

## **The Impact of Repeat Attendance on Sponsorship Effects**

Russell W. Lacey, Ph.D.\*  
Assistant Professor of Marketing  
University of New Orleans  
Department of Marketing and Logistics  
332 Kirschman Hall  
2000 Lakeshore Drive  
New Orleans, LA 70148  
Phone: (504) 280-6483  
E-mail: rlacey@uno.edu

Julie Z. Sneath, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Marketing  
University of South Alabama  
MCOB #359  
Mobile, AL 36688-0002  
Phone: (251) 461-1694  
Email: jsneath@usouthal.edu

R. Zachary Finney, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor of Marketing  
University of South Alabama  
MCOB #356  
Mobile, AL 36688-0002  
Phone: (251) 461-6033  
Email: zfinney@usouthal.edu

and

Angeline G. Close, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor of Marketing  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 Maryland Parkway  
Las Vegas, NV 89154  
Phone: (702) 895-0513

*\*Contact Author*

## **The Impact of Repeat Attendance on Sponsorship Effects**

### **Abstract**

Understanding the impact of retaining sponsors and event attendees offers important insight both to organizations that are contemplating long-term sponsorship relationships and to event marketers seeking ongoing sponsorship partnerships. Yet prior to this study, the impact of multi-year sponsorship and attendance on a sponsoring brand have not been investigated. The study addresses this gap through the examination of field survey results obtained during an annual sporting event. Data from a sample of 1,227 attendees suggest that multi-year attendance is associated with enhanced brand image and purchase intentions of an ongoing title sponsor's products. There are significant differences in attendees': 1) attitudes about the title sponsor and 2) increased likelihood of purchasing the sponsor's vehicles. Attitudes about the title sponsor were most favorable among spectators who attended the annual event multiple times and those who attended the event multiple times showed an increased likelihood of purchasing a new vehicle from the title sponsor. Advancing relationship theory, we find that consumers appreciate that the corporate brand contributes more to society than its primary business activities, and in turn, consumers indicate that they act on that appreciation.

**Keywords:** Sponsorship; Event Marketing; Relationship Marketing

## **The Impact of Repeat Attendance on Sponsorship Effects**

### **Introduction**

Forecasters predict that worldwide sponsorship spending will reach USD\$37.6 billion or EUR€1.1 billion in 2006; this represents an 11% increase over 2005 estimates (European Sponsorship Association, 2006). Many billions more in complementary marketing activities are spent to augment sponsorship investments. The continued growth suggests that sponsorships have emerged beyond their traditional use as an ancillary marketing communications tool. Furthermore, while researchers have asserted that sponsorships should not be viewed as a substitute for traditional promotion (e.g., Shimp, 2005), organizations continue to redirect their marketing communication dollars away from traditional advertising in favor of an ever-expanding assortment of educational, social, cultural, and sporting events (Mahoney and Howard, 2001). In terms of the latter, sponsorships have been expanded from the Olympics and mainstream professional and collegiate sporting events, to events such as cycling, snowboarding, and beach volleyball.

Despite the growing sponsorship marketing literature, no empirical research has investigated how sponsorship outcomes may be enhanced by repeat attendance at a sporting event. We fill this gap and contribute by comparing field survey results from a North American professional cycling event, the Dodge Tour

de Georgia, which drew more than 800,000 spectators over a six-day period in April 2005 ([www.tourdegeorgia.com](http://www.tourdegeorgia.com)).

By assessing field survey results of 1,227 respondents, we address two major research questions. First, does repeat attendance enhance an event sponsor's brand image? Second, do repeat attendees indicate that they are more likely to purchase the sponsor's brand? Understanding the impact of consumers' repeat attendance on brand image and behavioral intent offers important insight to organizations that are contemplating long-term sponsorship relationships. Event marketers seeking ongoing sponsorship partnerships may also benefit from such investigations.

We begin this paper by defining and describing sponsorship and how it can be used to support relationship marketing. Next, we review the literature assessing the effectiveness of sponsorship relationship performance. We then describe the research methods that were employed. Following an analysis and discussion of the results, we present major contributions of the study and their applications, and suggest avenues for future research.

### **Sponsorship Relationships**

Sponsorship builds a relationship in the consumer's mind between the brand and an organization or event (Crimmins and Horn, 1996). Sponsorship secures an organization's rights to affiliate, or directly associate, with an event so that the sponsor can benefit from that affiliation or association. Although the

terms *sponsorship* and *event marketing* are often used interchangeably, they refer to interrelated but separate activities. Sponsorship involves the support of individuals or groups participating in an activity, or the entity itself. Event marketing, on the other hand, is a form of marketing communications that includes a variety of activities; event marketing offers consumers the opportunity to interact personally with, and thus experience, branded products and services. While they are distinct activities and can occur independently, the synergistic nature of sponsorship and event marketing encourages their joint application with other communication tools (Walliser, 2003).

Originally regarded as a philanthropic endeavor and a form of public relations, sponsorship has been transformed into a combination of public relations, advertising, personal selling, and sales promotion activities. Today, most organizations regard sponsorship activities as part of a larger integrated marketing communications strategy (Amis *et al.*, 1999). Sponsorships often serve as the core around which the marketer builds its arsenal of diverse marketing communication activities, including publicity for recognition of a brand's support of the event, on-site personal selling, sales promotions through product and service experiences, and print and/or broadcast advertising (Parker, 1991).

A major factor in the shift from general advertising to sponsorship is that the latter's communications can be delivered in association with an event or activity. Consumers are considered to be more receptive to marketing messages,

and perhaps their predispositions towards sponsoring brands are even more positively influenced. This may be partially due to the more relaxed or compelling settings of sponsorship events. Problems associated with traditional advertising (i.e., increasing clutter, rising costs, audience fragmentation, questionable effectiveness) have also helped to drive the rapid growth of sponsorships (Meenaghan, 1991). However, these same charges have recently been directed toward sponsorship, whose critics are calling into question whether sponsorships are an appropriate outlay of funds given the limited supporting evidence of their value (Stotlar, 2004). In particular, there is limited evidence suggesting the role of sponsored events as a relationship marketing builder.

### **Relationship Marketing**

Relationship marketing has received considerable interest from researchers over the past 20 years (e.g., Berry, 1995; Lemon *et al.*, 2002; Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Reinartz and Kumar, 2003; Farrelly and Quester, 2003). However, the role of relationships has been largely ignored in business-to-consumer sponsorship research. The relationship marketing concept refers to marketing activities directed toward creating, enhancing, and sustaining successful relational exchanges (Morgan and Hunt, 1994). It includes all of the actions that are taken by an organization to retain its customers and strengthen relationships with them. As such, relationship marketing theory establishes a framework to describe the longer-term, mutually beneficial relationships between

exchange partners, with special emphasis on the relationships between organizations and their customers.

A relationship focus is increasingly vital to sponsorship marketing since there are multiple stakeholders, including sponsors, sponsored activities and properties, intermediaries, event participants, attendees, and the media. Even though individual stakeholders may not be in direct communication with each other, they are part of a network of relationships and have an effect on each other (Liljander, 2000). Since sponsorships involve a series of interrelationships and interactions between organizations (Farrelly and Quester, 2005), there is very little of the sponsorship relationship that can be depicted as a solitary, isolated exchange. A relationship focus holds the potential to bring about better understanding of the exchange processes inherent to sponsorship (Walliser, 2003).

From a business-to-consumer standpoint, the potential for a relationship to emerge between a sponsor and event attendees is dependent upon numerous factors. For example, what one customer considers a marketing relationship with the sponsor or sponsored event may not be defined as such by another (Fournier *et al.*, 1998). Perceptions of congruence between an event and sponsor (Musante *et al.*, 1999) may also influence this relationship. Given that customers form relationships with others and that services may be delivered over time, customer relationships are likely to be formed when purchasing services (Berry, 1995). Future considerations are now recognized as a crucial component to the service

relationship dimension (Lemon *et al.*, 2002).

As services, sporting events encourage relationships because of their potential to be personally important to the customer and high in personal involvement. As such, the obstacles that inhibit relationships between customers and manufacturers of standardized consumer goods – especially those who depend on intermediaries to deliver their products – may be a contributing factor to their widespread use of sponsorships of sporting events. Furthermore, customer relationship management tools can record purchase behavior information to calculate customer lifetime value at the individual or customer segment level (Reinartz and Kumar, 2003). Consequently, firms now build customer relationships through many types of sporting events, including direct marketing, loyalty programs, and relationship development programs (e.g., Brenner, 1997; Lapio and Speter, 2000).

### **Effectiveness of Sponsorship Relationships**

Both buyers and sellers of sponsorship are encouraged to consider sponsorship in terms of mutually-beneficial long-term relationships (Farrelly and Quester, 2003). Through the relationship, an event receives money and/or free goods and services from the sponsor. In exchange, a sponsor secures access to the event's audience and the potential to transfer the image associated with the event to the sponsor's brand. An effective sponsorship relationship links complementary sponsor and event images, thereby creating "the perfect marriage"



(Ferrand and Pages, 1999, p. 395). Given the thousands of sporting events that are held each year, opportunities are abound for promotion at these events. For an event sponsor, the sports sponsorship can lead to increased sales and/or market share, and contact with desirable consumer audiences and other important constituencies (Amis *et al.*, 1997; Farrelly and Quester, 2005).

Some sponsorship researchers have found strong support for attendees' willingness to buy sponsor branded products as a result of the sponsorship (e.g., Cornwell and Coote, 2005; Sneath *et al.*, 2005; Pope and Voges, 2000; Kennett *et al.*, 1998; Shannon and Turley, 1997; Howard, 1995), while others have uncovered only weak sponsorship effects (e.g., Pope and Voges, 1999; Javalgi *et al.*, 1994). These results are not surprising since factors other than sponsorship have been linked to purchase intentions. Furthermore, because sales performance cannot be attributed to a single variable, and researchers generally lack the control mechanisms to isolate a direct relationship between sponsorship and sales performance (Quester and Farrelly, 1998), purchase-related outcomes of sponsorship are often difficult to measure.

Despite these challenges, researchers continue to examine the factors that influence sponsorship-related outcomes (see Cornwell *et al.*, 2005). For example, interaction with a sponsor's offerings during an event has been shown to enhance purchase intentions (Sneath *et al.*, 2005) and identification with the sponsoring organization has been linked to increased purchase intentions among attendees at

nonprofit (Cornwell and Coote, 2005) and sporting (Dutton *et al.*, 1994) events. Antecedents to identification include perceptions of the sponsor as a good corporate citizen (Krol, 1996), organizational prestige (Cornwell and Coote, 2005; Bhattacharya *et al.*, 1995) and length of time in which the individual is affiliated with a sponsoring organization (Mael and Ashforth, 1992; Bhattacharya *et al.*, 1995).

### **Marketing Metrics: Quantifying Market's Impact**

Recent years have seen increased calls for marketing practitioners to measure the returns their firms obtain from marketing activities (Rust *et al.*, 2004). Practitioners have found that it is difficult to connect a firm's marketing activities to the firm's 'bottom line'.

To explain this process, researchers have developed a three-step framework that illustrates the link between firm strategy/tactics, marketing outcomes, and financial outcomes (Rust *et al.*, 2004). These scholars propose that the firm first sets its strategy (overall direction) and then chooses a set of tactics to implement the strategy. The tactics are the 'marketing actions' in which the firm engages to accomplish its overall objectives (i.e., strategy). Next, the successful implementation of the firm's strategy leads to the creation of a set of 'marketing assets' (such as customer equity and brand equity). Finally, the firm may draw on these marketing assets in order to serve customers and create superior financial performance.

In sum, the three-step sequence is: 1) firm strategy/tactics → 2) create marketing assets → 3) draw on these assets to create superior financial performance. The current study explores the link between the first and second steps. Specifically, it examines the link between event marketing (a tactic) and the creation of favorable customer attitudes (a marketing asset). In doing so, the study seeks to clarify how a firm can understand potential customers and serve the customers who will be most profitable, both of which are key benefits of improved marketing metrics (Rust *et al.*, 2004).

### **Hypothesized Relationships**

Based on the relationship marketing and sponsorship literature reviewed in the preceding pages, three hypotheses were formulated and tested for this study. The hypothesized relationships are as presented, followed by the methods and analyses.

- H1: Compared to first-time attendees, repeat event attendees will have a more favorable opinion of the sponsor's involvement in the community.
- H2: Compared to first-time attendees, repeat event attendees will have a more favorable opinion of the sponsor's brand.
- H3: Compared to first-time attendees, repeat event attendees will have a greater intention to purchase the sponsor's product(s).

### **Methods**

The Tour de Georgia is a six-day sporting event that consists of a 642-mile cycling race and series of festivals across 11 cities in Georgia (USA). In 2005, its

third year, the event attracted 128 cyclists from 18 countries and over 800,000 spectators ([www.tourdegeorgia.com](http://www.tourdegeorgia.com)). In addition to the race, event attractions in the host cities included entertainment and exhibits provided by the title sponsor and other sponsors. Celebrity athletes helped to increase attendance, as well as demand for sponsorship and hospitality opportunities at the event.

Dodge/DaimlerChrysler Corporation has served as the title sponsor for Tour de Georgia through the first three years of this event. In addition to naming rights, the Dodge name and logo are prominently displayed at the event on banners, signage, volunteers' shirts, and on large-screen televisions that project the race to the crowd during the race; the announcer also frequently mentions the sponsor's name over the public address system. In each city that hosts the race, the automobile manufacturer also has exhibits in which its new models are displayed. Although attendees are not provided with opportunities to test drive any vehicles during the event, they are able to inspect vehicles personally and speak with sales personnel. Those who attend the exhibits also become eligible to enter their names into a drawing for a new vehicle.

Adults who were attending the race in one of the seven host cities were approached by researchers and asked to participate in the study. Questionnaires were completed on location by the spectator respondents, who were asked to identify the number of years they had attended the three-time cycling event (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, or 3<sup>rd</sup> year), their attitudes and opinions of the event's title sponsor and its

products, and likelihood of purchasing the title sponsor's products. Attitudes and opinions were measured using a five-point scale (ranging from 1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree) for each of following questions: "I like that an automobile manufacturer cares to do more than just sell cars and trucks," "Having visited Tour de Georgia, my opinion of Dodge has changed for the better," and "As a result of what I've experienced today, I'm more likely to buy a Dodge in the future." The final section of the survey asked respondents to indicate the time frame in which they planned to acquire their next new vehicle and answer classification questions (gender, age, income, and education level).

### **Data Analysis and Results**

Responses to the classification questions suggest that demographic characteristics of attendees at the event were consistent with the title sponsor's primary target markets, i.e., buyers aged 35-to-64 with annual incomes of \$50,000 to \$80,000 ([www.eventmarketermag.com](http://www.eventmarketermag.com)). Although the initial sample for the study consisted of 1,388 adults, 161 cases were removed from the data set because of incomplete responses. The remaining sample of 1,227 adults consisted of 57.1% men and 42.9% women, reflecting attendance at the event and the popularity of cycling among men. As shown in Table 1, more than half of the respondents were aged 35-to-64 (63.5%) and had annual household incomes of \$50,000-\$100,000 (50.3%). More than half (56.6%) were attending the event for the first time and about two-thirds (67.1%) plan to purchase a new vehicle.

– INSERT TABLE 1 HERE –

Nearly three-fourths (72.5%) of respondents ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the statement that they liked that an automobile manufacturer cares about more than making and selling vehicles. When asked whether their opinion of the title sponsor had changed for the better after attending the event, slightly more than half of study participants (51.6%) responded favorably. However, when asked about their likelihood of purchasing a Dodge in the future, only one-third (32.2%) indicated they were more likely to buy a Dodge as a result of their experience at the event (Table 2).

– INSERT TABLE 2 HERE –

To examine the hypothesized effects for the enhanced relationships between repeat attendance and the sponsor’s brand image, and repeat attendance and purchase intentions toward the title sponsor and its products, respondents were split into three groups based on the number of years s/he had attended the event (1<sup>st</sup> year, 2<sup>nd</sup> year, and 3<sup>rd</sup> year). Specifically, we performed one-way ANOVA with Scheffe post hoc tests to determine mean group differences in attitudes toward the sponsor and purchase intent; in the ANOVA, we treated attendance history as a categorical independent variable with three attendee groups. The results are shown in Table 3. Regarded as the most conservative post hoc test with respect to Type 1 error (Hair *et al.*, 2006), the Scheffe method was selected because it is more robust with respect to comparing different sample

sizes of three or more groups.

– INSERT TABLE 3 HERE –

Contrary to expectations, we find no evidence for significant differences in responses between repeat attendees and first-time attendees regarding the manufacturer's concern for more than selling of cars and trucks. Therefore, our analysis does not support sponsor's community involvement beyond mere production. However, the F-values and corresponding *p*-value results do provide statistical support for the main effect group differences between repeat attendance and attendees' opinions of the sponsor in the predicted direction (H2), as well as the relationship between repeat attendance and their increased likelihood of purchasing the title sponsor's vehicles (H3).

In order to assess the individual group differences, the Scheffe post hoc test reveals that the significant main effect difference is due to a single group difference (i.e., first-time attendees versus third year attendees), while the other comparisons (i.e., first-time versus second year and second year versus third year) are not significantly different. Specifically, third year attendees' opinions of the title event sponsor are significantly more favorable than respondents who were attending the event for the first-time ( $p=.002$ ). In addition, those who were attending the event for the third time are significantly more likely than first-time attendees to express an intention to buy a Dodge car or truck ( $p=.035$ ).

The final aspect of the data analysis addresses the potential for individual

respondent characteristics to influence sponsorship effects of the study. As shown in Table 4, there are no significant differences among the three respondent groups in terms of gender, age, and plans to buy a new vehicle. In terms of respondents' income levels, there is marginal evidence ( $p < .10$ ) for significant differences among attendee groups; third-year attendee respondents' income levels are comparatively higher than respondents who were attending the event for the second time ( $p = .073$ ).

– INSERT TABLE 4 HERE –

## **Discussion**

The study captures three dimensions of the marketing relationships between attendees and the title brand sponsor: attitudes, opinions, and behavioral intentions. Consistent with relationship marketing theory, the findings support the association between exposure and attitude toward the event sponsor and its products. Empirical evidence also suggests that repeat attendance at a sponsored event is related to attendees' enhanced perceptions of the title sponsor.

In this study, we tap into respondents' sentiments regarding their appreciation for a particular corporate brand that is contributing to society, in addition to its primary business activities. The bond that is created between an individual consumer and sponsor by their joint appreciation of the welfare of the event can result in shared values. Shared values, in turn, are an important antecedent to relationship marketing (c.f., Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Sirdeshmukh



*et al.*, 2002).

The study indicates that serving as the sporting event's title sponsor strengthens the automaker's brand image. While the overall results indicate a modest impact on the sponsor's brand image, the results become more pronounced by repeated attendance at the event. We find evidence that attendees' opinions toward the brand improved with repeat event attendance. Hence, attendee responses suggest that attracting repeat attendees to a sporting event can enhance a sponsor's brand image.

Although attitudes and opinions are important precursors to behavioral intentions, our results suggest that positive opinions about the brand may have a limited impact on purchase intentions of the sponsor's brand. As anticipated, we find that purchase intentions are greater for third-time attendees of the event than first- or second-time attendees. However, contrary to our expectations, there is no difference between first- and second-time attendees. We suggest two possible explanations for these findings. First, a relationship takes time – often years – to develop. In the case of an annual event, a three-year span may have been necessary to develop this relationship. Second, a consumer may take years to form the opinion that a given company is involved in their community. A single, one-time sponsorship of a community event may not equate with community involvement from the consumers' point-of-view.

Findings also indicate a nonlinear impact of repeat attendance on purchase

intentions. First-time attendees may be more impressionable due to the novelty of the experience. This novelty factor is likely to diminish over time, e.g., after attending the event a second year. In the meantime, however, third year attendees may have had time to develop a relationship with the event, its sponsors, and their brands.

A second possible explanation for the nonlinear results may be partially accounted for by individual motivations for attendance and individuals' level of involvement with the local and cycling communities. First-time attendees may come to the event out of curiosity, convenience, or to spend time with friends and/or family. These attendees may not be as engaged with the event, or its sponsors, as repeat attendees. They may also be more interested in the social aspects of a large event, rather than the event itself. While second-time attendees may be more likely to be involved with the community in which the event was held, they may not have been able to attend one year. Still others may have attended the event twice simply to experience its social aspects, which could account for the mixed results among second-year attendees. Presumably, it is the third-year attendees who are most likely to be ardent local and cycling community activists and fans.

### **Contributions and Future Research Opportunities**

To our knowledge, this study is the first time that scholars have examined the impact of repeat attendance on attendees' perceptions of a title sponsor of an

annual sporting event. This study is of value to marketing scholars and to event marketers, sponsored activities and properties in search of long-term sponsorship relationships. At a time when rising costs and uncertainty about sponsorship effectiveness have placed such investments under increased scrutiny, an understanding of how repeat attendance can enhance brand image and purchase intentions is an important contribution to theory and practice. The findings indicate that organizations contemplating sponsorship relationships should consider repeat attendance in their evaluative criteria. Because it may take time for the sponsor of an annual event to develop a relationship with event attendees, a longer-term sponsorship relationship (compared to a year-to-year contract) may be a more valuable investment for the firm.

Consistent with Cornwell and her colleagues' (2005) call for a more theoretical approach to sponsorship research, future studies might explore the simultaneous impact of individual, group, market, and management factors on sponsorship-related outcomes, such as impact of prior brand experience in the product category, consumer involvement, brand equity, and usage or nonusage of the product category (Alba and Chattopadhyay, 1986). To examine the effects of repeat attendance on sponsorship relationships, researchers might also consider a longitudinal study that captures spectators' attitudes and opinions – about the sponsor and its brands – before and after the event, since other factors that could lead to favorable outcomes, such as organizational prestige, were not measured in

this study.

This study helps link marketing tactics (event marketing) to the creation of a marketing asset (favorable customer opinion); the first two steps in the three-step model developed by Rust and his co-authors (2004). A study that incorporated actual consumer purchases into the model could enhance understanding of the last two steps in the model, i.e., the connection between marketing assets and financial results. A related opportunity for future sponsorship research would be a study that captures actual behavior, in addition to purchase intentions, since consumers responding to surveys tend to overstate actual purchasing behaviors (Jones and Sasser, 1995).

For the results to be generalizable, the relevance of repeat attendance should be assessed in other event contexts. This research examines the impact of title sponsorship of a particular annual sporting event. There are many additional studies that might yield interesting insights. For example, researchers might compare the returns associated with sports marketing sponsorship to other marketing tactics. In addition, given the thousands of sporting events that are held in the United States alone each year, scholars might wish to examine multiple sports sponsorships within the same study, since this would help identify which sporting events offer sponsors the greatest returns.

Studies might also examine the moderating influence of different levels of sponsorship in comparison to title sponsorship. In addition, it would be helpful to

examine medium and/or low involvement products, as opposed to the high involvement product category tested here. Finally, while repeat attendance appears to be an antecedent to sponsor brand image and purchase intentions, it would be interesting to determine whether it is attendees' partiality for the event or exposure to the sponsor's message – or some combination of both – that leads to favorable sponsorship outcomes.

## References

- Alba, J. W. and Chattopadhyay, A. (1986) Effects of context and part-category cues on recall of competing brands. *Journal of Marketing Research* **22**(August), 340-9.
- Amis, J., Slack, T. and Berrett, T. (1999) Sport sponsorship as distinctive competence. *European Journal of Marketing* **33**, 250-72.
- Berry, L. (1995) Relationship marketing of services – growing interest, emerging perspectives. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* **23**(4), 236-45.
- Bhattacharya, C.B., Rao, H. and Glynn, M.A. (1995) Understanding the bond of identification: an investigation of its correlates among art museum members. *Journal of Marketing* **59**(4), 46-57.
- Brenner, S. (1997) Pursuing relationships in professional sport. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* **6**(2), 33-4.
- Cornwell, T.B. and Coote, L.V. (2005) Corporate sponsorship of a cause: the role of identification in purchase intent. *Journal of Business Research* (**58**), 268-76.
- Cornwell, T.B., Weeks, C.S. and Roy, D.P. (2005) Sponsorship-linked marketing: opening the black box. *Journal of Advertising* **34**(2), 21-42.
- Crimmins, J. and Horn, M. (1996) Sponsorship: from management ego trip to marketing success. *Journal of Advertising Research* **21**, 11-21.
- Dodge Tour de Georgia (2005) Available at [www.tourdegeorgia.com](http://www.tourdegeorgia.com). (Accessed March 2006).
- Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J.M. and Harquail, C.V. (1994) Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **39**(2), 239-63.
- European Sponsorship Association (2006) Available at [www.europeansponsorship.org](http://www.europeansponsorship.org) (Accessed August 2006).
- Farrelly, F.J. and Quester, P.G. (2003) What drives renewal of sponsorship principal/agent relationships? *Journal of Advertising Research* **43**(4), 353-

60.

- Farrelly, F.J. and Quester, P.G. (2005) Examining important relationship quality constructs of the focal sponsorship exchange. *Industrial Marketing Management* **34**(3), 211-9.
- Ferrand, A. and Pages, M. (1999) Image management in sport organizations: the creation of value. *European Journal of Marketing* **33**(3/4), 387-402.
- Fournier, S., Dobscha, S. and Mick, D.G. (1998) Preventing the premature death of relationship marketing. *Harvard Business Review* **76**(1), 42-9.
- Hair, J., Black, J.F., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E. and Tatham, R.L. (2006) *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6<sup>th</sup> ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Howard, T. (1995) Fast feeders rev engines with NASCAR sponsorship. *Nation's Restaurant News* **29**(35), 4.
- Javalgi, R.G., Traylor, M.B., Gross, A.C. and Lampman, E. (1994) Awareness of sponsorship and corporate image: an empirical investigation. *Journal of Advertising* **23**(4), 47-58.
- Jones, T.O. and Sasser, W.E. (1995) Why satisfied customers defect. *Harvard Business Review* **73**(6), 88-99.
- Kennett, P.A., Sneath, J.Z. and Erdmann, J.W. (1998) The quantitative and qualitative benefits of sponsoring the 1996 summer Olympics: an exploratory study. *International Sports Journal* **2**(1), 115-26.
- Krol, C. (1996) Consumers note marketer's good causes. *Advertising Age* **67**(46), 51.
- Lapio, R. and Speter, K. M. (2000) NASCAR: a lesson in integrated and relationship marketing. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* **9**(2), 85-95.
- Lemon, K., White, T. and Winer, R. (2002) Dynamic customer relationship management: incorporating future considerations into the service retention decision. *Journal of Marketing* **66**(January), 1-14.
- Liljander, V. (2000) The importance of internal relationship marketing for

- external relationship success. In T. Hennig-Thurau and U. Hansen (eds.) *Relationship Marketing*. Berlin: Springer, pp. 161-92.
- Mael, F.A. and Ashforth, B.E. (1992) Loyal from day one: biodata, organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. *Personal Psychotherapy* **48**(2), 309-26.
- Mahoney, D.F. and Howard, D.R. (2001) Sport business in the next decade: A general overview of expected trends. *Journal of Sport Management* **15**, 275-96.
- Meenaghan, T. (1991) The role of sponsorship in the marketing communications mix. *International Journal of Advertising* **10**(1), 35-47.
- Morgan, R.M. and Hunt, S.D. (1994) The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing* **58**(July), 20-38.
- Mullin, B.J., Hardy, S. and Sutton, W.A. (2000) *Sport Marketing* (2nd ed). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Musante, M., Milne, G.R. and McDonald, M.A. (1999) Sport sponsorship: evaluating the sport and brand image match. *International Journal of Sports Marketing Sponsorship* **1**(1), 32-47.
- “Oh What a Feeling.” Event Marketer (August 25, 2003). Available at [www.eventmarketermag.com](http://www.eventmarketermag.com). (Accessed March 2006)
- Parker, K. (1991) Sponsorship: the research contribution. *European Journal of Marketing* **25**(11), 22-30.
- Pope, N.K. and Voges, K.E. (1999) Sponsorship and image: a replication and extension. *Journal of Marketing Communications* **5**(1), 17-28.
- Pope, N.K. and Voges, K.E. (2000) The impact of sport sponsorship activities, corporate image, and prior use on consumer purchase intention. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* **9**(2), 96-102.
- Quester, P.G. and Farrelly, F. (1998) Brand association and memory decay effects of sponsorship: the case of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. *Journal of Product and Brand Management* **7**(6), 539-56.



- Reinartz, W. and Kumar, V. (2003) The impact of customer relationship characteristics on profitable lifetime duration. *Journal of Marketing* **67**(January), 77-99.
- Rust, R.T., Ambler, T., Carpenter, G.S., Kumar, V., and Srivastava, R.K. (2004) Measuring marketing productivity: current knowledge and future directions. *Journal of Marketing* **68**(October), 76-89.
- Sandler, D.M. and Shani, D. (1989) Olympic sponsorship vs. 'ambush marketing: who gets the gold? *Journal of Advertising Research* **29**(August-September), 9-14.
- Shannon, J.R. and Turley, I.W. (1997) The influence of in-arena promotions on purchase behavior and purchase intentions. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* **6**(4), 53-9.
- Shimp, T.A. (2005) Integrated marketing communications: advertising, promotions, and other marcom tools. In *Marketing Principles and Best Practices* (3rd ed). Mason, OH: South-Western, pp. 428-73.
- Sirdeshmukh, D., Singh, J. and Sabol B. (2002) Consumer trust, value, and loyalty in relational exchanges. *Journal of Marketing* **66**(1), 15-37.
- Sneath, J.Z., Finney, R.Z. and Close, A.G. (2005) An IMC approach to event marketing: the effects of sponsorship and experience on customer attitudes. *Journal of Advertising Research* **45**(4), 373-81.
- Stotlar, D.K. (2004) Sponsorship evaluation: moving from theory to practice. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* **13**(1), 61-4.
- Walliser, B. (2003) An international review of sponsorship research: extension and update. *International Journal of Advertising* **22**(1), 5-40.

**Table 1**  
*Characteristics of Sample (n=1227)*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	641	57.1
Female	481	42.9
<b>Age</b>		
18-24	133	11.6
25-34	244	21.3
35-44	354	31.0
45-54	253	22.1
55-64	119	10.4
65+	40	3.5
<b>Income</b>		
<\$25K	88	9.4
\$25K-\$50K	151	16.0
\$50-\$75K	257	27.3
\$75-\$100K	216	23.0
>\$100K	229	24.3
<b># Years Attend Event</b>		
First year	695	56.6
Second year	304	24.8
Third year	228	18.6
<b>Acquire New Vehicle</b>		
Within a month	46	3.8
2-3 months	70	5.8
4-6 months	57	4.7
7-12 months	250	20.7
> 12 months	386	32.1
Not planning to buy	398	32.9

**Table 2**  
*Attitudes, Beliefs, and Purchase Intent toward Sponsor and Sponsor's Products*

<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Level of Agreement</i>				
	<i>Strongly Agree</i>				<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
I like that an automobile manufacturer cares to do more than just sell cars and trucks.	57.4%	15.1%	12.2%	4.6%	10.6%
Having visited Tour de Georgia, my opinion of Dodge has changed for the better.	28.9%	22.7%	31.1%	8.4%	8.9%
As a result of what I've experienced today, I'm more likely to buy a Dodge in the future.	15.6%	16.6%	34.9%	14.7%	18.1%

**Table 3**  
***One-way ANOVA analysis of respondents' attitudes toward sponsor and sponsor's products by times attended event***

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Year (n=695)</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Year (n=304)</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Year (n=228)</i>	<i>F-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Scheffe Test</i>
I like that an automobile manufacturer cares to do more than just sell cars and trucks.	2.014 (1.386)	1.873 (1.247)	1.897 (1.39)	1.413	0.244	---
Having visited Tour de Georgia, my opinion of Dodge has changed for the better.	2.556 (1.211)	2.398 (1.231)	2.224 (1.292)	6.584	0.001	3 > 1
As a result of what I've experienced today, I'm more likely to buy a Dodge in the future.	3.087 (1.247)	3.054 (1.352)	2.83 (1.321)	3.43	0.033	3 > 1

*1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree*

**Table 4**  
**Profile of respondents by times attended event**

<i>Characteristics of Sample</i>	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Year n</i>	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Year %</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Year n</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Year %</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Year n</i>	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Year %</i>	<i>F-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>
<b>Gender</b>							1.135	0.322
Male	357	55.7	154	57.0	130	61.6		
Female	284	44.3	116	43.0	81	38.4		
<b>Age</b>							1.468	0.231
18-24	76	11.7	45	15.8	12	5.7		
25-34	142	21.8	56	19.7	46	22.0		
35-44	203	31.2	84	29.6	67	32.1		
45-54	142	21.8	53	18.7	58	27.8		
55-64	71	10.9	29	10.2	19	9.1		
65+	16	2.5	17	6.0	7	3.3		
<b>Income</b>							2.896	0.056
<\$25K	54	10.0	30	12.9	4	2.4		
\$25K-\$50K	92	17.0	36	15.5	23	13.5		
\$50-\$75K	147	27.2	56	24.3	54	32.0		
\$75-\$100K	112	20.7	55	23.7	49	29.0		
>\$100K	135	25.0	55	23.7	39	23.1		
<b>Acquire New Vehicle</b>							0.201	0.818
Within a month	23	3.4	13	4.4	10	4.5		
2-3 months	38	5.5	17	5.7	15	6.7		
4-6 months	40	5.8	11	3.7	6	2.7		
7-12 months	147	21.5	64	21.5	39	17.4		
>12 months	212	30.9	100	33.6	74	33.0		
Not planning to buy	225	32.8	93	31.2	80	35.7		