the level of investment.

The third company would have to face the disappointment of the community if it were to part ways with the university and stated that the relationship would probably continue but at a different level. It would have to be a possibility that the negative public relations that would result from dropped support of the university would be of more consequence to the company than the loss of an opportunity to promote the business.

A list including eight items and an "other" category was provided to survey respondents; respondents added price increase to the other category for nine reasons for ending a sponsorship relationship. When asked to provide the one main reason for ending sponsorship, little value or ROI was the most cited reason. With the current economic struggles faced by individuals and businesses alike, investments that are not earning some kind of positive return are being foregone. Poor execution by the property and budget cuts were the next most frequently mentioned reasons for discontinuance. There are some areas in which properties have little or no control, such as team performance or personnel changes, however these may be reasons for sponsors to end, or choose not to renew, an agreement. Some companies may even have clauses written into contracts where by each party can bow out if certain conditions are not met. This university has definitely had personnel/personality issues that may influence sponsor's desire to be associated with the program.

At the time of writing, there were no reported circumstances that had caused a sponsor to withdraw support for a specific incident related to any individuals. Changes may definitely occur in the near future because of recent changes in personnel and success records of individual sports teams. This would certainly make for an interesting research topic, but unfortunately it is highly unlikely that access to pertinent records would be granted. Additionally, the university's football program experienced an exceptional season, garnering national coverage and attention. These positive associations should parlay into sponsorship renewals and/or increases. It would be interesting to study if the property can take advantage of this success and develop close relationship with sponsors that can overcome any future downfalls as Lachowetz and his colleagues have led us to believe.

Three variables that had time of collection effects were analyzed separately. Analyses revealed that respondents from the first time period, with both short-term and long-term commitments were most likely to end, or not renew, sponsorships because of little value or ROI. Continued analyses with the remaining variables found no other significant differences in reasons for ending sponsorship. Small cell sizes in the investigation of this research question may have negated any differences or, it is possible that there were no significant differences between companies with different marketing areas and ways of committing to sponsorship.

The ninth research question predicted that every sponsorship would consist of different elements. The very nature of sponsorship almost dictates that individual packages are customized. No two properties are identical and no two sponsors can occupy the same space within a sponsored venue. Similarities are definitely possible, but some elements are still going to be specifically tied to one sponsor. It may be the size or location of sign or the length of the announcer's messages. Sporting events are live; there is no preset amount of time that will be available for television commercials or radio spots. There are certain time periods that recur on a regular basis, half-time, end changes, and natural breaks, but even the game length cannot be predicted because of different strategies by coaches, player injuries, penalties and the like.

The final research question posited that sponsors would like to have a closer relationship with the athletic department. Interview subjects had somewhat differing opinions on this subject. Company A did not really need to have a closer relationship with the athletic department. This company is almost in the reverse position, where the university probably benefits as much if not more from the association than the sponsor does. Ruth and Simonin (2003) believed that image transfer was possible between a well-known brand and a sports property, and that the association contributed to the brand equity of both. This company was an established sponsor and dictated to a property some of the elements that were included in its sponsorship agreements.

Company B liked the personal service that was received from another entity, and would like to receive similar service from this athletic program. Both Company A and Company B claimed that an outside entity might be better qualified to handle sponsorship sales across a variety of sports. The athletic department needs to find a way to develop a relationship with Company C in order to overcome some of the problems that have been faced in the past. The company was open to the prospect of a closer relationship with the athletic department, but may not be willing to take the first step.

Survey respondents were asked to rate statements about the importance of an outside company to coordinate sponsorships, as well as the opportunity to develop a working relationship with the athletic program. The first statement received a low neutral rating, indicating that the prospect was not one that was of great importance to respondents. The second statement rated much higher, indicating that sponsors did indeed find the chance to develop a relationship with the athletic department was one that was valuable. This indicates that the eduselling concept may be successful with this population.

When reviewing the above statements by market area, companies conducting business on a national/international scale viewed the importance of an outside company most positively. The rating given by respondents in this category was found to be significantly different than responses by other sponsors; however, the rating was in the range of neutral (4-6 on a scale of 0-10), suggesting that it was actually neither important nor unimportant. Sponsors conducting business on a regional level were most likely to find the use of an outside company to coordinate sponsorship activities as being not very important.

In light of the fact that two of the sponsors that were interviewed suggested that overall coordination of sponsorship would benefit the athletic department, the finding that national/international companies were more positive toward this idea was not surprising. The national and international businesses interviewed were the ones that suggested that overall sponsorship coordination would be beneficial, the regional company did not necessarily agree – as was confirmed by the statistical analyses. It is probably easier for larger companies to deal with one person for one property. If every property used multiple people for different events, coordination could become a logistical problem very quickly. For the purposes of the athletic department, it would also seem to make sense to have one person coordinating sponsorships across all involved sports. Doing so may allow the sports that are under-supported to receive additional funding. Company B did report that it would be willing to give a larger amount of money that the athletic department could divide as it wished. It was easier on the representative to participate in that manner, and justify the expenditure.

There were no statistical differences between market areas of companies when it came to wanting a closer relationship with the athletic department. The rating was consistently high across all categories, indication that all respondents desired a closer relationship with the athletic programs. Likewise there were no differences between companies making different length commitments. Again, this is an indication that agreement for a close relationship is seen as a valuable benefit for sponsorship participation. The implementation of a strategy similar to the eduselling process would seem to be welcomed by current athletic sponsors.

The first hypothesis predicted that sponsors in different market areas would feel differently about taking responsibility for the fulfillment of sponsorship contracts. Analysis was conducted using two rated statements. The first statement, being able to receive an audit of contract fulfillment, was not found to be significantly more important to national/international sponsors than it was to the other sponsors. The larger sponsors did rate the item higher, but not significantly so. Next was a statement specifically about monitoring the contract. This statement also received the highest ratings from sponsors with a national/international market area, and again the difference was not found to be significant. Responses from all respondents to these questions fell in the neutral range, indicating that there may not have been a lot of interest in these activities to begin with. Furthermore a wide standard deviation indicated that sponsors actually had large differences of opinion in each category. A larger sample size may have received different results.

The next hypothesis predicted that companies participating in leveraging and activation activities would claim that its sponsorships were beneficial to business.

Sponsors were asked about the fairness of the sponsor/property relationship, past and future spending and ROI, along with whether or not they leveraged the sponsorship. Additionally, statements about benefits received and the worthiness of investing in a sponsorship with the university were rated.

In answer to the first question, a majority of sponsors reported that the relationship with the athletic department was fair and equitable. More sponsors reported that the property received more benefit from the relationship than reported that their business received the bulk of the benefit. In some situations, sponsors may not realize all the benefits that are being received from association. A sponsor may see that their company has donated a certain amount of money to an event and in return they get a sign on the field. On the surface, the exchange does not seem very even. The sponsor does not see that the association with the property may add value to their business, or that seeing the sign may bring customers to the business. Many businesses do not ask customers if they have seen signage at sporting events, and unless a customer specifically mentions the sign, have no way of knowing if the sponsorship is equitable.

When looking at ROI and spending for the past few years and the next few years, responses were pretty static. Respondents reported that spending had either remained the same or increased over the past few years and that it would remain the same or increase in the next few years. This is positive news for the properties seeking sponsorship dollars. With regard to return on investment, again most reported either an increase or same value.

Participation in leveraging and activation activities was gauged by asking if sponsors had made investments over and above the sponsorship fee to promote the sponsor/property association. The majority of sponsors claimed to sometimes make this additional investment. Only a small number claimed to never invest additional funds. According to Poole (2002), this is a sign of diligent sponsors that are interested in gaining the most from the benefits of sponsorship.

A weak but statistically significant relationship between sponsors participating in some form of leveraging or activation and those that expected an increased ROI in the future was revealed. No connection was discovered with future spending. Cimperman (2007) believed that a key to success was to go beyond the venue or event to create impact. It appears that sponsors who take steps to make this happen expect to reap the associated rewards. Furthermore, sponsors that sometimes or always made additional investments rated the worthiness of investing in sponsorship with the university's athletic program very highly. Benefits of being associated with the program also rated highly, but with no significant differences were found between sponsors that did or did not make an investment in additional activities.

The third hypothesis predicted that differences in market size would make a difference in how likely companies would be to integrate their sponsorships into other marketing programs of the business. A series of four statements about incorporation of the sponsorship into marketing were rated by respondents on a scale of 0-10. Respondents had a tendency to agree with the statement that sponsorship was used as a marketing tool. A statement about sponsorship replacing other marketing communications received a slightly positive neutral rating, indication that respondents may sometimes see sponsorship as a way to replace other marketing elements. Verity (2002) emphasized that sponsorship should be viewed as an additional marketing communication element. She did not believe that sponsorship could serve as a substitute for a marketing or advertising plan. Highlighting the sponsorship association in other marketing communications received a rating of a low negative; indication that this activity was not a priority for respondents. The final statement asked if the sponsorship met the marketing objectives of the company. Sponsors were not asked about their marketing objectives, so there is no way to tell what the actual objectives were, however a slightly positive neutral rating was garnered. This may indicate that either sponsors do not know if objectives have been met, or perhaps they are only met on certain occasions. All of the four statements above were accompanied by wide standard deviations. This raises concern about the variation in responses. A larger sample may have revealed different findings.

Analysis by company size was not found to be influential on the integration of sponsorship into marketing programs. Companies with national/international marketing areas did rate some of the items higher than their lesser counterparts, but it was not consistent across the four statements. Given a larger sample, determinations may have been able to be made by industry type, perhaps indicating that integration is more likely when a certain kind of business involved.

The final hypothesis claimed that spending increases would be tied to the importance of evaluation. This was not found to be supported. On the whole, positive ratings were received for statements about the ability to measure sponsorship results as well as the availability of a post event report; however these responses were not tied to reports of increased spending in the next few years. This response begs more questions about how sponsorship is evaluated and how businesses justify the investments that are made in sponsorships. If evaluation of success is not a consideration, how are corporations convinced to continually increase spending on sponsorship year after year.

One of the latest reports from IEG (Chipps, 2008) claimed that corporate support of sports properties will rise by nearly 13%, the sixth consecutive year that sports sponsorship spending has increased. Undoubtedly, some of this increase will be money spent on the Olympic Games in Beijing, but Chipps (2008) reported that a majority of North American sponsorship spending is directly funneled to sports properties. Almost three quarters (69%) of all North American sponsorship spending is target to sports. Marketers are continually turning to this method of communicating with the public and many questions about the associations with both properties and sports consumers are still unanswered. This elusive combination of advertising and public relations works for the companies that participate, but the reasons for those successes remain, at best, a guess.

Limitations

The population for this study was 204 sponsors, an average size for the number of sponsors that would be involved with a property such as an athletic program, but not an ideal size for statistical investigation. The uniqueness of the association may be why past research on the sponsors themselves has centered on descriptive reports and case studies rather than in-depth analyses. Additionally, the delay in time for some sponsors to provide responses generated some differences between the answers that were provided. This reduced the size of the cases being analyzed even further.

The very nature of sponsorship, the fact that it can be customized for each sponsor, as well as the differences that are present between properties make it difficult to generalize from one population to another. Findings reported in this study may not be consistent with the findings at another property. Again, with any form of sponsorship, there are no identical conditions under which testing can be compared. The use of one university, in any study, makes the ability to generalize the findings to other populations one that is tenuous in the best of situations.

Every effort was made to ensure that all sponsors had an opportunity to participate. Each sponsor was contacted a minimum of four times. The possibility exists that non-respondents may offer different opinions than those that did respond. Survey responses were collected over a five-month period and involved solicitation by telephone e-mail and postal mail. Time differences for some variables (approximately 10%) required separate evaluation due by time of collection. Additionally, the overall small sample size required the use of statistics that compensated for small cell sizes, especially with the use of descriptive statistics. Cramer's V adjusted chi-square significances to factor out sample size. The analyses reported a norm from 0 to 1, indicating the strength of the association between variables, regardless of table size. In many instances, comparison of means analyses produced significance levels close to $\alpha = .05$ (e.g. .055, .062 and .077) that, given a larger sample, may have indeed indicated significant relationships between variables.

Future Research

The current study has opened the door to a lot more questions. Some of the responses provided deserved further explanation, and a way to probe responses in the future could add to the base of literature. Additional studies with similar properties would offer a way to validate the findings from this study and determine if additional questions may be answered. Sport sponsorship is an area that will benefit from continued research, both on the part of academia and those who are involved in the practice.

Only briefly touched on in the literature review is the concept of economic modeling. This model overlays sponsorship activities, those included as part of the sponsorship agreement, as well as additional leveraging or activation activities that were conducted by the sponsor, with sales activity so that marketers can view the impact that has been generated by each element. This concept may lead to development of better-executed sponsorship contracts by both sponsors and properties.

Conclusions

In general, stating that sponsors at all levels do basically the same things for basically the same reasons can sum up findings from this dissertation. Great differences were not readily apparent between sponsors at national or international levels and those that operated on a more local basis. Reasons for entering sponsorship relationships, methods of evaluation and conditions for contract termination were consistent among categories of businesses that were explored in this study.

Collegiate sponsorships, at least in this instance, appeared to follow the reasoning presented by researchers in previous studies that used national or international sponsorship occurrences. These similarities existed, not only with businesses or companies with national or international presences, but also among those operating on a local or regional basis, giving credence to Mack's belief that local businesses can play a vital role in sponsorship partnerships.

References:

Abratt, R., & Grobler, P. (1989). The evaluation of sports sponsorships. *International Journal of Advertising, 8,* 351-362.

Alexandris, K., Tsaousi, E., & James, J. (2007). Predicting sponsorship outcomes from attitudinal constructs: The case of a professional basketball event. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 16*, 130-139.

Alvarado, G. (2006). *Athletic donor perceptions of corporate collegiate sponsorship.* Unpublished masters thesis, Texas Tech University. Lubbock, TX.

Alvarado, G. (2007a). *Effects of proximity: Sponsor and consumer location influences on recall of collegiate athletic program advertisers*. Paper presented at the 2007 Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Conference in Washington, DC.

Alvarado, G. (2007b). *Sponsorship Integration: More is Better…But is it Integration?* Paper presented at "Expanding the Definition of Convergence and Integration" research colloquium in Lubbock, TX.

Amis, J., Slack, T., & Berrett, T. (1999). Sports sponsorship as distinctive competence. *European Journal of Marketing, 33*, 250-272.

Anderson, C. (2006, March 23). Will pro sports franchises soon sell team-naming rights? *PRLeap.com.* Retrieved on January 30, 2008 from http://www.prleap.com/pr/30211/.

Arens, W. (2005). *Contemporary Advertising*, 10th ed., NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Armstrong, C. (1988). Sports sponsorship: A case study approach to measuring its effectiveness. *European Research*, *16*(2), 97-103.

Bahli, B., & Rivard, S. (2003). The information of technology outsourcing risk: a transaction cost and agency theory-based perspective. *Journal of Information Technology, 18*, 211-221.

Bennett, G., Cunningham, G., & Dees, W. (2006). Measuring the marketing communication activations of a professional tennis tournament. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 15*, 91-101.

Bennett, R. (1999). Sports sponsorship, spectator recall and false consensus. *European Journal of Marketing, 33*, 291-313.

Bergen, M., Dutta, S., & Walker, O. (1992). Agency relationships in marketing: A review of the implications and applications of agency and related theories. *Journal of Marketing, 56* (3), 1-24.

Berrett, T., & Slack, T. (1999). An analysis of the influence of competitive and institutional pressures on corporate sponsorship decisions. *Journal of Sport Management, 13*, 114-138.

Berrett, T & Slack, T. (2001). A framework for the analysis of strategic approaches employed by non-profit sport organisations in seeking corporate sponsorship. *Sport Management Review, 4, 21-45.*

Billiot, T., & Grubb, M. (2005, August). *Women sportcasters and barriers to success*. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Bosman, J. (2006, March 22). First stadiums, now teams take corporate identity. *The New York Times.* Retrieved on January 30, 2008 from http://www.nytimes.com/2006/03/22/business/media/22adco.html?_r=1&st=cse&sq=%22first+stadiums%22&scp=1&oref=slogin.

Brown, M., Nagel, M., McEvoy, C., & Rascher, D. (2004). Revenue and wealth maximization in the National Football League: The impact of stadia. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13,* 227-235.

Bruno, M. (2001). Take me out to the ball game. *U.S. Banker, 111*(6), 40-41.

Burden, W., & Li, M. (2005). Circumstantial Factors and Institutions' outsourcing decisions on marketing decisions on marketing operations. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13,* 227-235.

Burton, R. (2003, May 12). Get the value from sponsorship. *Advertising Age, 74*(19), 29-29.

Burton, R., Quester, P., & Farrelly, F. (1998). Organizational power games. *Marketing Management, 7*(1), 26-36.

Calderon-Martinez, A., Mas-Ruiz, F., & Nicolau-Gonzalbez, J. (2005). Commercial and philanthropic sponsorship: Direct and interaction effects on company performance. *International Journal of Market Research, 47,* 75-99.

Chadwick, S., & Thwaites, D. (2005). Managing sport sponsorship programs: Lessons from a critical assessment of English soccer. *Journal of Advertising Research, 45*, 328-338.

Chipps, B. (2007). Spending on college sports sponsorships to total $515 million in 2007. *IEG Press Release.* Retrieved on January 30, 2008 from http://www.sponsorship.com/About-IEG/Press-Room/Spending-On-College-Sports-Sponsorship-To-Total-$5.aspx.

Chipps, W. (2008). Sponsorship spending to total $16.78 billion in 2008. Retrieved on October 17, 2008 from http://www.sponsorship.com/About-IEG/Press-Room/Sponsorship-Spending-To-Total-$16.78-Billion-In-20.aspx

Choi, J., Stotlar, D., & Park, S. (2006). Visual ethnography of on-site sport sponsorship activation: LG Action Sports Championship. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 15*, 71-79.

Clark, J., Cornwell, T., & Pruitt, S. (2002). Corporate stadium sponsorships, signaling theory, agency conflicts, and shareholder wealth. *Journal of Advertising Research, 42*(6), 16-32.

Cimperman, J. (2007, January 29). Sponsor's strongest bond with consumers lies beyond an event. *Street & Smith's SportsBusiness Journal, 9*(38), 15.

Cliffe, S., & Motion, J. (2005). Building contemporary brands: A sponsorship-based strategy. *Journal of Business Research, 58*, 1068-1077.

Coderre, G. Mathieu, A., & St-Laurent, N. (2004). Comparison of the quality of qualitative data obtained through telephone, postal and email surveys. *International Journal of Market Research, 46,* 347-357.

Connidis, I. (1983). Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods in survey research on aging: An assessment. *Qualitative Sociology, 6,* 334-352.

Copeland, R., Frisby, W., & McCarville, R. (1996). Understanding the sport sponsorship process from a corporate perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 10,* 32-48.

Cornwell, T. (1995). Sponsorship-linked marketing development. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 4*, 13-24.

Cornwell, T., & Maignan, I. (1998). An international review of sponsorship research. *Journal of Advertising, 27*(1), 1-21.

Cornwell, T., Relyea, G., Irwin, R., & Maignan, I. (2000). Understanding long-term effects of sports sponsorship: Role of experience, involvement, enthusiasm and clutter. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, 2*(2), 127-155.

Cornwell, T., Weeks, C., & Roy, D. (2005). Sponsorship-linked marketing: Opening the black box. *Journal of Advertising, 34*(2), 21-42.

Cousens, L., & Slack, T. (1996). Using sport sponsorship to penetrate local markets: The case of the fast food industry. *Journal of Sport Management, 10,* 169-187.

Covell, D. (2001). The role of corporate sponsorships in intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 10*, 245-247.

Cowan, S. (2005, January 7). College presidents must take charge of college sports. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. B20.

Crimmins, J., & Horn, M. (1996). Sponsorship: From management ego trip to marketing success. *Journal of Advertising Research, 36*(4), 11-21.

Crompton, J. (2004a). Sponsorship ambushing in sport. *Managing Leisure, 9,* 1-12.

Crompton, J. (2004b). Conceptualization and alternate operationalizations of the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness in sport. *Leisure Studies, 23,* 267-281.

Crompton, J., & Howard, D. (2003). The American experience with facility naming rights: opportunities for English professional football teams. *Managing Leisure*, *8,* 212-226.

Cutler, D. (1999). Corporate sponsorship: a necessary evil in collegiate athletics today. *Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing.* Retrieved on February 28, 2006 from http://www.ausport.gov.au/fulltext/1999/cjsm/v3n3/cutler33.htm.

Dean, D. (1999). Brand endorsement, popularity, and event sponsorship as advertising cues affecting consumer pre-purchase attitudes. *Journal of Advertising, 28*(3), 1-12.

Dean, D. (2003-4). Consumer perception of corporate donations: Effects of company reputation for social responsibility and type of donation. *Journal of Advertising, 32*(4), 91-102.

Devers, K. (1999). How will we know "good" qualitative research when we see it? Beginning the dialogue in health services research. *Health Services Research, 34,* 1153-1188.

Devers, K., & Frankel, R. (2000). Study design in qualitative research – 2: Sampling and data collection strategies. *Education for Health, 13,* 263-271.

Dobson, S. (2006). The measurement question. *Marketing Magazine, 111*(38), 15-17.

Dolphin, R. (2003). Sponsorship: Perspectives on its strategic role. *Corporate Communications, 8*(3), 173-196.

Doonar, J. (2004). Sponsorship is more than just a logo. *Brand Strategy, 185,* 46-49.

Drees, N. (1991). Das Sponsoring-Barometer-Ergebnisse einer Unternehmsbefraung. *Werbeforshung & Praix, 36*(1), 16-20.

Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 532-550.

Evans, A, James, T., & Tomes, A. (1996). Marketing in UK sport associations. *The Service Industries Journal, 16,* 207-222.

Farrelly, F., & Quester, P. (2003). What drives renewal of sponsorship principal/agent relationships? *Journal of Advertising Research, 43*, 353-360.

Farrelly, F., Quester, P., & Burton, R. (1997). Integrating sports sponsorship into the corporate marketing function: An international study. *International Marketing Review, 14,* 170-182.

Fiske, S. (1982). Schema-triggered affect: Applications to social perception. In M. S. Clark & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Cognition and affect: The 17th annual Carnegie symposium* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Fitch, E. (1986, September 1). Methods of keeping score for advertisers. *Advertising Age, Special Report.*

Fowler, F. (1993). *Survey research methods*, 2nd ed. Newbury Park: Sage.

Ganeshananthan, V. (2000). Stanford University removes corporate advertising from arenas. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(43). A49.

Gardner, M., & Shuman, P. (1987). Sponsorship: An important component of the promotions mix. *Journal of Advertising, 16*(1), 11-17.

Garson, G. (n.d.). "Nominal Association: Phi, Contingency Coefficient, Tschuprow's T, Cramer's V, Lambda, Uncertainty Coefficient", from Statnotes: Topics in Multivariate Analysis. Retrieved 10/04/2008 from http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/statnote.htm.

Gerrard, B. (1999). The dynamics of sport sponsorship; The case of English professional football. *International Journal of Sport Marketing and Sponsorship, 1*(1), 48-63.

Gilbert, D. (1998). Sponsorship strategy is adrift. *The Quarterly Review of Marketing, 3*, 6-9.

Gillis, R. (2005). Old issues needs new approach. *SportBusiness International, 98,* 13.

Gladden, J., & Milne, G. (1999), Examining the importance of brand equity in professional sport. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 8*, 21-29.

Grimes, E., & Meenaghan, T. (1998). Focusing commercial sponsorship on the internal corporate audience. *International Journal of Advertising, 17*(1), 51-74.

Gustafson, M. (2005). *The relative importance of the sportscape in football game attendance at NCAA Division I-A university.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, Lubbock.

Gwinner, K. (1997). A model of image creation and image transfer in event sponsorship. *International Marketing Review, 14*, 145-158.

Gwinner, K., & Eaton. J. (1999). Building brand image through event sponsorship: The role of image transfer. *Journal of Advertising, 28*(4), 47-57.

Gwinner, K., & Swanson, S. (2003). A model of fan identification: antecedents and sponsorship outcomes. *The Journal of Services Marketing, 17*, 275-294.

Hackley, C., & Tiwsakul, R. (2006). Entertainment marketing and experiential consumption. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 12*(1), 63-75.

Hansen, F., Halling, J., & Christensen, L. (2006). Choosing among alternative parties to be sponsored for supporting brand strategies, based upon emotional responses. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 5*, 504-517.

Hansen, F., & Scotwin, L. (1995). An experimental enquiry into sponsoring: what effects can be measured? *Marketing and Research Today, 23,* 173-181.

Harvey, B. (2001). Measuring the effects of sponsorships. *Journal of Advertising Research, 41*(1), 59-65.

Hastings, G. (1984). Sponsorship works differently from advertising. *International Journal of Advertising, 3,* 171-176.

Heerwegh, D., Vanhove, T., Matthijs, K., & Loosveldt, G. (2005). The effect of personalization on response rates and data quality in web surveys. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory and Practice, 8*(2), 85-99.

Hickman, T., Lawrence, K., & Ward, J. (2005). A social identities perspective on the effects of corporate sport sponsorship on employees. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 14,* 14-157.

IEG. (2000). IEG SR Briefing. Sponsorship activation: How smart sponsors leverage ties to sports, arts entertainment and causes. *IEG Sponsorship Report.*

IEG. (2004). IEG/Performance Research study finds sponsors earning bigger returns. *IEG Sponsorship Report.*

IEG. (2005). Sponsors say return on investment is up and they are doing more to prove it. *IEG Sponsorship Report.*

Irwin, R., & Asimakopoulos, M. (1992). An approach to the evaluation and selection of sport sponsorship proposals. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 1,* 43-51

Is sponsorship measuring up? (2006). *SportsBusiness International, 118,* 52-54.

Johar, G., & Pham, M. (1999). Relatedness, prominence, and constructive sponsor identification. *Journal of Market Research, 36,* 299-312.

Johar, G., Pham, M., & Wakefield, K. (2006). How event sponsors are really identified: A (baseball) field analysis. *Journal of Advertising Research, 46*, 183-198.

Jowdy, E., & McDonald, M. (2002). The FUTURES Golf Tour case study: Sponsorship sales and eduselling. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 4,* 248-251.

Kaplowitz, M., Hadlock, T., & Levine, R. (2004). A comparison of web and mail survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 68,* 94-101.

Keller, K. (1993). Conceptualization, Measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing, 53*(1), 1-22.

Kemp, E. (2007, June 20). Sponsorship leagues. *Marketing,* p. 33-35.

Kennen, W. (2007, September 1). Sponsorship versus advertising: Why non-profits care. *Suite101.com.* Retrieved on February 12, 2008 from http://nonprofitmanagement.suite101.com/blog.cfm/sponsorship_versus_advertising.

Kilby, N., & Wardle, S. (2006, August 6). Scoring goals with sponsorship. *Marketing Week,* 34-38.

Klayman B. (2009). Recession slams brakes on U.S. sponsorships – IEG. *Reuters.com.* Retrived on March 23, 2009 from http://reuters.com/articlePrint?articleId=USN2637590420090126

Koenderman, T. (2000, May). Media and Marketing focus. *Finance Week,* pp. 11-17.

Komoroski, L., & Biemond, H. (1996). Sponsor accountability: Designing and utilizing an evaluation system. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 5*(2), 35-40.

Koschler, G. & Merz, J. (1995) Sport sponsorship in isolation versus its integration into classical advertising. R'Activ: a case study on the effectiveness of sport sponsorship. In Proceedings of the ESOMAR Seminar on Advertising, Sponsorship and Promotion. March, pp. 105–124. Madrid: ESOMAR.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuzma, J., Shanklin, W., & McCally, J. (1992). Make corporate sponsorship more effective with promotional support. *Journal of Promotion Management, 1*(3), 95-103.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: an Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*, SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.

Lachowetz, A. (2001). *Corporate selling activities and the determinants of sponsorship renewal in the National Basketball Association.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Ann Arbor.

Lachowetz, A., Sutton, W., & McDonald, M. (2000). Selling the big picture. *Athletic Management, 12*(6). Retrieved on November 28, 2007 from http://www.momentummedia.com/artices/am/as1206/ovoselling.htm.

Lachowetz, A., Sutton, W., McDonald, M., Warnick, R., & Clark, J. (2002). Corporate selling activities and the determinants of corporate partner retention in the National Basketball Association (NBA). *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship, 3,*403-427.

Lapin, J. (1987), How to win with sports. *Public Relations Journal, 43,* 31-32.

Lardinoit, T., & Derbaix, C. (2001). Sponsorship and recall of sponsors. *Psychology & Marketing, 18,* 167-190.

Lardinoit, T., & Quester, P. (2001). Attitudinal effects of combined sponsorship and sponsor's prominence on basketball in Europe. *Journal of Advertising Research,* 41(1), 48-58.

Lawson, C. (1985). Intergovernmental challenges of the 1984 Olympic Games. *Publius, 15*, 127-141.

Lee, J. (2000, June 5). Commerce comes to campus. *Street and Smith's SportsBusiness Journal, 29,* 29 & 36.

Leedy, P., & Ormord, J. (2005). *Practical research planning and design*, 8th edn, Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Logan, M. (2000). Using agency theory to design successful outsourcing relationships. *The International Journal of Logistics Management, 11*(2), 21-32.

Long, J., Thibault, L., & Wolfe, R. (2004). A case study of influence over a sponsorship in a Canadian university athletic department. *Journal of Sport Management, 18,* 132-157.

Lough, N., & Irwin, R. (2001). A comparative analysis of sponsorship objectives for U.S. women's sport and traditional sport sponsorship. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 10,* 202-211.

Mack, R. (1999). Event sponsorship: An exploratory study of small business objectives, practices and perceptions. *Journal of Small Business Management, 37*(3), 25-30.

Madrigal, R. (2000). The influence of social alliance with sports teams on intentions to purchase corporate sponsor's products. *Journal of Advertising, 29*(4), 13-24.

Mahoney, D., & Howard, D. (2001). Sport business in the next decade: A general overview of expected trends. *Journal of Sport Management, 15,* 275-296.

Mandler, G. (1982). The structure of value: Accounting for taste, In M. S. Clark & S. T. Fiske (Eds), *Affect and Cognition: The 17th annual Carnegie symposium on cognition, 3-368.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Marber, A., Wellen, P., & Posluszny, S. (2005). The merging of marketing and sports: A case study. *Marketing Management Journal, 15*(1), 162-171.

Marshall, D., & Cook, G. (1992). The corporate (sports) sponsor. *International Journal of Advertising, 11,* 307-324.

Martensen, A., Grønholdt, L., Bendtsen, L., & Jensen, M. (2007). Application of a Model for the Effectiveness of Event Marketing. *Journal of Advertising Research, 47*, 283-301.

Martin, G. (n.d.). Does sport sponsorship have a direct impact on product sales? *Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing.* Retrieved on October 8, 2008 from http://fulltext.ausport.gov.au/fulltext/1997/cjsm/v1n4/wilson.htm.

Mason, R., & Cochetel, F. (2006). Residual brand awareness following the termination of a long‐term event sponsorship and the appointment of a new sponsor. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 12(*2), 125-144.

McAllister, D., & Ferrell, L. (2002). The role of strategic philanthropy in marketing strategy. *European Journal of Marketing, 36,* 689-717.

McAllister, M. (1998). College bowl sponsorship and the increased commercialization of amateur sports. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 153,* 357-381.

McAllister, M. (1999). Super Bowl advertising as commercial celebration. *Communication Review, 3,* 403-428.

McAuley, A., & Sutton, W. (1999). In search of a new defender: The threat of ambush marketing in the global sport arena. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, 1*(1), 64-86.

McDaniel, S. (1995). *The communication effects of positioning brands with sporting events: An experimental study of schema-triggered affect in consumer response to event sponsorship advertising.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

McDaniel, S. (1999). An investigation of match-up effects in sport sponsorship advertising: The implications of consumer advertising schemas. *Psychology & Marketing, 16,* 163-184.

Meenaghan, J. (1983). Commercial sponsorship. *European Journal of Marketing, 17* (7), 5-74.

Meenaghan, T. (1991). Sponsorship – legitimizing the medium. *European Journal of Marketing, 25*(11), 5-30.

Meenaghan, T. (1998). Current developments and future directions in sponsorship. *International Journal of Advertising, 17,* 3-28.

Meenaghan, T. (1999). Commercial sponsorship: The development of understanding. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, 1,* 19-31.

Meenaghan, T. (2001a). Sponsorship and advertising; A comparison of consumer perceptions. *Psychology & Marketing, 18,* 191-215.

Meenaghan, T. (2001b). Understanding sponsorship effects. *Psychology & Marketing, 18,* 95-122.

Meenaghan, T., & O'Sullivan, P. (1999). Playpower – sports meets marketing. *European Journal of Marketing, 33,* 241-249.

Meir, R., Arthur, D., Tobin, J., & Massingham, C. (1997) Professional rugby league in Australia: a case study in sponsor awareness. *Cyber–Journal of Sport Marketing* (online), 1(3). Retrieved on May 27, 2007 from www.cjsm.com.Vo11/Meir.html.

Meyers-Levy, J., & Tybout, A. (1989). Schema congruity as a basis for product evaluation. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16,* 39-54.

Miles, L. (1987, May 28). Sporting life: Sponsorship. *Marketing,* p. 26-28.

Miloch, K., & Lambrecht, K. (2006). Consumer awareness of sponsorship at grassroots sport events. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 15,* 147-154.

Misra, S., & Beatty, S. (1990). Celebrity spokesperson and brand congruence. *Journal of Business Research, 21*, 159-173.

Miyazaki, A., & Morgan, A. (2001). Assessing market value of event sponsoring: Corporate Olympic sponsorships. *Journal of Advertising Research, 41*(1), 9-15.

Modeen, M. (2002, February 27). Tacoma, Wash., officials peddle naming rights to buildings. *The News Tribune,* A1.

Molnar, A. (2002). The corporate branding of our schools. *Educational Leadership, 60*(2), 74-78.

Montalvo, A. (2008, September 19). Tech football weekends bring economic boost to South Plains. Retrieved on October 8, 2008 from http://everythinglubbock.com/content/fulltext/?cid=15191.

Moore, J., Pickett, G., & Grove, S. (1999). The impact of a video screen and rotational–signage systems on satisfaction and advertising recognition. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *13*, 453–468.

Morgan, G. (2006, August 6). Taking a different approach to measuring effective sponsorship. *Marketing Week,* p. 36.

Muret, D. (2000). University officials learn marketing and sponsorships are growing trend. *Amusement Business, 112*(12), 4.

Musante, M., Milne, G., & McDonald, M. (1999). Sport sponsorship: Evaluating the sport and brand image match. *International Journal of Sport Marketing and Sponsorship, 1*(1), 32-47.

Nardone, J., & See, E. (2007, March 5). Measure sponsorships to drive sales. *Advertising Age*, *78*(10), 20-21.

Newton, T. (1999). College athletic programs benefit from corporate sponsors. *The Business Press, 12*(18), 27.

Nicholls, J., & Roslow, S. (1994). Sports event sponsorship for brand promotion. *Journal of Applied Business Research, 10*(4), 35-42.

Nicholls, J., Roslow, S., & Dublish, S. (1999). Brand recall and brand preference at sponsored golf and tennis tournaments. *European Journal of Marketing, 33,*365-387.

Nowak, G., & Phelps, J. (1994). Conceptualizing the integrated marketing communications' phenomenon: An examination of its impact on advertising practices and its implications for advertising research. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, 14*(1), 49-66.

O'Reilly, N., & Madill, J. (2007). Evaluating social marketing elements in sponsorship. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13,* 1-25.

Ozanian, M. (1998, December 14). Selective accounting. *Forbes, 162*(13), 126-130.

Parks, K. (2000, September 19). What's in a name? *St. Petersburg Times,* p. 1E.

Patton, M. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research, 34,* 1189-1208.

Petty, R., & Cacioppo, J. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 19*, 124-205.

Petty, R. & Lindsey-Mullikin, J. (2006). The regulation of practices that promote brand interest: a "3Cs" guide for consumer brand managers. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 15,* 23-36.

Pham, M., & Johar, G. (2001). Market prominence biases in sponsor identification: processes and consequentiality. *Psychology & Marketing, 18,* 123-143.

Pitts, B. (1998). An analysis of sponsorship recall during Gay Games IV. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 7,* 11-18.

Pitts, B., & Slattery, J. (2004). An examination of the effects of time on sponsorship awareness levels. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13,* 43-54.

Poole, M. (2002, July 1-7). Activation turns the key on sponsorships. *Street & Smith's SportBusiness Journal,* p. 12.

Pope, N., & Voges, K. (1999). Sponsorship and image: a replication and extension. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 5,* 17-28.

Pruitt, S., Cornwell, T., & Clark, J. (2004). The NASCAR phenomenon: Auto racing sponsorships and shareholder wealth. *Journal of Advertising Research, 44*, 281-296.

Quester, P. (1997). Awareness as a measure of sponsorship effectiveness: The Adelaide Formula One Grand Prix and evidence of incidental ambush effects. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 3,* 1-20.

Quester, P., & Farrelly, F. (1998). Brand association and memory decay effects of sponsorship: the case of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 7,* 539-556.

Quester, P., & Thompson, B. (2001). Advertising and promotion leverage on arts sponsorship effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising Research, 41*(1), 33-47.

Reid, A. (2005). Is sponsorship really worth it? Retrieved on March 17, 2008 from http://www.redmandarin.com/news/media-articles/sponsorship-and-advertising.

Rifon, N., Choi, S., Trimble, C., & Li, H. (2004). Congruence effects in sponsorship: The mediating role of sponsor credibility and consumer attribution of sponsor motive. *Journal of Advertising, 33*(1), 29-42.

Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers.* London: Sage.

Roberts, K. (2006). Sponsorship strengthens its place in the mix. *SportBusiness International, 119*, 22-24.

Rosengren, S., & Dahlén, M. (2006). Brand–slogan matching in a cluttered environment. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 12*(4), 263-279.

Roy, D., & Cornwell, T. (2003). Brand equity's influence on responses to event sponsorship. *Journal of Product & Brand Management, 12,* 377-393.

Ruth, J., & Simonin, B. (2007). The power of numbers. *Journal of Advertising* [serial online]. *35*(4), 7-20. Retrieved on December 27, 2007 from Communication & Mass Media Complete, Ipswich, MA.

Ruth, J., & Simonin, B. (2003). Brought to you by brand A and brand B. *Journal of Advertising, 32*(3), 19-30.

Sandler, D., & Shani, D. (1989). Olympic sponsorship vs. ambush marketing: Who gets the gold? *Journal of Advertising Research, 29*(4), 9-14.

Sappington, D. (1991). Incentives in principal-agent relationships. *Journal of Economic Perspective, 5*(2), 45-66.

Sass, E. (2007). Nielsen: Coors Field knocked it out of the park. *Media Post Publications.* Retrieved on January 30, 2998 from http://publications.mediapost.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=Articles.showArticle&art_aid=71279&passFuseAction=PublicationsSearch.showSearchReslts&art_searched=&page_number=0.

Schaefer, A. (1992). *An analysis of endorser-product match-up and endorser likability on brand attitudes.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Scott, A. (2006, April 1). Goal Tending. *PROMO Magazine.* Retrieved on October 5, 2007 from http://promomagazine.com/mag/marketing_goal_tending/index.html.

Shanklin, W., & Kuzma, J. (1992). Buying that Sporting Image: What senior executives need to know about corporate sports sponsorship. *Marketing Management, 1*(2), 58-67.

Shannon, J. (1999). Sports marketing: an examination of academic marketing publication. *Journal of Services Marketing, 13,* 517-535.

Sheehan, K., & McMillan, S. (1999). Response variation in e-mail surveys: An exploration. *Journal of Advertising Research, 39,* 45-54.

Smee, A., & Brennan, M. (2000). *Electronic surveys: A comparison of e-mail, web and mail.* ANZMAC 2000 Visionary Marketing for the 21st Century: Facing the Challenge. Retrieved on March 5, 2006 from http://websm.org/uploadi/editor/1140638472Smee1.pdf.

Sneath, J., Finney, R., & Close, A. (2005). An IMC approach to event Marketing; The effects of sponsorship and experience on customer attitudes. *Journal of Adverting Research, 45*(4), 373-381.

Sneath, J., Hoch, M., Kennett, P., & Erdmann, J. (2000). College athletics and corporate sponsorship: The role of intermediaries in successful fundraising efforts. *Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing.* Retrieved on October 12, 2008 from http://fulltext.ausport.gov.au/fulltext/2000/cjsm/v4n2-3/sneath42.htm.

Sponsorship Report (2003). Sponsorship spending to increase 8.7 percent in 2004. *IEG sponsorship report, 22*(24), 1-4.

“State Farm inks three-year agreement to become an NCAA corporate partner.” (2005, March 28). *NCAA News, 42*(7), p. 6.

Steinberg, B. (2005, January 5). Sponsorships focus on 'activation'; Women's tennis tour deal with Sony Ericsson will let fans express themselves. *Wall Street Journal,* p. B2.

Stotlar, D. (1999). Sponsorship in North America: A survey of sport executives. *International Journal of Sport Marketing and Sponsorship, 1*(1), 87-101.

Stotlar, D. (2004). Sponsorship evaluation: Moving from theory to practice. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13,* 61-64.

Sutton, W., Lachowetz, T., & Clark, J. (2000). Eduselling: The role of customers education in selling to corporate clients in the sport industry. *International Journal of Sport Marketing and Sponsorship, 2*(2), 145-158.

Swartz, J. (2002, September 6). Teams still eager to sell stadium naming rights. *USA Today,* E07

Thjømøe, H., Olson, E., & Brønn, P. (2002). Decision-making processes surrounding sponsorship activities. *Journal of Advertising Research, 42*(6), 6-15

Thorne, D., Wright, L., & Jones, S. (2001). The impact of sports marketing relationships and antitrust issues in the United States. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 20,* 73-83.

Thwaites, D. (1995). Professional football sponsorship – profitable or profligate? *International Journal of Advertising,*

Tomasini, N., Frye, C., & Stotlar, D. (2004). National collegiate athletic association corporate sponsor objectives: Are there differences between divisions I-A, I-AA, and I-AAA? *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13,* 216-226.

Tripodi, A. (2001). Sponsorship - a confirmed weapon in the promotional armoury. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, 3*(1), 95-117.

Turco, D. (1996). The effects of courtside advertising on product recognition and attitude change. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 5,* 11-15.

Turner, L. (2005). Official sponsor versus regular program advertiser television strategies for the Sydney Olympic 2000 Games: A case study. *Journal of Promotion Management, 11*(4), 3-18.

Ulman, H. (2005, February 5). Company gets boost with name on super bowl stadium. *The Associated Press State and Local Wire.* Retrieved on March 20, 2005 from http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=c8bd39adda10241d6da2467212e5a001&_docnum=5&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkVb&_md5=16ee34aec64f24cae72cfa36ddcf86fe

Verity, J. (2002). Maximizing the marketing potential of sponsorship for global brands. *European Business Journal, 14*, 161-173.

Waddell, R. (1998). Universities unite for sponsorship dollars. *Amusement Business, 110*(25), 30.

Wakefield, K., Becker-Olsen, K., & Cornwell, T. (2007). I spy a sponsor. *Journal of Advertising, 36*(4), 61-74.

Walliser, B. (2003). An international review of sponsorship research: extension and update. *International Journal of Advertising, 22*(1), 5-40.

Walliser, B. (1994). Les déterminants de la mémorisation des sponsors. *Revue Française du Marketing, 150*, 83–95.

Wherely, S. (2003). *Collegiate sport sponsorship: Matching institutional components with corporate desires.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Wilkinson, D. G. (1993). *Sponsorship Marketing: A Practical Reference Guide for Corporations in the 1990's.* Toronto: The Wilkinson Group

Zhang, Z., Won, D., & Pastore, D. L. (2005). The effects of attitudes toward commercialization on college students' purchasing intentions of sponsors' products. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 14,* 177-187.

Appendices

Appendix A

Telephone Script

Hello – my name is Glenda Alvarado and I am a Ph.D. student at Texas Tech University. Craig Wells and Paige Holland gave me your contact information, and may have told you that I would be calling.

I am working in conjunction with the athletic department on a study which investigates how corporate sponsors view their associations with the university and would like to include your opinions and perspectives. Your participation is completely voluntary and your identity will be kept confidential. The process should take about 30-45 minutes if you are willing to participate.

(Response from prospect)

(No) Thank you for your time.

(Yes) – Great, thank you. I would be happy to come to your office, or we can get the interview done over the phone. When is a good time for you?

(Set time and date)

Great, I really appreciate your time on this. To make things a little easier, I would like to fax or e-mail you some basic questions that I would like to cover, along with a consent form. The questions are about general topics regarding sponsorship that I would like to cover in the interview, but I would also like to just have some open conversation about sponsorship as a whole. The consent form will tell you about keeping information confidential and give me permission to record the conversation to that I can have an accurate account of our chat.

Do you have any questions?

I really appreciate your time, and look forward to talking to you on (time and date).

Appendix B

Consent Form

I am asking you to participate in a research project involving corporate views on sponsorship with the Texas Tech University athletic program.

Glenda Alvarado, a Ph.D. student, of the College of Mass Communications at Texas Tech University is conducting this study under the supervision of Dr. Donald Jugenheimer. The department may be contacted at 806-742-3385.

The purpose of the project is to determine the reasons behind corporations motivations for entering into sponsorship agreements, along with methods of assessing sponsorship success, ways that sponsors use their sponsorships to reach customers, and how sponsorships are incorporated into a sponsors overall marketing plan. If you agree to participate, a convenient time and place to conduct an in-depth personal interview will be arranged. Interviews will last approximately 30 minutes to one hour.

The interviewer may record your comments on a tape recorder as well as take notes. All information provided by you will be reported using a generic business classification, such as bank, car dealership, pharmacy, etc. No identifying or proprietary information will be disclosed either to other participants or in the final report.

Information provided to researchers will be stored in a computer. Glenda Alvarado will have sole access to the information which will be password protected.

Participation in this research project is voluntary and participants may decline to participate at any time. There are no expected risks or discomforts.

Glenda Alvarado or Don Jugenheimer will answer any questions you have about this study. For questions about your rights as a subject or about injuries caused by this research, contact Texas Tech University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, Office of Research Services, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409. Or, you can call (806) 742-3884.

By signing this consent form, you are affirming that you have read and agree to all the above conditions. Any questions you may have should be asked prior to signing this release.

____ ____________

Signature of Participant Date

This consent form is not valid after May 1, 2009.

Appendix C

Questions for Interviews

1. What motivates your company or organization to enter into a sponsorship agreement?
2. Does your company track any results/responses from its sponsorship?
3. Does your company incorporate your sponsorship into other things that it does?
4. Do employees participate in programs or events associated with sports sponsorships supported by the company?
5. What sponsorship elements does your company take advantage of? This may include any or all of the following: signage, sampling opportunities, hospitality, program advertisements, audio/video advertisements, event tickets, or any thing else that you might do that is tied in with your sponsorship.
6. Which sponsorship elements do you feel are most important to your company?
7. Does your company participate in other sports sponsorships?
8. If, so, how do these sponsorships differ from the one at TTU?
9. How often is your company approached with sponsorship opportunities?
10. What kind of feedback would your company like to receive from the athletic department with regard to your sponsorship?
11. Would you be interested in having the athletic department provide your company with suggestions on how you can make your sponsorship more effective?
12. Do you feel that your company's sponsorship programs are successful in achieving corporate marketing objectives?
13. How would you describe your company's relationship with the TTU athletic marketing department?
14. In general, what would cause your company to terminate a sponsorship agreement?

Other questions may come up based on responses to the questions above. The interview will not be overly structured and any information related to sponsorship issues will be welcomed. ALL information will be confidentially maintained.

Appendix D

Front – Voice your opinion on sponsorship support of Texas Tech Athletics!

Dear Sponsor:

The Athletic Department appreciates your continued support and would like to take the opportunity to ask your opinions. In the next few days, you will be asked to participate in a survey about sports sponsorship that is being conducted by a graduate student. You will be given the opportunity to respond anonymously to questions about sports sponsorship and the relationship that your company has with the Texas Tech Athletic Marketing Office. Please take this opportunity to participate in this research aimed at increasing the knowledge about sponsorship programs.

Signature here.

Appendix E

Dear Sponsor,

Your support of the athletic program at Texas Tech is greatly appreciated.

In an effort to improve the strength of the program, your participation in a short online survey is requested. Your opinions are valued and the answers you provide will assist in further development of the athletic program. Participation in the survey is voluntary, and should only take about 15 minutes. Information that you provide will be kept strictly confidential.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact the Glenda Alvarado at 806-742-3385.

Click on the link below to begin the survey:

http://studies.tosm.ttu.edu/athl

The survey will be available until July 20th. If you would prefer to complete the questionnaire as a hard copy, you may respond to this message and request to have one mailed.

Your continued support of the Texas Tech Athletic Program is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Glenda Alvarado

Texas Tech University
Glenda Alvarado
PO Box 43082
Lubbock, TX 79409-3082

Appendix G

Thank you for your interest in this doctoral dissertation research project with the approval the Texas Tech University Athletic department. Your participation in this project is strictly voluntary, and you may chose to close your browser window at any time. If you have any questions about this study, or your rights as a subject in this research, please contact the Glenda Alvarado at 806-742-3385.

The purpose of this survey will be to determine the level of involvement of your organization in sport sponsorship, as well as about your association with the athletic program. You will be invited to enter any comments, suggestions or general feedback you have regarding your experiences. Your opinions are valued and the answers you provide will assist us in further development of the athletic program. The survey should take 10-15 minutes and there are no foreseeable risks or discomforts involved.

Dr. Donald Jugenheimer or Glenda Alvarado will answer any questions you have the study. For questions about your rights as a subject or about injuries caused by this research, contact Texas Tech University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, Office of Research Services, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409. Or, you can call (806) 742-3884.

This consent form is not valid after July 31, 2009.

By selecting the "Next" button below, you agree to voluntarily participate in this study and understand that information that you provide will remain confidential.

Thank you for your participation. As you go through the questionnaire, you may notice that some questions appear similar in nature. Please be sure to fully read the accompanying instructions as the context of the question may have changed.

1. How would you classify your company? Please select the one option that best fits.

Local – only do business in the immediate Lubbock area.
Regional – do business within Lubbock and the surrounding communities.
National – do business with customers all over the United States.
International – do business with customers around the world.

2. Which of the following industries best describes your business? Please select the one option that best fits.

Banking or Financial (including insurance)
Restaurant or Food & Beverage Service
Automotive and Related Services
Medical or Health-related Services

Media or Information Services
IT or Technical Services
Apparel or Fashion-Related Services (including Jewelry and Accessories)
Sporting Equipment or Services
Other, please specify

3. From the following list, please indicate in which types of sponsorship your company participates? Please select all that apply.

Charitable
Cultural
Educational
Health-Oriented
Sport-Related
Other, please specify

4. In your own words, please offer a definition of sports sponsorship.

5. What elements do you believe are, or should be, part of a sponsorship agreement?

6. On average, for how long do you commit to sports sponsorships?

One season at a time
One year at a time
More than one year, but less than three.
More than three years, but less than five.
More than 5 years at a time.

7. What type of support does your company typically provide as part of your sponsorship commitments? Please select all that apply.

Direct Financial Support (a cash donation)
Advertising Support (signage or advertisement in program)
Operational support (employees or equipment)
Barter or Trade (product or services in exchange for some benefit)
Goods and Services (product or services as a donation)

8. Please consider the following list of benefits that may be received from participation in sports sponsorships. When thinking about the most frequent type of sports sponsorship that your company or corporation participates in, please indicate how important these benefits are in making a sponsorship choice.
Please rate the importance on scale of 0-10, where 0 is Not at all Important and 10 is Very Important.

Your business is the only one in your category participating.

Ability to increase awareness of your company and its product or services
Ability to have signage at event
Ability for event audience to sample your products
Ability for event audience to buy your products
Ability to measure results of sponsorship
Ability to participate in an on-going effort
Opportunity to receive media coverage
Opportunity to improve community relations
Opportunity to entertain customers and clients

9. Please consider the following list of reasons for participating in sports sponsorships. When thinking of the most frequent type of sports sponsorship that your company or corporation participates in, please indicate how important these reasons are in making a sponsorship choice.
Please rate the importance on scale of 0-10, where 0 is Not at all Important and 10 is Very Important.

"Fit" of the sponsorship within advertising plans
Cross promotional opportunities
Sampling opportunities
Contribute to corporate image
Sets me apart from other businesses
Recommendation by friend/associate
Giving back to the community
Interest and concern about event
Employee involvement in event
Reach target or market customer
Status associated with event
Tax deductible contribution

10. Which of the following assessment methods does your company use to evaluate the success of your sponsorship? Select all that apply.

Customer awareness of sponsorship
Media exposure
Dealer/Trade feedback
Attendance at event
Match with target market
Involvement off field
Improved Corporate image
Market share
Sales Figures
Other
None of the above (don't evaluate)

11. What would give you reason to discontinue a sponsorship? Please select all that apply.

Little value/return on investment
Not achieving objectives
Different corporate direction/strategy
Budget cutbacks
Poor execution/performance of event organizer
Conflict with organizer
Wasn't asked to continue
Other

12. From the above list, please select the ONE MAIN reason that would cause your company to discontinue a sponsorship.

13. Who do you think gets more out of a sport sponsorship agreement?

Benefits are fair and equitable for both my company and the sports I sponsor
Benefits received by my business are more than those that I provide to the sport
Benefits I provide to the sport are more than those received by my business
I don't know/Not Sure

14. Over the past few years has your return on investment from sponsorship:

Increased, decreased, stayed the same, don't know

15. Over the past few years has your spending on sponsorship:

Increased, decreased, stayed the same, don't know

16. Over the next few years, do you expect your return on investment from sponsorship to:

Increase decrease, stay the same, don't know

17. Over the next few years do you expect your spending on sponsorship to:

Increase decrease, stay the same, don't know

18. In addition to sponsorship fees, does your company spend money on promoting the sponsorship?

Always, sometimes, never

19. Please indicate how important the following analyses are in the decision to change or renew a sports sponsorship.

Please rate the importance on scale of 0-10, where 0 is Not at all Important and 10 is Very Important.

Internal Feedback
Sales/promotional bounce backs
Information from the TTU Athletic Department
Consumer research conducted by my company
Television exposure analysis
Print media analysis
Syndicated research conducted by an outside source
Attendance figures

20. Please indicate how important the following services that may or may not be provided by the Texas Tech Athletic Program are to your company.
Please rate the importance on a scale of 0-10, where 0 is Not at all Important and 10 is Very Important.

Post-event report
Research on sponsor recall and recognition
Ways to increase the effectiveness of my sponsorship
Ways to connect with consumers through your sponsorship
Research on consumer loyalty to sponsors
Research on audience buying habits
An outside company to coordinate sponsorship across a variety of TTU sports
Audit of contract fulfillment

21. This question has a lot of elements, but there are only a few more questions after this. Your participation is appreciated.
Please consider the following statements about sponsorship of Texas Tech Athletic Programs. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.
Please rate the importance on scale of 0-10, where 0 is Totally Disagree and 10 is Totally Agree.

The sponsorship will improve my company's image.
The sponsorship will increase the productivity of my employees
The sponsorship will lead to increased sales for my company
The sponsorship will generate media coverage for my company
The sponsorship will allow me to reach new customers
The sponsorship will allow me to get tickets to sporting events
The sponsorship will allow me to entertain my customers
The sponsorship will be viewed by a large number of people
The sponsorship allow me to thank my employees
The sponsorship will show that I am involved in the local community
The sponsorship will show that I support the university.
The sponsorship will show that I care about the athletes.

The sponsorship will make people feel good about my company.
The sponsorship will make people think my business is important
Sponsoring Texas Tech athletics is the right thing to do.
Money spent on sponsoring Texas Tech athletics is a worthwhile investment.
The sponsorship will allow me to promote my company's products.
The sponsorship is important to Texas Tech Athletics
The sponsorship increases the morale of my employees.
My company uses the sponsorship as a marketing tool
My company highlights the sponsorship in other marketing activities.
The sponsorship replaces other marketing activities.
The sponsorship meets the marketing objectives of my company
The sponsorship is an affordable way to reach consumers.
The sponsorship is important to the owners/managers of my company.
The sponsorship will give my company an edge over competitors.
The sponsorship will allow me to receive feedback from my customers.
My company must monitor the sponsorship to ensure success.
My company benefits from being associated with Texas Tech Athletics.

22. Which of the following marketing communications channels do you use to promote your TTU sponsorship outside of athletic events?

Public Relations
Internal communications
Traditional advertising
Hospitality
Direct marketing
Internet tie-ins
Business to business
On-site sampling
Sales promotion offers

23. How valuable are the following benefits that may be attained through sponsorship of Texas Tech University Athletics?
Please rate value on scale of 0-10, where 0 is Not at all valuable and 10 is Very Valuable.

Identification as a sponsor in souvenir programs
Access to mailing list/database
Right to use Texas Tech Athletic trademarks/logos
Ability to reach different people through different sports
Opportunity to develop working relationship with Texas Tech Athletic Programs
Being the only business in your category

24. In a sentence, what do you see as the one main reason your company is involved with sport sponsorship?

25. Which of the following sponsorship elements are included in your agreement with Texas Tech Athletics? Please select all that apply.

Posters/Banners
Printed Materials
On-site promotions
Off-site promotions
Apparel
On-site displays
Off-site displays
Awards
Promotions with other sponsors
Contact with coaches
Contact with players
Contact with fans
Logos or other exposure with television broadcasts
Logos or other exposure with print media
Name mentions or other exposure with radio
Other, please specify

26. The space below is for any additional comments that you would like to make about sponsorship in general, as well as about your sponsorship with Texas Tech Athletics.

Thank you for your time and participation. Your opinions are important and appreciated. Please close your browser window to exit from the survey.

Appendix H

Texas Tech University
Glenda Alvarado
PO Box 43082
Lubbock, TX 79409-3082

Dear Sponsor,

Your support of the athletic program at Texas Tech is greatly appreciated.

In an effort to improve the strength of the program, your participation in a short online survey is requested. Your opinions are valued and the answers you provide will assist in further development of the athletic program. Participation in the survey is voluntary, and should only take about 15 minutes. Information that you provide will be kept strictly confidential.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact the Glenda Alvarado at 806-742-3385.

Please take the time to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return in the postage-paid envelope that has been included. Completed surveys should be received no later than July 20th for inclusion in this research study.

If you would prefer to complete the questionnaire on the Internet, you may do so at http://studies.tosm.ttu.edu/athl. The survey only needs to be completed one time by each sponsor.

Your continued support of the Texas Tech Athletic Program is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Glenda Alvarado

Appendix I

Thank you for your interest in this doctoral dissertation research project with the approval the Texas Tech University Athletic department. Your participation in this project is strictly voluntary, and you may chose to close your browser window at any time. If you have any questions about this study, or your rights as a subject in this research, please contact the Glenda Alvarado at 806-742-3385.

The purpose of this survey will be to determine the level of involvement of your organization in sport sponsorship, as well as about your association with the athletic program. You will be invited to enter any comments, suggestions or general feedback you have regarding your experiences. Your opinions are valued and the answers you provide will assist us in further development of the athletic program. The survey should take 10-15 minutes and there are no foreseeable risks or discomforts involved.

Dr. Donald Jugenheimer or Glenda Alvarado will answer any questions you have the study. For questions about your rights as a subject or about injuries caused by this research, contact Texas Tech University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, Office of Research Services, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409. Or, you can call (806) 742-3884.

This consent form is not valid after July 31, 2009.

Thank you for your participation. As you go through the questionnaire, you may notice that some questions appear similar in nature. Please be sure to fully read the accompanying instructions as the context of the question may have changed. Questions are on the front and back of each page.

1. How would you classify your company? Please check the one option that best fits.

☐ Local – only do business in the immediate Lubbock area.

☐ Regional – do business within Lubbock and the surrounding communities.

☐ National – do business with customers all over the United States.

☐ International – do business with customers around the world.

2. Which of the following industries best describes your business? Please check the one option that best fits.

☐ Banking or Financial (including insurance)

☐ Restaurant or Food & Beverage Service

☐ Automotive and Related Services

☐ Medical or Health-related Services

☐ Media or Information Services

☐ IT or Technical Services

☐ Apparel or Fashion-Related Services (including Jewelry and Accessories)

☐ Sporting Equipment or Services

☐ Other, please specify ____

3. From the following list, please indicate in which types of sponsorship your company participates? Please check all that apply.

☐ Charitable

☐ Cultural

☐ Educational

☐ Health-Oriented

☐ Sport-Related

☐ Other, please specify ____

4. In your own words, please offer a definition of sports sponsorship.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

5. What elements do you believe are, or should be, part of a sponsorship agreement?

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

6. On average, for how long do you commit to sports sponsorships? Please check the one option that best fits.

☐ One season at a time

☐ One year at a time

☐ More than one year, but less than three.

☐ More than three years, but less than five.

☐ More than 5 years at a time.

7. What type of support does your company typically provide as part of your sponsorship commitments? Please check all that apply.

☐ Direct Financial Support (a cash donation)

☐ Advertising Support (signage or advertisement in program)

☐ Operational support (employees or equipment)

☐ Barter or Trade (product or services in exchange for some benefit)

☐ Goods and Services (product or services as a donation)

8. Please consider the following list of benefits that may be received from participation in sports sponsorships. When thinking about the most frequent type of sports sponsorship that your company or corporation participates in, please indicate how important these benefits are in making a sponsorship choice.

Your business is the only one in your category participating.

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Ability to increase awareness of your company and its product or services.

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Ability to have signage at event.

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Ability for event audience to sample your products.

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Ability for event audience to buy your products

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Ability to measure results of sponsorship

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Ability to participate in an on-going effort

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Opportunity to receive media coverage

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Opportunity to improve community relations

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Opportunity to entertain customers and clients

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

9. Please consider the following list of reasons for participating in sports sponsorships. When thinking of the most frequent type of sports sponsorship that your company or corporation participates in, please indicate how important these reasons are in making a sponsorship choice.

"Fit" of the sponsorship within advertising plans

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Cross promotional opportunities

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Sampling opportunities

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Contribute to corporate image

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Sets me apart from other businesses

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Recommendation by friend/associate

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Giving back to the community

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Interest and concern about event

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Employee involvement in event

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Reach target or market customer

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Status associated with event

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Tax deductible contribution

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

10. Which of the following assessment methods does your company use to evaluate the success of your sponsorship? Please check all that apply.

☐ Customer awareness of sponsorship

☐ Media exposure

☐ Dealer/Trade feedback

☐ Attendance at event

☐ Match with target market

☐ Involvement off field

☐ Improved Corporate image

☐ Market share

☐ Sales Figures

☐ Other (please specify)____

☐ None of the above (don't evaluate)

11. What would give you reason to discontinue a sponsorship? Please check all that apply.

☐ Little value/return on investment

☐ Not achieving objectives

☐ Different corporate direction/strategy

☐ Budget cutbacks

☐ Poor execution/performance of event organizer

☐ Conflict with organizer

☐ Wasn't asked to continue

☐ Other (please specify) ____

12. From the previous list, please select the ONE MAIN reason that would cause your company to discontinue a sponsorship.

____

13. Who do you think gets more out of a sport sponsorship agreement?

☐ Benefits are fair and equitable for both my company and the sports I sponsor

☐ Benefits received by my business are more than those that I provide to the sport

☐ Benefits I provide to the sport are more than those received by my business

☐ I don't know/Not Sure

14. Over the past few years has your return on investment from sponsorship:

☐ Increased ☐ Decreased ☐ Stayed the same ☐ Don't know

15. Over the past few years has your spending on sponsorship:

☐ Increased ☐ Decreased ☐ Stayed the same ☐ Don't know

16. Over the next few years, do you expect your return on investment from sponsorship to:

☐ Increase ☐ Decrease ☐ Stay the same ☐ Don't know

17. Over the next few years do you expect your spending on sponsorship to:

☐ Increase ☐ Decrease ☐ Stay the same ☐ Don't know

18. In addition to sponsorship fees, does your company spend money on promoting the sponsorship?

☐ Always ☐ Sometimes ☐ Never

19. Please indicate how important the following analyses are in the decision to change or renew a sports sponsorship.

Internal Feedback

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Sales/promotional bounce backs

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Information from the TTU Athletic Department

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Consumer research conducted by my company

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Television exposure analysis

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Print media analysis

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Syndicated research conducted by an outside source

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Attendance figures

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

20. Please indicate how important the following services that may or may not be provided by the Texas Tech Athletic Program are to your company.

Post-event report

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Research on sponsor recall and recognition

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Ways to increase the effectiveness of my sponsorship

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Ways to connect with consumers through your sponsorship

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Research on consumer loyalty to sponsors

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Research on audience buying habits

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

An outside company to coordinate sponsorship across a variety of TTU sports

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

Audit of contract fulfillment

Not Important At All 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Important

21. This question has a lot of elements, but there are only a few more questions after this. Your participation is appreciated.

Please consider the following statements about sponsorship of Texas Tech Athletic Programs. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

The sponsorship will improve my company's image.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will increase the productivity of my employees

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will lead to increased sales for my company

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will generate media coverage for my company

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will allow me to reach new customers

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will allow me to get tickets to sporting events

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will allow me to entertain my customers

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will be viewed by a large number of people

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship allow me to thank my employees

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will show that I am involved in the local community

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will show that I support the university.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will show that I care about the athletes.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will make people feel good about my company.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will make people think my business is important

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

Sponsoring Texas Tech athletics is the right thing to do.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

Money spent on sponsoring Texas Tech athletics is a worthwhile investment.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will allow me to promote my company's products.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship is important to Texas Tech Athletics

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship increases the morale of my employees.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

My company uses the sponsorship as a marketing tool

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

My company highlights the sponsorship in other marketing activities.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship replaces other marketing activities.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship meets the marketing objectives of my company

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship is an affordable way to reach consumers.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship is important to the owners/managers of my company.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will give my company an edge over competitors.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

The sponsorship will allow me to receive feedback from my customers.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

My company must monitor the sponsorship to ensure success.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

My company benefits from being associated with Texas Tech Athletics.

Totally Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Totally Agree

22. Which of the following marketing communications channels do you use to promote your TTU sponsorship outside of athletic events? Please check all that apply

☐ Public Relations

☐ Internal communications

☐ Traditional advertising

☐ Hospitality

☐ Direct marketing

☐ Internet tie-ins

☐ Business to business

☐ On-site sampling

☐ Sales promotion offers

23. How valuable are the following benefits that may be attained through sponsorship of Texas Tech University Athletics?
Please rate value on scale of 0-10, where 0 is Not at all valuable and 10 is Very Valuable.

Identification as a sponsor in souvenir programs

Not At All Valuable 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Valuable

Access to mailing list/database

Not At All Valuable 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Valuable

Right to use Texas Tech Athletic trademarks/logos

Not At All Valuable 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Valuable

Ability to reach different people through different sports

Not At All Valuable 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Valuable

Opportunity to develop working relationship with Texas Tech Athletic Programs

Not At All Valuable 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Valuable

Being the only business in your category

Not At All Valuable 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Valuable

24. In a sentence, what do you see as the one main reason your company is involved with sport sponsorship?

____

____

____

____

25. Which of the following sponsorship elements are included in your agreement with Texas Tech Athletics? Please check all that apply.

☐ Posters/Banners

☐ Printed Materials

- ☐ On-site promotions
- ☐ Off-site promotions
- ☐ Apparel
- ☐ On-site displays
- ☐ Off-site displays
- ☐ Awards
- ☐ Promotions with other sponsors
- ☐ Contact with coaches
- ☐ Contact with players
- ☐ Contact with fans
- ☐ Logos or other exposure with television broadcasts
- ☐ Logos or other exposure with print media
- ☐ Name mentions or other exposure with radio
- ☐ Other, please specify ______________________________

26. The space below is for any additional comments that you would like to make about sponsorship in general, as well as about your sponsorship with Texas Tech Athletics. You may continue on the back of this page, if needed.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

Thank you for your time and participation. Your opinions are important and appreciated. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope.

Appendix G

Dear Sponsor:

You were recently contacted to participate in a research project about sports sponsorship. Thank you for your opinions if you have already participated. If you have not yet had the chance to complete the survey, I sincerely hope that you will take the opportunity to voice your opinions about sponsorship and the relationship that your company has with the Texas Tech Athletic Marketing Office. The survey will close on July 20th, and can be accessed at http://studies.tosm.ttu.edu/athl.

Signature here.

Appendix K.1
Affect of different collection times on categorical data

Variable	Time of Collection: Original Yes	Original No	Additional Yes	Additional No	χ
Use PR to Promote S'ship	23	15	10	20	4.96*
Internal Promo of S'ship	12	26	15	15	2.38
Use Adv to Promote S'ship	13	25	8	22	0.45
Hospitality to Promote S'ship	10	28	2	28	4.45*†
Direct Mtg to Promote S'ship	6	32	3	27	0.49†
Internet to Promote S'ship	2	36	3	27	0.55†
B2B S'ship Promotion	5	33	3	27	0.16†
Sampling to Promote S'ship	11	27	6	24	0.72

Variable	Time of Collection: Original	Additional	χ
Market Area			2.98†
Local	15	7	
Regional	30	19	
National	14	16	
International	5	5	

Variable	Time of Collection: Original	Additional	χ
Type of Business			1.72†
Fin'ce/Ins'ce/RE	6	8	
Food & Beverage	14	7	
Auto & Related Services	9	4	
Medical & Health Services	6	4	
IT & Communication Svcs	1	0	
Apparel & Fashion	3	2	

Sporting Equip. & Svcs	1	0
Retail Sales	2	1
Entertainment	4	3
Printing Services	3	1
Ag, Energy & Prof Svcs	6	2
Miscellaneous	0	3

Variable	Time of Collection: Original Yes	Original No	Additional Yes	Additional No	χ
Charitable Sponsorship	40	23	29	18	0.01
Cultural Sponsorship	23	41	13	34	0.85
Educational Sponsorship	34	30	24	23	0.05
Health Sponsorship	23	41	13	34	0.85
Sport Sponsorship	57	7	40	7	0.39

Variable	Time of Collection: Original	Additional	χ
Length of Commitment			6.42[†]
One Season at a Time	23	14	
One Year at a Time	16	13	
>One, but < Three	6	0	
Three, but < Five	5	8	
Five or More	1	1	

Variable	Time of Collection: Original Yes	Original No	Additional Yes	Additional No	χ
Direct Financial Support	22	28	15	24	0.28
Advertising Support	33	17	30	9	1.26
Operational Support	8	42	4	35	0.62

Barter or Trade	27	23	16	23	1.48
Goods & Services	17	33	12	27	0.10

	Time of Collection				
	Original		Additional		
Variable	Yes	No	Yes	No	χ
Reasons to End Sponsorship					
Little Value/No ROI	28	18	29	5	5.69*
Not Ach'ving Objectives	12	34	20	14	8.73*
Different Strategy	12	34	15	19	2.84
Budget Cut	25	21	24	10	2.17
Poor Execution	23	23	26	8	5.77*
Conflict w/ Organizers	15	31	16	18	1.72
Not Asked to Renew	11	35	12	22	1.24
Price Increase	5	42	3	31	0.07

	Time of Collection		
Variable	Original	Additional	χ
How Fair is the Relationship			$4.28^{\dagger}$
Fair & Equitable	28	16	
Business Gets More	2	0	
Property Gets More	13	11	
Don't Know/Not Sure	4	7	

	Time of Collection		
Variable	Original	Additional	χ
ROI in the Past			4.09
Increase	7	6	
Decrease	5	8	
Stay the Same	19	14	
Don't Know/Not Sure	16	6	
Spending in the Past			$6.89^{\dagger}$

Increased	15	15	
Decreased	4	8	
Stay the Same	22	9	
Don't Know/Not Sure	6	2	
ROI in the Future			1.46†
Increase	20	11	
Decrease	4	4	
Stay the Same	18	13	
Don't Know/Not Sure	5	6	
Spending in the Future			1.81†
Increase	18	9	
Decrease	5	5	
Stay the Same	19	14	
Don't Know/Not Sure	5	6	

	Time of Collection		
Variable	Original	Additional	χ
Spend Money Over & Above Fee to Promote Sponsorship (Leveraging)			4.50†
Always	8	1	
Sometimes	24	23	
Never	15	10	

	Time of Collection				
	Original		Additional		
Variable	Yes	No	Yes	No	χ
Elements of Sponsorship					
Posters/Banners	9	29	9	20	0.45
Printed Materials	14	24	17	12	3.14
On-Site Promotions	13	25	12	17	0.36
Off-Site Promotions	3	35	2	27	0.24†
On-Site Displays	10	28	13	16	2.50
Off-Site Displays	1	37	0	29	0.78†
Awards	0	38	1	28	1.33†
Promotions W/ Others	4	34	1	28	1.19†
Contact with Coaches	11	27	5	25	1.41
Contact with Players	5	33	6	23	0.68†

Contact with Fans	11	27	5	24	1.24
Logos on TV	5	33	8	21	2.19
Logos w/ Print Media	9	29	11	18	1.59
Radio Mentions	13	25	5	14	2.07
Tickets	3	35	28	2	0.58†
JumboTron	3	35	0	29	2.40†

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.
† Cell size has expected count of less than 5

Appendix K.2
Affect of different collection times on continuous data

	Time of Collection				
	Original		Additional		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	
Variable					*t*
Benefits Associated with Participation					
Identification in Program	5.73	3.64	6.30	3.15	0.68
Access to Data	5.97	4.15	7.07	3.52	1.15
Right to use Logo	6.81	3.90	7.33	2.68	0.62
Reach Diff Ppl w/ Diff Sports	6.41	3.30	7.67	2.70	1.69
Develop Relationship	8.14	2.32	8.13	2.15	0.01
Only Biz in Category	6.69	3.56	7.78	2.85	0.38
Increase Awareness	8.38	2.65	9.00	2.39	1.12
Signage	7.06	3.45	8.08	2.88	1.44
Sampling Opportunities	4.04	3.71	4.36	3.36	0.41
Purchasing Opportunities	4.56	3.63	4.56	3.53	0.01
Ability to Measure Success	6.23	3.10	7.58	3.13	1.98
P'pate in On-Going Effort	7.08	2.77	7.31	2.98	0.35
Receive Media Coverage	7.42	3.17	8.14	2.12	1.17
Improve Comm'ty Relations	7.98	2.34	8.64	2.27	1.30
Entertain Customers/Clients	6.60	2.92	6.67	3.36	0.09
Reasons to Participate					
'Fit' of Sponsorship	6.72	3.13	8.31	2.08	2.60*
Cross Promotion Opp'ty	6.36	3.29	7.66	2.27	2.00*
Sampling Opportunities	4.02	3.21	4.31	3.30	0.89
Improve Corporate Image	7.40	2.52	7.74	2.33	0.70
Be Set Apart from Others	7.64	2.68	8.52	2.20	0.10
Others Recommended	6.30	3.36	5.69	3.46	0.78
Give Back to Community	8.43	1.82	8.37	1.93	0.15
Interest/Concern for Event	7.41	2.54	8.14	1.91	1.42
Employee Involvement	5.74	3.32	5.37	2.88	0.52
Reach Target Consumers	7.80	3.27	9.14	1.63	2.22*
Event Status	7.09	3.05	7.06	2.57	0.28
Tax Deduction	4.96	3.65	3.80	3.44	0.89
Types of Analyses Used					
Internal Feedback	6.02	3.02	7.29	2.13	2.01*
Bounce Backs	5.73	3.05	5.97	3.11	0.33
Information from Property	7.16	2.47	6.84	2.70	0.53
Company Research	4.09	3.27	5.00	3.39	1.17

Television Exposure	3.95	3.50	6.71	2.83	3.62*
Print Analyses	4.32	3.56	5.74	3.39	1.74
Syndicated Research	3.89	3.22	4.42	3.37	0.69
Attendance Figures	4.91	3.43	7.06	2.63	1.58
Objectives Behind Participation					
Improve Company Image	7.84	1.90	7.40	2.19	0.89
Increase Empl. Productivity	3.71	3.38	3.33	2.80	0.49
Increase Sales	6.55	2.88	6.33	2.37	0.34
Generate Media Coverage	6.03	3.41	6.33	2.82	0.40
Reach New Customers	6.92	3.00	7.43	2.50	0.75
Get Tickets	7.18	3.31	6.30	3.33	1.09
Entertain Customers	6.53	3.41	5.37	3.60	1.36
Viewed By Many	7.55	3.20	7.90	2.66	0.48
Thank Employees	5.54	3.28	4.43	3.76	1.30
Community Involvement	7.49	2.69	7.80	2.44	0.50
Support the University	9.03	1.25	8.50	1.82	1.43
Care About Athletes	8.46	1.75	7.07	3.16	2.24*
People Feel Good About Co.	7.90	2.35	7.20	2.46	1.20
Biz is Seen as Important	7.05	2.83	6.27	2.94	1.12
Right Thing to Do	8.56	2.15	7.00	3.03	2.51*
Worthwhile Investment	8.51	1.83	6.77	2.37	3.45
Ability to Promote Products	7.05	3.03	6.60	2.70	0.64
Important to Athletic Dept	8.56	1.97	7.67	2.20	1.78
Increases Employee Morale	4.92	3.32	4.77	3.49	0.19
Used as a Marketing Tool	7.21	3.53	6.53	3.38	0.80
Highlighted Other Places	4.69	3.45	3.73	3.87	1.19
Replaces Other Marketing	5.13	3.55	5.33	3.87	0.23
Meets Company Objectives	6.21	2.76	5.43	2.76	1.15
Affordable	6.23	2.86	5.37	2.25	1.36
Important to Owners	7.90	2.33	6.00	2.84	3.05*
Gives Edge over Competitors	5.92	2.80	5.63	2.71	0.43
Gather Feedback	4.85	3.18	4.43	3.51	0.51
Have to Monitor	4.74	3.60	5.67	3.11	1.12
Benefit from the Association	8.08	1.79	7.20	2.01	1.91

* Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.