ATHLETIC DONOR PERCEPTIONS OF CORPORATE

COLLEGIATE SPONSORSHIP

by

GLENDA J. ALVARADO, B.A.

A THESIS

IN

MASS COMMUNICATIONS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved

Todd Chambers
Chairperson of the Committee

Coy Callison

Judi Henry

Accepted

John Borrelli
Dean of the Graduate School

August, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Sports sponsorship continues to grow as an important part of advertising and marketing expenditures. Sports sponsorship's ability to reach consumers in locations where they have strong ties can strengthen the bond between businesses and their target audience. This study utilized a web-based survey with 771 respondents to determine the values of sponsorships as perceived by an athletic program's donors. Respondent proximity and the scope of advertisers reach was considered when looking at recognition. Findings appear to show that proximity played a part in respondents' ability to recall sponsors, and local sponsors are seen to be the most valuable to the program.

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Advertisers have become frustrated with continued audience fragmentation and increased clutter on television and radio (Meenaghan & O'Sullivan, 2001). Corporations are seeking new media opportunities as outlets for their advertising and promotion. There is an increased push by advertising agencies and marketing departments to find new and innovative ways to achieve brand recognition and drive purchasing habits. Sponsorship and product placement have increasingly become ways for businesses to place their brands in positions that are hard to ignore. Various forms of advertiser investment in sponsorships continues to grow, especially as technology is developed for consumers to be able to circumvent advertising in traditional media.

A sponsorship can be defined as when a corporation creates a link with an issue or event, hoping to influence the audience by the connection (Rifon, Choi, Trimble, & Li, 2004). McAllister (1996) made the distinction between traditional advertising and sponsorship by adding that "large amounts and special types of promotion" (p. 358) are connected with the sponsored activity, allowing for exposure beyond the sponsorship itself. Most sponsorships aim to project the sponsor's corporate image to an audience, rather than actually attempting to sell a product. However, Crimmins and Horn (1996) argued that sponsorships are a powerful form of consumer persuasion, and Dean (1999) stated that event sponsorship is designed to positively effect consumer perceptions. Shaw and Amis (2001) reported that sports sponsorship is recognized as an effective communication tool with which to enhance a company's image and reputation, and Nicholls and Roslow (1994) stated that sporting events are a major category in the sponsorship arena and annually account for billions of dollars of revenue.

For continued success in selling sponsorships, marketers must demonstrate their value in order to recruit and retain advertisers (Turco, 1996). This study attempts to gauge the importance of sport sponsorships at a southwestern university to individuals and businesses who donate to its athletic program by surveying sponsor recall levels and the support they offer sponsors. Proximity of the sponsor and respondents will be evaluated to determine whether location has an effect on brand awareness and recall. In addition, an effort will be made to determine if financial supporters of the athletic program consider sponsorship on a local or national level to be more valuable to the program. As a consideration to sponsoring companies, an effort is made with this study to determine whether corporations who have paid for naming rights are the most often recalled sponsors.

Continued commitment to sponsorship, according to Meenaghan (2001a), is evidenced by the substantial growth in investment from $2 billion in 1984, up to $23.16 billion in 1999. In a report by IEG (2003), sponsorship spending was estimated to reach $28 billion worldwide in 2004. Public attitudes towards traditional advertising have received mixed reviews, leading advertisers to expand or redirect their marketing budgets to include sponsorship. Verity (2002) found that 63% of all sponsorship expenditure in the UK for 2001 went to sports teams and events. 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. Verity (2002) attributed much of the growth of sports sponsorships to increased leisure time and 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, as 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. They 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 to increase the appreciation of a consumer towards 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) said 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.

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, often times 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.

Findings from this study may be of benefit to both advertisers and athletic departments or other sport-related organizations. Advertisers may be able to discern that budget investments made in sports sponsorships pay off with enhanced name recognition and come to expect 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 people's opinions of the sponsoring organization or company. They may also be able to identify businesses that have found success in the sponsorship arena and translate that 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 determined. It is the goal of this research to establish the actual value of this relationship and the influence of sports sponsorship upon the audiences sought by sports marketers.

Scope of this Study

Chapter II reviews the history of sponsorships, and specifically looks at stadium naming practices. The review encompasses professional and collegiate examples and looks at the methods behind entering sponsorship agreements and criteria used to measure their successes. Schema and congruence theories are overviewed as a theory which relates to consumer perceptions and abilities to recall sponsors. Consumer identification levels connected with sports and location factors conclude the section.

Hypotheses and research questions are identified in Chapter III. Literature to support the hypotheses is presented and previous research that led to the posing of the research questions is reviewed.

Chapter IV covers the methodology used in this study. The procedures performed and measures used are presented and explained. Chapter V presents the study's results. An analytical report of the data collected utilizes information produced from SPSS for Windows.

The sixth chapter concludes this research with a discussion of findings, limitations and directions for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

History

Sports leagues, along with colleges and universities, originally relied on event gate revenues to maintain financial solvency. Income from television and other media sources now contribute substantially to revenue streams, but traditional advertising sales no longer generate enough revenue to support a professional franchise (Bruno, 2001). *Forbes* magazine reported the 1997 revenue breakdown for the four major sports (NHL, NBA, NFL, MLB) as 39% media; 38% gate; 16% stadium and 7% other (Ozanian, 1998). (More recent numbers were not found.) Considering the growth of sponsorship expenditures, it is reasonable to assume that major sports teams have also seen increased revenues from their stadium sponsorships. Ernst (2002) reported that sponsorship revenue increased by 44% after the Seattle Seahawks constructed a new stadium. Revenue sharing agreements in the NFL allow team owners to tap new and outside resources to help finance their growing operating costs. Sponsorships have been developed and stadium-naming deals have become a prime source of revenue for teams, with these arrangements paying for everything from player contracts to stadium maintenance (Swartz, 2002).

Stadium Naming

Large corporations' purchase of stadium naming rights became popular in the mid-1990s (Bruno, 2001). Such purchases have reached record numbers in recent years, both in the terms of the number entered into or currently being shopped or negotiated and in terms of the monies paid by corporate naming partners (Moorman, 2002). According to Chen and Stone (2002), 27 teams struck naming rights deals between 1998 and 2000, at an average of nearly $100 million per sponsor. By 2002, the number of teams playing in facilities named after major companies totaled 80 out of 121 (Crompton, & Howard, 2003).

A majority of stadium naming deals occurred in the 1990s, but the earliest instance of a stadium being named after a corporation can be traced to the 1926 naming of Wrigley Field. It was named after the owner of the Cubs, William Wrigley, Jr., who also owned the Wrigley Gum Company. Although the naming was intentionally made for the individual, the value of having his company name on the facility could not have been lost on the entrepreneur who additionally had one of the city's downtown landmarks named after him (McCarthy, & Irwin, 1998). In 1953, August Busch, Jr. informed his board that purchasing the St. Louis Cardinals baseball club and subsequent renaming of their ballpark, at that time known as Sportsman's Park, Busch Stadium, would be one of the finest moves in Anheuser-Busch history (McCarthy, & Irwin, 1998). This agreement is still in place today, was transferred to the current stadium in 1966, and will be transferred to a new stadium that opens in 2006 (Leach, 2004). Busch maintains the pouring rights (alcohol sales) at the stadium, to the exclusion of all other brewing companies.

The first corporate naming rights deal of the modern era is considered the 1973 naming of Rich Stadium (McCarthy, & Irwin, 1998). Rich Products Corporation agreed to pay $1.5 million over 25 years to have its name on the new home of the Buffalo Bills. There was much controversy around the deal, and Bills owner, Ralph Wilson, battled to have the stadium named Erie County Stadium. Robert Rich won the rights to name the stadium for his company after a court battle, which ultimately cost more than he paid for the naming rights (Clark, Cornwell, & Pruitt, 2002). After the agreement expired in 1998 the stadium was renamed Ralph Wilson Stadium.

The first instance of altering the name of an established arena to benefit a corporate sponsor occurred in 1987. The home of the Los Angeles Lakers and Los Angeles Kings, the Forum, was renamed the Great Western Forum when the naming rights were purchased by Great Western Bank (McCarthy, & Irwin, 1998). The Lakers and Kings, along with the Los Angeles Clippers and WNBA's Los Angeles Sparks now play in Staples Center. Staples Office Products purchased the naming rights to the newly constructed arena in 1999.

Current Practices

Much of the stadium naming-right growth of the late 1990s can be attributed to the large number of facilities that were constructed during that time period (Crompton, & Howard, 2003). Franchises moved and expansion teams were developed: the Baltimore Ravens, Carolina Panthers and Houston Texans, for example. Mahoney and Howard (2001) observed that as many as 170 new professional sports teams, part of more than 12 new leagues, came into existence during the 1990s. They estimated that there are now more than 600 professional sports teams, including women's leagues. New stadium construction can substantially boost the value of a team by millions of dollars, without even counting the stadium naming rights and sponsorship revenues. *The Dallas Morning News* reported that the 11 NFL teams that have built new stadiums since 1998 have seen a substantial increase in worth, more than 23%, a total of more than $120 million per team (Fairbank, Maxon, & Aasen, 2004). Weinstein and Clower (1999) predicted that more than $7 billion will be spent by professional teams for new facilities by 2006, how much of this will subsidized and supported by corporate funds remains to be seen.

When a franchise moves to a new facility, a new identity may be established, and a corporate-named stadium may be easily accepted. However, if the new facility maintains features of the old one, and there is strong community and emotional attachment to it, such as is the case in Denver with Mile High Stadium, the public may refuse to acknowledge the new name, in this case Invesco Field at Mile High, and continue to identify with the old moniker (Crompton, & Howard, 2003). *The Denver Post* reported a local businessman was considering a lawsuit to block the sale of naming rights for the new Broncos stadium (Seibert, & Brovsky, 2001). The taxpayers and voters of Denver approved a tax increase to build the stadium, and their argument was that the stadium belonged to the people and any rights sold should be refunded to the city. Part of the referendum to build the facility gave the Broncos the advertising rights inside the stadium; therefore, only a portion of the naming right revenue will be returned to the city, the portions that cover suites, tickets and inside advertising will remain with the Bronco organization (Seibert, & Brovsky, 2001). As with many other deals, the controversy has drawn commentary during nationally televised games that ultimately results in more exposure for the sponsoring corporation.

In Denver, public sentiment in favor of keeping the “Mile High” moniker meant that naming rights would cost more (Invesco, 2001). Denver’s mayor, Wellington Webb, was quoted as saying “the Mile High tag marking the Denver stadium’s perch 5280 feet above sea level is a priceless local icon that shouldn’t be traded away” (Kass, 2000, p 40). Kass (2000) reported that local surveys indicated that more than two-thirds of the area’s residents agreed. Invesco Funds Group ultimately contracted to pay $120 million over 20 years to Denver’s Metropolitan Football Stadium District. Invesco Field at Mile High was the official name given to the new stadium. National media soon began referring to the stadium as Invesco Field, dropping the “at Mile High” portion of the hybrid name that was a compromise to public sentiment (Brovsky, 2001). A survey of area residents showed that many dropped the Invesco Field portion, and that they continue to call the facility “Mile High Stadium,” as do several local Denver media outlets.

Commemoration

Boyd (2000) suggested that naming a stadium or arena is a commemorative event, and the name of the building communicates its role in the community. The name of the site is not only part of “public memory,” but it is the label for all that the experience of the place involves. For the first century of professional sport in America, stadiums and arenas were named to commemorate local or club history, simply referred to the home team, or held the name of the city in which they were located. Boyd (2000) stated that a corporate name, even when the corporation has close ties to the community, “abbreviates the narrative that connects team, space, and community; a corporation paid, so the stadium got a temporary new name” (p. 339).

A counter to the commemorative versus commercial argument is that public memory will not be damaged because fans have a commitment to remember, which may well be true for hard core fans, but as media accounts and signage at the stadium use only the corporate name, the ubiquity of the corporate tag will overwhelm this commitment. To quote Boyd (2000) “as the corporate advertisement supplants the commemorative, community-grounded name, the public memory gradually loses that name which is no longer spoken, written or seen” and “children will grow up knowing only the new name” (p. 335). He also noted that a “parade of names” disrupts the connection that consumers have with both the brand and the organization and highlights the corporate element of sports that many fans attempt to ignore (p. 340).

Continuity

Stadium naming deals have a finite duration in that all are for a certain number of years, and many have had contracts terminated or voided if a company is overtaken, purchased by another entity, or become financially unstable. Thus, a venue may change names many times over a period of years. DeSchriver and Jensen (2003) noted that sponsors are more inclined to pay to have their name on a facility that is a “new” home or home to a “new” team. There may not be the same willingness to invest in a stadium which has previously been known by a corporate name, but now has an expired contract.

Creating a viable stadium naming deal goes beyond having a corporation that wants their name on the building. Financial stability is a key consideration that needs to be addressed when negotiating these deals. Notable problems have included contracts with “Dotcoms” that led to cancelled deals and a controversial example is Enron Corporation’s sponsorship of a newly constructed stadium for the Houston Astros. Economic and legal battles led to the court ordered removal of the Enron name from the facility, which has now been renamed Minute Maid Park. ProPlayer Stadium in Miami, Qualcomm Stadium in San Diego and more recently PSINet Stadium in Baltimore are further examples of agreements that have failed or been dissolved due to financial instability of the naming sponsor (Crompton, & Howard, 2003). As a remedy for this situation, both Moorman (2002) and Crompton and Howard (2003) offered the inclusion of a contract clause that allows for disassociation if a donor or corporate partner embarrasses a franchise or sports organization, similar to those that are regularly included in celebrity endorsement contracts.

Sponsorship Changes

During its financial and political woes, Enron Corporation listed its sponsorship of the stadium as an asset, and as such, desired to continue with the contract. The Houston Astros president of business operations claimed that the Astros had been “materially and adversely affected by the negative public perception and media scrutiny”

(Alm, 2002, p. 3D) surrounding Enron and wanted to dissolve the partnership. Enron continued to make payments on the contract, including a payment of $198,000 in the first quarter of 2002 for season tickets and luxury suites, while being charged with "financial misdeeds" (Alm, 2002, p. 3D). The original contract was for $100 million over 30 years, a\nd included luxury suites, season tickets and other amenities. The Astros eventually repaid $2.1 million to reclaim the rights to the stadium and the naming rights were resold to Minute Maid, again for $100 million, for the remaining 28 years of the contract.

Minute Maid Co., the nation's number one juice-maker, had been based in Houston for 35 years and was proud of that association reported an article in the *Dallas Morning News* (Nichols, 2002). It continued, stating that it was a mutually beneficial merging of two wholesome images – orange juice and baseball, and Minute Maid spokesman Dan Shafer said it was a big step into the limelight for a company that was largely invisible to the average Houstonian and for which most Americans didn't know was based in Houston. The naming rights deal connects Minute Maid orange juice with baseball in the minds of consumers, creating a positive link between the Minute Maid brand and fans of Houston Astros baseball.

A challenge facing both the sponsoring corporation and sponsored venue is the likelihood that over the 20- or 30-year period covered by the agreement, a logo or name change will occur. Moorman (2002) cited the instance of the University of Louisville modifying its official Cardinal bird logo. The stadium manager for Papa John's Cardinal Stadium had to replace more than 90 signs throughout the stadium, in addition to office supplies and concession items. Long-term agreements have been favored to ensure a stable income stream over an extended period of time. Identities are given time to develop and marketing programs have time to realize a return on the sponsors' investments (Crompton, & Howard, 2003). Consumers are given time to adapt to the corporate monikers and develop favorable opinions of the sponsors. It is only logical to assume that sometime during the life of the arrangement, one entity or the other is going to make a change to their image, how both the sponsor and the facility handle these changes effects how the public perceives the value of the sponsorship. A constantly changing partnership is going to create weak links in consumer minds.

Sponsorship Evaluation

Clark et al. (2002) performed a study to determine the profitability and return to shareholders involved with corporations who 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. He 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 compare sales figures in the weeks surrounding the sponsored event.

In a study by Amis, Slack, and Berrett (1999), an assessment of what constituted a success or failure of a sponsorship was left to the company involved. They 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 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 agrees that integrating advertising aids in leveraging benefits of the sponsorship. Crimmins and Horn (1996) found that companies that spend additional dollars to communicate its sponsorship to consumers report a strong positive persuasion link with their brands.

Sponsorship Success

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. Corel Corporation's sponsorship deal to rename the home ice of the Ottawa Senators is estimated to bring 400 million media impressions annually. In addition to the name recognition from the arena itself, Corel gets executive suites, tickets for employees, special access to the building for Corel promotional events and more. Pat Reid, director of sponsorship and promotion at Corel Corporation, is quoted as saying, “A stadium sponsorship is worldwide exposure,” and “we could have put a shingle on individual trees in the forest…we stepped back and put our name on the whole forest” (as cited by Kaydo, & Trusdell, 1997, p. 74).

Many studies have shown that use of sponsorship as an integral part of a marketing or advertising mix helps to build brand awareness and increases sponsor’s brand image with sport consumers. Events are 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 are created to increase brand preference which translates 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. Continuing research to discover the depth and strengths of the associations between sponsoring companies and the values that consumers place on that financial support could lead to the overt, and deliberate, dedication of budgets to sport sponsorship in an effort to establish brand dominance.

Sponsorship Levels

The level of sponsorship that is undertaken can have an effect on the recognition of consumers (Cornwell et al., 2005). Sponsorships can take a variety of forms – title sponsor, presenting sponsor, in-kind sponsorship, exclusivity agreements, along with sponsorships with and without special rights or privileges. Each type of sponsorship will provide different opportunities for a business to put their message in front of a consumer, and each sponsorship will have a different effect on that consumer.

Sponsor Recognition

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 will tend to have long-term advantage when a sponsorship is integrated with the rest of a corporation's marketing mix. Increased brand equity and perceived customer value is realized when a corporation is able to differentiate itself from its competitors and recognizes that a sponsorship is a valuable resource that is 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).

Having your name in the stadium holding the Super Bowl and being one of the sponsors 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) believes that the media have given so much attention and legitimacy to the advertising in the Super Bowl that consumers can't 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.

Schema and Congruency Theory

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 the consumer matches 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). In this study, congruence and schema are extended to include the propensity of a respondent to be able to recall a sponsor that falls within their geographic location, be that local sponsors for those in close proximity to the university, or on a national level for out of area respondents.

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. 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 correctly recall that association when asked. Additionally, schema and congruence may serve as an explanation as to why respondents report supporting or buying products from sponsors who support an athletic program, as investigated in this study.

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 both 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.

When location is factored in, a market prominence bias may exist for small brands when a competitor with a large market share is recalled (Cornwell et al., 2005). Cornwell et al. (2005) reported that although sponsor confusion may occur when major competitors are engaged in sponsorship activities, the value of perceived congruence between the sponsor and event outweighs any disadvantages presented by the false recall associated with the relationship. Pham and Johar (2001) suggested that businesses considered to be more prominent in a market are often credited with a sponsorship regardless of whether or not the sponsorship actually exists. In a study of UK football supporters, Bennett (1999) found that frequent game attendees were more likely to be able to correctly recall sponsors than were those who attended less frequently. Additionally, less frequent attendees were more likely to falsely recall sponsors that were not visible in the stadium. He did, however find that less frequent attendees were able to correctly name sponsors when using aided recall for specific advertiser categories.

Beyond Stadiums

Corporate naming deals in major sports do not stop at the stadium. Reynolds (2002) reported that the Philadelphia Eagles have a state-of-the-art practice facility that is called the NovaCare Complex. NovaCare Rehabilitation partnered with the Eagles to create a practice facility that doubles as an outpatient sports medicine center. The Eagles reach new fans year-round through actual patients and media stories on new practices and expert doctors (Reynolds, 2002). Here again, when there is a positive association between the brand and the sports organization, they become strongly linked in consumer's minds.

Corporate naming rights are considered the 'norm' in the professional sports arena 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.

Sponsorship Effects

Hansen and Scotwin (1995) developed a model for measuring sponsorship effects. They stated that measuring these effects can be complex as there are 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). In most cases, there are limitations that restrict the complexity of messages that can be communicated. 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. 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 coincide 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, such as the current study, 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 sponsors' 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 are typically focused on awareness. Awareness of the association between sponsor and event is the most basic outcome that can be achieved through sponsorship. Cognition effects occur when there is an association between the sponsor and sponsored. This can include close associations, such as sporting equipment and a player, or image associations where a sponsor is aligned with a sport because of the type of audience that is 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 product or service. 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.

Sponsorship Assessment

There appears to be no set way for corporations to accurately assess the success of their sponsorships. Intentions behind sponsorships are 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 allows measurement to occur 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. 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 if 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. They determined that companies' market values showed an increase when they support 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). Research by Hickman et al. (2005) indicated that sport sponsorship can be a successful form of internal communication and increase employee morale which can motivate customer service. In addition, they found that sports sponsorships can create a bond between employees and customers through identification with the sponsored entity.

Brand Equity

Marber, Wellen and Posluszny (2005) define a brand as the "name, term, symbol, sign or combination intended to identify or differentiate" an advertiser from its competitors (p. 162). Brand equity is the assets and liabilities that are linked to the brand. Managers 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.

Sponsorship Selection Decisions

Competition and industry trends play a part in sponsorship decisions. Berrett and Slack (1999) showed that there are distinct influences that play a part in sponsorship activities. These include 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. Corporations that felt they were proactive in sponsorships took deliberate action to prevent rivals from taking advantage of 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.

Sponsorship is often incorporated into sales promotions, advertising, and public relations departments of companies. Companies that include sponsorship in departments that are led by managers that are accustomed to measuring success by increased sales place an emphasis on quantifiable promotions that generate sales. Managers within public relations departments leaned toward sponsorship programs that generated and maintained goodwill and company image (Berrett, & Slack, 1999). Input of influential executives or investors who are connected both formally and informally with other organizations can influence sponsorship decisions. There are also certain mimetic pressures wherein an organization enters into a sponsorship agreement because another firm that they have modeled themselves after has developed an association. Again, this can lead to disaster if there is no accurate and unbiased assessment of the potential effectiveness of a sponsorship.

Sponsorships for the purpose of having your name on something or “because it’s the right thing to do” are 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 taken into consideration when entering into a sponsorship agreement. Knowing what will be attained by sponsoring a team or event is the first of six steps the recommend. Assuring that the audience involved is to whom you wish to communicate with is essential. Secondly, what the connection is between the sponsored property and a companies’ marketing objective ensures that the right message is 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 your brand and the sponsorship. The fifth step is defining what the sponsorship means to your target audience. Make sure they know why the connection is important. Finally, don’t go overboard. One well thought out and executed sponsorship that fans identify and correctly associate with is infinitely more valuable than multiple sponsorships that are unnoticed, unremembered or meaningless (Crimmins, & Horn, 1996).

Lardinoit and Derbaix (2001) defined two forms of sponsorship. Field sponsorship is defined as “the placement of sponsored messages, usually involving a name or logo on sports equipment and billboards located around the arena” (p 168). Television sponsorships include announcements outside of 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 lead to differing levels of recall and recognition.

Collegiate Sponsorships

Tomasini, Frye and Stotlar (2004) reported that approximately 85% of the NCAA Division I athletic programs operated with an annual budget deficit. According to Lee (2000), operating expenses in successful athletic departments at any level is growing at such a rate that less than 45% of them operate in the black. Increasing pressure is placed on these departments to raise funds through sponsorship and related events. In turn, corporations are turning to college athletics to reach those highly vested fans for increased sales, brand awareness and image enhancement (Covell, 2001). Corporate encroachment into college athletics has led many college presidents into turmoil over the academic mission for which most of then were established. There is 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).

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 1940's dealt with the commercialism and returned the Ivy League schools to their educational focus. Harvard currently maintains 41 athletic programs for more than 1500 student-athletes with no athletically 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 other athletic programs, Harvard advocates donor programs. Donations from individuals in exchange for better seating or parking is very much a part of their revenue generation plan, but it is made clear that there will be no corporate influence on the athletic program.

Tulane president Scott Cowan wrote that the presidents of the University of Michigan and Ohio State University recently refused to allow corporate sponsorship of their annual high profile 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 too often hinges 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 embodies 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 their facilities. Ganeshananthan (2000) reported that small concessions would be allowed for university events and organizations (such as ABC) that report 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).

Newton (1999) reported that state universities need outside funding for athletics in order 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 community that they are located in. 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).

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). Individuals holding season tickets at a successful and well-known university were selected to participate in the study. The selected participants were mailed a survey a short time after the first home game of the season, and the respondents to that survey were mailed a follow-up survey just after the last home game. 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.

Goodwill Among Fans

Meenaghan (2001b) stated that a sponsor's investment in an activity generates an effect of goodwill among activity fans. The intensity of the fan involvement provides a framework against which the measures of perceptions of benefit and consumer response can be measured. Meenaghan (2001a) described three levels of goodwill that can be generated by sponsorship. Generic level goodwill is generated when commercial sponsorship is seen as delivering a benefit to society. It is deemed as being a "good idea", but it does not touch the consumer in a deep or meaningful way. Category level goodwill is felt with consumer disposition towards a particular category (e.g. sports or arts) and is most prevalent with sponsoring of social causes.

Individual activity level of goodwill occurs when there is a perceived benefit and related appreciation. This is most prevalent when the sponsorship benefits an activity in which the consumer is involved. Goodwill effects are strongest at this level because they are driven by the involvement level of the consumer or fan – intimate involvement with a sport, team or event generates a high level of goodwill and gratitude toward a sponsor.

Fan Identification

Meenaghan (2001b) stated that fan involvement refers to the extent to which consumers identify with, and are motivated by, their engagement in and affiliation with leisure activities. Sports marketing literature refers to this phenomenon as "fan identification." Sutton, McDonald, Milne and Cimperman (1997) defined fan identification as "the personal commitment and emotional involvement customers have with a sport organization" (p 15). They suggested that there are three distinct levels of fan identification. Low identification (social) fans, are those that have relatively passive, but often long-term relationships with a sport. They are attracted by entertainment value and do not have an emotional attachment to a particular team or event. They watch or attend sporting events for pleasurable and social reasons; they are not concerned with the outcome of the game, only the quality of the entertainment it can provide. Tailgaters who never enter the actual event are included in this category.

Medium identification (focused) fans have an association with at sport or team which has attributes or elements that they find attractive. This could be a coach, social fad or trend, or even a particular player. This level of fan may make significant personal and financial investments in that team or sport, but only for the duration that the attraction remains. Wearing team apparel is common among this fan group, but they are fickle and involvement levels wane after poor team performance or the trade of their favorite player. Their interest is easily diminished and favorites may vary with each season or year.

High identification (vested) fans are the strongest and most loyal supporters. They have a heavy emotional and financial investment in the sport or team, in terms of money and time or both. This category includes "die hard" fans who support their chosen team through winning and losing seasons with the same intensity; loyalty is intense, unwavering and long-term.

Geographic Location

Geographic location of sponsors appears to play a part in the success of sponsorships and consumer recognition of sponsors' names. 3Com Park in San Francisco is located within 40 minutes of the headquarters of its sponsoring company. Location is a key feature that is leveraged with major clients according to David Abramson, corporate public affairs manager for 3Com (as cited by Kaydo, & Trusdell, 1997). (It should be noted that many fans continue to refer to this venue by its previous name, Candlestick Park.) Coors Field in Denver is a natural geographic and demographic fit. The brewer is located in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, a regularly publicized fact, and fans of baseball are considered a target audience for beer companies. Shanklin and Kuzma (1992) note that Coors does not sponsor professional golf and tennis because those audiences tend to be too upscale, and therefore are not considered their target audience. Heinz Field, home of the Pittsburgh Steelers, is an example of a corporate sponsor that is welcomed by the community. Heinz finished first in a survey of Pittsburgh area residents as the preferred corporate name for the new facility that was completed in 1991 ("It's Heinz Field", 1991). The Steelers president was quoted as saying, "The Steelers and Heinz are a winning combination because we share historic Pittsburgh roots and a strong commitment to the region's growth and vitality."

Summary

This chapter has presented an overview of sport sponsorship and consumers. The history of sports sponsorship has led us to where we are today: the majority of professional and collegiate sporting programs garner a large portion of their budgets from some form of sponsorship. As sport entities continue to depend on revenue from advertisers, the need for theoretical research in the area of sponsorship benefits and the variables that influence the value of these sponsorships increases. This study attempts to further the research by considering what effects variables such as game attendance and proximity to a university have on sponsor recall and the value respondents place on such advertiser support.

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Madrigal (2000) reported that higher levels of team identification, as determined by game attendance, were positively related to intentions to purchase a sponsor's products. Additionally, fan identification literature suggests that consumers who financially support and attend sporting programs will have greater involvement with the program and perceive a higher value in sponsorships. To test these associations, the following hypotheses are extended:

H1: Fans who attend more home games will correctly recall more sponsors in the corresponding stadium than those who attend on a less frequent basis.

H2: Fans who attend more home games will place a higher value on sponsorships than those who attend few on a less frequent basis.

Westerbeek (2000) conducted a study in Australia to gauge the dependency of geographic location of success of a sports sponsorship. He surveyed sponsors of a Melbourne based football club and found that in general, "revenue maximization from sponsorship of the tenants of sports facilities is dependent on the geographical location of the facility" (p. 66). In other words, sponsorships were more successful when the sponsoring company's headquarters was located in reasonable proximity to the venue being sponsored. No information examining if the location of the supporters plays a part in the value of the sponsorships could be found. In that vein, the following hypothesis is extended.

H3: Fans from the local area will have a higher recall of local sponsors.

Previously reviewed literature suggests that corporations receive a higher level of benefit from being located in close proximity to the event or venue being sponsored. Little research has been discovered to assess whether fans perceive any difference in the value of support from a local or national sponsor.

RQ1: Are local or national sponsors recalled differently by fans who attend games at different levels of frequency?

RQ2: Are local or national sponsors recalled more frequently?

RQ3: Are local or national sponsor recall levels affected by the location of the respondent?

RQ4: Does proximity have an effect on how sponsorship is valued?

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Access to a university with strong football and basketball programs that play in corporately sponsored venues allows for a comparison in fan recognition of sponsors on a local and national level. The university that serves as the case for this study has a football stadium that includes a national corporation in its name and displays signage of both national and local sponsors. The basketball arena bears the name of a local corporation and also displays signage for national and local sponsors.

Data Collection

Granello and Wheaton (2004) listed many advantages for the use of online surveys and data collection, not the least of which is the reduced cost involved. They also cited reduced response time, and ease of data entry as being significant considerations in using this form of data collection. Schaefer and Dillman (1998) conducted an experiment and found that response rates to e-mail surveys were faster than those conducted on paper and were greatest for respondents who received a reminder. Coderre, Mathieu and St-Laurent (2004) found that the quality of data collected through a web-based survey was comparable to information gathered through traditional telephone and postal surveys.

Based on the above studies it was determined that an e-mail invitation to participate in a web-survey would be of little cost to the researcher, garner quick responses, and allow for streamlined data entry. In an effort to achieve the highest possible response rates it was decided that an initial e-mail would be sent out on a Tuesday, as determined by Hutchison and Fleishcman (2000) to be a convenient day for potential respondents, with a reminder message sent 10 days later.

An e-mail list was received from a campus organization and edited to remove duplicates and persons who had been previously exposed to the survey. A random number generator was used to divide the remaining 2398 records into sixteen groups of approximately 150 e-mail addresses. These groups were required for a parallel incentive study that was conducted along side with the sponsorship study. The influences of the incentives are controlled for in this study by systematically varying incentives across all conditions.

After the initial survey invitation with survey links were sent on a Tuesday afternoon, 602 unduplicated error messages were received from inactive, invalid or incorrect e-mail addresses. These messages were returned to the campus organization that then mined its files, along with other university records to which they had access, to correct as many e-mail addresses as possible. Almost 300 new addresses were located and replaced within each group. A reminder e-mail was sent out on the following Thursday, 10 days after the original invitation. Three hundred and twenty-nine unduplicated returns were received from the second e-mailing. A total of 2069 valid e-mail addresses received the invitation to participate in the survey.

Respondents

Nine hundred and ten responses were received. Of these respondents, 68 who did not progress to the second question of the survey were removed because they provided no usable information. In addition, 69 respondents who claimed that they were not members of the athletic donor organization and two respondents who completed the survey more than once were removed from the sample. Of the remaining 771 people who responded with usable information, 694 were fully completed and 77 were partially completed. All usable information provided was included in evaluation.

Measures

Respondents were asked an unaided recall question to determine brand awareness of the sponsors in the football stadium and basketball arena. Respondents were asked to list as many sponsors as they could recall seeing or hearing for each facility. Recalled sponsors were totaled by respondent for each facility and coded as to whether or not the sponsor recalled was active with the athletic program. Advertisers who were correctly identified were further broken down as being either local or national sponsors based on the scope of their marketing plans. Any sponsor or brand that could be recognized as having an advertising budget that was placed outside of a local or regional market was determined to be national sponsor, the remainders were considered to be local sponsors. A complete list of recalled sponsors and their coding is included in the appendix. Each respondent was further coded as to if they could identify the title sponsor for each facility.

Respondents were asked if they were season ticket holders, and how frequently they attended home games for football, men's basketball and women's basketball. Game attendance was reported as follows: all of the time (never miss a game), most of the time (attend at least half of the games), some of the time (attend less than half of the games), and none of the time (do not attend). A table showing attendance by sport is included in the appendix. These are the only sports in either the basketball arena or football stadium that allow for the purchase of season tickets, and are the most frequently attended sporting events on campus.

Respondents were asked to enter their zip code which was used to determine their proximity to the university. An 18-county area was determined to be the Designated Market Area (DMA) as described by Nielsen Media Research (2005). Zip codes falling within this area were considered to be in-area. Those falling outside the DMA were considered to be out-of-area for this study. The following states are represented in the population: Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Washington DC, Virginia, North Carolina, Texas, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Colorado, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, California and Washington State.

Sponsorship value was determined by the use of a series of questions that asked respondents to rate their agreement with statements about importance of supporting businesses that support the athletic program and the likelihood that they would buy products from companies that sponsor the athletic program (Pitts, & Slattery, 2004). Additionally, respondents were asked how important they felt financial support from individuals, local businesses and national businesses were for the athletic program. Kuzma, Veltri, Kuzma and Miller (2003) reported using an 11-point scale as a measurement of attitude towards a sponsorship. In turn, this study used an 11-point scale to measure levels of value attributed to sponsors and financial supporters of the athletic program.

Analysis

Respondent information from the internet survey was exported to Excel where it was visually checked for discrepancies. It was then converted to SPSS For Windows Version 11.0 for analysis. Analysis was conducted using t-tests, crosstabs and one-way ANOVA statistical calculations. Tukey HSD post hoc analyses were used with comparison of means tests to determine where differences existed. This post hoc test was used because of the unequal sample group sizes.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Description of the Sample

Demographic information was gathered at the end of the questionnaire and can only be reported for respondents who progressed to that point. Of those who reported demographic information, 86.5% were male and 13.5 % female. Ages of respondents ranged from 19 to 85, with a mean age of 46.8 years (*SD* = 12.8). Annual household income was reported as being $75,000 and above by 74% (*n* = 519) of respondents. Residents of the city where the institution is located totaled 32.6% (*n* = 226) and state residents totaled 61.4% (*n* = 426). Only 6.1% (*n* = 42) responded with zip codes outside of the state of the institution. Seventy-seven percent reported that they were graduates of the institution to whose athletic program they were donating; 6% (*n* = 48) reported having more than one degree from the institution.

Season ticket holders for football equaled 69.1% (*n* = 533) of respondents, along with 26.2% (*n* = 202) who reported having season tickets to men's basketball games, and 17.6% (*n* = 136) who had season tickets to women's basketball games. Attendance frequencies are included in a table in the appendix.

Correct Sponsor Recall Hypothesis

H1 theorized that respondents who attended more home games would be able to correctly recall more sponsors. This hypothesis was tested for football, men's basketball and women's basketball. According to data analysis, fans who attend more home football games do correctly recall more sponsors, $F(3, 535) = 12.93$, $p < .001$, than those who attend fewer games. Tukey post hoc tests showed that significantly more sponsors were correctly recalled by people who attended all home football games ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 2.28$) than by those who never attended ($M = 1.19$, $SD = 0.32$) or those who only attended some and most games ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 1.36$, and $M = 2.42$, $SD = 1.67$, respectively).

Furthermore, data analysis revealed that fans who attended more home football games recalled more total sponsors, $F(3, 535) = 13.93$, $p < .001$, than those who attended fewer home games. Again, post hoc tests indicated that significantly more total sponsors were recalled by people who attended all home football games ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 2.45$) than by those who never attended ($M = 1.10$, $SD = 0.32$) and those who only attended some and most home games ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 1.44$ and $M = 2.65$, $SD = 1.83$, respectively). The percentage of correctly identified sponsors was not influenced by the number of games attended, $F(3, 535) = 0.81$, $p > .05$.

For men's basketball, data analysis revealed that fans who attend more home games do correctly recall more sponsors, $F(3, 405) = 9.80$, $p < .001$, than those who attend fewer games. Tukey HSD post hoc tests showed that significantly more sponsors were correctly recalled by people who attended all of the men's basketball games ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 3.45$) than by respondents who never attended men's home games ($M = 1.74$, $SD = 1.11$) and respondents who attended some of the men's home basketball games ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 1.36$).

Continued data analysis outlined that fans who attended more home men's basketball games recalled more total sponsors, $F(3, 405) = 10.69$, $p < .001$, than those who attended fewer home games. Post hoc tests brought out that significantly more total sponsors were recalled by respondents who attended all of the men's basketball games ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 3.57$) than by those who never attended men's home games ($M = 1.79$, $SD = 1.11$), respondents who attended most of the time ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 2.03$), and those who attended some of the men's home basketball games ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 1.44$). The percentage of correctly identified sponsors was not influenced by the number of games attended, $F(3, 405) = 0.40$, $p > .05$.

For women's basketball, results showed that fans who attend more home games do correctly recall more sponsors, $F(3, 405) = 18.06$, $p < .001$, than those who attend fewer games. Tukey HSD post hoc tests pointed out that significantly more sponsors were correctly recalled by people who attended all or most of the home women's basketball games ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 3.02$ and $M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.68$, respectively) than by those who never attended and those who only attended some women's home games ($M = 1.23$, $SD = 0.66$ and $M = 1.71$, $SD = 1.24$, respectively).

Additional data analysis revealed that fans who attended more home women's basketball games recalled more total sponsors, $F(3, 405) = 16.78$, $p < .001$, than those who attended fewer home games. Post hoc tests highlighted that significantly more total sponsors were recalled by people who attended all of the women's basketball games ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 3.11$) than by those with any other attendance level. Additionally, those who never attended and those who only attended some women's home games ($M = 1.33$, $SD =$

0.62 and $M = 1.77$, $SD = 1.28$, respectively) recalled fewer total sponsors than those who attended most of the time ($M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.68$).

For women's basketball, the percentage of correctly identified sponsors was influenced by the number of games attended, $F(3, 405) = 3.37$, $p < .05$. Tukey HSD post hoc tests showed that people who never attended women's basketball games had a significantly lower percentage of correct recall ($M = 91.65$, $SD = 26.97$) than those who attended most home games ($M = 100.00$, $SD = 0.00$).

Overall, H1 was supported for football, men's basketball and women's basketball. Correct recall of sponsors was affected by the number of games attended. More games attended by respondents resulted in more correctly identified sponsors for all three sports investigated, see Table 1. When considering the total number of sponsors recalled, increased game attendance also resulted in an increased number of sponsors recalled for all three sports, see Table 2. The percentage of sponsors correctly recalled was found to be affected by game attendance only in women's basketball, where those who attended most home games had the highest percentage of correctly identified sponsors, see Table 3.

Table 1

Means for correctly recalled sponsors

Sport	Attendance							
	All Games		Most Games		Some Games		No Games	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football	3.09^{A}	2.28	2.42^{B}	1.67	1.92^{B}	1.36	1.10^{B}	0.32
Men's Basketball	3.29^{A}	3.45	2.46^{AB}	1.99	1.97^{B}	1.58	1.74^{B}	1.11
Women's Basketball	3.18^{AB}	3.02	2.53^{B}	1.68	1.71^{C}	1.24	1.23^{C}	0.66

$F(3, 535) = 12.93$, $p < .001$, Football.
$F(3, 405) = 9.80$, $p < .001$, Men's Basketball
$F(3, 405) = 18.06$, $p < .001$, Women's Basketball
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Tukey HSD.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Table 2

Means for total number of recalled sponsors

Sport	Attendance: All Games		Most Games		Some Games		No Games	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football	3.36^{A}	2.45	2.65^{B}	1.83	2.05^{B}	1.44	1.10^{B}	0.32
Men's Basketball	3.43^{A}	3.57	2.52^{AB}	2.03	2.01^{B}	1.57	1.79^{B}	1.11
Women's Basketball	3.25^{AB}	3.11	2.53^{B}	1.68	1.77^{C}	1.28	1.33^{C}	0.62

$F(3, 535) = 13.93$, $p < .001$, Football.
$F(3, 405) = 10.69$, $p < .001$, Men's Basketball
$F(3, 405) = 16.78$, $p < .001$, Women's Basketball
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Tukey HSD.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Table 3

Means for percentage of correctly recalled sponsors

Sport	Attendance							
	All Games		Most Games		Some Games		No Games	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football	92.10	18.41	93.17	16.27	93.75	19.05	100.00	0.00
Men's Basketball	95.59	15.76	98.60	7.57	97.53	14.31	97.53	15.23
Women's Basketball	98.47	6.12	100.00^{A}	0.00	96.85	15.23	91.65^{B}	26.97

$F(3, 535) = 0.81$, $p > .05$, Football.
$F(3, 405) = 0.40$, $p > .05$, Men's Basketball
$F(3, 405) = 3.37$, $p < .05$, Women's Basketball
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Tukey HSD.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Sponsorship Value Hypothesis

H2 theorized that fans who attend more games would value sponsorships more highly than those who attend fewer games. This hypothesis was tested for football, men's basketball and women's basketball. According to data analysis, fans who attended more football games said that it was more important to support sponsors $F(3, 704) = 5.81$, $p = .001$, than those who attended fewer games. Tukey HSD post hoc tests revealed that people who never attended home football games felt it was significantly less important to support sponsors of the athletic program ($M = 4.46$, $SD = 3.43$) than those who attended all, most or some home games ($M = 6.45$, $SD = 3.18$, $M = 6.68$, $SD = 2.95$, and $M = 6.19$, $SD = 3.01$, respectively).

Additionally, data analysis revealed that fans who attended more football games said that it was more important to buy from sponsors $F(3, 703) = 2.83$, $p < .05$, than those who attended fewer games. Tukey HSD post hoc tests outlined that people who never attended home football felt it was significantly less important to buy from sponsors of the athletic program ($M = 5.71$, $SD = 3.15$) than those who attended all and most home games ($M = 6.95$, $SD = 2.67$ and $M = 7.04$, $SD = 2.82$, respectively).

Supplemental analysis unveiled no significance for what type of financial support was the most valued when looking at individual support, $F(3, 702) = 1.48$, $p > .05$, or support from local businesses, $F(3, 701) = 1.22$, $p > .05$. Frequency of football game attendance did have an effect on the value of financial support from national businesses, $F(3, 701) = 3.10$, $p < .05$. Tukey HSD post hoc analysis showed that respondents who reported attending some home football games valued sponsorships from national sponsors more highly ($M = 8.55$, $SD = 1.82$) than those who attended all of the time ($M = 8.00$, $SD = 2.25$).

For men's basketball, data analysis indicated that number of home games attended does not have an effect on how important it is to support sponsors $F(3, 704) = 2.03$, $p > .05$ or how important it is to buy products from businesses which support the athletic program, $F(3, 703) = 2.42$, $p > .05$.

As with football attendees, analysis of financial support showed no significance for individual financial support, $F(3, 702) = 1.77$, $p > .05$, or support from local businesses, $F(3, 701) = 0.22$, $p > .05$. Frequency of men's basketball game attendance did, however, have an effect on the value of financial support from national businesses, $F(3, 701) = 3.47$, $p < .05$. Due to unequal group sizes and discrepancies with variances, a small, although statistically significant F-value was reported, but Tukey HSD post hoc analysis did not identify where the differences occurred. It can be assumed that the differences were between the attendance levels with the highest and lowest means. A review of the associated means showed that respondents who reported never attending home games valued sponsorships from national sponsors more highly ($M = 8.37$, $SD = 2.20$) than those who attended all of the time ($M = 7.60$, $SD = 2.60$).

For women's basketball, data analysis highlighted the fact that fans who attended more home games said that it was more important to support sponsors, $F(3, 704) = 3.31$, $p < .05$, than those who attended fewer games. Tukey HSD post hoc tests showed that people who never attended women's basketball home games felt it was significantly less important to support sponsors of the athletic program ($M = 5.70$, $SD = 3.32$) than those who attended most of the home games ($M = 6.91$, $SD = 2.86$).

Further analysis showed that the number of women's basketball games attended have no effects on how important it is to buy from sponsors who support the athletic program, $F(3, 703) = 0.79$, $p > .05$. In addition, data analysis of financial support showed no significance for individual financial support, $F(3, 702) = 0.12$, $p > .05$, support from local businesses, $F(3, 701) = 0.67$, $p > .05$, or financial support from national businesses, $F(3, 701) = 1.52$, $p > .05$.

Results for H2 were mixed. H2 was supported for football attendees whose value of sponsorships, as determined by the sponsor support and product purchases, was affected by number of games attended. No support was found for H2 in men's basketball attendees in either sponsor support or product purchases. Significant effects were found for women's basketball attendees who felt it was important to be supportive of sponsors, but no differences were found between game attendance and product purchases. See Table 4 for results for importance of sponsor support and Table 5 for likelihood of product purchases.

Table 4

Means for the importance of supporting sponsors who support the athletic program

	Attendance							
Sport	All Games		Most Games		Some Games		No Games	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football	6.45^{A}	3.18	6.68^{A}	2.95	6.19^{A}	3.01	4.46^{B}	3.43
Men's Basketball	5.74	2.92	7.04	2.40	6.46	3.01	6.18	3.29
Women's Basketball	6.48	3.19	6.91^{A}	2.86	6.39	3.08	5.70^{B}	3.32

$F(3, 704) = 5.81$, $p = .001$, Football.
$F(3, 704) = 2.03$, $p > .05$, Men's Basketball
$F(3, 704) = 3.31$, $p < .05$, Women's Basketball
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Tukey HSD.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Table 5

Means for the likelihood of purchasing products from businesses who support the athletic program

	Attendance							
Sport	All Games		Most Games		Some Games		No Games	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football	6.95^{A}	2.67	7.04^{A}	2.82	6.89	2.49	5.71^{B}	3.15
Men's Basketball	6.28	2.95	6.25	2.83	7.08	2.54	6.93	2.72
Women's Basketball	6.87	2.80	6.90	2.63	6.99	2.58	6.60	2.91

$F(3, 703) = 2.83$, $p < .05$, Football.
$F(3, 703) = 2.42$, $p > .05$, Men's Basketball
$F(3, 703) = 0.79$, $p > .05$, Women's Basketball
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Tukey HSD.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

In an effort to further available research, H2 was extended to include the value placed on different forms of financial support given to the athletic program from individuals, local businesses and national businesses. The only significant effect was found between the number of football and men's basketball games attended with the value placed on financial support offered by national businesses, see Table 6.

Table 6

Means for the importance of support for the athletic program for national businesses

Sport	Attendance							
	All Games		Most Games		Some Games		No Games	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football	8.00^{A}	2.25	8.42	2.06	8.55^{B}	1.82	8.17	2.48
Men's Basketball	7.60^{A}	2.60	7.69	2.27	8.30	1.85	8.37^{B}	2.20
Women's Basketball	8.07	2.32	7.84	2.27	8.31	2.01	8.36	2.12

$F(3, 701) = 3.10$, $p < .05$, Football.
$F(3, 701) = 3.47$, $p < .05$, Men's Basketball
$F(3, 701) = 1.52$, $p > .05$, Women's Basketball
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Tukey HSD.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Proximity Recall Hypothesis

H3 theorized that donors in close proximity to the university would have a higher recall of local sponsors. According to data analysis, proximity does have an effect on recall of the title sponsor of the basketball arena (a local supermarket), $\chi^2(1, N = 771) = 17.19$, $p < .001$. Of the respondents who were able to identify the local title sponsor 51.5% ($n = 87$) were in-area and 48.5% ($n = 82$) were out-of-area. Additionally, of those who could not identify the local title sponsor, 66.8% ($n = 175$) were in-area and 81.0% (n

= 350) were out-of-area. However, proximity does not have an effect on recall of the football stadium (a national communication company), $\chi^2(1, N = 771) = .08$, $p > .05$.

Continuing analysis was conducted to determine if proximity had an effect on correct sponsors, total number of sponsors or percentage of correct sponsors recalled. For the football stadium, data analysis highlighted that proximity did have an effect on the number of sponsors correctly recalled, $t(325.16) = 5.83$, $p < .001$. Sponsors were recalled correctly more often by in-area respondents ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 2.45$) than by out-of-area respondents ($M = 2.21$, $SD = 1.54$). Additionally, proximity did have an effect on the total number of sponsors recalled, $t(330.95) = 5.63$, $p < .001$. The total number of sponsors recalled was higher for in-area respondents ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 2.62$) than by out-of-area respondents ($M = 2.43$, $SD = 1.70$). However, proximity does not have an effect on the percentage of correct sponsors recalled in the football stadium, $t(525) = 0.56$, $p > .05$.

For the basketball arena, data analysis advanced that proximity did have an effect on the number of sponsors correctly recalled, $t(291.47) = 4.73$, $p < .001$. Sponsors were recalled correctly more often by in-area respondents ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 2.31$) than by out-of-area respondents ($M = 1.67$, $SD = 1.21$). Proximity also had an effect on the total number of sponsors recalled, $t(289.88) = 4.62$, $p < .001$. The total number of sponsors recalled was higher for in-area respondents ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 2.36$) than by out-of-area respondents ($M = 1.72$, $SD = 1.23$). However, proximity did not have an effect on the percentage of correct sponsors recalled in the football stadium, $t(362.23) = 1.15$, $p > .05$.

Mixed support was found for H3, but it can be shown that in-area respondents recalled the title sponsors of both facilities at a higher level than out-of-area respondents, see Table 7. The sponsor recalled most often for the football stadium was, in fact, the title sponsor, a national corporation. The sponsor recalled most often for the basketball stadium was also a national sponsor, the local title sponsor was the second most frequently listed sponsor.

Table 7

Percentage of respondents who could correctly identify title sponsors

	Proximity	
Facility	In-Area	Out-Of-Area
Football Stadium	50.4%	49.3%
Basketball Arena	33.2%	19.0%

$\chi^2(1, N = 771) = .08, p > .05$, Football Stadium.
$\chi^2(1, N = 771) = 17.19, p < .001$, Basketball Arena.

Proximity Recall and Game Attendance Research Question

RQ1 asked if local or national sponsors would be recalled differently based on the number of games attended. Differences were investigated at for football and men's and women's basketball. For football, data analysis revealed that game attendance did have an effect on the number of local sponsors recalled, $F(3, 535) = 15.07, p < .001$. Tukey HSD post hoc tests indicated that respondents who go to football games all of the time were able to recall significantly more local sponsors ($M = 1.81$, $SD = 1.79$) than do those who never go to football games ($M = 0.10$, $SD = 0.32$) and those who attend some of the time ($M = 0.84$, $SD = 1.06$), as well as those who attended most home football games ($M = 1.25$, $SD = 1.72$). Game attendance was not found to have an effect on recall of national sponsors, $F(3, 535) = 1.63$, $p > .05$.

For men's basketball, data analysis led to the conclusion that game attendance did have an effect on the number of local sponsors recalled, $F(3, 405) = 11.28$, $p < .001$. Post hoc tests brought to light that significantly more local sponsors were recalled by respondents who attended all of the men's home games ($M = 2.04$, $SD = 2.55$) than by those who never attended ($M = 0.82$, $SD = 0.84$) and those who attended some games ($M = 1.06$, $SD = 1.13$). Additionally, those who attended men's home basketball games most of the time were able to recall significantly more sponsors ($M = 1.40$, $SD = 1.43$) than those who never attended ($M = 0.82$, $SD = 0.84$). As with football, game attendance was not found to have an effect on recall of national sponsors at men's basketball games, $F(3, 405) = 2.10$, $p > .05$.

For women's basketball, data analysis revealed that game attendance did have an effect on the number of local sponsors recalled, $F(3, 405) = 13.59$, $p < .001$. Post hoc tests directed support for local sponsors who were recalled significantly more by respondents who attended all of the women's home games ($M = 1.84$, $SD = 2.19$) than by those who never attended and attended some of the time ($M = 0.55$, $SD = 0.64$ and $M = 0.88$, $SD = 0.99$, respectively). Additionally, fans who attended most women's home basketball games were able to recall significantly more local sponsors ($M = 1.38$, $SD =$

1.29) than by those who never attended (M = 0.55, SD = 0.64) and those who only attended some of the time (M = 0.88, SD = 0.99).

In conclusion, women's basketball home game attendance was found to have an effect on the number of national sponsors recalled, $F(3, 405) = 7.05$, $p < .001$. Post hoc tests outlined that significantly more national sponsors were recalled by respondents who attended all of the women's home games (M = 1.34, SD = 1.24) than by those who never attended and attended some of the time (M = 0.68, SD = 0.62 and M = 0.83, SD = 0.76, respectively). Additionally, fans who attended most women's home basketball games were able to recall significantly more national sponsors (M = 1.16, SD = 0.75) than by those who never attended (M = 0.68, SD = 0.62) and those who only attended some of the time (M = 0.83, SD = 0.75).

RQ1 results showed that game attendance was a factor in recall levels of local and national sponsors. Football and men's basketball home game attendance affected recall level of local sponsors, but showed no affect on recall of national sponsors. Attendance at women's basketball games had effects on recall of both local and national sponsors. See Table 8 for results on recall levels for local sponsors and Table 9 for recall levels of national sponsors.

Table 8

Means for recall of local sponsors

Sport	Attendance: All Games		Most Games		Some Games		No Games	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football	1.81^{A}	1.79	1.25^{B}	1.17	0.84^{B}	1.06	0.10^{B}	0.32
Men's Basketball	2.04^{AB}	2.55	1.40^{B}	1.43	1.06^{BC}	1.13	0.82^{C}	0.84
Women's Basketball	1.84^{AB}	2.14	1.38^{B}	1.29	0.88^{C}	0.99	0.55^{C}	0.64

$F(3, 535) = 15.07$, $p < .001$, Football.
$F(3, 405) = 11.28$, $p < .001$, Men's Basketball
$F(3, 405) = 13.59$, $p < .001$, Women's Basketball
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Tukey HSD.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Table 9

Means for recall of national sponsors

Sport	Attendance							
	All Games		Most Games		Some Games		No Games	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football	1.81^{A}	1.79	1.25^{B}	1.17	0.84^{B}	1.06	0.10^{B}	0.32
Men's Basketball	2.04^{AB}	2.55	1.40^{B}	1.43	1.06^{BC}	1.13	0.82^{C}	0.84
Women's Basketball	1.39^{AB}	1.24	1.16^{B}	0.75	0.83^{C}	0.76	0.68^{C}	0.62

$F(3, 535) = 1.63$, $p > .05$, Football.
$F(3, 405) = 2.10$, $p > .05$, Men's Basketball
$F(3, 405) = 7.05$, $p < .001$, Women's Basketball
All comparisons are horizontal across means using Tukey HSD.
Horizontal means not sharing a superscript are significantly different.

Local vs. National Recall Research Question

RQ2 asked if local or national sponsors would be recalled more frequently. Paired t-tests were run to look at local/national effects and arena effects. All tests proved to have significant findings. When looking at the local/national pairing in the football stadium, $t(539) = 3.53$, p < .001, results indicated that respondents recalled local sponsors more frequently ($M = 1.45$, $SD = 1.59$) than national sponsors ($M = 1.21$, $SD = 0.92$). When considering the basketball arena, $t(409) = 2.21$, $p < .05$, results echoed those of the football stadium with local sponsors having a higher frequency of recall (M = 1.12, SD = 1.38) than national sponsors (M = 0.98, SD = 0.89).

Pairing facilities with local sponsors showed that there was an effect created by the different venues, $t(373) = 4.74$, $p < .001$. A comparison of means indicated that local sponsors in the football stadium were recalled more frequently (M = 1.53, SD = 1.63) than were local sponsors in the basketball arena (M = 1.16, SD = 1.39). Differences were also detected in national sponsor recall rates, $t(373) = 4.58$, $p < .05$. Results mirrored the findings for local sponsors in that national sponsors were recalled more often in the football stadium (M = 1.23, SD = 0.89) than in the basketball arena (M = 0.98, SD = 0.90).

RQ2 revealed that local sponsors were recalled more frequently than national sponsors in the football stadium and basketball arena, see Table 10. Additionally, both local and national sponsors were recalled more in the football stadium than in the basketball arena, see Table 11.

Table 10

Means for recall of national and local sponsors by facility

Facility	Sponsor: Local *M*	*SD*	Sponsor: National *M*	*SD*
Football Stadium	1.45	1.59	1.21	0.92
Basketball Arena	1.12	1.38	0.98	0.89

$t(539) = 3.53$, $p < .001$, Football Stadium.
$t(409) = 2.21$, $p < .05$, Basketball Arena.

Table 11

Means for recall of national and local sponsors by sponsor designation

Sponsor	Facility: Football Stadium *M*	*SD*	Facility: Basketball Arena *M*	*SD*
Local	1.53	1.63	1.16	1.39
National	1.23	0.89	0.98	0.90

$t(373) = 4.74$, $p < .001$, Local Sponsors.
$t(373) = 4.58$, $p < .05$, National Sponsors.

Proximity Effect on Local vs. National Recall Research Question

RQ3 asked if local or national sponsor (other than title sponsors) recall would be affected by the proximity of the respondent to campus. For the football stadium, data analysis made evident that location did have an effect on local sponsor recall, $t(299.17) = 6.49$, $p < .001$. More local sponsors were recalled by the in-area respondents ($M = 2.03$, $SD = 1.99$) than by out-of-area respondents ($M = 1.06$, $SD = 1.09$). Examination of national sponsor recall showed that there were no differences between the recall levels of in-area and out-of-area respondents, $t(426.96) = 1.61$, $p > .05$.

Data analysis for the basketball arena also evidenced that location did have an effect on local sponsor recall, $t(296.17) = 5.82$, $p < .001$. More local sponsors were recalled by in-area respondents ($M = 1.52$, $SD = 1.66$) than by out-of-area respondents ($M = 0.74$, $SD = 0.89$). Examination of national sponsor recall showed that there were no differences in the recall levels of in-area and out-of-area respondents, $t(363.56) = 1.10$, $p > .05$.

Results from RQ3 showed that in-area respondents were able to recall more local sponsors than out-of-area respondents both in the football stadium and the basketball arena, see Table 12. No differences were found between in-area and out-of-area respondents and their recall of national sponsors.

Table 12

Means for recall of local sponsors by resident location and facility

	Proximity			
	In-Area		Out-Of-Area	
Facility	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Football Stadium	2.03	1.99	1.06	1.09
Basketball Arena	1.52	1.66	0.74	0.89

$t(299.17) = 6.49$, $p < .001$, Football Stadium.
$t(296.17) = 5.82$, $p < .001$, Basketball Arena.

Proximity Effect on Sponsorship Value Research Question

RQ4 asks if proximity to the university will have an effect on sponsorship values. Data analysis pointed out that proximity had no effect on how important respondents felt it was to support sponsors of the athletic program, $t(692) = 0.31$, $p > .05$. Closeness did, however, have an effect on how important respondents felt it was to buy products from sponsors of the athletic program, $t(507.56) = 2.69$, $p < .01$. Buying products from sponsors was more important to out-of-area respondents ($M = 7.11$, $SD = 6.53$) than it was to in-area respondents ($M = 6.53$, $SD = 2.84$).

Furthermore, analysis to determine if type of financial support was affected by proximity to the university revealed that individual support was affected by the nearness of the respondent, $t(474.71) = 2.92$, $p < .01$. According to data analysis, individual financial support was more important to out-of-area respondents ($M = 8.86$, $SD = 1.73$) than it was to in-area respondents ($M = 8.41$, $SD = 2.08$). Proximity had no effect on the value of local business support, $t(692) = 0.36$, $p > .05$. However, the importance of national support was more important to out-of-area respondents ($M = 8.45$, $SD = 1.97$) than it was to in-area respondents ($M = 7.87$, $SD = 2.35$), $t(692) = 3.45$, $p = .001$.

Results from RQ4 highlighted that out-of-area respondents were more likely to purchase products from sponsors than in-area residents, see Table 13. Also pointed out was that individual financial support and national financial support was of more importance to out-of-area respondents than in-area respondents, see Table 14.

Table 13

Means for product purchases by respondent location

	Purchase Products	
Proximity	*M*	*SD*
In-Area	6.53	2.84
Out-Of-Area	7.11	2.56

$t(507.56) = 2.69$, $p < .01$.

Table 14

Means for importance of financial support by respondent location

	Proximity			
	In-Area		Out-Of-Area	
Support Level	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Individual	8.41	2.08	8.86	1.73
Local Businesses	8.89	1.69	8.94	1.52
National Businesses	7.87	2.35	8.45	1.97

$t(474.71) = 2.92$, $p < .01$, Individual Financial Support
$t(692) = 0.36$, $p > .05$, Local Business Financial Support
$t(692) = 3.45$, $p = .001$, National Business Financial Support

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

As sponsorship spending continues to rise, and college athletic departments and other sports entities keep taking their share, information pertaining to the best outlets for these funds will remain in demand. The goal of this study was to discover if corporate sponsorships were valued by donors to an athletic program and if donor proximity to the university played any part in their evaluations. Open recall was used to evaluate respondent awareness of local and national sponsors for the football stadium, which has a national communication corporation for a title sponsor, and the basketball stadium, which is named in support of a local supermarket. Previous studies have not focused on the issue of proximity or the likelihood that consumers favor either national or local sponsors. This study is unique in its dual focus on the location of respondents and their awareness of both local and national sponsors, and their support for either or both.

Sutton et al. (1997) developed levels of fan identification that explained attachment to a sporting organization. As involvement with sport increases, so does attachment to and awareness of other aspects of sporting activities. H1 theorized that fans who attended more games would be able to recall more sponsors that were present in the football stadium and basketball arena. This hypothesis was supported for home football game attendees as well as attendees of men's and women's home basketball games. Those who attended more games were able to correctly identify more sponsors than less frequent visitors. In addition, frequent home game attendees were able to identify more total sponsors than their less active counterparts. The number of games attended did not have an effect on the percentage of correct sponsors that a respondent could recall with the exception of women's basketball. The percentage of correctly identified sponsors was much higher for those who attended at least some of the women's basketball games over those who never went to home games.

As with sponsor recall being elevated by level of game attendance, the perceived value of those sponsorships was also expected to increase when fans were committed to an activity. H2 tested the connection between game attendance and the value placed on sponsorships. H2 was supported for respondents who attended most or all home football games in that frequent attendees felt that it was more important to support businesses that support the athletic program than did respondents who attend less frequently. Additionally, frequent attendees were more likely to feel that it was important to buy products from sponsors than were those who attended few or no games.

Collegiate football programs always seem to be surrounded by a perception that there is not enough money for the right coaches or recruiting or travel or equipment. Therefore it would sense that game attendees would have favorable impressions of those who provide support for the program. To gauge the types of support that are considered to be most important respondents were asked how important they felt financial support from individuals, local businesses and national businesses were for the athletic program.

The only evident effects for the various levels of financial support based upon attendance at home football games was that from national businesses. Respondents who went to some home games were more likely to view national business financial support as being more important than those who attended all the time. This may be because fans who are not able to attend on a regular basis may like to see more games broadcast on television, and this could be achieved by sponsorship on a national level. Fans may feel that attention from national businesses may make the team more attractive to national audiences, which would lead to more broadcast time.

When looking at attendees of men's basketball games, no effects were found for sponsor support or product purchases based on the number of games attended. Therefore, H2 was not supported for men's basketball. As with football, the only significant effects were associated with financial support from national businesses. Although the ANOVA calculation showed that there were statistical differences between the means associated with game attendance, the *F* value was small and post hoc analyses could not detect where differences occurred. Differences can be assumed to be between respondents who attended all home football games and those who never attended, which is where the largest mean differences existed.

This result is understandable with the men's basketball program in that there is very much a national appeal because of the charisma and national reputation of the head coach. The program has been thrust into the national spotlight and there is an attraction on a level that has not been present in the past. The coach has the ability to attract support from national advertising budgets and fans obviously see the benefits of this association. In this instance, fans may be are attracted to the games because of the personalities rather than affiliation with the team (Sutton et al., 1997). It is possible that support from businesses for the coach is more valuable to attendees than the personal support that they are willing to offer sponsors.

Fans of women's basketball had differing views from the respondents who attended football and men's basketball games. Partial support can be found for H2 with women's home basketball game attendees. The number of games attended did play a role in respondent's views of sponsor support, but no effects were found for buying from sponsors or for the importance of financial support of individuals or local and national businesses. When looking at the audience make up of the women's basketball home games, it is evident that these are not average sporting fans. Season ticket holders are older, more affluent and highly devoted to their "ladies." It is important to them to support those who support the team, but purchasing products from advertisers isn't done by this crowd. Furthermore, this audience doesn't associate financial contributions to the athletic program with direct benefits to "their team." They are appreciative of the support that is given to the team, but they do not expect to be recognized for the support they give and therefore do not see a reason to give recognition to others.

Westerbeek (2000) connected sponsors located within a reasonable proximity of the sports program to successful sponsorship relationships. It is reasonable to assume that supporter proximity to a sporting event or facility would have an effect on the value placed on sponsorships, although no previous research was uncovered to support or disprove this. An 18 county area surrounding the university was deemed to be in-area based on a known advertising designation. Mixed support was found for H3. Proximity to the program did have a significant effect on recall for the local sponsor of the basketball arena, but none on recall for the national sponsor of the football stadium. In-area respondents were able to recall both title sponsors more often than out-of-area sponsors, but the percentages of respondents able to do this was lower than expected. The title sponsor of the football stadium was the most often recalled name for that facility, but the title sponsor of the basketball arena was the second most frequently recalled sponsor.

A national sponsor was far and above the most recalled sponsor for the basketball arena. Cornwell et al. (2005) reported that broadcast exposure may be more influential on respondents than the arena exposure. The athletic department reported that this particular sponsor takes full advantage of leveraging opportunities. In addition, they are a sponsor for the entire conference and therefore receive additional television exposure not afforded to locals businesses. On the other hand, the local supermarket does not leverage their association as much as they could. They have a tendency to remain rather low key about their support. Future research investigating the overlapping or combination effects of sponsorship leveraging would be beneficial.

Proximity did have an effect on the total number and number of correct sponsors that could be recalled for both the football stadium and basketball arena. In both instances, in-area respondents had the higher means. No effect was found for percentage of correct sponsors recalled.

All sponsors recalled were classified as being either local or national based on their marketing plans. The question was asked whether or not the number of games attended would have any effect on the recall of local and national sponsors. Frequent game attendance tended to increase the number of local sponsors recalled by attendees at football and both men's and women's basketball games. There was no effect on recall levels for national sponsors by game attendance for either football or men's basketball. However, frequent attendees at women's home basketball games were able to recall significantly more national sponsors than those who attended less often. It was suspected that national sponsor recall could be significant for men's basketball based on endorsements in place with the head coach, although this was not evident in this study.

Respondent recall of national and local sponsors was compared and contrasted by facility and it was discovered that local sponsors were recalled more frequently than national sponsors in both the football stadium and the basketball arena. Additionally, recall of sponsors was higher on both a national and local level in the football stadium than it was in the basketball arena. The survey was conducted in November, and basketball season had just begun, while football season was winding down. There may not have been enough opportunities for sponsors in the basketball arena to be exposed to game attendees. Furthermore, the capacity of the football stadium far surpasses that of the basketball arena, and more respondents reported that they were season ticket holders of football than either basketball team. Further research is needed to determine if there really is more sponsor recognition in a football stadium over a basketball arena.

Proximity to the university played a part in the recall levels of local sponsors (other than the title sponsors) in both playing facilities. More local sponsors were recalled by in-area respondents than those considered out-of-area. Recall of national sponsors was not affected by proximity. It is logical that in-area respondents would be able to better recall local sponsors than out-of-area respondents because they have familiarity with the businesses and are more likely to make connections with the limited advertising forms that are often available in sporting facilities. Although out-of-area respondents may be exposed to the signage around the playing areas, they may not make the connection as to who the advertiser is.

Proximity did not have any effect on sponsor support, however, purchasing products from sponsors of the program was seen to be more important to out-of-area respondents that it was to in-area respondents. Reasons for this finding could include the fact that in-area respondents may see the sponsors as companies they do business with regardless of their affiliation to the athletic program. Out-of-area respondents may perceive importance in purchasing products from sponsors because that is what they do when they come to town to attend games. For them, the sponsorship in the stadium may act as a trigger or reinforcement for the purchasing decisions they make when they attend home games.

Out-of-area respondents were more likely to see individual financial support and support from national businesses as being more important than did those who reside in-area. There were no effects of proximity on perceived value of support from local businesses. A sense of guilt may come into play in this area. Out-of-area respondents who are unable to provide in person support by attending routine events or supporting the program with a regular presence may feel that it is more important to give to the program financially. Conversely, in-area respondents see their in person support as being their contribution and personal financial support is less important to them.

Overall, support was found for recall effects based on proximity and frequency of game attendance, which makes sense. Those who live closer and go to more games were more aware of sponsors. Interesting information was gathered about the sponsors that were most visible in both facilities. In both cases it was a national sponsor, one who leverages their sponsorship effectively, the other who has their name integrated into the stadium name. Specific mentions were made of sponsors seen during televised coverage of basketball games, but none were made for the football games.

Limitations

Although web-based surveying is convenient and widely accepted, there are still large numbers of people that do not have access to, or choose not to use, the Internet (Solomon, 2001). Approximately half of the athletic program's donors had e-mail addresses on file, and were presented with the opportunity to participate in the survey. The possibility exists that different responses could have been received if the survey was administered as a postal mail or phone survey. In addition, those with access to e-mail and the Internet may have been reluctant to participate in the survey. Although this study was not overly intrusive, and was sent from a known address, attitudes towards e-mail have been negatively affected from the deluge of unwanted messages and SPAM mail that has become prevalent (Bachman, Elfrink & Vazzana, 1999/2000).

Timing may have also played a part in the recall levels for this study. As previously mentioned, the survey was conducted during November, shortly after a bowl game bid had been confirmed. Attention was focused on the football programs successful season, and the basketball season was just beginning. Additionally, about two weeks before the survey was e-mailed, the athletic department announced that the title sponsor of the football stadium had bought out a competitor and the name would be changing. There was quite a bit of media coverage about the change and how the stadium name would also be affected.

If this same study was conducted using a general audience rather that with people who have a vested interest in the program, results may be different. All respondents had given some level of financial support to the program, and their views on value of sponsorships may not mirror that of those who are not financial contributors. Additionally, unequal group sizes may have been avoided with the use of a different respondent sample.

Conclusions

Support can be found in this study for feelings of value and goodwill that were extended to businesses and individuals who sponsor collegiate athletic programs. All responses pointed to positive associations and appreciation for those who offer financial support. Living close to the university increased the chance that consumers would support a business and buy products from advertisers. The benefit associated with a business having its name on the game facility was positive for both title sponsors, although the national corporation on the football stadium received more overall recognition. Local support was perceived to have a higher value than national support, however all forms of supports were seen as valuable to the athletic program. As expected those who spent more time in the facilities were able to correctly identify more sponsors. Additionally, there was sponsor awareness from respondents who do not attend any home games, for any of the sports that were investigated. This could be attributed to watching televised games for any or all of three sports in this study.

Sporting organizations could use this research to recruit additional local sponsors by showing that they are more frequently recalled by game attendees and that out-of-area respondents are likely to support their businesses when they are in town based upon the association with the team or facility. Advertisers can feel comfortable with the investments they make in sports sponsorships because it can be shown that their contributions are recognized and considered to be valuable to the program.

Future directions for research include study of general game attendees, not just those who make financial contributions to the athletic program. Additionally, there is much room for investigating how combinations of sponsorship affect recall levels and perceived values from fans. Leveraging should be considered in future research as it appeared to have played a part in respondents' abilities to recall a national sponsor over the local title sponsor of the basketball arena.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

Alm, R. (2002, February 6). Enron could lose field naming rights for ballfield. Astros make bid to end contract; Firm says it is honoring agreement. *Dallas Morning News,* p. 3D.

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

Bachmann, D., Elfrink, J. & Vazzana, G. (1999/2000). E-mail and snail mail face off in rematch: Despite e-mail surveys' advantages response rates still lag. *Marketing Research, 11*, (4), 11-15.

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

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.

Boyd, J. (2000). Selling home: Corporate stadium names and the destruction of commemoration. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*(4), 330-346.

Brovsky, C. (2001, April 12). Mutual-funds firm Invesco scores as Denver stadium loses Mile-High moniker. *The Denver Post,* p. B01.

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

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.

Chen, A., & Stone, C. (2002, March 4). The moniker morass. *Sports Illustrated, 96* (10), 24.

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.

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.

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

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

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

DeSchriver, T., & Jensen, P. (2003). What's in a name? Price variation in sport facility naming rights. *Eastern Economic Journal, 29,* 359-376.

Ernst, S. (2002, July 19). Home field advantage: Seahawks already reaping the financial benefits of new stadium. *Puget Sound Business Journal.* Retrieved on May 15, 2006 from Http://seattle.bizjournals.com/seattle/stories/2002/07/22/focus2.html

Fairbank, K., Maxon, T., & Aasen, E. (2004, October 19). Voter approval for Arlington, Texas, stadium could boost Cowboy's value. *The Dallas Morning News*, p. 1A/9A.

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

Granello, D. & Wheaton, J. (2004). Online data collection: Strategies for research. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82,* 387-393.

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

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

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.

Hutchinson, P., & Fleishcman, G. (2000). Electronic surveys are better data gatherers for your business. *American Business Perspectives, 219*, 1-5.

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

Invesco bids $120 million for football stadium naming rights. (2001, January 29). *Mutual Fund Market News*, p. 7.

It's Heinz Field! (2001, June 15). Heinz, Steelers announce stadium naming rights. Retrieved on April 23, 2005 from http://football.ballparks.com/NFL/PittsburghSteelers/articles.htm.

Kass, J. (2000, November 13). Mile High Conundrum. *U.S. News & World Report*, p. 40.

Kaydo, C., & Trusdell, B. (1997). Stadiums ‘r us. *Sales & Marketing Management, 149*(1), 74-76.

Kuzma, J., Veltri, F., Kuzma, A., & Miller, J. (2003). Negative corporate sponsor information: The impact on consumer attitudes and purchase intention. *International Sports Journal, 7*(20), 140-147.

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

Leach, M. (2004, August 8). Busch name to move to new park. *StLouisCardinals.com*. Retrieved on December 3, 2004 from http://stloius.cardinals.mlb.com/NASApp/mlb/stl/ballpark/index.jsp.

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

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 tast, 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.

McAllister, M. (1996). *The commercialization of American culture: New advertising, control and democracy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

McCarthy, L., & Irwin, R. (1998). Names in Lights: Corporate purchase of sport facility naming rights. Retrieved on December 3, 2004 from http://www.ausport.gov.au/fulltext/1998/cjsm/v2n3/mccarthyirwin23.htm.

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, 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. (2001). Editorial: The passionate embrace – consumer response to sponsorship. *Psychology & Marketing, 18,* 87-94.

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

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,* p. A1.

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

Moorman, A. (2002). Naming rights agreements: Dream deal or nightmare? *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 11,* 126-127.

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

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

Nichols, B. (2002, June 6). For Astros fans, it's pulp fiction: Minute Maid Park leaves a funny taste with some Houstonians. *The Dallas Morning News,* p. 1A/7A.

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

Nielsen Media Research (2005, May). *Nielsen station index, Viewers in profile, Lubbock, TX.* New York, NY: Author.

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.

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

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

Reynolds, G. (2002, September 30). NFL math: Smart marketing = revenue. *Brandweek*, p. 33.

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.

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

Schaefer, D., & Dillman, D. (1998). Development of a standard e-mail methodology: Results of an experiment. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 62,* 378-397.

Shaw, S., & Amis, J. (2001). Image and Investment: Sponsorship and women's sport. *Journal of Sport Management, 15*, 219-246.

Siebert, T., & Brovsky, C. (2001, February 2). Lawsuit over Denver stadium name unlikely. *The Denver Post.* A1.

Solomon, D. (2001). Conducting web-based surveys. *Practical assessment, Research and Evaluation, 7*, (19). Retrieved March 15, 2006 from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?=7&n=19.

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.

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

Sutton, W., McDonald, M., Milne, G., & Cimperman, J. (1997). Creating and fostering fan identification in professional sports. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 6,* 15-22.

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

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.

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

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.

Weinstein, B., & Clower, T. (1999). Economic impact of sports teams is vast and far reaching. *The Business Press, 12*(18), 27.

Westerbeek, H. (2000). Is sponsorship retention dependent on the geographic location of the sports facility? *Journal of Marketing Communications, 6,* 53-68.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Thank you for your interest in this joint research project between the Red Raider Club and a doctoral student in the College of Mass Communications. 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 survey, please contact the Center for Communications Research at 806-742-3385.

This survey will ask you questions about your association with the Red Raider Club and ask you to provide information about athletic events you may have attended. You will be invited to enter any comments, suggestions or general feedback you have regarding your experiences. The survey should take 8-10 minutes.

At the conclusion of the survey, you will have the opportunity to provide contact information to be entered in a drawing for $25 cash. This information will be separated from your other survey responses in order to assure the confidentiality of your answers. (This paragraph will be customized to reflect incentive levels, or removed when no incentive is offered.)

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 in advance for your time and consideration of the following questions.

Are you a Texas Tech graduate? N/Y If so what year?

What is your current annual donation level with the Red Raider Club?

a. $25,000 (Athletic Director's Council)
b. $10,000 (Full Ride)
c. $9,999-$6,000 (Golden Raider)
d. $5,999-$3,000 (Bronze Raider)
e. $2,999-$1,500 (Win Raider)
f. $1,499-$600 (Fight Raider)
g. $599-$300 (Go Raider)
h. $299-$150 (Red Raider)
i. $149-100 (Matador)
j. $99 or less (Picador)
k. Not currently a Red Raider Club Member

How would you characterize your donation to the Red Raider Club?

a. Personal or individual
b. Family
c. Business or Corporate
d. A memorial or honorarium
e. Other, please specify

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

I donate to get better seating options.
0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree
I donate to get better parking options.
0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree
I donate to provide educational opportunities to student athletes
0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree
I donate to enhance my business opportunities.
0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree
I donate to promote the image of the university.
0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree
I donate to repay the past benefits I have received from the athletic department.
0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree
I donate because Texas Tech athletic events are enjoyable to attend.
0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Which of the following describes your intentions to donate to the Red Raider Club in the 2006-2007 academic year?

I plan to continue at the current level
I plan to increase my level of giving
I plan to decrease my level of giving
I do not plan to give at all
I am uncertain at this time

Do you have season tickets to any of the following sports?

a. football
b. men's basketball
c. women's basketball
d. baseball
e. other, please specify

How often do you attend the following home games?

Football
All of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never.
Women's Basketball
All of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never.

Men's Basketball

All of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never.

Baseball

All of the time, most of the time, some of the time, never.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Being able to provide more scholarships for athletes would encourage me to increase my donation.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Being able to get better seats would encourage me to increase my donation.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Being able to get better parking would encourage me to increase my donation.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Receiving more recognition for my support would encourage me to increase my donation.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Receiving incentives for my support would encourage me to increase my donation.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

A campaign promoting the benefits of the Red Raider Club would encourage me to increase my donation.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Please list any other reasons that might encourage you to increase your donation to the Red Raider Club.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

I receive adequate benefits for my level of giving.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

I understand the overall benefits of being a member of the Red Raider Club.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Red Raider Club staff members are helpful and courteous.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

I receive an appropriate amount of communication from the Red Raider Club.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

I understand how the priority point system works.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

I understand that my donation is used for student athlete scholarships.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

I would like to receive more information on how my donation benefits athletes.

0-10 Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Please all list the sponsors that you remember seeing (or hearing) at the Texas Tech football stadium.

Please all list the sponsors that you remember seeing (or hearing) at the Texas Tech basketball arena stadium.

Please all list the sponsors that you remember seeing (or hearing) at any other Texas Tech athletic event.

Please consider the following question:

How important is it to you to shop at businesses that support Texas Tech athletic programs?

0-10 Not Very Important – Very Important.

Please consider the following scenario:
The athletic department is considering the construction of a new facility for one of their lesser-known sports. Corporate sponsorship is important to the success of the project, and several businesses have been approached to contribute to the facility fund in return for their name on the building. The leading contender is a LOCALLY OWNED (or NATIONAL CHAIN) steakhouse. This business has been in Lubbock for several years and will be opening a new location close to the proposed new facility. The steakhouse offers top quality steaks and seafood and is known for their home made desserts. They have excellent service, offer catering and have rooms for meetings and special events.

How likely are you to support this steakhouse?

0-10 Very Unlikely – Very Likely

Please select the response what most closely matches your feelings.

How likely are you to buy products of sponsor companies because they are sponsors of the athletic program?

0-10 Not Very Likely – Very Likely

Please consider the following:

How important do you feel individuals' financial support is for the athletic program?

0-10 Not Very Important – Very Important

Please consider the following:

How important do you feel local businesses' financial support is for the athletic program?

0-10 Not Very Important – Very Important

Please consider the following:

How important do you feel national businesses' financial support is for the athletic program?

0-10 Not Very Important – Very Important

If you could make one suggestion to increase your satisfaction with your membership in the Red Raider club, what would it be?

Is there anything about the Texas Tech athletic program or Red Raider Club that you would like to comment on at this time?

Please select your gender: Male/Female

In what year were you born?

What is your annual household income?
Less than $25,000
$25,000 - $39,999
$40,000 - $54,999
$55,000 - $74,999
$75,000 - $99,999
$100,000 and above
Prefer not to respond

What is your residential zip code?

Do you or any members of your household work for the Texas Tech Athletic Department? Y/N

Do you or any members of your household work for a business or company who sponsors Texas Tech Athletics? Y/N

To be entered in the drawing for $25 cash, please provide your name and phone number in the space below. (This sentence will be customized to reflect incentive levels, or removed when no incentive is offered.)

Thank you for your time and participation. Your continued support of the Red Raider Club and Texas Tech athletics is appreciated.

To exit, please close your browser window.

APPENDIX B

ADVERTISER CLASSIFICATION AND SPONSOR IDENTIFICATION LIST

Advertiser Recalled	Classification	Current Sponsor
104.9	Local	Yes
50 Yard Line	Local	Yes
ABC Bank		Past sponsor, not current
Abuelo's	Local	Yes
ACCO	Local	Yes - ASCO
Adidas	National	Yes
Advanced Graphics		No
Advantage Rent A Car	National	Yes
Alan Henry Insurance		No
Alderson Cadillac		No
Alliance		No
Allstate Insurance	National	Yes
American Eagle	National	Yes
American Outfitters	National	Yes - American Eagle Outfitters
American State Bank (ASB)	Local	Yes
ASCO	Local	Yes
AT&T	National	Yes
Atmos Energy	National	Yes
ATSI		No idea what this is
Avis		No
Aycock Trucking		No
Bank of America		No
Benchmark	Local	Yes
Bigham's BBQ	Local	Yes
Blue Bell		No
Buckner Children and Family Services	Local	Yes
Budweiser	National	Yes
Buns Over Texas	Local	Yes
Bush's Chicken		No - probably Chicken Express
Cagle's Steaks	Local	Yes

Advertiser Recalled	Classification	Current Sponsor
Campus Design	Local	Yes
Caprock Home Health		No
Cardinals	Local	Yes
Carpet Tech	Local	Yes
Carrier and Bryant Air Conditioning		No
Chevrolet	National	Yes
Chicken Express	Local	Yes
Cingular	National	Yes
City Bank	Local	Yes
Classic Chevrolet	National	Just Chevrolet
Coca Cola	National	Yes
Computer Transition Services	Local	Yes
Cooper Tires		No
Coors Distributors	Local	Not "Coors", Great Plains Distributors
County Line		Past sponsor, not current
Covenant Health System	Local	Yes
Cowamungus	Local	Yes
Cox Cable		No
Daffy Duck Car Wash	Local	Yes - Quick Quack Car Wash
Dasani	National	Yes
David Thomas		No
Dillards	National	Yes - Women's Basketball only
Dodge	National	Yes
Domino’s	National	Yes
Dory Wiley		No
Double T Carpet Cleaners		No - probably Carpet Tech
Double T Shop	Local	Yes – now Double T Zone
Dr. Pepper		No
Ensco		No - probably an ASCO reference
Enterprise		No
ESPN		Past sponsor, not current
Ex Students Association	Local	Yes
Farm Bureau Insurance	National	Yes
Farmers Insurance		No

Advertiser Recalled	Classification	Current Sponsor
Federated Insurance	National	Yes
Fields & Co.		No
Fina	National	Yes
First Ag Credit		No
First Bank and Trust	Local	Yes
First United Bank	Local	Yes
Ford	National	Yes
Fox 34	Local	Yes
FSN	National	Yes
Full Throttle	National	Yes
Furrs		No
Gandys	Local	Yes
Gatorade		No
Gene Messer		Past sponsor, not current
Golden Chick		No
Gray EOT		No
Hallmark		No
Hartz		No
Home Plate Diner		Past sponsor, not current
Hugo Reed	Local	Yes
Hurst Farm Supply	Local	Yes
Impressions	Local	Yes
ING	National	Yes
J. Keith Jewelry	Local	Yes
JACC	Local	Yes - Joe Arrington Cancer Center
Jason's Deli	Local	Yes
JCPenney		No
Jerry Pittman	Local	Yes
Jim Sowell	Local	Yes - through his ownership of Sergeant's Pet Care Products
Josie's	Local	Yes
KKAM	Local	Yes
KLBK	Local	Yes
Klemke Sausage	Local	Yes
KLLL	Local	Yes

Advertiser Recalled	Classification	Current Sponsor
Landmark		No
Lifegift Organ		Past sponsor, not current
Lowes	National	Yes on Lowe's Home Improvement, not Lowe's grocery
LP&L	Local	Yes
Lubbock Avalanche-Journal	Local	Yes
Lubbock Heart Hospital	Local	Yes
Lubbock Inn		No
Lubbock National Bank	Local	Yes
Lubbock Sports Authority	Local	Yes - Red Raider Open hole sponsor
Lubbock Sports Medicine	Local	Yes
Lubbock Truck Sales	Local	Yes
Magic 93.7	Local	Yes
Market Lubbock	Local	Yes
Market Street	Local	Yes
Marriot Residence	National	Yes
Mass Mutual		No
MasterCard		No
McDonald’s	National	Yes
McDougal Properties	Local	Yes
Messer Racz International Pain Institute	Local	Yes
Mix 100	Local	Yes
Morgan Stanley	National	Yes
Neal Aircraft	Local	Yes
Neurosurgical Associates	Local	Yes
Nextell Media	Local	Might be a NextMedia reference, so yes
Nike	National	Yes
North Star Hospital	Local	Yes
North Star Medical	Local	Yes
NTS		No
O'Reilly Auto Parts	National	Yes
Orlando’s		No
Outerwear USA	Local	Yes

Advertiser Recalled	Classification	Current Sponsor
Overstock.com		No
Papa John’s	National	Yes
Patterson Drilling	Local	Yes
People’s Bank	Local	Yes
Pizza Hut		No
PlainsCapital Bank	Local	Yes
Pollard Ford		No on Pollard, yes on South Plains Ford Dealers
Rayburn & Hilliard		No
Powerade	National	Yes
Powers Jewelry	Local	Yes
Quick Quack Car Wash	Local	Yes
Quiznos		No
Radio Lab	Local	Yes
Raider Power		No
Ramar	Local	Yes
Rawls Golf	Local	Yes
RCA	National	Yes through Radio Lab tie-in
Red Raider Club	Local	Yes
Red Raider Outfitter		No
Red Raider Sports	Local	Not sure, could be Red Raider Sports Mag or coach's shows
Rib Crib	Local	Yes
Rich’s Chicken		No
Rip Griffin	Local	Yes
Robert Lance Jewelers		No
Rosa's	Local	Yes
Rositas		No, probably Rosa's reference
Royce Mullins TV		No
SAMCO		No
Saturn	National	Yes
SBC	National	Yes
Scarborough Specialties	Local	Yes
Schlotzsky’s	National	Yes
Scott’s Auto Care	Local	Yes
Sergeant Pet Products	National	Yes

Advertiser Recalled	Classification	Current Sponsor
Sewell Motor Cars		No
Shamrock Chevrolet	Local	Yes
Sign Pro	Local	Yes
Sonic	National	Yes
South Plains Electric	Local	Yes
Southwest Airlines	National	Yes
Southwest Bottling	Local	Yes - Coke
Spirit Shop		No
Sprint		No
Sprite	National	Yes
Stacy Urban Nissan		No
State Farm Insurance	National	Yes
Subaru of Dallas		No
Subway		No
Summitt	Local	Yes - Summitt Alliance
Sylvan Learning		No
Taco Bell		No
Tailgater Meats	National	Yes
Tech Hecklers	Local	Yes
Tech Talk		No - a service provided to football season ticket holders
Tejano Radio	Local	Probably a Magic 93.7 FM reference
Terry Fuller	Local	Yes - big RRC donor
Texas Land & Cattle	Local	Yes
Texas State Bank		No
Texas Tech Bookstore		No
The Exchange	Local	Yes
The Zone	Local	Yes - Double T Zone
Thrifty		No
TTU Alumni Association	Local	Yes
TTUFCU	Local	Yes
Tylenol		No
UMC	Local	Yes
United Supermarkets	Local	Yes
Video Season Ticket		A DVD project, not a sponsor

Advertiser Recalled	Classification	Current Sponsor
Wells Fargo		Past sponsor, not current
Wentz Orthodontics	Local	Yes
WestMark	Local	Yes
Whataburger		No
Wienerschnitzel	National	Yes
Willis Moving and Storage	Local	Yes
Xtreme Auto Wash		Past sponsor, not current
Youth Corps	Local	Volunteer Group, not a sponsor

APPENDIX C

Table 15

Game attendance by percentage

Sport	Attendance			
	All Games	Most Games	Some Games	No Games
	%	%	%	%
Football	49.3	19.5	25.5	5.7
Men's Basketball	8.0	9.0	35.6	47.4
Women's Basketball	12.3	13.5	51.3	22.4

PERMISSION TO COPY

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Texas Tech University or Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center, I agree that the Library and my major department shall make it freely available for research purposes. Permission to copy this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Director of the Library or my major professor. It is under stood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my further written permission and that any user may be liable for copyright infringement.

<u>Agree</u> (Permission is granted.)

Glenda J. Alvarado 7/7/06

Student Signature Date

<u>Disagree</u> (Permission is not granted.)

Student Signature Date