Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging – a Fast Moving Consumer Goods Context

Frances M Woodside

B. Bus (Marketing) (First Class Honours)

Submitted in fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Southern Queensland 2010

CERTIFICATION OF DISSERTATION

I certify that the ideas, results, analyses and conclusions reported in this dissertation are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award, except where otherwise acknowledged.

Signature of candidate:

Date

ENDORSEMENT

Signature of Supervisor/s

Signature of Supervisor/s

Date

Date

Abstract

In the last decade, sponsorship has become a mainstream marketing communications tool with worldwide sponsorship spending approaching US\$45 billion. However, the rapid growth of corporate sponsorship has led to the emergence of 'sponsorship clutter', a major challenge for companies seeking sponsorship opportunities. As the market for sponsorship becomes intensely competitive, it is essential that sponsorship investments be carefully managed to ensure their effectiveness.

One type of sponsorship leveraging that is widely used in the Australian Fast Moving Consumer Goods industry (FMCG) is sponsorship leveraged packaging (SLP). SLP involves depicting the sponsored property's image and logos on the sponsoring brand's packaging. Despite its widespread use, little empirical research exists to explain whether sponsorship leveraged packaging (SLP) impacts consumer behaviour in low involvement settings. This research specifically addresses these gaps in the known body of literature relating to sponsorship, packaging and marketing communications by empirically investigating the relationship between SLP and consumer behaviour.

Given the current trend of large sponsorship leverage investments, it becomes increasingly important to have a clear understanding of what to expect when SLP is used and how to maximise its impact on consumers and the marketplace. In this research, image transfer theory, together with an attention-trial-response model are presented in order to develop a framework to explain factors impacting consumer response to SLP. Empirical results indicate that consumer response to SLP is impacted by identification with the sponsored property and perceived fit of the property and sponsor. Furthermore, the relationship is moderated by type of sponsored property, awareness of the sponsorship, frequency of purchase of the sponsoring brand and respondent characteristics. Theoretically, this research provides understanding of a little explored context for sponsorship, i.e. FMCG. It also provides strategic relevance for brand managers in guiding sponsorship investment and package design decisions.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Publications Produced in Conjunction With This Thesis	X
Acknowledgements	xi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Sponsorship as a Marketing Communications Tool: an Overview	1
1.2 Purpose of the Research	3
1.3 Justification for the Research	3
1.3.1 Academic Contributions	4
1.3.2 Contributions to Practice	5
1.4 Methodology	5
1.4.1 Stage One: Literature Review and Research Design.	6
1.4.2 Stage Two: Study 1	7
1.4.3 Stage 3: Study 2	7
1.4.4 Research Paradigm and Methodology	
1.5 Delimitations of Scope and Definitions	9
1.6 Outline of the Thesis	10
1.7 Conclusion	11
Chapter 2 Literature Review	12
2.1 Introduction	
2.2 Marketing Communications	
2.3 Sponsorship	16
2.3.1 Sponsorship Defined	17
2.3.2 Sponsorship Types	
2.3.3 Sponsorship Research	
2.4 Theoretical Framework – Sponsorship Processing Mechanics	
2.4.1 Low Level Processing	
2.4.2 Brand Image transfer	
2.4.3 Sponsored Property Identification	30
2.4.4 Perceived Fit	32
2.5 Leveraging Sponsorship Through Packaging	

2.6 Consumer Response to Sponsorship Messages	
2.6.1 Hierarchy of Effects Model	
2.6.2 Attention, Trial, Reinforcement Model	
2.6.3 Consumer Attitudes Toward the Sponsoring Brand	
2.6.4 Brand Experience	
2.6.5 Purchase Intention Toward the Sponsor's Products	40
2.6.6 Trial Intention Toward the Sponsor's Products	41
2.7 Preliminary Model - Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP	44
2.8 Conclusion	47
Chapter 3 Study 1	48
3.1 Introduction	48
3.2 Theoretical Foundations	49
3.3 Rationale and Objectives for Study 1	52
3.4 Methodology for Study 1 - Exploratory Research	53
3.4.1 Step 1 - Focus Group Methodology	53
3.4.2 Step - 1 Focus Group Findings	56
3.4.3 Step 2 - Depth Interview Methodology	60
3.4.4 Step 2 - Depth Interview Findings	62
3.4.4 Step 3 - Qualitative Survey Methodology	64
3.4.5 Step 3 - Qualitative Survey Findings	66
3.5 Discussion of Results from Study 1	69
3.6 Revised Model and Hypotheses	
3.7 Conclusions	
Chapter 4 – Study 2 Methodology	77
4.1 Introduction	
4.2 Rationale for Research Method	
4.3 Study 2 Methodology	
4.3.1 Experiment Design	
4.3.2 Questionnaire Design and Measurement Scales	82
4.3.3 Sampling	
4.3.4 Ethical Considerations	
4.3.5 Data Analysis Strategies	
4.4 Conclusion	103

Chapter 5 – Study 2 Results	104
5.1 Introduction	. 104
5.2 Development of Conceptual Model and Hypotheses	. 105
5.3 Profile and Analysis of Respondents	. 107
5.3.1 Response Rate	. 109
5.3.2 Assessment of Profiles	. 109
5.4 Preliminary Analysis	. 109
5.4.1. Cleaning and Screening	. 110
5.4.2 Descriptive Statistics	. 113
5.5 Measurement Models	. 117
5.5.1 Sponsored Property Identification Scale	. 121
5.5.2 Sponsoring Brand Loyalty scale	. 123
5.5.3 Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging (SLP) scale	. 126
5.5.4 Perceived Fit Scale	. 129
5.5.5 Four Factor Measurement Model	. 131
5.6 Analysis of the Structural Models and Tests of Hypotheses	. 136
5.6.1 Descriptive Statistics	. 136
5.6.2 Correlation Analysis	. 137
5.6.3 Structural Equation Model Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLF	2138
5.7 Moderating Hypotheses	. 142
5.7.1 Type of Sponsored Property	. 143
5.7.2 Awareness of Sponsorship	. 145
5.7.3 Frequency of Purchase	. 147
5.7.4 Demographic Groups	. 150
5.8 Conclusions	. 152
Chapter 6	154
6.1 Introduction	. 154
6.2 Implications of Results of Study 2	. 157
6.3 Conclusions about the Research Purpose	. 165
6.4 Theoretical Contribution	. 167
6.5 Implications for Practice	. 170
6.6 Limitations and Future Research	. 171

LIST OF REFERENCES	174
APPENDIX 1 – EXPLORATORY RESEARCH PROTOCOLS	193
APPENDIX 2 – STUDY 2 QUESTIONNAIRE VERSIONS	202
APPENDIX 3 – CORRELATION MATRIX	203

List of Tables

Table 1.1 – Summary of Research Program	6
Table 2.1 – Definitions of Sponsorship	17
Table 2.2 – Types of Sponsorship	
Table 2.3 – Sponsorship Research Streams	
Table 2.4 – Sponsorship Processing Mechanics	
Table 2.5 – Image transfer Study Findings	29
Table 2.6 – Sponsored Property Identification Study Findings	31
Table 2.7 – Congruency Study Findings	33
Table 2.8 – Sponsorship Outcomes	
Table 3.1 – Alternative Enquiry Paradigms	50
Table 3.2 – Focus Group Profiles	55
Table 3.3 – Depth Interview Profiles	61
Table 3.4 – Qualitative Survey Participant Profiles	65
Table 3.5 – Response to Category Involvement	66
Table 3.6 – Response to Packaging in Product Categories	67
Table 3.7 – Response to Attitude Questions – Qualitative Survey	68
Table 3.8 – Research Hypotheses	76
Table 4.1 – Operationalisation of Variables	88
Table 4.2 – Validity and Reliability	
Table 5.1 – Research Hypotheses	107
Table 5.2 – Demographic Profile of Respondents	107
Table 5.3 – Means and standard deviation of variables used in Study 2	114
Table 5.4 – Exploratory Factor Analysis - Factor Correlation Matrix	118
Table 5.5 – Pattern Matrix Study 2	120
Table 5.6 – Sponsored Property Identification Scale	121
Table 5.7 – Item Correlations Sponsored Property Identification Scale	122
Table 5.8 – Measures of Fit for the Sponsored Property Identification Scale	e 122
Table 5.9 – Sponsoring Brand Loyalty Scale	124
Table 5.10 – Item Correlations Sponsoring Brand Loyalty Scale	124
Table 5.11 – Measures of Fit for the Sponsoring Brand Loyalty Scale	126
Table 5.12 – Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging Sca	ale 126
Table 5.13 – Item Correlations Consumer Response to SLP scale	127

Table 5.14 – Large Standardised Residuals Consumer Response to SLP Scale 128
Table 5.15 – Measures of Fit for the Consumer Response to SLP Scale 129
Table 5.16 – Perceived Fit Scale 130
Table 5.17 – Measures of Fit for the Perceived Fit Scale 131
Table 5.18 – Four Factor Measurement Model 132
Table 5.19 – Large Standardised Residuals Four Factor Measurement Model 133
Table 5.20 – Measures of Fit for the Four Factor Measurement Model 134
Table 5.21 – Construct Descriptive Statistics 137
Table 5.22 – Correlation Table for Constructs in the Model
Table 5.23 – Measures of Model Fit – Multi-group Analysis Perceived Fit 142
Table 5.24 – Regression Coefficients – Multi-group Analysis Perceived Fit 142
Table 5.25 – Measures of Fit – Multi-group Analysis Type of Sponsored Property143
Table 5.26 – Measures of Fit Constraints freed – Type of Sponsored Property 144
Table 5.27 – Regression Coefficients – Multi-group Analysis Perceived Fit 145
Table 5.28 – Measures of Fit – Awareness of the Sponsorship 146
Table 5.29 – Regression Coefficients –Awareness of the Sponsorship 147
Table 5.30 – Measures of Fit – Multi-group Analysis Frequency of Purchase 148
Table 5.31 – Regression Coefficients – Frequency of Purchase 149
Table 5.32 – Moderating Hypotheses – Respondent Characteristics151
Table 5.33 – Results of Hypotheses Tests 1 - 8153
Table 6.1 -Results of Hypotheses Tests 1 - 8

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 – Outline of the Thesis
Figure 2.1 – Literature Review Sequence 12
Figure 2.2 – Model Sponsorship Linked Marketing Communications 24
Figure 2.3 – Preliminary Model - Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP 46
Figure 3.1 – Chapter Outline 49
Figure 3.2 – Revised Research Model for Study 2
Figure 4.1 – Chapter Outline
Figure 5.1 – Chapter Outline 105
Figure 5.2 – Conceptual Model - Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP. 106
Figure 5.3 – Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP 139
Figure 5.4 – Final Model of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP 152
Figure 6.1 – Chapter Outline

Publications Produced in Conjunction With This Thesis

Woodside, F, Summers J, and Johnson Morgan M, 2006, 'Sponsorship of Fast Moving Consumer Goods – Does packaging endorsement contribute to brand attitude? A conceptual paper' International Business Trends: Contemporary Readings, Sam Fullerton and David L. Moore, editors, The Academy of Business Administration: Ypsilanti, MI, 2006, pp213 – 221.

Woodside, F, Summers J, and Johnson Morgan M, 2006, 'The Effect of Sponsorship Endorsed Packaging on Consumer Attitudes: a conceptual enquiry' Proceedings of 2006 ANZMAC Conference (1 – 3 December) Brisbane QLD.

Woodside, F, Summers, J and Johnson Morgan, M 2007, 'Sponsorship leveraging improves consumer attitudes and purchase intentions towards the sponsoring brand – but is it relevant for FMCG packaging?' Proceedings of 2007 ANZMAC Conference (3-5 December), Dunedin, New Zealand. ** Awarded Best Paper in IMC track

Woodside, F, & Summers, J 2008 'Packaging Exploitation In Fast Moving Consumer Goods: Consumer Processing Of Sponsorship Messages', Proceedings of 2008 Global Marketing Conference, Shanghai (March).

Woodside, F, & Summers, J 2008 Sponsorship logos on FMCG packaging – what factors impact effectiveness? Proceedings of 2008 ANZAM Conference, (4-6 December), Auckland, New Zealand.

Woodside, F, & Summers, J 2009, Consumer Awareness of Sponsorship – a FMCG context' Proceedings of 2009 ANZMAC Conference (1-3 December), Melbourne VIC.

Woodside, F, & Summers, J, Consumer Awareness of Sponsorship – a FMCG context, Journal of Marketing Communication, [paper accepted October 2009 - publication date to be advised]

Acknowledgements

This is an excellent opportunity to express my admiration and appreciation to all those who have greatly assisted me in this work. Firstly, to my husband Malcolm for his encouragement, assistance and patience, you have made a challenging time more bearable. To my helpful and supportive children Tiffany, James, Jeremy, Bronson and Natasha, thanks everyone.

My supervisor, Associate Professor, Dr Jane Summers provided invaluable, guidance, constructive feedback and encouraging support throughout my research program, thank you for your expertise and understanding, Jane. I would also like show my appreciation to my associate supervisor, Dr Melissa Johnson Morgan. Thanks for your sincere friendship, Melissa. I value greatly the tremendous assistance you have given by being there and cheering me on.

To my friends and marketing colleagues: Jason, Eric, Tiana, and Dawn, your care and encouragement, sympathetic ear and humorous adages made the hard work seem like fun (almost). To my parents, thank you Mum and Dad, for your prayers and support, and for teaching me by example, to do whatever I do, with wholehearted dedication and determination.

Finally, thank you to my Lord and Heavenly Father, for granting me wisdom to understand what I was doing and inspiration to make this thesis happen. Without God's grace, patience and longsuffering, I would not have succeeded in this often challenging, frequently frustrating but greatly rewarding adventure.

1 Introduction

This chapter provides an introduction to sponsorship leveraged packaging and outlines the theoretical framework for the research program. The purpose for the research and the specific objectives are then discussed. The three-stage program of research, which includes both qualitative and quantitative studies, is summarised and finally, the structure of the six chapters of the thesis is described.

1.1 Sponsorship as a Marketing Communications Tool: an Overview

In the last decade, sponsorship has become a mainstream marketing communications tool with worldwide sponsorship spending reaching US\$43 billion (IEG 2009). With large corporations such as Coca-Cola allocating over US\$230 million to sponsorship (IEG 2007), sponsorship has become a critical strategic tool, with the potential to generate a sustainable competitive advantage in the marketplace.

Investment in global sponsorship spending has been increasing in the last 10 years (Alexandris et al. 2008) and continues to show impressive growth (Fenton 2009). Consequently, the rapid growth of corporate sponsorship has led to the emergence of 'sponsorship clutter' reflecting the intense competition for sponsorship (Fahy et al. 2004). As the market for sponsorship becomes intensely competitive and challenging, it is essential that sponsorship investments be carefully managed to ensure their effectiveness.

Calls for better measurement in sponsorship research have been made for some years, particularly in considering the impact of sponsorship and consumer behaviour (Ali et al. 2006). One of the most needed areas of research concerns spending that occurs in addition to the sponsorship contract known as sponsorship leveraging (Cornwell 2008). While understanding of sponsorship in general is growing, very little research has attempted to address the integrative effects of sponsorship in combination with leveraging (Cornwell 2008). This is particularly important as sponsorship effectiveness has been shown to be directly related to the degree to which sponsors leverage their investment (Quester & Thompson 2001; Fahy et al. 2004; Grohs et al. 2004).

One particular type of sponsorship leveraging widely used in the Australian Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) Industry is sponsorship leveraged packaging (SLP). SLP involves depicting the sponsored property's image, logos or symbols on the sponsoring brand's packaging. Examples in the Australian FMCG Industry include: Weetbix and the sponsorship of Kids Triathlon; Arnotts Tim Tams and the sponsorship of National Breast Cancer Foundation; and Powerade and the sponsorship of the Wallabies Rugby Union Team. SLP capitalizes on the benefits of packaging and the commercial potential of sponsorship investment to *communicate sponsorship arrangements to consumers*.

Some researchers suggest that sponsorship is particularly suitable for low involvement products such as FMCG (Lee 2005; Gwinner 1997; McDaniel 1999). Given that low involvement purchase decisions require consumers to choose between brands that have many common characteristics, sponsorship's effects may provide a stronger point of differentiation. However, most sponsorship research has examined high-involvement product categories (e.g. banking; motor vehicles) where evidence suggests that it is more difficult to change consumers' attitudes and behaviour (Lee 2005). Therefore, this research will contribute to the understanding of sponsorship particular in a FMCG context.

In addition to the suggested appropriateness of sponsorship for FMCG, packaging has also been suggested as an extremely powerful and unique marketing tool. For low involvement consumer products, such as FMCG, packaging has been shown to be a critical stimulus to the creation and communication of brand identity and communicating brand meaning and strengthening the consumer-brand relationship (Underwood 2003). In recent years, packaging has developed well beyond its original function as merely a means of product protection and now plays a key marketing role in developing on shelf appeal by providing product information and in establishing brand image and awareness.

Given that both sponsorship and packaging play significant roles in developing brand image and awareness, it seems logical that they would complement each other in a marketing strategy such as sponsorship leveraged packaging. Indeed, the synergy created by integrating elements of the promotions mix is considered to be a crucial component of an effective IMC strategy (Sneath et al. 2005; Belch & Belch 2009). What is not known is whether leveraging sponsorship through packaging contributes to strengthening the consumer-brand relationship in this FMCG context. This lack of understanding makes management decisions about whether and how much to invest in sponsorship leveraged packaging all the more challenging. This research seeks to overcome this dearth in knowledge by examining consumers' reactions to sponsorship messages on packaging in general and then extends this contribution by examining sponsorship in a FMCG context.

1.2 Purpose of the Research

As indicated, despite the widespread use of SLP by FMCG organisations, little empirical research exists to explain its impact on consumers' behaviour towards the sponsors and their products. In addition, little research exists that explains the factors that impact consumer response to SLP, or the relationship between these factors. This program of research will address these gaps in the known body of literature relating to sponsorship, packaging and marketing communications by empirically investigating the factors that impact consumer response to SLP in FMCG markets. Therefore, the following question will be answered: "What factors impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging in FMCG markets?"

In order to answer this research question, this program of research will develop and test a model of factors that impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. Following on, two specific research objectives to be addressed in this program of research are:

- 1. to determine the factors that impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging in a FMCG context
- 2. to develop and test a structural model that describes the network of relations among these variables.

1.3 Justification for the Research

This research has both academic and practitioner value. Firstly, in terms of the academic contributions of the research, it will contribute to a greater understanding of consumer behaviour relating to sponsorship and particularly in a FMCG context. Secondly, in terms of its contributions to marketing practice the research will provide

a theoretical framework for sponsorship leveraged packaging decisions. Each contribution is now examined in more detail.

1.3.1 Academic Contributions

This research will make two contributions to the literature on consumer behaviour relating to sponsorship. Firstly, this study brings together areas of study not normally considered: sponsorship and packaging, for a marketing strategy that is commonly used in practice, yet has received little empirical attention. As little research has attempted to address the combined effects of sponsorship and packaging, this research combines these areas into a broader framework demonstrating how components of sponsorship and packaging interrelate.

This study will provide understanding of SLP and will assess the relationships among the key variables impacting consumer response to sponsorship: sponsored property identification; sponsor brand loyalty; and perceived fit. This information is important because it contributes to our understanding of the role packaging plays in communicating sponsorship arrangement.

Second, whilst previous research has advanced our understanding of factors that impact consumer response to sponsorship, this study will explain those factors in a new context: that of sponsorship leveraged packaging in FMCG. This is important given the nature of low involvement decision making where little cognitive effort is expended in purchase decisions.

This research will determine whether leveraging sponsorship through packaging has the capacity to influence purchase decisions (as the hierarchy of effects suggests), or whether it acts mainly by reinforcing existing brand attitudes (as the ATR model suggests). This research will provide answers as to what outcomes SLP has the capacity to impact, be it attitude, trial intention or purchase intentions. Such knowledge will not only help generate academic research and discourse, but will also assist sponsors and properties, to fully realise the business opportunities from sponsorship leveraged packaging.

1.3.2 Contributions to Practice

This research program will make two major contributions to the practice of sponsorship marketing. Firstly, this study provides a valid and empirically tested structural model for describing consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. The structural model explains the factors that impact consumer response to SLP i.e. sponsored property identification, sponsoring brand loyalty and perceived fit. Furthermore, the model explains the relationships between those factors and the mediating relationship of perceived fit. In addition, the final model explains the moderating factors of type of sponsorship, frequency of purchase of the sponsoring brand, awareness of the sponsorship arrangement and respondent characteristics.

Secondly, this study provides a robust and more detailed understanding of consumer response to sponsorship. Given the current trend for large sponsorship investments, it is becoming increasingly important for organisations to establish how consumers are affected by SLP. The findings from this study will inform management decisions in relation to sponsorship arrangements through packaging.

This study will provide understanding on two key elements of the sponsorship management process: (1) the sponsorship selection decision; and (2) the development of the sponsor leveraging strategy. This information will allow marketers to design their strategies and tactics more effectively in order to justify continued spending on sponsorship leveraging and to differentiate their competitive offerings. A further contribution this study will make is the identification of the role of sponsoring brand loyalty in consumer response to SLP and how this can be best utilised to improve sponsorship effectiveness.

1.4 Methodology

This program of research was conducted in three stages. Stage one, consisted of secondary research, namely a review of the literature and then development of an appropriate research design to answer the propositions. Stage two, consisted of Study 1, an exploratory phase designed to investigate in more detail the constructs to be used in Study 2. Study 1 was designed to enrich the current knowledge about the constructs of consumer response to sponsorship and the factors impacting that response. This study also aimed to explore the relationships between these

constructs, allowing the researcher to propose a number of specific hypotheses, which could then be tested in Study 2.

The final stage, Study 2 an experimental survey, was then designed to test the full conceptual model, which attempted to describe the factors impacting consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. It specifically included the constructs of Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsoring Brand Loyalty, Perceived Fit and Consumer Response SLP. The three stages combined both qualitative and quantitative methods. Each stage will now be presented in more detail with a summary of the program of research provided in table 1.1.

	Research Method	Sample	Data	Objective
Stage 1	Literature Review	N/A	Secondary	review of the literature and then development of an appropriate research design to answer the propositions
Stage 2	Study 1 – Exploratory Focus Groups, Depth interviews Qualitative survey	46	Qualitative	Explore consumers' responses about sponsorship packaging and the factors that impact that response
Stage 3	Study 2 – Explanatory Experiment survey	256	Quantitative	Test conceptual models, validate final measurement scales, answer hypotheses

Table 1.1 – Summary of Research Program

1.4.1 Stage One: Literature Review and Research Design.

This stage of the research included a review of the literature of the parent and sub disciplines identified by the research purpose (Chapter 2). From this, an integrated two step methodology was developed to address the research question and propositions, together with an initial conceptual model of the constructs being examined. To gain insights into sponsorship leveraged packaging, to check for completeness of the conceptual framework and to inform the process for measurement development, both exploratory and explanatory research was needed (Zikmund 2003). This research required qualitative research to better examine and define the problem and quantitative research to provide empirical evidence of the relationships involved in this phenomenon. Study 1 will now be explained in detail.

1.4.2 Stage Two: Study 1

The first study was qualitative in nature and was used to explore the constructs impacting consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging, sponsored property identification, brand experience and perceived fit. Two focus groups, eight depth interviews and twenty-six qualitative surveys were conducted. In the course of these discussions, the existence and the role of SLP were explored and a number of dimensions of consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging that were not specifically captured in the original conceptual model were identified.

As a result, several new items were recommended for inclusion into the model, which was to be tested in Study 2. The results of Study 1 were used to assist the development of specific hypotheses and the conceptual model developed at the end of Chapter 2 was reviewed and updated. The objectives of the study were to: inform the theory generation process, to assist in the identification of constructs and the development and purification of measures. This study is explained in Chapter 3.

1.4.3 Stage 3: Study 2

The second study was quantitative in nature and involved experimental research to test the final empirical model. The study focused on examining the hypothesized relationships between the constructs of consumer response to SLP, sponsored property identification, sponsoring brand loyalty, and perceived fit.

The experiment took the form of a four group after only with control design with one experimental condition, sponsorship type. The four groups can be represented as:

- 1 brand A with sponsorship (sport)
- 2 brand A without sponsorship (control)
- 3 brand B with sponsorship (cause)
- 4 brand B without sponsorship (control)

The experiment method was a self-administered survey using real world examples of SLP packaging and non-SLP packaging currently or recently available in the Australian FMCG market. In order to apply the experimental condition, four survey instruments were developed, each one including a different representation of a FMCG package: brand A with sponsorship; brand A without sponsorship (control);

brand B with sponsorship; and brand B without sponsorship (control). This research design has the advantages of randomization of participants and test conditions and ability to control for sources of error in the experiment. In addition, this method allows the researcher to isolate the effects of sponsorship from the effects of other promotional activities as much as possible. This study is discussed in Chapter 4.

1.4.4 Research Paradigm and Methodology

The proposed program of research was based on the post-positivist paradigm (also known as critical realism). This paradigm allows for the existence of an external reality that is not known completely and it allows for the integration of both qualitative and quantitative studies in the research program. The justification for this paradigm and choice of research design follows.

The purpose of this research (as outlined in section 1.2) was to gain a better understanding of the marketing tool 'sponsorship leveraged packaging' and how that marketing tool impacts consumer response. Therefore, to gain insights into sponsorship leveraged packaging, to check for completeness of the conceptual framework and to inform the process for measurement development, both exploratory and explanatory research was needed (Zikmund 2003).

Given the lack of available literature that explains how sponsorship leveraged packaging works; an exploratory approach was needed to provide a rich understanding of the consumer behaviour associated with SLP. Exploratory research is generally qualitative in nature and uses methods such as focus groups and depth interviews (Aaker et al. 2007). Further, as exploratory approaches are often followed by more conclusive research, the research problem suggests that explanatory research was necessary to establish whether there is a relationship between consumer response to SLP and the factors highlighted in the exploratory research as impacting that response. Explanatory research typically is quantitative in nature and involves experiment methodologies.

Research methodology literature gives considerable support for the efficacy of combining both qualitative and quantitative research, called pluralistic research (Burns & Bush 1998). Pluralistic research combines the advantages of both

qualitative research and quantitative research, and is becoming increasingly popular, especially with complex marketing issues (Burns & Bush 1998). Given that the post positivist paradigm allows for the integration of both qualitative and quantitative studies in the research program, this research follows a post positivist paradigm.

The fundamental nature of the post positivist paradigm is that reality is "real" but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehensible, suggesting that although the answers found in this research point in some respect to reality, the research may not uncover 'all' that is to be known about Consumer Response to SLP and the factors that impact it. This fallibility is addressed in two ways. Firstly, the data are triangulated across multiple sources including literature, and Studies 1 and 2. Secondly, structural equation modeling allows an attempt at generalising to a population while allowing for measurement error (Perry et al. 1998; Aaker et al. 2007). To this effect, structural equation modeling considers complex interdependencies while using multi-item scales to measure latent, unobservable variables (Godfrey & Hill 1995). Theory construction is discussed in Chapter 3.

1.5 Delimitations of Scope and Definitions

This research will operate within the following parameters. Firstly, the sample for the quantitative stage Study 2 was drawn from the general population of all household shoppers in Australia. As this study focused on consumer purchase behaviour, the sample was limited to those people who were regularly responsible for the main household shopping. Secondly, this research considers sponsorship leveraged packaging in a FMCG context. Given the unique nature of this type of product, it will not be possible to apply the conclusions of the study to a high involvement product.

Thirdly, although the study considers sponsorship leveraged packaging in a FMCG context, the packaging examples chosen for the experiment questionnaire were from the breakfast cereal category as this is where this marketing tactic is applied most often. This sampling decision will limit the capacity to generalize the findings of this study to other low involvement categories. However, as 80% of Australians adults and 90% of children consume breakfast cereals (Woods & Walker 2007), a logical conclusion from this, is that the majority of households purchase breakfast cereals.

Furthermore, given that the breakfast cereal market contributes \$894 million to the Australian FMCG industry (Woods & Walker 2007), investigation of the impact of SLP on consumer behaviour is warranted.

With regard to defining common terms used in this research, two concepts will be defined here, sponsorship and sponsorship leveraged packaging, commencing with sponsorship. There is general consensus among scholars that sponsorship involves two principal activities. These are: (1) an exchange between sponsor and property, whereby the property receives compensation and the sponsor obtains the right to associate itself with the property; and (2) the sponsor leverages the association by developing marketing activities to communicate the sponsorship (Cornwell & Maignan 1998). With the intention of incorporating both these principal activities, sponsorship will be defined for the purposes of this study as, 'the provision of financial support to a property to allow it to pursue its activities thereby creating opportunities for the sponsor to market the sponsorship association to achieve corporate and marketing objectives' (developed from D'Astous & Bitz 1995). The definition of sponsorship is discussed in section 2.3.2.

Secondly, sponsorship leveraged packaging (SLP) involves depicting the sponsored property's image, logos or symbols on the sponsoring brand's packaging. SLP involves two main parties: the sponsoring brand and the sponsored property. In the sponsorship literature, the sponsoring brand is sometimes referred to as the sponsor and the sponsored property, the sponsee. For the purposes of this research, the term 'sponsoring brand' is used to represent the party providing financial assistance (e.g. Weetbix); and the term 'sponsored property' is used to represent the party being supported be it a sport, event, cause or arts activity (e.g. Kids Triathlon). Whilst both sets of terms are commonly used in the literature, this stance was taken in order to avoid confusion given the similarity between the terms of sponsor/sponsee.

1.6 Outline of the Thesis

This thesis is presented in 6 chapters. Figure 1.1 presents an overview of the structure. Chapters 1 and 2 represent stage 1 of the research and provide an outline of the research, identifying the key literature that was used to guide the research. Chapter 3 represents stage two of the research and reports the methodology and

results of the exploratory research Study 1. Chapter 4 presents the methodology used in the main study of the research (Study 2). Chapter 5 presents the results of Study 2. Finally, Chapter 6 draws conclusions from the entire research process and discusses these in terms of their academic and practical contributions. This chapter also highlights implications for future research and limitations.



Figure 1.1 – Outline of the Thesis

1.7 Conclusion

This chapter has laid the foundation for the thesis. It has presented the research purpose and the research objectives. Justification for the research was provided and a brief outline of the methodology and layout of the thesis were given. The delimitations of the research were outlined to ensure that the reader understands the parameters of the work and can view its contribution within these confines. The next chapter will present the key literature, which guided the research program.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will justify and detail the theoretical foundation for this study. This first part of Chapter 2 situates the emerging area of sponsorship within the parent discipline of marketing communications. This is followed by a review of the sponsorship literature, specifically focusing on definitions of sponsorship and its application. The third part of this chapter will then examine the role of sponsorship leveraging and the general body of literature relating to sponsorship effects on consumer behaviour. The chapter will conclude with a proposed theoretical model of factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP, which will address the research question "What factors impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging in FMCG markets?" to be addressed.

Figure 2.1 – Literature Review Sequence



2.2 Marketing Communications

Marketing communications is the most visible and prominent component of the marketing mix (De Pelsmacker et al. 2007). Marketing communications are the attempts of marketing firms or management groups to "inform, persuade, incite, and remind customers, directly or indirectly, about the brands they sell" (Keller 2001, p. 819). The significance of marketing communications has increased in recent years due to the increased demand by consumers for product quality and choice, increased media fragmentation, the focus on reinforcing consumer loyalty and the emphasis on building and increasing a brand's image-based equity (Kitchen 2004).

Marketing communications allow companies to communicate with their target groups and stakeholders through a variety of tools categorized into four broad areas: advertising; public relations; sales promotions; and personal selling. In order to see the different roles and abilities of each element in the marketing communications mix, a brief overview of each one is now provided, commencing with advertising.

Advertising has been hailed as one of the oldest, most visible and most important instruments of the marketing communications mix. Advertising is any non-personal mass communication using mass media, where the content is determined and paid for by a clearly identified company (Pickton & Broderick 2005). It is capable of reaching large audiences and is effective and cost efficient at: achieving high levels of awareness; creating brand differentiation; informing and reminding; and in time, developing and maintaining brands (Pickton & Broderick 2005).

Advertising has the ability to reach mass audiences, selectively if required, in a cost effective and efficient manner. However, despite these advantages, advertising in recent decades has seen a decline in effectiveness as a result of changing technology, economics and consumer lifestyles (Cornwell 2008). In particular, increasing advertising clutter is one of the greatest concerns facing the advertising industry (Danaher et al. 2008). While advertising still remains a vital tool, it is increasingly becoming one element among equals in the promotion mix (Gilbert 2005). Sales Promotion is the next element in the promotion mix that is discussed.

Sales promotions, another form of marketing communications, are generally designed to stimulate short-term sales. Sales promotions are marketing communications activities that offer an incentive to consumers to buy a brand where the incentive temporarily changes its perceived price or value (Shimp 2000). Sales promotions include a vast array of tools including: sampling, coupons, merchandising, loyalty schemes and contests. Sales promotions are prolific in consumer markets as customers have come to expect them as part of the marketing communications effort. At the same time, consumers have become more price aware and price sensitive, creating a greater role for sales promotions featuring price incentives. As a result, the strength of sales promotion is in its impact on purchase behaviour, particularly the direct and immediate effect on sales and profits (Pickton & Broderick 2005).

Despite the capabilities of sales promotion, the impact on consumers may only be temporary as consumers are also becoming less brand loyal and displaying brandswitching behaviour (Pickton & Broderick 2005). This is particularly true in the FMCG market. Some authors advocate that in these markets, because involvement is relatively low and distinctions between brands are becoming fewer, consumers purchase on a portfolio basis as the norm rather than display single brand loyalty (Ehrenberg, 1988; Uncles et al, 1995; Kennedy and Ehrenberg 2000). What is important to note here is that, whilst sales promotion is capable of creating positive short term impacts on sales and profits, the benefits gained from it may be transitory and may in some cases be detrimental to long term brand equity. The third element in the marketing communications mix is personal selling and this is discussed next.

Personal selling is a face-to-face communication method used to inform, demonstrate, persuade, or develop a relationship with members of a target audience (De Pelsmacker et al. 2007). Personal selling differs from the other one-way communication elements in that it offers two-way communication with the prospective customer. Personal selling techniques include: trade selling; retail selling; business-to business selling; professional selling and direct selling (Blythe 2003). Personal selling can help build consumer trust and satisfaction through its ability to gain knowledge of current and future customer needs, and provide customer-oriented solutions. Although personal selling is an important element of the communications mix, given its focus on face-to-face contact with consumers, it is

outside the scope of this research and will not be considered in any more depth. However, the fourth element in the marketing mix, public relations focuses on the management of communication between an organisation and its publics and is thus more closely aligned with sponsorship. Public relations then requires closer examination particularly in regard to its role in marketing communications and its capacity to impact consumer behaviour.

Public relations plays a vital role in promoting the goodwill of the firm. Essentially, public relations is the planned and sustained effort to establish and maintain good relationships, mutual understanding, sympathy and goodwill with a firm's publics (De Pelsmacker et al. 2007). Public relations may be used to achieve a number of objectives, including: creation and maintenance of corporate identity and image; improving the company's standing as a good corporate citizen; maintaining good relations with media; attendance at trade exhibits and managing internal communications. In comparison to advertising, public relations has the advantages of relatively low cost, extensive visibility and most importantly, higher credibility (Pickton & Broderick 2005).

A number of important changes and potentially detrimental trends have created a need and urgency to improve effectiveness of marketing communications. Firstly, there is a widespread belief that mass media communications are becoming increasingly cluttered (Lacey et al. 2007; Cornwell 2008; Smith et al. 2008). Secondly, this increased communications clutter has led to advertising avoidance behaviour where traditional, impersonalised media is less and less capable of attracting attention let alone impacting consumer behaviour (Pickton & Broderick 2005; Mason & Cochetel 2006; Lacey et al. 2007). These long terms changes in the marketing environment have seen a corresponding growth of non-traditional forms of marketing and viral marketing. In order to understand where sponsorship fits into the marketing communications mix, the following section outlines its key benefits and the main difference between it and the other marketing communications tools.

2.3 Sponsorship

Sponsorship is a promotional activity that plays an important role in supporting an organisation's attainment of communication objectives (Seguin 2007). One of the most important goals of sponsorship is to develop an association between sponsors and sponsored properties (Ko et al. 2008). Its premise is that the sponsor's name, brand or products will benefit from the successful association with a property, be it a sport, an event, the arts or cause related activities (Fleck & Quester 2007).

Throughout the last two decades, sponsorship has outperformed other marketing communication tools in terms of growth in many international markets, with worldwide sponsorship spending reaching \$43 billion (IEG 2009). Sponsorship growth has been attributed to factors such as: persistent clutter of print and electronic media; concerns about effectiveness of traditional media; increased popularity and commercialisation of events; and an increase in the understanding and practice of relationship marketing (Quester & Thompson 2001; Cornwell 2008; Dardis 2009).

These factors have mitigated the more widespread use and intensity of sponsorship with many organizations associating themselves with key image-building events or sports that are complementary to their own positioning (Fahy et al. 2004). Additionally, sponsorship users have found that through sponsorship they can achieve new levels of exposure at lower cost than through traditional advertising methods (Lyberger & McCarthy 2001). Sponsorship is suggested to have the power to escape the advertising clutter and to create differentiation (De Pelsmacker et al. 2007).

However, the rapid growth of corporate sponsorship has led to the emergence of 'sponsorship clutter' reflecting the intense competition for sponsorship of certain properties (Fahy et al. 2004). Sponsorship clutter can occur when events have a large number of official sponsors, which limits the value of the marketing tool for potential sponsors. A prime example of this is the reduction in the number of top level sponsors for the FIFA 2010 World Cup from 15 to 6 with a view to making each of the sponsorships more valuable (Fullerton 2010). It can be seen that sponsorship has progressed over time to become a key component of many companies IMC mix. In order to establish a foundation for this research, the next section discusses the definition of sponsorship.

2.3.1 Sponsorship Defined

The increased attention attracted by sponsorship has not been limited to commercial applicability. There has also been a corresponding interest in sponsorship by academic scholars, with all taking the view that sponsorship is a distinct promotional activity within the marketing communications activity of organisations (e.g. Roy & Cornwell 2004; Cornwell et al. 2005; Cornwell et al. 2006; Tripodi 2001). Within this research stream there have been a number of differing definitions of what sponsorship is. Table 2.1 provides a summary of the principal and most often cited scholars and their perspective on a definition of scholarship.

Author/Year	Definition	Emphasis
Meenaghan 1983	The provision of assistance either financial or in-kind to an activity e.g. sport, musical event, festival, fair, or within the broad definition of the Arts by a commercial organization for the purpose of achieving commercial objectives.	Reflects phasing out of the donation mentality and its replacement by economic- based sponsorship arrangements.
Sandler & Shani 1989	The provision of resources by an organization directly to an event or activity in exchange for a direct association of the event or activity.	Reciprocal agreement where the property obtains funds and sponsor obtains right to associate itself with sponsored property.
D'Astous & Bitz 1995	An element of the communication mix where a firm provides some financial support to an entity, which may be an individual (e.g. sports), an organization (e.g. a humane society) or a group (e.g. an orchestra), in order to allow this entity to pursue its activities (e.g. a cultural event) and, at the same time, benefit from this association in terms of image and awareness of the firm's offerings.	Reciprocal agreement where the property obtains funds and sponsor obtains right to associate itself with sponsored property through marketing.
Cornwell & Maignan 1998	Sponsorship involves two activities (1) an exchange between a sponsor and a sponsee whereby the latter receives a fee and the former obtains the right to associate itself with the activity sponsored and (2) the marketing of the association by the sponsor.	Reciprocal agreement where the property obtains funds and sponsor obtains right to associate itself with sponsored property through marketing. Indicates both activities are necessary if the sponsorship fee is to be a meaningful investment.
International Events Group 1999	A cash and/or in-kind fee paid to a property (typically a sports, entertainment, non-profit event or organization) in return for access to the exploitable commercial potential associated with that property	Reciprocal agreement where the property obtains funds and sponsor obtains right to associate itself with sponsored property through marketing.

 Table 2.1 – Definitions of Sponsorship

Author/Year	Definition	Emphasis
Thompson 2005	Sponsorship involves a relationship or exchange between two entities, which differs from other business- to-business relationships in that the elements of the exchange are not always definite. At one extreme, sponsorship may be equated with patronage (Calderon- Martinez et al. 2005), while at the other extreme may involve a joint sharing of resources between two entities with no clear-ct donor- recipient roles specified.	Reflects movement away from donor-recipient position, towards a – relationship-oriented position, where mutual sharing of relative expertise and resources is becoming the norm (Harvey 2001)
Farrelly & Quester 2003, 2005, Farrelly, Quester & Burton, 2006	A form of exchange between a sponsor and sponsored organisation, with both parties seeking to achieve their own strategic goals. Sponsors and sponsored organisations engage in a business relationship where both parties invest time and efforts to achieve predetermined and mutually beneficial goals. Involves multiple stakeholders (e.g. sponsor, sponsored organisation, consumers, fans, media), multiple objectives, and potentially, different views of what constitutes sponsorship value.	Applies a relationship focus to clarify the dimensions of the exchange, as well as key roles and responsibilities of the relationship partners.
Olkkonen & Tuominen 2006	A mutually beneficial business relationship between the sponsor and the sponsee. The sponsors benefit through two main dimensions: sponsorship objectives connected to a product or corporate image and awareness of the product or firm; and secondly, stakeholder relationships may also be established and developed. The benefits for the sponsored organisation usually come in the form of financial resources, products, services and know-how.	Reflects emerging perspective that builds on the exchange process, to incorporate relationship considerations.

(Source: developed for this study)

As this table shows, some definitions emphasize the exploitable commercial potential of sponsorship (e.g. Meenaghan 1983), and others stress the importance of exchange theory in sponsorship (e.g. Sandler & Shanni 1989). Still more recent focus has been on the stakeholder relationships and relationship quality (Farrelly & Quester 2003, 2005; Farrelly, Quester & Burton 2006; Olkkonen & Tuominen 2006). Regardless of whose approach is used, there is consensus among all these scholars that sponsorship involves two principal activities. These are: (1) an exchange between sponsor and property, whereby the property receives compensation (i.e. a rights fee) and the sponsor obtains the right to associate itself with the property; and (2) the sponsor leverages the association by developing marketing activities to communicate the sponsorship (Cornwell and Maignan 1998).

With the intention of incorporating both these principal activities, sponsorship will be defined for the purposes of this study as, 'the provision of financial support to a property to allow it to pursue its activities thereby creating opportunities for the sponsor to market the sponsorship association to achieve corporate and marketing

objectives' (developed from D'Astous & Bitz 1995). This definition reflects the two principles previously mentioned, in that sponsorship agreements can benefit both the sponsored property and the sponsoring brand and the sponsorship association can (and should) be leveraged through marketing communications. Thus, sponsorship provides the sponsoring company with opportunities for additional advertising and publicity to create brand awareness and influence consumer attitudes and purchase behaviours by aligning with properties or products to enhance competitive advantage (Nicholls & Roslow 1999; Pitts & Stotlar 2002).

Despite general agreement among scholars on the broad principals involved in sponsorship, some confusion remains about the distinction between sponsorship and other forms of promotional communications, especially advertising, event marketing and cause related marketing. The distinctions between sponsorship and these other forms of promotional communications are discussed next.

It is common in the literature for sponsorship to be considered merely a form of advertising (Tripodi 2001). This view can be supported by the fact that some forms of sponsorship share similar goals to advertising (i.e. increasing brand or company awareness and image). However, in spite of this, the main distinguishing factor between sponsorship and advertising is the goodwill or positive association of consumers to the company due to the support of a favoured property. Consumers look on sponsorship communications in a halo of goodwill, generated by the perception of benefit to society in general, the subtlety of the message and the disguised commercial intent of the communication (Meenaghan 2001). This is in contrast to advertising, which is received in skepticism and suspicion driven by factors such as the forceful nature of the communication; the obvious commercial intent and consumer beliefs about advertisers' motivation. Additionally, advertising is associated with directly influencing consumer perception (Crimmins & Horn 1996), whereas sponsorship is often seen as indirectly influencing consumer perceptions of the brand. This is due to the fact that some sponsorship materials (e.g. arena signage, public banners) are not capable of communicating much, if any information about product attributes (McDaniel 1999). These contrasts then provide strength to the conclusion that sponsorship should not be considered a form of advertising (McDonald 1991; Meenaghan 1991, 1998).

Similarly, researchers have also attempted to clarify the distinction between sponsorship and event marketing (i.e. the integration of the marking mix elements around an event) (Cunningham et al. 1993, p. 408). Event marketing may indeed involve sponsorship, but only when the event's organisers sell sponsorship rights in exchange for a fee, and when the sponsorships are exploited in the sponsors' promotions (Cornwell & Maignan 1998). Thus, event marketing can and often does incorporate sponsorship, but does not always necessarily do so. Similarly, sponsorship can and often is applied independently of an event. Thus, sponsorship should also be viewed as an independent activity to event marketing.

Another area often used interchangeably with sponsorship is Cause Related Marketing (CRM). However, sponsorship and CRM are distinctly different activities that have been investigated and researched separately in the past (Polonsky & Speed 2000). CRM involves a 'sponsor' acquiring and leveraging the right to be associated with a cause. This activity differs from pure sponsorship in that it is generally characterized by an offer from the sponsor to contribute a specified amount to the cause when a sale is made (Varadarajan & Menon 1998) (e.g. 5 cents will be donated to the cause per returned proof of purchase). In particular, CRM programs involve specified customer revenue based on sales: whereas with sponsorship, the contribution to the property precedes the generation of sales revenue and is made in anticipation of an outcome. Therefore, CRM and sponsorship should be researched as separate marketing strategies (Cornwell & Maignan 1998; Polonsky & Speed 2000). (For a fuller explanation of CRM see Polonsky & Speed 2000.)

In summary, although sponsorship is often used in conjunction with, and shares some similar components and marketing goals to CRM, advertising and event marketing, there is sufficient theoretical evidence for it to be considered as a distinct and separate marketing activity to these marketing strategies and as a separate theoretical domain for research purposes (Seguin 2007; De Pelsmacker 2007). Overall, the lack of consensus as to what sponsorship encompasses points to the need for further research regarding sponsorship and its role within the communication mix; a call that this program of research will take up. In order to understand how sponsorship is used, the various types of sponsorship are now briefly explained.

2.3.2 Sponsorship Types

The low cost to the sponsored property that is characteristic of sponsorship arrangements, has seen it extensively used by a number of different non-profit groups to extend marketing reach and to raise investment capital. Most notably are groups such as the arts, sports, causes and events. With this type of sponsorship use there has also been considerable investigation into the viability and impact of these sponsorship investments.

Sponsorship investment has been historically directed toward sports with US spending reaching US\$11.4 billion (66%) in 2008 (IEG 2009). This is primarily because of sport's flexibility as a communication vehicle and because of the opportunity it affords for association with increasingly commercial sport and sports heroes (Meenaghan 1991). The second largest investment is in sponsorship of the arts (US\$827 million 2008), which although it has attracted little research attention, its contribution to sponsorship investment is growing (Poon & Prendergast 2003; Quester & Thompson 2001). Cause sponsorship has also grown significantly in recent decades, with US spending reaching US\$1.52 billion (IEG 2009). Although it accounts for a significant proportion of sponsorship investment, cause related sponsorship research is sparse (yet considerable research exists in the CRM domain).

Table 2.2 highlights the main research conducted into these various aspects of sponsorship and also indicates the contribution of each type to total US spending on promotional activity. The table shows that sports groups are most likely to use sponsorship with current spending estimates highlighting that USA sports properties contribute 69 percent of all sponsorship investments (IEG 2009). It can be seen that sponsorship is a flexible communications tool that can be used in a variety of ways, and has been extensively used in relation to sport, the arts and causes. Having briefly explained what sponsorship is and what it encompasses, the next section outlines 'how' sponsorship works.

Type	Author/ Year (Activity)	Proportion of US spending	
Sports	Crimmins & Horn 1996; Meenaghan 1991;	69% US\$11.4 billion	
	Cornwell et al. 2001;Stipp 1998; Witcher et al.		
	1991; Lordinoit & Quester 2001; Thwaites et al.		
	1998; Grimes & Meenaghan 1998; Madrigal		
	2000; Gwinner & Eaton 1999; Dean (1999)		
Causes	Dean 2002 (social cause – special Olympics); 11% US\$1.52 billion		
	Irwin, Lachowetz, Cornwell & Clark 2003,		
	Varadarajan & Menon 1988; Arnott 1994		
Tours/attractions	Ruth & Simonin 2003 (parade)	10% US\$1.3 billion	
Arts	Thompson 2001, Thompson 2004; Quester &	6% US\$827 million	
	Thompson 2001 (festival), Farrelly & Quester		
	1997, Gross et al. 1987, Poon 2003		
Festivals, fairs,		5% US\$773 million	
annual events			
Associations,		3% US\$482 million	
membership			

Table 2.2 – Types of Sponsorship

(Source: developed for this study - spending figures based on IEG 2009)

2.3.3 Sponsorship Research

Sponsorship research can be generally classified into five streams representing the topics most commonly addressed: (1) nature of sponsorship; (2) managerial aspects of sponsorship; (3) measurement of sponsorship effects; (4) strategic use of sponsorship; and (5) legal and ethical considerations in sponsorship. Table 2.3 provides a summary of these research streams and main contributing authors. This table shows that the area of measurement of sponsorship effects has received the most attention from academics during the late 1990s and early 2000s. It is in this area of measurement of sponsorship effects that this program of research is framed.

Stream	Focus	Authors/ Year
Nature of Sponsorship	Definition, objectives, relation to other	Angenendt 1993, Bloxham 1998, Cegarra 1985, 1986, 1994; Cheng & Stotlar 1999; Endogan & Kitchen
	communication tools	1998; Meenaghan 1998b, 2001; Walliser 1997a.
Managerial	Objectives,	Farrelly et al. 1998; Hermanns 1991; Olkkonen et al.
Aspects	organisation, control,	2000; Olkkonen 2001; Pope 1998b; Quester et al.
	audience	1998; Thwaites 1995
Measurement	Examination of	Cornwell et al. 1997, 2001, 2005; Crimmins & Horn
Sponsorship	communication	1996; Daneshvary & Schwer 2000; Gwinner 1997;
Effects	effectiveness and	Grimes & Meenaghan 1998; Harvey 2001; Hoek et al.
	sponsorship effects,	1997; Johar & Pham 1999; Lardinout 1997, 1998,
	determination of	1999; Madrigal 2001; Pope 1998a; McDaniel 1999;
	causal relationships	McDaniel & Mason 1999; Meenaghan 2001;
	between sponsorship	Meenaghan & Shipley 1999; Pham & Johar 2001;
	stimuli and consumer	Pope & Vogues 1997; Quester & Farrelly 1998;
	perception	Quester & Thompson 2001; Stipp 1998; Stipp &
		Schiavone 1996; Walliser 1996, 1997; Speed &
		Thompson 2000; Smith 2006, Alexandris et al. 2008.

Table 2.3 – Sponsorship Research Streams

Stream	Focus	Authors/ Year
Strategic use of Sponsorship	Strategies and counter strategies	Amis et al. 1999; McDaniel & Kinney 1998; Meenaghan 1996, 1998a, Shani & Sandler 1998; Hock 1997; Vignali 1997.
Legal and Ethical Considerations	Consumer attitudes toward sponsorships by tobacco & alcohol co.	Aitken et al. 1986; Beck 1990; Crabble & Pinkerton 1992; Crawford 1992; Crompton 1993; Furlong 1994; Hoek et al. 1993; Ledwith 1984; Stotlar 1992;

(Source: adapted from Walliser 2003, Coppetti 2004)

One theme particularly popular in the studies in this research area has been the impact of sponsorship on the attitudes and behaviours of consumers. Many of these studies have sought to discover theoretical explanations related to the cognitive processing of sponsorship stimuli and the effects on response outcome, using various theoretical approaches or processing mechanics to explain how consumers process sponsorship messages (e.g. low-level processing; reactivation; matching/congruence). These theories are expanded in the next section.

2.4 Theoretical Framework – Sponsorship Processing Mechanics

To bring together the understanding gained from previous research of the processing mechanics, Cornwell et al. (2005) developed a model of consumer-focused sponsorship-linked marketing communications. The model considers five dimensions: individual and group factors that influence processing of messages and responses; market factors that impact outcomes and are largely uncontrollable; management factors that are controllable and can strongly influence both processing and outcomes; the mechanics of processing and consumer outcomes of sponsorship.

In this model, various theories explaining how sponsorship works are included as processing mechanics including:- exposure (Zajonc 1980, Olson & Thjomoe 2003), low-level processing (Petty, Cacioppo & Schumann 1983, Olson & Thjomoe 2003), reactivation (Pham & Vanhuele 1997), matching/congruence (Becker-Olsen & Simmons 2002; Cornwell et al. 2003; Gwinner 1997); and balance/meaning transfer (Dean 2002; Keller 1993; McCracken 1989). Figure 2.2 below demonstrates this model. The main research studies conducted in relation to processing mechanics are outlined in table 2.4.

Figure 2.2 – Model Sponsorship Linked Marketing Communications



(Source Cornwell et al. 2005, p. 22)

Table 2.4 – 9	Sponsorship	Processing	Mechanics
---------------	-------------	------------	-----------

Processing Mechanic	Authors/ Year
Hierarchy of Effects	Witcher et al. 1991; Meenaghan 1991 and 2001
Mere exposure	Olson & Thjomoe 2003, Bennett 1999
Recall & Recognition	Pope & Voges 1995, D'Stotlar & Johnson 1989; Pope & Voges 2000
Schema	McDaniel 1999; Roy & Cornwell 2004; Madrigal 2001; Keller 1993
Low-level processing	Petty et al. 1983, Olson & Thjomoe 2003
Balance/ image transfer	Dean 2002; Gwinner 1997; Keller 1993; McCracken 1989
Reactivation	Pham & Vanhuele 1997
Matching/congruence	Becker-Olsen & Simmons 2002; Cornwell et al. 2003; Cornwell et al.
(also known as Perceived	2001, Gwinner 1997; Gwinner & Eaton 1999; Johar & Pham 1999;
Fit)	McDaniel 1999 and Speed & Thompson 2000
Attribution	Riffon et al. 2004; Dean 2002
Identification	Cornwell & Coote 2005; Madrigal 2000; Madrigal 2001
Classical Conditioning	Speed & Thompson 2000

(Source: adapted from Cornwell et al. 2005)

Importantly, Cornwell et al. (2005) point out that these processing mechanics are generally not competing theories, but complementary concepts from a management viewpoint. Given the framework of investigation of FMCG and its low involvement nature, a discussion of low involvement processing theory establishes the framework for this research. From a review of the literature, one prominent theory that has been used to explain the link between the sponsored property and sponsoring brand is image transfer theory. Other processing mechanics or theories that are relevant for
this research are identification (i.e. sponsored property identification) and congruence theory (also known as perceived fit). The following sections describe these theories, commencing with low level processing. This is followed by discussion of image transfer theory, identification theory and perceived fit theory.

2.4.1 Low Level Processing

In the FMCG industry, marketers are aware that most consumer purchase decisions are made at the point-of-sale or in the store (Harris 2000; POPAI Europe 1998; Martinez & Cardona 1997). These types of purchases belong to the category of low involvement purchases characterised by: little cognitive investment by consumers; emotional decision making; and low brand loyalty (Summers et al. 2005). It has been suggested that sponsorship is particularly suitable for low involvement products such as FMCG (Lee 2005; Gwinner 1997; McDaniel 1999; Sandler & Shani 1989), given that low involvement purchase decisions require consumers to choose between brands with common characteristics and sponsorship's effects may provide a stronger point of differentiation at the point of purchase.

By contrast, 'high-involvement' decisions involve more complex attributes and greater risk and thus prompt a more detailed cost-benefit analysis. In a high-involvement context, sponsorship is less likely to assist in differentiating between competing offers and so might be expected to have less effect on consumers' behaviour (Hoek & Gendall 2001). Given the suitability of FMCG for sponsorship then, sponsorship leveraged packaging may provide differentiation and might prove to be an important tool in building and reinforcing valuable brand associations. Yet how consumers process sponsorship messages depicted on FMCG packaging is not well understood. A useful approach to understanding how consumers process marketing messages is provided by the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion.

Petty and Cacioppo's (1986) elaboration likelihood model (ELM) demonstrates that consumers process marketing communications such as advertising and sponsorship on a continuum ranging from "low" cognition, motivation and consumer involvement (peripheral route to persuasion) to extensive elaboration, motivation and high involvement (central route to persuasion). The choice by a consumer as to how much effort to expend on processing the information (the degree of cognition) is largely a factor of the level of involvement that a consumer has with the object of the marketing communications (degree of involvement) (see Petty & Cacioppo 1986 for a full account of the ELM and consumer persuasion).

In practical terms then, the preferred route for consumers by marketers will depend on the company's market position and the degree of positive consumer attitudes toward the brand or product. For products that are market leaders or where there is high favourable consumer attitudes, marketers would prefer that consumers were motivated to take the peripheral route to persuasion and use their emotional attachment to the brand or product to lead to a purchase decision. When the product or brand is trying to gain consumer attention, to change beliefs or to overtake a market leader, then marketers would attempt to stimulate consumers to "think" about or to elaborate on the messages incorporated into their marketing communications and to activate the central route to persuasion.

When this process is combined with the use of sponsorship as a marketing tool, consumers become motivated and able to elaborate when the message content (in this case sponsorship leveraging) is perceived as relevant and when they have the knowledge and ability to think about the message. In many sponsorship situations, however, marketing communications are only peripheral to the events that audiences are involved with. For example, the sidelines, arenas and backgrounds of many sporting fields, events surrounds and cultural exhibits will be accompanied by dozens of posters, signs and verbal announcements of sponsoring brands (Olson & Thjomoe 2003). These stimuli are minimal by nature and cannot carry the wealth or quality of information available in more complex communications.

In contrast, sponsorship leveraged packaging (SLP) may provide the capacity for more detailed messages incorporating the sponsored property's image, logos, symbols and information on the sponsoring brand's packaging. Furthermore, if marketing messages such as sponsorship leveraged packaging are processed through the central route, attitudes toward the sponsored property and sponsoring brand may be more enduring and may have a greater capacity to affect purchase intentions than other sponsorship advertising does. In a sponsorship arrangement, consumers are exposed to a number of marketing messages or brand stimuli such as sponsorship advertising, event signage and point of sale promotions such as SLP. When exposed to such stimuli, pre-existing consumer feelings and attitudes toward the sponsoring property may be transferred to the sponsoring brand. This transference of feelings and attitudes is known as brand image transfer and is discussed next.

2.4.2 Brand Image transfer

Current sponsorship research has confirmed that sponsorship can be used to successfully: increase brand awareness (Tripodi 2001; Thwaites 1995, 1999; Hermans 2000); to enhance corporate image (Abratt & Grobler 1989, McDonald 1991); and to alter public perception (Irwin & Asimakopoulos 1992). However, considerable importance has also been placed on sponsorship's ability to act as a catalyst for attitude and behavioural change (Geldard & Sinclair 2002).

In particular, brand awareness and image development have been identified as the most common objectives of sponsorship (Cornwell & Maignan 1998; Crowley 1991; Gwinner 1997; Marshall & Cook 1992; Meenaghan 1991). Considerable research attention has been devoted to sponsorship's ability to develop and enhance brand image (Javalgi et al. 1994; Gwinner 1997; Gwinner & Eaton 1999; Grohs & Reisinger 2005; Grohs et al. 2004).

Evidence suggests that sponsorship improves brand image by flanking consumer beliefs about the brand and linking the brand to an event or organization that the target audience already values highly (Crimmins & Horn 1996). One particularly important association for sponsorship arrangements is the emotional connection that consumers can have with a favourite property (Madrigal 2001). Emotional attachment to teams, sports, arts and causes allows sponsoring organisations to connect with consumers. As a result, attributes and attitudes associated with the sponsored property in the memories of consumers may become indirectly linked with the sponsoring brand (Tripodi 2001). Image transfer then, is the transfer of associations attributed to the sponsored activity to the sponsoring brand (Gwinner 1997). In particular, the preexisting associations held in consumers' memories regarding sponsored property become linked in memory with the sponsoring brand. Researchers have found empirical support for the transfer of association from sponsored property to sponsoring brand. Crimmins and Horn (1996), Otker and Hayes (1987) as well as Rajaretnam (1994) find a weak but consistently significant image change for the sponsor as a result of sponsorship. Similarly, Stipp and Schiavone (1996) find that attitude towards Olympic sponsors has a highly significant positive impact on the images of sponsors. Grohs et al. (2004) find support for a basic level of image transfer with magnitude of image transfer depending on two factors, sponsorship leverage and event-sponsor fit. Grohs and Reisinger (2005) support these findings with a high perceived fit leading to increased image transfer. Studies examining brand image transfer are summarised in table 2.5.

The previous discussion reviews research that indicates that the image of a sponsored property can be transferred to a sponsoring brand through sponsorship arrangements. In addition, it has been shown that image transfer through sponsorship is more effective when the pre-existing emotional associations held in consumers' memories regarding a sponsored property become linked in memory with the sponsoring brand (Gwinner & Eaton 1999). This association with a favourite property is called Sponsored Property Identification and is discussed next.

Table 2.5 –	- Image	transfer	Study	Findings
--------------------	---------	----------	-------	----------

Author/ Year	Focus of Study	Methodology	Findings
Otker and Hayes 1987	Measure effects of sponsorship	Empirical survey	The stronger the link between sponsor and event, the greater the impact on sponsor's image.
Rajaretnam 1994	Examines effect of sponsorship in the absence of other communication.	Case study & longitudinal survey	Image strength is greater among those who recall unaided. Sponsorship has greater impact than advertising on awareness, brand preference and corporate image.
Javalgi et al. 1994	Examines sponsorship and corporate image relationship	Exploratory	Sponsorship can improve image, but results vary from situation to situation.
Stipp & Schiavone 1996	Discusses the benefits of being an Olympic sponsor.		Shows significant benefits for Olympic sponsors.
Gwinner 1997	Presents model identifying factors that influence the creation of an event's image.	Conceptual	Proposes that an event's image associations are transferred to the sponsor through sponsorship activities, moderated by degree of fit, level of sponsorship, event frequency, product involvement.
Gwinner & Eaton 1999	Assesses degree to which a sporting event's image is transferred to a brand through sponsorship activity.	Experiment	When event and brand are matched on either an image or functional basis the transfer process is enhanced, indicating that if the match between event and product can be made stronger, then the resulting image transfer is more pronounced.
McDaniel 1999	Matching event and brand in terms of involvement		Subjects rated attitude toward the ad significantly more positively when a highly involving product (e.g. an automobile) was paired with a highly involving sporting event (e.g. the Olympics) than when the product was paired with a low involvement sporting event.
Grohs et al. 2004		Pre/post event survey testing recall and image transfer.	Event-sponsor fit, event involvement and exposure positively affected sponsor recall. Brand prominence only partly affected sponsor recall. Positive relationship was evidenced between sponsorship leverage and the magnitude of image transfer.
Grohs & Reisinger 2005	Investigates strength of image transfer in sponsorship including event-sponsor fit, sponsorship exposure and sponsor prominence.	Questionnaire Beach Volleyball World Tour 2002	High Perceived Fit between event and sponsor and a high sponsor prominence lead to an increased image transfer. Longer sponsorship exposure results in a smaller image transfer. If sponsorship exposure interacts with event-sponsor fit, then the interaction effect on the magnitude of image transfer is positive.

(Source: developed for this study)

2.4.3 Sponsored Property Identification

Sponsored property identification indicates the extent to which consumers identify themselves with a specific activity (be it leisure activity or a cause) through their engagement with the property (Grohs et al. 2004). For example, in Australia the fanatic loyalty of an Australian Cricket Team fan, or the strong affinity by a breast cancer sufferer toward the National Breast Cancer Foundation, would be considered high sponsored property identification. Empirical evidence suggests that sponsored property to sponsoring brand (Cornwell & Coote 2005; Daneshvary & Schwer 2002; Meenaghan 2001; Madrigal 2000). Studies examining sponsored property identification are summarised in table 2.6.

The studies in table 2.6 show that image transfer in sponsorship is mainly driven by the degree to which a consumer identifies with the sponsored property. In particular, consumers have been shown to have a higher intention to purchase the sponsor's product if they: identify with the sponsored property; if that property or cause is personally relevant; and if they perceive the source as credible (Daneshvary & Schwer 2002). This suggests that the extent to which a consumer is involved with the sponsored property will positively affect the consumer's attitude and purchase intention toward the sponsor and their products. Therefore, whilst it is evident in the literature that sponsored property identification is positively correlated with consumer response to sponsorship, whether that relationship remains constant in the case of SLP in a FMCG context, requires further investigation.

In addition to sponsored property identification impacting image transfer, evidence suggests that perceived fit between the property and sponsor also positively impacts image transfer. In order to understand how the fit between sponsoring brand and sponsored property impacts image transfer, perceived fit is now discussed.

Author/ Year	Focus of Study	Methodology	Findings
Madrigal 2000	Examined how social alliances between sports fans and preferred sports teams influence consumers' purchase intentions toward a sponsor's products.	Event questionnaires	Purchase intentions were greater among those who identified with the team being sponsored, and when such intentions were perceived to be the group norm.
Madrigal 2001	Examined how consumers' levels of team identification an influence their attitudes toward a sponsor and their purchase intentions		Team identification was found to moderate the effect of attitude on intention to purchase.
Meenaghan 2001	Defines and explores goodwill, image transfer and fan involvement and their contribution to consumer response to sponsorship.	In-depth interviews with industry spokespeople and focus group research	Proposes model that suggests sponsorship is fundamentally driven by the consumer's degree of involvement with and knowledge about the property and the related extent of goodwill directed toward the sponsor. Based on findings from qualitative research:- high levels of knowledge about the property arising from high activity involvement enables the fan/consumer to recognize the sponsor, judge the congruence of the relationship and associate the image values the property onto the sponsor, thereby enabling the sponsor to achieve the primary marketing objectives of awareness creating and brand image building.
Olsen & Thjomoe 2003	Examined sponsorship with low involvement products and in cases with limited processing, comparing mere- exposure conditions to peripheral route conditions		Their findings indicated that individuals who had processed the additional brand information had a greater attitude change than those who were exposed to the information but did not process it.
Cornwell & Coote 2005	Social identity theory was used to examine people's willingness to purchase the products of the firms that sponsor non-profit organisations.		Found positive relation between consumers' identification with the non-profit organization and their intention to purchase its sponsor's products.

Table 2.6 – Sponsored Property Identification Study Findings

(Source: developed for this study)

2.4.4 Perceived Fit

Studies examining perceptions of the sponsor-property relationship consistently suggest that the impact of a sponsorship is dependent on the fit [or congruence] between the property and the sponsor (Speed & Thompson 2000; D'Astous and Bitz 1995; Gwinner 1997; Gwinner & Eaton 1999; Meenaghan 2001; McDaniel 1999). In particular, a positively perceived sponsor/property fit has been shown to enhance consumer attitudes toward sponsorship (Cornwell et al. 2003, Becker-Olsen & Simmons 2002, McDaniel 1999).

Studies examining perceived fit are summarised in table 2.7. Apart from showing that a positive perceived fit between the sponsor and property enhances consumer attitudes and purchase intention toward the sponsor, the findings also show a positive relationship between perceived fit and sponsored property identification. This suggests that consumers who have a strong personal liking for a property will respond more positively than other consumers will when the sponsor is able to show a fit with the property (Speed & Thompson 2000). In addition, congruency theory also suggests that the similarity of the sponsor and the property influences storage in memory and recall of information about the sponsorship arrangement (McDaniel 1999). Given the importance of information processing to this research, and particularly considering the limited processing typical of FMCG, it is necessary to determine if perceived fit is a factor impacting consumer response to SLP.

The sponsorship literature clearly indicates that perceived fit is a major factor affecting common attitudinal and behavioral measures (Dardis 2009). A number of authors (e.g. Dean 2002; Crimmins & Horn 1996; Gwinner & Eaton 1999) suggest that sponsorship effects are largely due to the perceived linkage between a sponsor and the property (Dardis 2009). The importance of the brand/property fit has also been supported in recent studies conducted by Koo et al. (2006), Speed and Thompson (2000) and Grohs et al. (2004). Yet, despite its importance, research in this area has focused on outcomes of perceived fit and less attention has been given to understanding the variables that influence perceived fit. This assertion that perceived fit is crucial to sponsorship outcomes indicates it is likely to act as a mediator between particular variables and consumer response to sponsorship. For example, Rifon et al. (2004)conducted mediation analysis on

Author/ Year	Focus of Study	Findings
D'Astous & Bitz 1995	Nature of sponsorship, sponsor/property link and effect on consumer reactions.	Philanthropic sponsorship has a more positive impact on corporate image than commercial sponsorship. Positive impact of consumer interest in the event on perceptions of the sponsor's image.
Johar & Pham 1999	Three experiments investigating brand-event fit & market prominence.	Consumers (mis)identified sponsors as being those companies that were congruent with the event being sponsored and were more prominent in the marketplace
McDaniel 1999	Influence of brand/event fit and advertising placement on measures of advertising effectiveness. Gender also examined	Matching sponsors to sponsored sport may influence consumer response to sport sponsorship advertising. Consumers may have memory-based expectations of advertised sponsorship relationships, as well as expectations of where sponsorship advertising should appear. Fit and media manipulations were found to significantly impact attitude toward the ad. Consumer response moderated by gender (females higher).
Speed & Thompson 2000	Used a classical conditioning framework to examine consumers' attitudes about sponsors, events, perceptions of sponsor-event fit.	Response to sponsorship is stronger when consumers perceive there is a sponsor/ property fit. Perceived property status is associated with a positive response at lower levers of the hierarchy. Attitude toward the sponsor was positively associated with response to sponsorship. Positive relationship between fit and personal liking of property. Consumer response was influenced by attitudes toward the sponsor, perceived sponsor-event fit, and the perceived sincerity and ubiquity of the sponsor. Fit moderates the impact of attitude toward the ad and preexisting attitude toward the brand.
Becker-Olsen & Simmons 2002	Compares effects of native fit (the extent to which the sponsor and the property are perceived as fitting together, independent of program details or communications) and created fit	Effects of fit on firm equity, as indicated by affective and behavioural responses, were completely mediated by attitude toward the sponsorship and the perceived clarity of the sponsor's positioning. Low fit decreases equity relative to no sponsorship, while high fit increases equity. Effects of created fit parallel those observed for native fit and remain significant up to one year later. A non-profit sponsoring organisation generally results in more favourable responses than a company sponsoring organisation. Created fit strategy improves recall of the property over a one-year period.
Cornwell et al. 2003	Manipulated congruence and level of sponsor and property	Recall was better for congruent sponsors than for incongruent sponsors. Recall for incongruent sponsors improved with articulation
Hamlin & Wilson 2004	Fit between causes, companies, products and brands in CRM.	Degree of 'fit' between sponsor and property has a significant effect on consumers' evaluations of products that carry a cause 'brand identity' as part of CRM campaign. Cause cues in low involvement purchase situations create their impact by disrupting existing decision heuristics
Rifon et al. 2004	Consumer attributions of sponsor motives & influence on fit	Sponsor-cause congruence was associated with attributions of altruistic motives, greater sponsor credibility, and positive attitudes about sponsors. Congruence effects mediated by sponsor credibility.
Dardis 2009	Congruence and repeated exposure of message	For a sponsor initially deemed incongruent, perceived congruence mediated the positive effects of repeated exposure on other brand evaluations. Perceived congruence is a malleable factor that can be positively influenced by repeated exposure to sponsorship messages.

 Table 2.7 – Congruency Study Findings

the relationships between congruence and altruistic motives, sponsor credibility and sponsor attitudes. The findings indicated that congruence had direct effects on sponsor credibility, as well as indirect effects through altruistic motives, however the effects of congruence on sponsor attitudes was not significant. More recently, Dardis (2009) found that perceived fit mediated the relationship between repeated exposure to sponsorship messages and attitude toward the sponsor and purchase intention. Similarly, research by Gwinner and Bennett (2009) indicates that the relationships between brand cohesiveness and sport identification and sponsorship outcomes are mediated by perceived fit. Alternatively, some studies have found that perceived fit moderates consumer attitudes and behaviours (e.g Speed & Thomson 2000).

These studies and the reported importance of perceived fit in nearly all sponsorship studies, suggests that perceived fit may play a moderating or mediating role in consumer response to SLP. As it is not clear how perceived fit acts in a FMCG context it will be included as an independent variable in the preliminary model to be developed at the end of this chapter. In order to understand how sponsorship is leveraged through packaging, this is considered next.

2.5 Leveraging Sponsorship Through Packaging

It has been well documented that in order to achieve marketing objectives, sponsorship must be supported by leveraging (Seguin 2003; Kearney 2003, Fahy et al. 2004 Crimmins & Horn 1996; Quester & Thompson 2001 and Grohs et al. 2004). Indeed, the latest sponsorship advice to marketers is that to be effective, leverage of up to three times the original sponsorship investment is required (Seguin 2005).

Leveraging allows the sponsor to increase awareness of the association and to deliver a message about why the sponsorship is being undertaken (Grohs et al. 2004). Hence, leveraging sponsorship presents an opportunity to increase the effectiveness of the sponsorship in terms of its impact on consumers' behavior. As consumers are exposed to messages promoting a property by a sponsor, there is an expectation that consumers will develop favourable associations with that brand. These associations may then secure top-of-mind awareness of the brand, create greater preference for the brand and lead the consumer to purchase the brand (Tripodi 2001), which are all positive outcomes of sponsorship (Meenaghan & Shipley 1999). A wide range of tools can be used to achieve sponsorship communication goals and to reinforce the link between the property and the sponsor's brand to achieve the desired identity and project a good image. One tool used to communicate sponsorship arrangements is point-of-purchase communication. Research indicates that up to 70 percent of purchase decisions are made at the point of purchase (Harris 2000; POPAI Europe 1998; Martinez & Cardona 1997). Therefore, it is logical that point of purchase communication tools play a crucial role in sponsorship campaigns. Point-of-purchase communications include: product presentation, store atmosphere, product demonstrations, shelf displays and packaging (De Pelsmacker et al. 2001).

In particular, the role and importance of packaging has increased relative to other communication tools because of its: increased significance in buying decisions instore; its presence at the critical moment of purchase decision, and its extensive reach to most purchasers of the product (Orth & Malkewitz 2006; Underwood & Klein 2002). Evidence suggests that the primary communication role for product packaging at the shelf is to generate consumer attention, by breaking through competitive clutter. It also communicates brand image and personality using visual elements, including: logos, colours, pictorials, and other elements providing rich brand associations (Underwood 2003). In fact, packaging is considered to be one of the strongest associations a consumer can have with a brand (Keller 1998); and is a very important tool in building and reinforcing brand associations (Roper & Parker 2006). Hence, leveraging sponsorship through packaging capitalizes on the commercial potential of sponsorship and the benefits of packaging.

In the case of sponsorship images on packaging, it is likely that the emotional attachment to a favoured property is recalled and reactivated. In addition, information provided on the packaging regarding the sponsorship arrangement may impact consumer beliefs about the sponsoring brand. Thus, it can be seen that using sponsorship images on product packaging may affect consumer response to sponsorship. However, it is not yet known if using SLP, particularly in a FMCG context, impacts consumer response to sponsorship. Considering the current trend for large sponsorship leveraging investments in this area, it is essential for organizations to establish how consumer outcomes are affected by SLP. This will enable management to adjust strategies and tactics, to justify continued spending on

sponsorships and to differentiate competitive offerings. In order to understand how consumer response to SLP is measured, this is discussed next.

2.6 Consumer Response to Sponsorship Messages

Consumer reaction to sponsorship has received extensive research attention, particularly investigation of consumer's psychological processing of sponsorship (Cornwell 2005; Walliser 2003; Madrigal 2000). The literature highlights the debate concerning sponsorship's effect on consumer behaviour with two emergent schools of thought. One school is based upon a framework developed from the hierarchical model of effects by Lavidge and Steiner (1961), and the other school supports the attention, trial, and reinforcement (ATR) advertising model by Ehrenberg (1974).

The ATR model views the role of promotional stimuli such as sponsorship as reinforcing purchasing behaviour (Hoek et al. 1997) whilst the Hierarchy of Effects Model renders sponsorship as an initiator of purchasing behaviour. The majority of lead authors follow the Hierarchy of Effects Model with few studies considering that sponsorship may work by reinforcing existing behaviours, rather than by persuading consumers to take up new behaviours (Hoek & Gendall 2003). As the focus of this study is not on the order of effects but the effects themselves, this study considers effects from both models commencing with the Hierarchy of Effects Model.

2.6.1 Hierarchy of Effects Model

The Hierarchy of Effects Model is a derivative of the adoption process and is designed to explain how consumers move through a number of stages towards the act of purchase (Tripodi 2001). Although this model is principally used to evaluate advertising effectiveness, authors such as Witcher et al. (1991) and Meenaghan (1991) suggest that it can also be applied to the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness, given the similarities between advertising and sponsorship. Other sponsorship studies have also suggested that sponsorship aligns to a hierarchical effects structure with causal properties (McDonald 1991; Olivier and Kraak, 1997) (cited in Tripodi 2001). In applying this model, improving brand awareness and brand image via sponsorship are communication effects that then lead to influencing the purchase decision (Meenaghan 1983).

This model is underpinned by an acceptance that there are three distinct stages of psychological response to a marketing communication or purchase situation by consumers. These are: cognition; affection; and conation. Cognition refers to a stage when a consumer develops the beliefs about specific attributes of a marketing communication or overall product offering. Affection refers to the stage when a consumer develops emotional responses in relation to a marketing communication or product offering. Finally, conation refers to the stage when consumers develop a desire for action or behavioural intent as a response to a marketing communication or product offering (Joyce 1967).

The Hierarchy of Effects Model suggests that consumers progress through these stages in a different sequence depending on the situation, type of purchase or marketing communication and the level of involvement they attribute to the purchase decision. When faced with a sponsorship communication, consumers have been shown to take a sequence that begins with the cognitive stage, particularly given that sponsorship messages are often limited to only brand name and logo. The consumer would then proceed to an emotional stage (affect) as they consider their feelings about the property. These feelings are thought at this stage to be transferred to the sponsoring brands, thereby achieving affective goals. The cognitive and affective goals of creating or improving brand awareness and brand image via sponsorship then precede and influence the conative stage of the hierarchy, in particular, the decision to purchase or use a particular brand (Meenaghan 1983).

In contrast, Ehrenberg's (1974) Attention Trial Reinforcement Model, suggests that a reversal of this causal process is in fact the case where attitudes follow behaviour. This model is now explained in more detail.

2.6.2 Attention, Trial, Reinforcement Model

The Attention Trial Reinforcement Model devised by Ehrenberg (ATR) (1974) is underpinned by three stages, which are to: create attention; facilitate trial purchase; and reinforce purchase patterns. Although it has been suggested that sponsorship may act in each of the three stages; sponsorship's cognitive function is thought to be peripheral to its key role of reinforcing consumers to acquire a repeat purchasing habit for the sponsoring brand (Tripodi 2001). With this in mind, it is thought that sponsorship strengthens consumer affection for the sponsoring brand after its consumption or usage. A study by Hoek, Gendall and Tweed (1999) found evidence supporting the functioning of sponsorship in accordance with the ATR model.

Empirical evidence suggests that positive attitudes toward a sponsor are associated with intentions to: pay attention to; act favourably towards; and be willing to consider a sponsor's product (Speed & Thompson 2000). Whilst consumers generally declare themselves more likely to support sponsored products compared to non-sponsored products, there is still conjecture and disagreement among scholars about declaring a direct link between sponsorship and purchase intentions (Cornwell & Maignan 1998; Otker and Hayes, 1987; Wilson 1997).

The ATR model when applied to sponsorship, suggests that sponsorship has an effect on consumers who have prior experience with the brand (Tripodi 2001). Ehrenberg (1974) suggests that most consumers are already knowledgeable about the product categories from which they purchase and rather than creating awareness, sponsorship maintains a brand's position in consumers' repertoire. Further, as sponsorship's selling message is often confined to signage, packaging or advertising that promotes the sponsorship association rather than the brand, its ability to persuade consumers to purchase the sponsoring brand is suggested to be limited (Hoek & Gendall 2003).

Using Ehrenberg's ATR model, Hoek and Gendall (2003) argue that sponsorship increases the overall attractiveness of a brand within a consumer's repertoire, but that the increase is small, insignificant and insufficient to attract new users to the brand. In Hoek and Gendall's (2003) choice modeling experiment involving instant coffee, sponsorship did not significantly improve the utility of any of the brands tested, although they afforded minor protection when competing brands offered a price discount. These results suggest that sponsorship particularly in FMCG may not prompt new behaviour, but make existing brand choices slightly more attractive. From a review of the literature, it is unclear whether sponsorship in a FMCG context follows the hierarchy of effects approach or the ATR approach. Therefore, it is important to determine how effective sponsorship leveraged packaging is in persuading consumers in a FMCG context. This study will determine whether sponsorship has the capacity to induce trial, improve existing brand attitudes and increase purchase intent as the hierarchy of effects approach suggests; or whether sponsorship in a FMCG context follows an ATR approach where it reinforces existing attitudes but has little capacity to create new behaviours.

2.6.3 Consumer Attitudes Toward the Sponsoring Brand

Enhancing consumer brand attitudes towards a company is one of the most common reasons companies engage in sponsorship (McDaniel & Kinney 1998). This perspective has been well supported by both experimental and survey based sponsorship research, which has highlighted the importance of attitude toward the sponsor in effective sponsorship (Javalgi et al. 1994; Stipp & Schiavone 1996). Attitudes are of great importance to marketers as they signify consumers' favourable or unfavourable inclination towards particular products, thus giving an indication of future consumption patterns. Attitudes are learned, and established as a result of a personal experience, reasoning or information and the communicated experience of others (Fishbein et al. 1975).

Cornwell and Coote (2005) have found that there is a positive relationship between consumer attitudes and purchase intentions towards sponsor's products and empirical evidence suggests that positive attitudes toward a sponsor are associated with intentions to; act favourably towards; and be willing to consider a sponsor's product (Speed & Thompson 2000). Prior research also suggests that brand experience has been found to be a significant factor in predicting consumer attitudes. Therefore, in order to understand how brand experience impacts attitudes towards the sponsoring brand, it is examined next.

2.6.4 Brand Experience

Within the consumer behaviour research stream and to a certain extent in sponsorship research, brand experience has also been found to be a significant factor in predicting consumer attitudes (see for example: Pope & Voges 2000; Peracchio & Tybout 1996; Sujan & Bettman 1989). Past brand experience may influence consumer perceptions of marketing stimuli and also may aid the interpretation of stimuli (Nancarrow et al. 1998). Furthermore, a consumer's prior experience with a sponsor or property can trigger cognitive and affective responses that can impact the

processing of sponsorship messages. Prior experience (usually derived from the use of a brand) has been found to increase attitude strength and enhance the ability to distinguish between brands (Pope & Voges 2000).

Attitude toward the sponsoring brand for more experienced users is more likely to be based on personal experience and more detailed knowledge of salient brand attributes (Peracchio & Tybout 1996; Sujan & Bettman 1989). Despite the importance of prior experience in the processing of additional information regarding the brand, few studies in sponsorship have considered it. More extensive consideration of past experience is therefore warranted within the sponsorship domain and in particular the FMCG context. Therefore, prior brand experience will be included in the preliminary model of consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. In addition to brand experience impacting consumer attitudes toward the sponsor brand, it has also been suggested to impact purchase intention. Purchase intention is discussed next.

2.6.5 Purchase Intention Toward the Sponsor's Products

Prior research supports the premise that consumers who have previously used the sponsoring brand have a higher purchase intention, than consumers who have not previously used the brand (Pope & Voges 2000). Purchase intentions are formed on the basis of many factors, including: perceptions about attributes such as quality; endorsement by an association; identification with the sponsored property; and attitudes that have been formed towards the brand (Westberg & Pope 2005).

Previous research has found that sponsorship is directly effective in influencing purchase intentions towards sponsor's products (Crimmins & Horn 1996; Kohl & Otker 1985). In addition, anecdotal evidence from commercial research companies also suggests that sponsorship is directly effective in creating sales (Gordon 2007, Crompton 2004). However, some researchers are still uncertain that sponsorship influences purchase intentions [or sales] (e.g. Cornwell & Maignan 1998; Hoek et al. 1997). Hoek and Gendall (2003) suggest that this is because sponsorship may work in a "weak" sense by reinforcing existing behaviours rather than create new behaviour. This lack of agreement in the literature highlights an important gap and points to the need for further research focused on clarification of the effect of sponsorship on purchase intent, a call this study takes up.

While it appears then that sponsorship can be effective in gaining attention for brands and impact brand attitudes; the way that sponsorship leveraged packaging impacts consumer attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intention towards the sponsor's products needs to be better understood. The understanding gained from this research will assist in determining SLP's value as a marketing tool and provide information to enhance its effectiveness. Therefore, this study proposes an examination of sponsorship leveraged packaging and its impact on consumer attitudes toward the sponsoring brand and purchase intention towards the sponsor's products because of their crucial importance to marketers. Further as the previous discussion shows consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging may be impacted by the experience a consumer has had previously with the sponsoring brand, brand experience also needs to be included in a preliminary model of factors impacting consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging.

2.6.6 Trial Intention Toward the Sponsor's Products

In the sponsorship literature, there is limited empirical research that has considered sponsorship's trial-inducing capabilities (Hoek et al. 1999). One of the few studies to consider trial as a result of sponsorship by Hoek et al. (1997) examined Snickers' sponsorship of the 1994 Soccer World Cup. Findings indicated that a sponsorship message created greater awareness among non-users (than advertising did). However, neither sponsorship nor advertising increased the likelihood of purchase for either users or nonusers of the brand (Hoek et al. 1997). As little is known about sponsorship's capacity to influence trial of a sponsored product, this study seeks to provide such information. Therefore, the model of factors impacting consumer response to SLP will include trial intention as a consumer response to SLP. Research relating to sponsorship outcomes is summarised in table 2.8.

Author /Year	Study Description	Findings
Recall/ Recognition		
Cornwell et al. 2003	Manipulated congruence and level of sponsor-property relationship explanation via press releases and assessed cued recall.	Recall was better for congruent sponsors than for incongruent sponsors. Recall for incongruent sponsors improved with articulation.
Gwinner 1997	Outlined a model of how sponsorship can impact brand image.	Image transfer is aided by factors such as sponsor-sponsee similarity.
Gwinner & Eaton 1999	Assessed the extent to which image transfer occurs from brand to event, through event sponsorship depictions.	Participants tended to rate events and brands similarly in terms of 'personality', particularly when they were matched on either image or functional bases.
Hansen and Scotwin 1995	Experimental enquiry into sponsorship effects using recall and recognition testing	Sponsoring messages generate attention at all levels of response hierarchy. Researchers suggest that sponsoring can be applied effectively as marketing communication.
Johar & Pham 1999	Manipulated congruence and perceived market prominence of sponsor, and measured sponsor identification.	Consumers (mis)identified sponsors as being those companies that were congruent with the event being sponsored and were more prominent in the marketplace.
Attitudes		
McDaniel 1999	Examines consumer schemas that influence reactions to advertising leveraging sport sponsorship. Tested influence of brand/event fit and advertising placement on measures of advertising effectiveness. Gender was also examined.	Fit and media manipulations were found to significantly impact attitude toward the ad. Females were found to report significantly higher attitude towards the ad and purchase intentions than males.
Rifon et al. 2004	Examined how consumer attributions of sponsor motives influence the effects of sponsor-cause congruence on ratings of sponsor attitude and sponsor credibility.	Sponsor-cause congruence was associated with attributions of altruistic motives, greater sponsor credibility, and positive attitudes about sponsors. Congruence effects on attitudes about sponsors were mediated by sponsor credibility.
Speed and Thompson 2000	Used a classical conditioning framework to examine consumers' attitudes about sponsors and events, and perceptions of sponsor- event fit.	Consumer response was influenced by attitudes toward the sponsor, perceived sponsor-event fit, and the perceived sincerity and ubiquity of the sponsor.
Crimmins & Horn	Operationally defines and illustrates consumer impact of	Fans of an event or organization are grateful to the sponsors and are

Table 2.8 – Sponsorship Outcomes

Author /Year	Study Description	Findings	
1996	sponsorship. Examines the rate of success in achieving consumer impact by large companies sponsoring major events. Measures strength and duration of the link, gratitude and perceptual change due to the link.	apparently willing to change their perception of the brand, but they need to be told how the perception should change. Organisations who invest in communicating sponsorship are more successful at creating a link with the property.	
Involvement			
Dean 2002	Examined balance theory and attribution theory in relation to sponsorship.	Sponsorship of a well-liked charitable event resulted in enhanced corporate community relations, and in both positive and negative attributions.	
Petty et al. 1983	Manipulated level of product involvement, strength of argument, and type of endorser in a magazine advertisement for a product.	, Two routes to persuasion were found: central and peripheral. High involvement consumers were influenced by strength of argument, and low-involvement consumers by type of product endorser.	
Brand			
Preference			
Olson & Thjomoe	Compared mere exposure of a brand with varying levels of cognitive	Mere exposure enhanced preference for the brand name. Exposure to	
2003	processing of brands	additional, but unprocessed information did not affect preference.	
Purchase			
Intention			
Cornwell & Coote 2005	Social identity theory was used to examine people's willingness to purchase the products of the firms that sponsor non-profit organisations.	Found positive relation between consumers' identification with the non-profit organization and their intention to purchase its sponsor's products.	
Madrigal 2000	Examined how social alliances between sports fans and preferred sports teams influence consumers' purchase intentions toward a sponsor's products.	Purchase intentions were greater among those who identified with the team being sponsored, and when such intentions were perceived to be the group norm.	
Madrigal 2001	Examined how consumers' levels of team identification influences	Team identification was found to moderate the effect of attitude on	
	their attitudes toward a sponsor and their purchase intentions	intention to purchase.	
Popes & Voges	Examined relationships between corporate image, prior product use	Significant effects on purchase intention were found from the brand,	
2000	and belief that a company sponsors.	from the belief that the company sponsored sport and from the	
		corporate image of the company. No interaction effects between the independent variables were found.	

(Source: adapted from Cornwell et al. 2005)

In summary, it is known that sponsorship can increase brand awareness and contribute to brand image. It is strongly believed that the combined use of sponsorship with other communication techniques increases its (awareness and image) impact. Therefore, it is expected that a sponsored property's image would be transferred to the sponsoring brand's image when stimulated by sponsorship leveraged packaging. It is further expected that this relationship would be affected by sponsored property identification, perceived fit and brand experience. These findings provide considerable input into the process of answering the primary research question for this program of research, which is "What factors impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging in FMCG markets?" From this discussion, a theoretical model of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP is now proposed and discussed.

2.7 Preliminary Model - Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP

Based on the literature, the components of a preliminary model of factors impacting consumer response to SLP are now developed along with a series of propositions that will guide the next stage of this research program. The literature has indicated that several constructs are likely to contribute to the understanding of Factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP. These are: sponsored property identification; perceived fit; and brand experience. Each of these is now reviewed.

Sponsored Property Identification is proposed to directly impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. That is, as the degree of sponsored property identification increases, consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging will also increase. Sponsored property identification is a construct that captures the consumer's degree of personal relevance of the sponsored property. Furthermore, a consumers' level of sponsored property identification will impact their decision-making in terms of how they will respond to sponsorship communication. Therefore, this construct is proposed to have the main effect in predicting consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. Moreover, it is proposed that this construct is likely to influence the remaining constructs in their ability to impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging.

Brand Experience. Brand experience with the sponsoring brand is proposed to directly impact consumer response to SLP. That is, as the degree of brand experience with the sponsoring brand increases, consumer response to SLP will also increase.

Perceived Fit. A consumer's perceived fit between the sponsoring brand and the sponsored property is proposed to directly impact consumer response to sponsorship. That is, as the degree of perceived fit increases, consumer response will also increase. Prior research reported in section 2.4.4 provides some evidence that perceived fit may act as a moderator or mediator (depending on the context) between certain variables and consumer response to sponsorship. Previous research has indicated the importance of perceived fit in determining sponsored property identification. Therefore, for this study, it is proposed that perceived fit impacts consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. As it appears from the sponsorship literature that perceived fit may moderate the relationship between sponsored property identification and consumer response to SLP, it will also be tested in the data analysis stage of this research.

Consumer Response to SLP. Image transfer theory suggests that, when exposed to sponsorship stimuli, such as SLP, consumer feelings toward this stimulus are likely to become associated with existing information about the brand and property stored in This results in attitudes toward a favoured property being long-term memory. transferred to the sponsoring brand. Furthermore, as prior research indicates that consumers who have previously used the sponsoring brand have a higher purchase intention than consumers who have not previously used the brand, an examination of the impact of brand experience on purchase intentions towards the sponsor's products is also warranted. Therefore, consumer attitudes and purchase intention towards the sponsor's products are chosen as the variables of interest because of their importance to marketers. In addition to attitude and purchase intentions, in order to determine whether sponsorship acts in a Hierarchy of Effects manner or follows an ATR approach, it is necessary to include trial intention as a consumer response to SLP. Such information would help marketers to understand which sponsorship arrangements have the greatest potential to create trial intention and higher purchase intention among consumers.

Figure 2.3 shows the proposed relationships between these constructs. As the exact interrelationships between the proposed constructs are unknown, they are shown in the model in figure 2.3 to have equal effect on consumer response to SLP. It is intended that this model will be reviewed following the completion of exploratory research when more information is known about the constructs and how they relate to each other.

Figure 2.3 – Preliminary Model - Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP



Overall, the literature reviewed here enables a number of research propositions to be formulated, relating to the relationships between these variables. The propositions are:

- P1 Consumer response to SLP is impacted by the consumer's identification with the sponsored property.
- P2 Consumer response to SLP is impacted by the consumers' degree of experience with the sponsoring brand.
- P3 Consumer response to SLP is impacted by the degree to which the consumer perceives a match between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property.

2.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, a theoretical framework for Consumer Response to SLP has been proposed. The Elaboration Likelihood Model, Image Transfer and Associate Network theories provide understanding into this little researched marketing strategy. The literature indicates that Consumer Response to SLP is likely to be impacted by Sponsored Property Identification, Brand Experience and Perceived Fit. Yet there is a need for further research on the impact of sponsorship and SLP on consumer response. The next chapter considers the design, implementation and findings of the exploratory phase of this research, Study 1.

Chapter 3 Study 1

3.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 provided a review of the literature and identified a number of constructs that are proposed to impact Consumer Response to SLP. At the conclusion of Chapter 2, Sponsored Property Identification was proposed to be the main construct impacting Consumer Response to SLP. Perceived Fit and Brand Experience were proposed to impact Consumer Response to SLP. Furthermore, Perceived Fit was proposed to possibly act as a moderator of Consumer Response to SLP. As the interrelationships between these constructs are not known, and the combination of these constructs together in a study is unique, it is important that these constructs be explored more fully to define their composition and to assist in operationalising them for inclusion in this study. Thus, this program of research will take the form of two studies. The first will be exploratory in nature and will investigate the composition and behaviour of some of the constructs proposed in the research model to allow modification of the proposed model and confirmation of hypotheses. The second study will be explanatory in nature and will empirically test the model and research hypotheses. This chapter will focus on the rationale and results from Study 1.

This chapter commences with a discussion of the theoretical grounding for the methodology used in this program of research. Specifically, it will provide the foundation epistemology for the methods proposed in each study and justify the choice of methods used (section 3.2). The chapter will then provide the rationale and objectives for Study 1 (section 3.3). The methodology used for this study will be described, specifying the research design, the sampling methodology, and the data analysis techniques to be used (section 3.4). The chapter then presents the results of Study 1 and concludes with a discussion of the implications of this study for the larger program of research (section 3.5). Finally, the research model proposed at the completion of Chapter 2 will be amended based on the results, and a final research model and hypotheses will be presented for testing in the next stage of the research, Study 2 (section 3.6). Conclusions for the chapter follow.

Figure 3.1 – Chapter Outline



3.2 Theoretical Foundations

Prior to discussing the method applied to this research, it is necessary to consider the purpose of the research as well as the research paradigm appropriate to the study. The purpose of this research (as outlined in section 1.2) was to gain a better understanding of the marketing tool 'sponsorship leveraged packaging' and how the use of that tool impacts consumer behaviour. Given the lack of literature that explains how SLP works, an exploratory approach was needed to provide a rich understanding of consumer behaviour associated with SLP. Exploratory research is generally qualitative in nature and uses methods such as focus groups and depth interviews (Aaker et al. 2007). Furthermore, as exploratory approaches are often followed by more conclusive research, it would be appropriate to also include explanatory research with a view to explaining the factors highlighted in the exploratory research as impacting consumer response to SLP. Having established the purpose of the study, selection of an appropriate research paradigm must be considered. A paradigm has been described as "a basic orientation to theory and research" (Neuman 2003 p.70). The two broad approaches relevant to the social sciences are positivism and interpretivism (Carson et al. 2001). The positivist perspective relies on objective fact and includes quantitative methodologies such as surveys and experiments. The focus of research from a positivist perspective is to test a theory that has been developed based on reviewing existing theory: that is, a deductive approach to research. The theory is then subjected to empirical measurement and evaluation.

Conversely, interpretivism focuses on understanding human behaviour by observation, accounting for multiple realities including: the participants, the researcher and the context (Carson et al. 2001). Interpretivist researchers usually prefer qualitative methods such as observation and field research with a focus on building theory by understanding a phenomenon, i.e. an inductive approach (Blaikie 1993). Within these two paradigms, a range of philosophies exists including post-positivism, critical theory, realism, and constructivism. These paradigms are summarised in table 3.1.

	Positivism	Realism	Critical theory	Constructivism
Ontology	naïve realism: reality is real and apprehensible	<i>critical realism:</i> reality is "real" but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehensible and so triangulation from many sources is required to try to know it	historical realism: "virtual" reality shaped by social, economic, ethnic, political, cultural, and gender values, crystallised over time	<i>critical</i> <i>relativism:</i> multiple local and specific "constructed" realities
Epistemology	objectivist:	Modified objectivist:	subjectivist: value	subjectivist:
	findings true	findings probably true	mediated findings	created findings
Methodology	experiments/	Case studies/convergent	dialogic/dialectical:	hermeneutical /
	surveys:	interviews: triangulation,	researcher is a	dialectical:
	verification	interpretation of research	"transformative	researcher is a
	of hypotheses:	issues by qualitative and	intellectual" who	"passionate
	chiefly	quantitative methods such	changes the social	participant"
	quantitative	as structural equation	world within which	within the world
	methods	modeling	participants live	being investigated

Source: Perry, Riege & Brown (1996, p. 547) based on Guba and Lincoln (1994).

One paradigm that stands out as being particularly relevant to the purpose of this program of research is the post-positivist paradigm. The post-positivist paradigm (also known as critical realism) is consistent with positivism in assuming that an objective world exists. However, it assumes the world might not be readily apprehended and that variable relations or facts might be only probabilistic, not deterministic. Thus, the positivist focus on experimental and quantitative methods used to test and verify hypotheses is complemented by an interest in using qualitative methods to gather broader information outside of readily measured variables (Gephart 1999).

The fundamental nature of the post-positivist paradigm is that reality is "real" but only imperfectly, suggesting that although the findings of this research point in some respect to reality, the research may not uncover 'all' that is to be known about Consumer Response to SLP and the factors that impact it. This fallibility is addressed in two ways. Firstly, the data are triangulated across multiple sources including literature from the areas of sponsorship, marketing communications and consumer behaviour, and Studies 1 and 2. Secondly, structural equation modeling (used to analyse the data in Study 2) allows an attempt at generalising to a population while allowing for measurement error and considers complex interdependencies, using multi-item scales to measure latent, unobservable variables (Aaker et al. 2007; Godfrey & Hill 1995).

In a critical realism approach, the positivist focus on experimental and quantitative methods used to test and verify hypotheses is complemented by using qualitative methods to gather broader information outside of readily measured variables (Gephart 1999). Given the purpose of this program of research, the post-positivist paradigm is an appropriate paradigm as its focus is on the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods. Therefore, this research takes a post-positivist approach.

3.3 Rationale and Objectives for Study 1

The literature reviewed in the previous chapter highlighted a general lack of empirical research examining consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging in a FMCG setting. Nonetheless, theoretical models have been used to explain and measure antecedents to consumer responses to sponsorship in general (Alexandris et al. 2007; Gwinner & Swanson 2003; Madrigal 2001; Speed & Thompson 2000). These research findings have indicated that property-sponsor fit and sponsored property identification, are most often the dominant factors when attempting to predict sponsor recall (Grohs et al. 2004).

The context of previous research undertaken in relation to consumer responses to sponsorship has largely been within the domain of high involvement goods and services, and generally in relation to advertising or other forms of marketing communications. Conversely, there has been a corresponding call for research into sponsorship from a low involvement product perspective (Close et al. 2006; Lacey et al. 2005). Thus, it is not known whether the pattern of interrelationships between these constructs will remain consistent in a purchase situation, which is close to the point of purchase, as is the case with SLP in a FMCG context. It is anticipated that these constructs are likely to perform differently in this context, and that some may not be relevant. The gap in the current literature only allows us to conceptually propose how the constructs are likely to behave (see figure 2.3).

Therefore, it is important before moving to a comprehensive research program to test the preliminary research model (presented in Chapter 2) that more is known about how these constructs perform in a low involvement decision setting on FMCG packaging. Study 1 will use a qualitative approach (justified in section 3.2) to explore how these constructs behave, their likely relationships to each other and to determine the measurement of consumer response to SLP. Finally, it will allow fine-tuning and operationalisation of the measures of these constructs to account for the change of context. Given that the rationale for Study 1 has been established and its objectives outlined, the methodological issues relating to Study 1 now need

to be discussed. This section will begin with discussion relating to the data collection method. The results of the study will then be reported and implications of the results will be considered.

3.4 Methodology for Study 1 - Exploratory Research

The purpose of the exploratory research was to inform the theory generation process, to assist in the identification of constructs and the development and purification of measures. Three exploratory research steps were undertaken: focus groups, depth interviews and a qualitative survey. This approach enabled triangulation of findings, which is suggested as an appropriate technique for ensuring the validity of qualitative research (Creswell 1998; Miles & Huberman 1994). Methodology and findings from each step are discussed next, commencing with the focus group methodology.

3.4.1 Step 1 - Focus Group Methodology

The first step of the exploratory research in Study 1 used two focus groups with consumers to tease out and better define the issues and patterns of interaction between the variables under study. Focus groups were chosen as an appropriate method of gaining rich information given the known advantages of focus groups, including: respondent interaction, synergy, spontaneity, stimulation and serendipity (Stokes & Bergin 2006). The use of focus groups to assist in verification and clarification of the constructs in this study is also consistent with other research in the field (Hamlin & Wilson 2004; Underwood & Klein 2002; Silayoi & Speece 2004).

Initially it was proposed that focus groups would be conducted until no new information was forthcoming. However, during the first two focus groups, the situation arose on several occasions where a dominant participant in the group was particularly negative about sponsorship. At this time, the researcher felt that this may have influenced other members of the group, with the outcome that some individuals may have felt less able to discuss their views on sponsorship and sponsorship leveraged packaging. In order to avoid this situation, the researcher decided it would be better to change the method of collection of the information to one-on-one interviews. This impact on the exploratory research methodology is discussed in section 3.4.2. Sampling for the two focus groups is discussed next.

The participants for the two focus groups were recruited through a convenience sampling method, using staff and their personal contacts at University of Southern Queensland. Though this is not a preferred method to ensure objectivity, the participants were from a variety of demographic and socio-economic groups, ensuring a cross section of the target population defined as 'all household shoppers living in Australia'. As richness and depth of information was a key objective of conducting this exploratory research, randomization was not considered critical. This view is supported by Zikmund (1997, p.463) who suggests, "Convenience samples are best used for exploratory research when additional research will be conducted with a probability sample".

The principal objectives of the focus groups were to: uncover consumers' general feelings toward the use of SLP and to examine the factors that might affect consumer response to SLP. Additionally, the focus groups provided the opportunity to check for completeness of the conceptual framework and to inform the process of measurement modification.

Focus Group Protocol. Both focus groups followed the following format. Participants of the focus groups were firstly questioned to determine general grocery shopping habits. Participants were asked to complete an unaided recall exercise, listing packaging promotional campaigns that they could remember (e.g. celebrity endorsement, gift inclusions, causes marketing, sponsorship). Participants were asked to recall any promotional campaigns with no prompts, and then asked more specifically, to recall any sponsorship packaging campaigns with no prompts. Participants were shown a variety of packages depicting promotional campaigns and were asked questions regarding their perceptions of the packages. Participants were asked if they recognised the sponsorship packaging examples. Participants were then asked about their opinions of sponsorship packaging and how sponsorship packaging influenced their behaviour.

There were 21 broad topic areas posed for the focus group discussions, which suggests that these sessions were of a structured nature (Leaderman 1990). The order of questions was not strictly controlled and the researcher had freedom to rearrange questions to suit the dynamics and flow of discussion for each group. The discussions from the focus groups were transcribed and a summary of the main themes was prepared (Berlson 1971). The Focus Group Protocol is provided in Appendix 1.

A total of twelve participants were recruited for the two focus groups comprising nine females and three males aged between 31 and 55 years. Each participant was allocated to a focus group on the basis of their age and family life cycle to achieve two relatively homogeneous groups. Participant profiles are provided in table 3.2. The data were thematically analysed. That is, the data were reviewed and coded into discrete descriptive themes. The themes were chosen based on the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. Each theme is presented in turn: consumer response to FMCG packaging; consumer response to SLP; sponsored property identification; type of sponsorship; and sponsoring brand loyalty. The results are now discussed.

	Focus Group 1	Focus Group 2
No. of subjects	5	7
Females (%)	100%	57%
Males (%)	0	43%
Age range/mean	25-41/38	31-55/45
Choice elements	Price, quality, value for money	Price, quality, consistency in quality
Interest in SLP	Ranged from not at all interested to very	not at all interested
	interested if gift included	

Table 3.2 – Focus Group Profiles

3.4.2 Step - 1 Focus Group Findings General shopping behaviour

Participants varied in their shopping habits, particularly with regard to number of shopping trips per week, where they shopped and their enjoyment of grocery shopping. Most participants said they used shopping lists, but also bought products on impulse. Participants varied in the degree to which they considered themselves to be price conscious, with some participants suggesting that they might be price sensitive with some products and not with other products.

Focus group participants were asked, "When choosing grocery products, what things do you consider to be important?" Participants in both the focus groups identified: price; brand name; quality and weight as being important when choosing grocery products. Participants indicated that in some product types (category), the brand was particularly important. For example in cereal products, one participant felt that the brand leaders (e.g. Kellogg's, Sanitarium) were more consistent as far as taste and quality were concerned, compared to home brands which varied in these respects.

In addition, participants indicated that there were some categories of products for which they were extremely brand loyal, including: coffee, breakfast cereals, toilet paper and particularly tinned goods. In these types of categories, participants indicated that in most cases they bought their favourite product and would not consider any substitutes regardless of price or other promotions.

Consumer response to FMCG packaging. Focus group participants were asked, "When choosing grocery products, do you look at the packaging?" Some participants indicated that they often looked at product packages, whilst others said they usually did not really look at the packaging but did occasionally. Focus group participants were asked "When you do look at the packaging itself, what things do you consider to be important?" Participants indicated that the packaging elements they saw as important in their choice of brand included: ingredient and nutritional information; package size; colour; country of origin and promotional giveaways.

Participants completed an unaided recall exercise, where they were asked to recall any promotional campaigns on product packaging. Participants recalled such campaigns as free-gifts, two-for-one price discounts, competitions, and the Heart Foundation 'tick'; yet no sponsorship or CRM campaigns were recalled (unaided). When shown the examples, most participants recognised the SLP campaigns.

Consumer Response to SLP. Participants claimed that they noticed that sometimes the packaging had sponsorship on it; yet, recall of specific campaigns was very poor with only one participant out of the twelve being able to accurately list any sponsorship campaigns on FMCG packaging. Although the participants could not recall any sponsorship or CRM campaigns without prompts, they did appear to recognize those types of promotions once they were shown examples. This suggests that although they were unable to recall unaided the sponsorships, most respondents were aware of the sponsorship. Whether being aware of the sponsorship impacts consumer response to SLP or not, is not known.

When the respondents were asked, "What do you think of the 'sponsorship packaging'?" the participants indicated that they believed that they were generally unaffected by SLP with comments such as:

- 'I never look at packaging. I take absolutely no notice of those campaigns'
- 'As long as the packaging keeps the product fresh I don't have any interest'
- 'Some people might be affected by SLP but I wouldn't be'.

Further, respondents indicated that the sponsorship would not encourage or influence them to purchase the sponsor's products. Most participants felt they were not influenced by SLP, when asked "Do you think it would affect whether you bought the product or not?" five out of the twelve participants adamantly said 'no'.

However, participants were able to suggest when SLP might be effective, by commenting:

- 'It might work better depending on what sporting season was current'
- 'It might be effective if you supported the team on the packaging.'
- 'If it was a new product you were not familiar with, you might try the product'
- 'I'd buy it if it had free collectors cards my son collects the cards'.

These comments indicate that although the participants suggested they would be unlikely to be influenced by SLP, there were some conditions under which they or other consumer may be influenced. These conditions included: involvement with the sponsored sporting team; currency of the sporting season; trial of an unfamiliar product; and gift inclusions.

Sponsored Property Identification. Some participants indicated that their involvement with a favourite sponsored group would impact their response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. Participants indicated that they were influenced by the sponsorship of a favourite property, recognizing this relationship through the pictures on the packaging by commenting:

- "I feel that by purchasing the product I am helping out a cause I support."
- It might 'tip the balance' for the sponsored one if I supported that cause."

Therefore, it would appear that the findings from Study 1 support the literature examined in Chapter 2, which indicated that the emotional tie a consumer has with a sponsored property is a key factor in consumer response to sponsorship.

Type of Sponsorship. Interestingly, participants showed a different response to their favourite sport using SLP than to a favourite cause using SLP. In the majority of cases, the participants indicated that if a FMCG had SLP involving a favourite sport, it would make little difference to their attitude with such comments as:

- 'I would note it, but not necessarily buy the product'
- 'It wouldn't affect me either way'
- 'It wouldn't change whether I purchased it or not'.

However when considering SLP involving a favourite cause, their response was more positive with comments such as:

- 'I might be more inclined to buy the product'
- 'Good, cancer research should be getting a % from the sale'
- 'I'd consider buying it, but only if other criteria were also satisfied'
- 'Maybe people buy products supporting causes like breast cancer, because it is only 10 or 20 cents extra, and that doesn't matter that much.'

These comments indicate that Consumer Response to SLP may be impacted by the type of property sponsored. In particular, these findings suggest that sponsorship of a cause is likely to engender a higher attitude and higher purchase intentions than sponsorship of a sport. Moreover, the comments also indicate that some participants appeared to confuse SLP with cause related marketing (CRM), which differs from sponsorship in that a contribution is made to the cause based on sales. Whilst theoretically there is much effort to distinguish between these marketing activities (Seguin 2007) it seems that in practice, consumers may respond to and consider them to be the same. However as this study considers the use of SLP only, CRM is outside the scope of this study.

Brand Experience. Participants indicated that in considering grocery shopping in general, over time they had tried a number of brands of the products they generally purchased. Although they considered that for most products they would have considerable brand experience, it did not mean they bought those brands regularly. From this discussion, it would appear that frequency of purchase would be a better variable to capture the dimension needed. To this end, instead of brand experience, frequency of purchase will be included in the conceptual model of factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP.

Furthermore, participants indicated that there were some product categories where the participants considered they would be loyal to particular brands and not consider alternative brands. In cases where there was a high degree of brand loyalty, participants indicated that they did not consider alternative brands at all and therefore any SLP on those brands, even for properties they supported, were unlikely to gain their attention or impact their purchase decisions. This would suggest that loyalty to the sponsoring brand is a key variable, which needs to be included in a model of factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP.

Exposure to Other Media and Promotions. When the participants were asked, "When might sponsorship packaging impact your behaviour?", participants suggested:

- 'It might back-up advertising at events etc.'
- 'You might see the sponsor's ads at the game and then when you go to the shops you might buy the product'

This would indicate that Consumer Response to SLP is likely to be impacted by exposure to other promotions as sponsorship often occurs in conjunction with other promotional activities such as advertising, merchandising and sales promotions. Furthermore, participants suggested that consumers would be exposed to other marketing tools such as television advertising and event signage in addition to the SLP. This supports the view that Consumer Response to SLP is generally a combination of information stored in memory from other marketing communication efforts as well as reactions to the packaging seen in-store. Therefore, in order to understand the specific contribution of SLP, it would be necessary to isolate the effect of SLP from other promotional efforts.

3.4.3 Step 2 - Depth Interview Methodology

Initially, focus groups were chosen as an appropriate method for gaining richness and depth of information. However, the second focus group highlighted a possible disadvantage of that data collection method, particularly relating to the topic under discussion i.e. sponsorship. There were some very strong feelings amongst several of the participants that sponsorship was an advertising gimmick. This negative perception of sponsorship may have affected the other participants' willingness to
express their own ideas regarding sponsorship and sponsorship leveraged packaging. This could have influenced the depth of the information gathered. It was then necessary to consider how this problem could be overcome. Careful consideration was given to how the same information could be gathered using a different method without the negative effects of "group think" involved with focus groups. With this in mind, it was decided that the second step of the exploratory research in Study 1 would involve depth interviews with consumers. In this way, the required information could be gathered from individuals rather than groups.

Participants for the depth interviews were recruited from the staff of University of Southern Queensland and their personal contacts, using a referral sampling method. The participants were from a variety of demographic and socio-economic groups. Eight depth interviews were conducted. During the last two interviews, no new information was revealed and it was decided to cease the interviews.

The interviewees consisted of six females and two males aged between 30 and 45 years. Although a mixture of males and females were asked to participate, generally males indicated that the majority of household shopping was conducted by their wives and they felt unqualified to provide information relating to grocery shopping. Participant profiles are provided in table 3.3. The data were reviewed and coded into descriptive themes. The themes were based on the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 and on the issues highlighted during the interviews. Each theme is presented in turn: general shopping behaviour; consumer response to FMCG packaging; Consumer Response to SLP; Sponsored Property Identification; Sponsoring Brand Loyalty and exposure to other media and promotions.

	Interviews
No. of subjects	8
Females (%)	75%
Males (%)	25%
Age range/mean	30-45/35
Important choice elements	Price, consistency in quality, new products
Interest in SLP	Ranged from not interested to interested depending on cause

Table 3.3 – Depth Interview Profil

Depth Interview Protocol Interviewees were initially questioned regarding general grocery shopping habits and shopping behaviour in various grocery categories. Following on from this, interviewees were asked a number of questions relating to packaging in general before completing an unaided recall exercise, listing packaging promotional campaigns that they could remember (e.g. celebrity endorsement, gift inclusions, cause marketing, sponsorship). Interviewees were asked to recall any sponsorship packaging campaigns. The interviewees were then shown a variety of current market-place packages depicting promotional campaigns including sponsorship leveraged packaging and were asked questions regarding their perceptions of the packages. During the interviews, when reference was made to sponsorship leveraged packaging, it was termed 'sponsorship packaging'. The depth interview protocol provides details of the specific questions asked (see Appendix 1).

3.4.4 Step 2 - Depth Interview Findings

General shopping behaviour. Interviewees varied in their shopping habits, regarding the number of shopping trips per week, where they shopped and their enjoyment of grocery shopping. Most interviewees said they used shopping lists, but also bought some products on impulse. Interviewees were asked, "When choosing grocery products, what things do you consider to be important?" As a result, price, nutritional content and country of origin were identified as being most important when choosing grocery products. Interviewees indicated that in product categories such as: clothes detergent, breakfast cereals, coffee and toilet tissue: brand was particularly important. In these categories, interviewees indicated that in most cases they bought their favourite product and would not consider any substitutes regardless of price or other promotion.

Consumer response to FMCG packaging. Interviewees were asked, "When choosing grocery products, do you look at the packaging?" Some interviewees indicated that they sometimes considered the packaging, by looking at the front and back of the package. Participants indicated that the packaging elements they

saw as important in their choice of product included: ingredient and nutritional information; package size; colour, and country of origin.

Participants completed an unaided recall exercise, where they were asked to recall any promotional campaigns on product packaging. Participants recalled such campaigns as The Heart Foundation 'tick'; Think Pink Breast Cancer Ribbon, Olympic sponsorship, and cause related promotions. When shown the stimulus packages, most interviewees recognised the campaigns, including those with SLP.

Consumer Response to SLP. Some interviewees were able to recall without prompts a number of promotional campaigns including sponsorship of the Olympics and Breast Cancer Foundation. However when asked, "What they thought of the 'sponsorship packaging'?" the interviewees indicated that despite being familiar with the concept of 'sponsorship packaging' they were generally unaffected by it. Interviewees showed little interest in sponsorship packaging by commenting,

- 'I am only interested in the product from a nutritional perspective'
- 'As long as the product had the same quality and price, I would consider it if it sponsored a good cause'.

Further, when asked "Do you think it would affect whether you bought the product or not?" some interviewees indicated that the sponsorship would not encourage or influence them to purchase the sponsor's products with comments such as,

- 'It might affect how I felt about the company, but I wouldn't necessarily buy it'
- 'The sponsorship packaging might influence whether I buy the product or not depending on the price.'

When the interviewees were asked, "When do you think sponsorship packaging might be effective?" the interviewees indicated that SLP would be unlikely to impact many consumers unless they were interested in the group pictured on the packaging.

Sponsored Property Identification. The majority of interviewees were not personally involved in any sport, however most had family members who were involved and supported both sports and particular teams. In addition, a number of interviewees regularly donated to charitable causes and were interested in those causes. Some interviewees indicated that their involvement with a favourite cause would help them to decide to purchase the product. Thus, there was some support that the type of sponsorship could impact Consumer Response to SLP.

Sponsor Brand Loyalty. Interviewees indicated that there were some categories of products for which they were extremely brand loyal. In particular, beverages (tea and coffee); personal care products (toilet paper, toothpastes, hair care); tinned foods (fish, vegetables, fruit) and frozen goods. In cases where there was a high degree of brand loyalty, participants indicated that they did not consider alternative brands at all and therefore any SLP on those brands, even for properties they supported, were unlikely to gain their attention or impact their purchase decisions. This provides support that loyalty to the sponsoring brand is a variable which needs to be included in a model of factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP.

3.4.4 Step 3 - Qualitative Survey Methodology

The third stage of the exploratory research was to assist in the fine tuning of measures and wording for the final questionnaire used in the experimental stage of the research. It also aided in the selection of the specific packaging examples to be used for the final questionnaire instrument. To this end, a qualitative survey instrument was developed to clarify issues relating to: product category involvement; product category elaboration; importance of product packaging; importance of packaging images and elements; brand loyalty; and participation and support of sports and causes. A copy of the qualitative survey is included in Appendix 1.

Participants for the qualitative survey were recruited through a convenience sampling method, using general and academic staff at University of Southern Queensland. Twenty-six participants completed the qualitative survey. In describing sample size for this part of the exploratory research, sampling was driven by the desire to learn in detail and in depth about the experience of consumers. Therefore, the final decision about sample numbers was based on data saturation, which occurred when no new information was obtained. From the 26 qualitative surveys, there was sufficient consensus and communality of terms amongst the responses to provide input to aid in the design of the experimental questionnaire (Study 2).

Participant profiles are provided in table 3.4. From this, it can be seen that the majority of survey participants were female (88%), a similar sample profile to the depth interviews. Again, males who were approached were reluctant to participate in the survey as their wives were responsible for household shopping. The disparity between this sample and the population sample (63% female – Roy Morgan Research 2009) may be the result of the limited sample parameters. As richness and depth of information were considered paramount for this stage of the research, this issue was not considered critical.

With regard to data analysis, the survey data were thematically analysed based on the themes highlighted from Steps 1 and Steps 2 of the exploratory research. In addition, the quantitative sections of the survey including category involvement, packaging importance and attitude sections were analysed using SPSS software to determine frequency counts and means only. These results are now discussed, commencing with shopping behaviour.

Table 3.4 –	Qualitative	Survey I	Participan	t Profiles
		•/		

	Survey
No. of subjects	26
Females	23
Males	3
Age range/mean	31-70/45
Important choice elements	Nutritional info, price, ingredients, country of origin

3.4.5 Step 3 - Qualitative Survey Findings

General shopping behaviour. Respondents indicated that there were some product categories for which they spent a moderate amount of time and effort in making the purchase decision (i.e. category involvement). Respondents were asked how much time and effort they put into choosing various products (response was measured on a three point scale 1 = no time and effort, 2 = spend some time and effort, 3 = a lot of time and effort). In particular, consumers indicated that when purchasing such products as: coffee, chocolate, breakfast cereals, biscuits, medicine, fresh fruit and vegetables, they expended either a moderate or high level of shopping involvement. Table 3.5 reports frequency and means for these items.

Whilst this is a small sample, it was used for exploratory purposes only, to aid in the choice of SLP examples to be used in the main study, Study 2. It is important in a study that attempts to determine the full value of SLP as a communication vehicle that the SLP examples chosen are from a product category that typically involves at least limited decision making. As can be seen from these results, product choice in some categories of FMCG (see table 3.5) involves at least limited decision making.

Product Category	Some shopping effort & time (n=26)	Lot of shopping effort and time (n=26)	Mean*
Breakfast cereals	11 (44%)	6 (24%)	1.9
Biscuits	11 (44%)	0 (0%)	1.4
Medicine	11 (44%)	9 (36%)	2.1
Baking	13 (50%)	3 (11%)	1.7
Fresh Fruit and vegetables	9 (36%)	10 (41%)	2.1
Toilet paper	13 (50%)	6 (24%)	1.9

 Table 3.5 – Response to Category Involvement

* measured on 3 point scale 1=no shopping effort 2=some shopping effort 3=lot of shopping effort.

Furthermore, in choosing the product examples for Study 2, it is important that the chosen product category should be one where consumers could be expected to evaluate some aspects of the product packaging in making their product choice. In general, the majority of respondents (23/26) indicated that they usually examined

products before choosing them when grocery shopping. Respondents indicated that when choosing grocery products, they consider the following criteria to be most important in choosing: price, nutritional value, ingredients, use-by-date, quality, fresh appearance, and country of origin. Specifically, the majority of respondents (22/26) indicated that they considered the packaging of the product before choosing. When asked which types of products they looked at packaging, the majority of respondents indicated that they looked at packaging in the following product categories: breakfast cereals, medicines, fresh fruit and vegetables, and dairy products (see table 3.6).

Product Category	Looks at packaging (n=26)
Breakfast cereals	16 (61%)
Biscuits	10 (38%)
Medicine	12 (46%)
Baking	8 (30%)
Fresh Fruit and vegetables	12 (46%)
Toilet paper	10 (38%)
Toothpaste	10 (38%)
Laundry Products	9 (34%)
Dairy Products	17 (65%)

 Table 3.6 – Response to Packaging in Product Categories

Consumer Response to SLP. The majority of respondents (15/26) indicated that they had noticed sponsorship pictured on product packaging. Yet recall of sponsorship packaging campaigns was considerably lower with only nine of the respondents being able to accurately recall unaided any sponsorship campaigns. When asked whether the sponsorship of a favourite sport or cause pictured on packaging would impact their purchase decision, thirty percent of the respondents (8/26) indicated that SLP may impact their decision. Respondents gave reasons for this impact by commenting:

- 'It would indirectly support the cause'
- 'I would buy it to be socially responsible'
- 'If the product was good value, I would probably buy it out of a sense of altruism'.

For those respondents who indicated that SLP would not impact their decision, they gave reasons such as:

- 'It would not impact the decision as I have preferred brands'
- 'It's not relevant, one is food, the other sport'
- *I buy a product for the product, not because it is related to any cause'.*

Attitudes and purchase intentions toward the sponsor. The questionnaire used in this study contained a set of quantitative questions that examined consumer attitudes and purchase intentions toward a nominated SLP. There were 12 attitude questions in all, covering the areas of attitude and purchase intention toward the sponsor, perceived fit and importance of perceived fit. Responses were measured by a five point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neither agree nor disagree 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree). Results for these questions are reported in the table 3.7. Whilst this is a very small sample, it was used for exploratory purposes only, to give an indication of possible responses with a view to including the measures in the main study, Study 2.

Statement	Stro	ngly D/ Disagree (n=26)	S A	Strongly A/ gree(n=26)	Mean*
If a firm sponsors a favourite property it helps me decide which product to buy	9	(34%)	5	(19%)	2.5
This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the sponsor	9	(34%)	5	(19%)	2.5
This sponsorship would make me more likely to notice the sponsor at other times	9	(34%)	6	(23%)	2.4
This sponsorship would make me more likely to remember the sponsor's promotions	8	(30%)	6	(23%)	2.6
Based on all of my experiences, I have a favourable impression of the sponsor	5	(19%)	10	(38%)	3.2
I would buy from a sponsor of the property even if competitors' prices were lower	11	(42%)	1	(3%)	2.1
I see a link between the property and sponsor	8	(30%)	4	(15%)	2.5
Its important that there is a link between the property and the sponsor	10	(38%)	4	(15%)	2.4
My associations with the property are similar to those with the sponsor	9	(34%)	1	(3%)	2.3
When choosing brands it makes little difference to me if they sponsor the property.	3	(11%)	12	(46%)	3.7

Table 3.7 – Response to Attitude Questions – Qualitative Survey

*measured on a five point scale 1=strongly disagree -5 = strongly agree

As can be seen in table 3.7 the most outstanding from these results, were the responses from two statements relating to purchasing the sponsor's products. In the first instance, relating to the statement 'I would buy from a sponsor of the property even if competitors' prices were lower', 42% disagreed with the statement. This suggests that respondents would be unlikely to buy a sponsored product if competitors' prices were lower. Secondly, with regard to the statement 'When choosing brands it makes little difference to me if they sponsor the property', the majority of respondents (46%) indicated that sponsorship would have little impact on product choice. Thus, it would appear that the respondents consider that SLP would have little impact on their purchase decisions. This finding is particularly important, given that the purpose of the majority of sponsorship promotions is aimed at improving awareness, attitudes, purchase intentions or brand loyalty. Should SLP be having little impact on consumer behaviour its effectiveness is limited in this regard.

In summary, the participants from the three steps of Study 1 (focus groups, interviews and qualitative study) in the exploratory stage of this research strongly suggested that they were not conscious of paying particular attention to sponsorship messages depicted on packaging of FMCG. Supporting this claim, the unaided recall for this form of marketing activity was very poor. When prompted however, recall improved and participants appeared to be familiar with the concept of SLP. Furthermore, participants also suggested that they were unlikely to be influenced in their purchase decisions by SLP. Findings from the three steps in the exploratory research also indicated that consumer response to SLP is impacted by sponsored property identification, sponsoring brand loyalty, perceived fit, type of sponsored property, and exposure to other media and promotions. These results will now be discussed.

3.5 Discussion of Results from Study 1

Chapter 2 concluded with a preliminary model that posited that Consumer Response to SLP (i.e. attitudes, trial intention and purchase intention toward the sponsor's product) could be explained by the degree to which a consumer relates to the sponsored property (Sponsored Property Identification) and the previous experience a consumer has with the sponsoring brand (Brand Experience). It was further posited that this relationship would be moderated by the degree of Perceived Fit between the sponsored property and sponsoring brand. It can be seen that much of what was posited to occur in relation to Consumer Response to SLP, was supported by the exploratory research.

However, one consumer response not previously considered critical in a FMCG context was highlighted in the exploratory research, i.e. consumer awareness of the sponsorship. As this consumer response has not been previously considered in this study, it will be discussed first. This will be followed by the other constructs previously mentioned in Chapter 2, consumer response to SLP, sponsored property identification, brand experience and perceived fit.

Awareness of the Sponsorship. The results of the exploratory research suggest that consumer response to SLP is very likely to be impacted by the consumer's awareness of the sponsorship arrangement. Several studies support that sponsorship is an effective tool in increasing brand awareness levels (Johar & Pham 1999; Pham & Johar 2001; Rifon et al. 2004; Speed & Thompson 2000; Apostolopoulou & Papadimitriou 2004; Chadwick & Thwaites 2005). By increasing consumer awareness, sponsors try to influence the development and depth of brand association and increase the chance that consumers will select a brand or product (Busser et al. 2001; Crompton 2004). Given the importance companies place on consumers' ability to remember the sponsorship (Bennett et al. 2006) awareness of sponsorship is a critical aspect for organisations to manage.

Some studies show that awareness is impacted by high property involvement (Meenaghan 2001; Grohs et al. 2004) and perceived fit between the sponsoring brand and the sponsored property (Crimmins and Horn 1996; Johar and Pham 1999; Speed & Thompson 2000; Grohs et al. 2004). As ninety-three percent of the companies involved with sport sponsorship have a primary objective of increasing

product awareness (Koo 2008), it is becoming increasingly important to determine how awareness impacts consumer response to sponsorship in a FMCG context. What is not yet understood is the impact of awareness of the sponsorship on consumer response to SLP. This program of research seeks to gain understanding on the role awareness plays in Consumer Response to SLP.

These conclusions prompt changes to the preliminary model proposed at the conclusion of Chapter 2 and suggest consumer response to SLP is likely to be impacted by awareness of the sponsorship. This would suggest that awareness moderates consumer response to SLP. Therefore, awareness of the sponsorship will be included as a moderator in the conceptual model. It was also posited in the preliminary research model that consumer response to SLP will be impacted by sponsored property identification, brand experience and perceived fit. These will now be discussed, commencing with consumer response to SLP.

Consumer Response to SLP. Participants in Study 1 the exploratory stage of this research, indicated that in the majority of cases they felt they were unlikely to be influenced in their attitudes or purchase intentions towards the sponsor's products, as a result of the SLP. However, there was some indication that in the event that the participant highly valued the sponsoring property (particularly in the case of a sponsored cause), there was likely to be some impact on purchase behaviour. In the case of participants being particularly interested in a sport property, there was some indication that the sponsorship may be noted, but not necessarily impact on the purchase decision. In addition, there was some suggestion that in the case of a new product, a valued property may influence a consumer to try the sponsored product due to the association with the sponsored property.

Sponsored Property Identification. Sponsored property identification was identified in the exploratory research to impact consumer response to SLP. Respondents indicated that their response to SLP was impacted by their level of identification with a particular property. As it is evident in the literature and

exploratory research that the degree to which a consumer identifies with the sponsored property positively impacts consumer response to sponsorship; this research posits that sponsored property identification will be positively correlated with consumer response to SLP. That is, the greater the degree of sponsored property identification the higher will be the consumer response to SLP.

Brand Experience. Although brand experience was highlighted in the literature as a construct that would impact consumer response to SLP, it was found in the exploratory research to have a lesser impact on consumer response to SLP. This could be explained by the transitory nature of the FMCG market, where consumers may have considerable brand experience but are prone to switching behaviour. In this case, frequency of purchase and loyalty to the sponsoring brand were thought to more closely capture a consumers' preference for a brand. Therefore, frequency of purchase and loyalty to the sponsoring brand will be included in the model of factors impacting consumer response to SLP.

Loyalty to the Sponsoring Brand. The exploratory research indicated that it would be necessary to include in a model of factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP, the variable 'loyalty to the sponsoring brand'. In today's fiercely competitive FMCG industry, brand managers have attempted to tackle consumers increasing price sensitivity by creating stronger brands. In light of brand loyalty's significance as a competitive advantage (Helmig, Huber & Leeflang 2006), and the suggestion that sponsorship is particularly suitable for low involvement products such as FMCG (Lee 2005) SLP may provide a point of differentiation for organisations. Moreover, as marketers are aware that most FMCG consumer purchase decisions are made at the point-of-purchase (Harris 2000); promotion techniques are considered particularly important since on-pack promotions can influence the consumer (Royd-Taylor 2007).

However, the literature also suggests that there is an inverse relationship between brand loyalty and responsiveness to competitive promotion that is: as brand loyalty increases, the vulnerability to competitive action is reduced (Aaker 1991). This suggests that in the case of SLP, for consumers who are already loyal to a brand, SLP will have little effect on their purchase behaviour.

Following this logic, when a consumer is not loyal to a particular product, SLP may provide a point of differentiation and thus prompt consumers to consider the sponsored product. Thus, it is posited that loyalty to the sponsoring brand would have an inverse relationship to consumer response to SLP in FMCG. In addition to sponsored property identification and sponsoring brand loyalty, perceived fit, type of sponsored property and exposure to other media and promotions were also highlighted in the exploratory research as factors that may impact consumer response to SLP. Therefore, these are now discussed in turn.

Perceived Fit. Some participants indicated that in the case where they were interested in the SLP, the similarity between the property and the sponsor's image would have little impact on whether they bought the product or not. This indifference to fit (compared to what is cited in the literature) could be explained by the use of real world SLP examples that logically would have a reasonable fit and therefore the participants did not see any obvious incongruence. Alternatively, in a low involvement product context where consumers may not even process the sponsorship message consciously, unless there was an obvious mismatch between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property, consumers would be unlikely to consider the fit between the images.

Although perceived fit between the sponsored property and sponsoring brand was not found in the exploratory stage to be a crucial factor in consumer response to SLP, it is considered extremely important in the relevant theory relating to sponsorship. Therefore, it is retained for further testing in the conceptual model to determine if the perceived fit between sponsored property and sponsoring brand in a FMCG context impacts consumer response in the same way as in previous sponsorship research. **Type of Sponsored Property.** The exploratory research indicated that consumers may respond differently to sponsorship of a sport compared to sponsorship of a cause. The results suggest that consumer response to SLP may be impacted more in the case of sponsorship of a cause. Given that cause sponsorship is generally associated with humane causes it is likely to create positive emotions among consumers.

These positive emotional reactions would then extend to positive attitudes towards the sponsor, thereby creating a strong association between the cause and the sponsor. The strong emotional tie between consumers and a favoured cause may influence consumer response to sponsorship messages. Thus, a consideration of the type of sponsored property would be a necessary component to a study of consumer response to SLP. Thus, it is posited that consumer response to SLP will be impacted by type of sponsored property (sport or cause).

Exposure to Other Media and Promotions. In the exploratory research, an additional factor was highlighted as impacting consumer response to SLP that is: exposure to other media and promotions. Logically most organizations involved in sponsorship, leverage their sponsorship investment in a variety of ways. As previously mentioned these leveraging tools can include: advertising (both broadcast and event); merchandising, point-of-purchase and packaging.

To this end, and based on the results reported in the previous sections, consumers would be exposed to a variety of means of learning of a sponsorship arrangement. SLP is one component of a sponsorship leveraging campaign used in conjunction with other tools. Despite this, as sponsorship leveraged packaging has received little academic and empirical research interest, it is important to determine its value in isolation before considering its impact in conjunction with other marketing communication tools. The implications of this are discussed in the next chapter. This discussion provides direction for revising the model proposed at the end of Chapter 2 before proceeding with the next stage of research, Study 2. The revised model and associated hypotheses are discussed next.

3.6 Revised Model and Hypotheses

This revised model (shown in figure 3.2) proposes that consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging is impacted by sponsored property identification and sponsoring brand loyalty. Consumer response to SLP is measured by positive attitude toward the sponsor, trial intention and purchase intention towards the sponsor's product. This relationship is moderated by type of property sponsored, frequency of purchase (sponsoring brand), awareness of sponsorship, and respondent characteristics. There is likely to be a difference in consumer response to SLP depending on the type of property sponsored (sport or cause).

In addition, when the sponsored property is a cause, there is likely to be a stronger positive impact on consumer response to SLP than when the sponsored property is a sport. In cases of frequent purchase of the sponsoring brand, there is likely to be a strong positive impact on consumer response to SLP. Furthermore, in cases of high degrees of perceived fit there is likely to be a strong positive impact on consumer response to SLP. Furthermore, incases of consumer response to SLP. Overall, the literature and exploratory research conducted so far enables a number of hypotheses to be formulated. These are summarized in table 3.8.





H1	That there is a direct and positive relationship between sponsored property identification and consumer response to SLP. That is: as the degree of sponsored property identification increases, there will be a direct positive impact on consumer response to SLP
H2	That there is a direct and positive relationship between perceived fit and consumer
	increases, there will be a direct positive impact on consumer response to SLP.
Н3	That there is a direct and negative relationship between sponsoring brand loyalty and consumer response to SLP. That is: in cases of low sponsoring brand loyalty, there will be a direct positive impact on consumer response to SLP.
H4	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by type of sponsored property. That is there will be a difference in consumer response depending on the type of sponsored property.
H5	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by type of sponsored property. That is there will be a difference in consumer response depending on the type of sponsored property.
H6	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by awareness of the sponsorship. That is in cases where the respondent is aware of the sponsorship; there will be a positive impact on attitudes toward the sponsor and purchase intention toward the sponsor's products.
H7	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by frequency of purchase of the sponsoring brand. That is in cases where the respondent frequently purchases the sponsoring brand; there will be a positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP.
H8	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by respondent characteristics. That is consumer response to SLP will vary depending on age, income, household status & respondent gender.

Table 3.8 – Research Hypotheses

3.7 Conclusions

In recent years, considerable research has been undertaken toward a better understanding of how consumers process sponsorship messages. Many of these studies have sought to discover theoretical explanations related to the cognitive processing of sponsorship stimuli and the effects on consumer response. Cornwell et al. (2005) suggested that the various theories used to explain how sponsorship works in consumers' minds (i.e. processing mechanics) are influenced by individual and group-level factors, market factors and management factors. The exploratory research reported in this chapter found support for Cornwell's proposition that individual factors such as sponsored property identification, frequency of purchase and brand loyalty influence consumer response to SLP. Further, management factors such as type of property sponsored appeared to impact consumer response to SLP. Yet there is a need for further research to determine the extent of impact of these factors on consumer response to SLP and furthermore the relationships between these factors. The program of empirical research proposed in the next chapter addresses this need.

Chapter 4 – Study 2 Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter provided details of the exploratory stage of this research (Study 1). The purpose of this chapter is to describe and justify the research methodology used in the second stage of this program of research (Study 2). The chapter is organised into three main sections. Firstly, the rationale for the research method will be discussed (section 4.2). Following on from this the research design will be described (section 4.3). In this section, specific areas of the research design will be described, such as: experiment design; questionnaire development; the sampling method; ethical considerations and data analysis strategies. Finally, conclusions will be drawn (section 4.4). Figure 4.1 provides a chapter outline.

Figure 4.1 – Chapter Outline



4.2 Rationale for Research Method

Calls for better measurement in sponsorship research have been made for some years particular in considering the interchange of sponsorship and consumer behaviour (Ali et al. 2006) and how the image of the property transfers onto the sponsoring organisation (Close et al. 2006). It is suggested in the literature that the combined use of sponsorship with other communication techniques increases its impact on

awareness and image development (Walliser 2003). Indeed, one such communication technique specifically focused on in this study is that of sponsorship leveraged packaging. In order to determine if the combined use of sponsorship and packaging as a marketing communication tool does increase the impact on awareness and image development, it is necessary to examine these constructs in more detail.

Despite the synergy engendered by integrating sponsorship with other promotion tools, the primary challenge for researchers is the difficulty of separating the effects of the sponsorship from the effects of other promotional activities (Sneath et al. 2005). Notwithstanding anecdotal evidence of sponsorship effectiveness, practitioners and academics argue that we cannot effectively measure sponsorship's ability to influence consumer response as the results are influenced by prior perceptions of the brand, as well as by advertising and promotion spending that is not directly related to the sponsorship program (Wakefield et al. 2007).

With these difficulties in mind, researchers have made a call for well-controlled experimental studies to better investigate the processing of sponsorship communication stimuli (Cornwell et al. 2005; Dudzik & Groppel-Klein 2005; Sneath et al. 2005). Experimental designs allow for control of extraneous variables (Cornwell 2005; Pham 1991) and are thus able to assess the true impact of sponsorship communication tools.

The research question seeks to describe a relationship between consumer response to SLP and the factors impacting that response. As it was reported in Chapter 3 that consumers may be impacted by prior perceptions of the sponsoring brand and other advertising and promotions, it would be important for this study to be able to control extraneous variables. An experimental design allows this and also allows the manipulation of independent variables and hypothesis testing. Therefore, with a view to controlling for extraneous variables as much as possible, Study 2 will take an experimental approach, to determine the relationships between consumer response and the factors impacting that response. Having briefly highlighted what direction this study will take, the research method is now discussed in further detail.

4.3 Study 2 Methodology

There are four main methodological issues that need addressing for this study. The first is the experiment design, which explains the type of experiment and describes the experiment groups and control groups (section 4.3.1). Secondly, questionnaire design is described considering questionnaire development and operationalisation of the variables (section 4.3.2). The third issue relates to the sampling decisions that were made (section 4.3.3) and ethical considerations (section 4.3.4). Finally, the data analysis strategy is explained (section 4.3.5). Each of these will now be discussed.

4.3.1 Experiment Design

Experimental research involves decision-making based on three major issues: (1) the type of experimental design to be used (2), whether a laboratory setting or a field setting is used and (3) the control of internal and external threats to validity. Each of these issues will now be addressed.

In determining the experiment design, consideration needed to be given to the hypotheses to be tested. Hypothesis 8 in particular had an influencing factor in the type of design. To be able to test the different types of sponsorship, it was necessary to have two experimental groups: a) sport sponsorship and b) cause sponsorship. In addition, it was necessary to include corresponding control groups where no sponsorship was shown on the packaging. The inclusion of the control groups allowed the study to compare whether the sponsored product had more effect on attitudes and purchase intentions than the corresponding non-sponsored product. This indicated that the experiment needed to have four groups. Furthermore, to ensure a true experiment design, test subjects needed to be randomized (Aaker et al. 2007). To this end, the experiment took the form of a four group, after only with control design with one experiment condition: sponsorship type. The respondents were randomly assigned to the experiment groups represented as:

Experiment group:	R	\mathbf{X}_1	O_1	Group 1
Control group:	R		O_2	Group 2
Experiment group:	R	X ₂	O_3	Group 3
Control group:	R		O_4	Group 4

In order to determine the appropriate setting for the experiment, consideration was given as to whether to conduct the experiment in a laboratory or field setting. Advantages and disadvantages of each setting were taken into account and the cost and method of administration in each case was calculated. It was determined that a field setting using self-administered questionnaires (to be completed within respondents' homes) would provide the most realistic and cost effective method of obtaining the required information. This experiment design had the advantages of ensuring external validity, generalisability and randomisation of test subjects. This design also limited the risks of selection bias and interaction effect. Each of these will be explained next.

External validity

This experiment design capitalises on the advantages of questionnaires and experiments whilst minimising the disadvantages of both. In self-administered questionnaires, there are advantages of reduced costs and administration and the elimination of interviewer bias. However, questionnaires lack the ability to control conditions and cannot determine causality (Aaker et al. 2007). Experiments, on the other hand, have the ability to control conditions and can determine causality, yet suffer from lack of generalisability and managerial application (Speed & Thompson 2000). This research design overcomes many of these problems by combining an experimental approach with a self-administered questionnaire.

Generalisability

The use of a field setting (in this case respondent's homes), mimics a natural setting as closely as possible whilst containing costs. This research design enables the respondent to complete the questionnaire in a convenient, relaxed atmosphere, in their own time, at their own pace, thereby reducing the likelihood of inaccurate responses. In addition, the use of realistic and current examples of SLP (rather than ones developed for the experiment) ensures the results are generalizable to current market conditions and management practice.

Randomisation

This experiment design allows for the randomisation of test subjects. Randomisation ensures that each respondent has an equal likelihood of being assigned to any of the groups. In this way any individuals with varying characteristics are spread equally among the groups (Aaker et al. 2007), reducing the impact of extraneous variables.

Selection bias

The experiment design incorporating the experiment treatment (groups 1 and 3) helped to reduce selection bias. Selection bias occurs where the response to the experiment is strictly a function of the specific [SLP] example (either sport or cause) used. Having two groups (with SLP) will ensure that any impact on the dependent variable is not as a result of the SLP example used. Furthermore, having corresponding control groups will ensure that any impact on the dependent variable is not as a result of the particular brand or product example used in the questionnaire.

Interaction effects

The design of the experiment specifies an after-only experiment, which has the advantages of limiting history and maturation effects (common in before-after designs). However, it should be noted that in this case, the respondents pre-existing attitudes toward the sponsoring brand were measured (prior to exposure to SLP). In addition, the respondent's attitudes toward the sponsoring brand were also measured after exposure to SLP (in the case of the experiment groups) in the construct Consumer Response to SLP. Both measures occurred in the one questionnaire. This may be considered by some researchers to be a before/after measure. However, the purpose of measuring the respondents pre-existing attitude toward the sponsoring brand, was to create a precise measure of the Consumer Response to SLP.

Unfortunately, a before measure can sensitise respondents and introduce a bias into the responses to the dependent variable, thereby affecting the validity of the experiment (Aaker et al. 2007). To overcome this, particular attention was paid to ensuring that the wording in the questions relating to the Sponsoring Brand Loyalty construct, was sufficiently different to those of the dependent variable (i.e. Consumer Response to SLP). In this way, the impact of answering before/after questions relating to the same brand on similar yet different dimensions was reduced.

This section described the experiment design, in particular considering the type of experiment and the setting for the experiment. The advantages and disadvantages of this design and setting were explained, with some issues of validity being considered. Further assessment of reliability and validity of the experiment is considered in section 4.3.2 Step 6. Having determined the experiment design, it was then necessary to develop a questionnaire, the process of which will now be discussed.

4.3.2 Questionnaire Design and Measurement Scales

The process used to design the questionnaire broadly followed that suggested by Malhotra et al. (1996) and Churchill (1991). Initially the information needed was specified and the type of questionnaire and method of administration were determined. Following on from this a draft of the questionnaire was prepared based on measurement scales previously validated and the results of Study 1. The questionnaire was pre-tested, revised and a final draft was prepared. The questionnaire was then administered and the details of the reliability and validity tests are discussed in Step 6 of this section. Each of these steps is now discussed in detail.

Step 1 – Specify the information needed and from whom.

In this thesis, the main purpose for the research was determined in section 1.2 and a number of propositions that were used to guide the exploratory research were developed in section 2.7. The information needed to be collected from Australian residents responsible for household shopping. The issue of target respondents and in particular the sampling process is discussed in more detail in section 4.3.3.

Step 2 – **Determine the type of questionnaire and the process of administration.**

Although a number of options are available for questionnaire administration (i.e. mail, personally administered, telephone, internet or combination), the most

appropriate one for this study was self-administered through group networks. This data collection method was chosen as it would provide easy access to the target market for the selected product category examples of SLP. Justification for choice of this method is explained in more detail later in this section (Step 5). This method has the advantages of: the ability to ask complex questions; the ability to ensure anonymity; the ability to design a longer questionnaire and reduced requirements for training/ supervision of interviewers. The advantages of using group networks included: data collection speed, high response rate and cost savings.

The key disadvantages of using this method of delivery were lack of sample control and lack of administrative control. However, though these disadvantages existed, where possible, strategies were designed to minimize these and the disadvantages did not outweigh the benefits of high response rate, low cost, ability to ask many and complex questions and short data collection time.

The questionnaire length is bounded at the upper end by the amount of time the respondent would be prepared to spend in answering the questions (Bagozzi 1994b). Given the choice of a self-completion questionnaire and considering the type of questions being asked and the sampling frame (section 4.3.2), the maximum length of the questionnaire was considered to be 4 pages. The questionnaire took most respondents in the pilot test around 10 minutes to complete. The type of questionnaire and its maximum length set the parameters for the remaining design issues.

Step 3 – Draft the questionnaire

Once the type and length of the questionnaire, its objectives and the respondents who are to complete it, have been determined a first draft can be completed. At this stage, three issues needed to be considered. These were:

- the choice of product examples used in the questionnaires
- the development and identification of appropriate measures and
- the general principles of questionnaire design considering: question content; wording; structure; and response format.

In determining the product examples to be used for the questionnaires, consideration was given to the various product categories in FMCG that use SLP. SLP is commonly used in such categories as sports drink, snack bars, personal care products and breakfast cereal products. During the exploratory stage of research, a number of different product categories were used to determine the most often purchased product categories that use SLP. Furthermore, consideration was also given to each product category and the extent of promotion used in general in those categories. The information provided in the exploratory research relating to category involvement and use of packaging in purchase decisions was particularly useful for this purpose.

One product category that particularly stood out in the exploratory research was breakfast cereals. All of the respondents regularly purchased breakfast cereals, however this was not the case with other product categories. It has been reported that 81 per cent of Australian adults (Woods & Walker 2007) and 91 per cent of Australian children (MJA 2000) regularly eat breakfast cereals, with the majority or breakfast cereal promotion targeted at children (Chapman et al. 2006). The breakfast cereal market in Australia is quite substantial with approximately \$894.5 million spent in 2004 on breakfast cereals (Woods & Walker 2007). Given the large contribution the breakfast cereal market makes to the Australian FMCG industry, investigation of the impact of SLP on consumer behaviour is warranted. Based on these considerations, it was decided that the breakfast cereal category would provide suitable product examples to be used in the questionnaires.

In order to apply the experiment conditions, four questionnaire instruments were developed, each one including a different representation of a FMCG package, this allowed testing of the different experiment conditions. The experiment versions with sponsorship are identified as 'SLP' versions and the control versions without the sponsorship are identified as 'NOSLP' versions. The versions were as follows:

- 1 brand A with sponsorship (sport)
- 2 brand A without sponsorship (control)
- 3 brand B with sponsorship (cause)
- 4 brand B without sponsorship (control)

Each version contained questions that were similar in content adapted to suit the experiment condition. Five-point Likert scales with all points labeled were used for the collection of most of the data. Likert scales were used for a number of reasons. Likert type scales are most popular for gathering attitudinal type responses (Cox 1980) and also promote satisfactory properties in relation to the underlying distribution of responses (Bagozzi 1994b). In cases where it is possible for the respondent to adopt a neutral position as is in this thesis, an odd rather than an even number of scale points is preferred (Cox 1990). Furthermore, while there is no single number of response categories that is appropriate under all circumstances, fewer than five does not discriminate enough and more than nine is too many for respondents to distinguish between (Cox 1990). Given the context of this study i.e. FMCG where little thought is put into purchase decisions, having too many points may cause the respondents to put more thought into the answering of the questions than usual in a natural setting. Based on these considerations it was decided to use a five-point scale.

There is considerable controversy over the using of ordinal scaling and whether they constitute continuous scales (Davis 2000). There are proponents that take the view that there are complex scales and indices of an ordinal nature that are useful in certain situations that allow the use of more powerful parametric statistical techniques. However opponents suggest that the scales do not provide absolute information regarding the intervals between the points on the scale (Davis 2000). If the researcher assumes interval scale measurement (i.e. that the intervals between the numbers are equal), then more powerful statistical techniques can be used to analyse the data. For the purposes of this study, the procedure will be to treat the ordinal measurements as though they were interval, but to be on the alert to the possibility of inequality of measurement (Davis 2000).

The following section details the questionnaire operationalisation of Versions 1 and 3 of the questionnaire. Versions 1 and 3 differed in minor detail (different cereal varieties and sponsored properties). Each difference is highlighted in the sections that follow. Following on from the operationalisation of Versions 1 and 3 (SLP), will

be operationalisation of Versions 2 and 4 (NOSLP). Table 4.1 shows the corresponding question numbers for each version.

Operationalisation of Versions 1 and 3 (SLP) of Questionnaire

Versions 1 and 3 (SLP) of the questionnaires used in the study were divided into four sections over four pages and included 61 questions (full copy Versions 1 and 3 provided in Appendix 2). Each section of the questionnaire will be discussed in terms of the measurement items incorporated and a summary of each of these, with their original sources, is provided in table 4.1.

The survey instrument comprised 61 items relating to the following areas:

- 1. shopping profile
- 2. sport/ charity involvement
- 3. category involvement
- 4. demographic information
- 5. prior purchase and loyalty to sponsor brand
- 6. sponsored property identification
- 7. attitude toward sponsorship leveraged packaging
- 8. attitude toward the sponsor
- 9. purchase intention toward the sponsor's products.

The first section of the SLP questionnaires was designed to profile the general shopping behaviour of the respondent. It opened with a number of questions relating to grocery shopping preference, including frequency and location of grocery shopping, enjoyment of grocery shopping, and tendency to try new products. The section also asked questions relating to breakfast cereal category involvement, and frequency of purchase of the selected brand. These questions were sourced from Ailawadi et al. (2001); Campo et al. (2000) and Sen et al. (2001).

Six items measured the respondents' prior brand attitude and loyalty and respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the statements on 5-point Likert scales (a rating of '1' denoted strong agreement and a rating of '5' denoted strong disagreement). These statements were sourced from Sen et al. (2001); Dahl et al. (2001) and Ahluwalia et al. (2000). Table 4.1 shows the items used and their sources.

The second section of the SLP questionnaires was concerned with the collection of demographic information such as age, gender, family status, occupation, income and nationality. This demographic information will be used to validate the sample's representativeness and will be incorporated into the examination of sponsored property identification, sponsor brand loyalty and consumer response to SLP to determine any interrelationships among these variables. Also in this section were questions relating to involvement with the type of cause in general (either sport or cause). These statements were sourced from Fullerton and Johnson (2008). These variables were included on an exploratory basis for future research purposes.

The third section of the SLP questionnaires commenced with an open response question "*What is your opinion of sponsorship in general?*" The section also contained questions relating to attitude towards sponsorship in general. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with three statements on 5-point Likert scales (a rating of '1' denoted strong agreement and a rating of '5' denoted strong disagreement). These statements were sourced from Fullerton and Johnson (2008). These variables were included on an exploratory basis for future research purposes.

Respondents were then asked questions relating to their involvement of the specific property from the selected brand (either National Breast Cancer Foundation, or Cricket Australia, depending on version of questionnaire). The questions corresponded with the construct 'Sponsored Property Identification' and respondents were required to rate their level of agreement on 5-point Likert scales (a rating of '1' denoted strong agreement and a rating of '5' denoted strong disagreement). These statements were sourced from Speed and Thompson (2000); Grohs et al. (2004) and Gwinner and Swanson (2003) (see Table 4.1 for details these items).

Variable	Question	Scale	Author	Q.SLP*	Q.NOSLP#
Shopping Profile	How often do you shop for groceries? At which retailer do you do most of your grocery shopping? Do you enjoy grocery shopping? Attitude statements I like to finish my grocery shopping quickly I generally like to try different grocery products I often switch brands to try something different I am interested in cereal products in general I get involved with what cereal my family uses I often switch between brands of cereal	6 point scale Categorical 4 point scale Yes/No/sometimes 5 point Likert scales 1 = strongly agree 5 = strongly disagree	Ailawadi et al. (2001); Campo et al. (2000) Sen et al. (2001).	1-5	1-5
Interest in sports (Weetbix/CA Versions)	Attitude statements I participate regularly in organized sport I exercise regularly to stay fit I like to watch or listen to sports on TV or radio I look at sports websites I read the sports pages in newspapers I enjoy conversations about sports	5 point scale	Adapted from Johnson & Summers	18	24
Interest in cause (Light 'n' Tasty/ NBCF versions)	Attitude statements I volunteer my spare time for charity work I donate regularly to worthy causes I am interested in charity events I look at charity or cause websites I buy products which support worthy causes	5 point scale	Developed for this study	18	24
Frequency of purchase	How often do you purchase Sanitarium (Weetbix/Light 'n' Tasty)? 1 = weekly 2 = fortnightly 3 = monthly 4 = occasionally 5 = never	5 point scale	Adapted Pope & Voges 2000	9	9
Sponsored Property Identification	I am a strong supporter of Cricket Australia (Breast Cancer Foundation) I am interested in Cricket Australia (Breast Cancer Foundation) If a company sponsored Cricket Australia (Breast Cancer Foundation), it would positively influence how I felt about that company. Its good that companies sponsor Cricket Australia(Breast Cancer Found) I am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor Cricket Australia (Breast Cancer Foundation)	5 point Likert scale 1 = strongly agree 5 = strongly disagree	Speed & Thompson 2000	21	27

Table 4.1 – Operationalisation of Variables

Variable	Question	Scale	Author	Q.SLP*	Q.NOSLP#
Sponsoring	I like this brand	5 point Likert scale	Sen et al.	10	16
Brand	This brand is reliable	1 = strongly agree	(2001); Dahl		
Loyalty	I would recommend this brand to others	5 = strongly disagree	et al. (2001)		
	I have a favourable opinion of this brand		Ahluwalia et		
	I am loyal to this brand		al. (2000).		
	I would buy this brand even if competitors prices were lower				
Attitude	This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the sponsor.	5 point Likert scale	Speed &	29	
toward the	This sponsorship would improve my perception of the sponsor.	1 = strongly agree	Thompson		
Sponsor	This sponsorship would make me like the sponsor more.	5 = strongly disagree	2000		
Attitude	When a sponsorship supports a cause or a sport that I think is worthy, it	5 point Likert scale	Speed &		29
toward	makes me think more highly of the grocery brand	1 = strongly agree	Thompson		
sponsor		5 = strongly disagree	2000		
Purchase	Would you try this product because of the sponsorship?	Yes/No	Gwinner &	26	
intention	This sponsorship would not influence my purchase decision in any way	5 point Likert scales	Swanson	29	
	I would buy more of this Weetbix (Light 'n' Tasty) product with the	1 = strongly agree	2003		
	sponsorship than non-sponsored Weetbix (Light 'n' Tasty)	5 = strongly disagree	Cornwell &		
	I would buy this product even if competitors prices were lower		Coote 2005		
Purchase	If I didn't normally purchased the sponsor's product, sponsorship	5 point Likert scales	Gwinner &		30
intention	packaging would encourage me to try the product	1 = strongly agree	Swanson		
	If I normally purchased the sponsor's product, I would buy more than	5 = strongly disagree	2003		
	usual because of the sponsored packaging.		Cornwell &		
	I would purchase the sponsored product even if comp. prices were lower		Coote 2005		
Perceived Fit	Its logical for Weetbix (Light 'n' Tasty) to sponsor Cricket Australia	5 point Likert scales	Speed &	30	29
	(Breast Cancer Foundation)	1 = strongly agree	Thompson		
	Weetbix (Light 'n' Tasty) and Cricket Australia (Breast Cancer	5 = strongly disagree	2000 Grohs		
	Foundation) have a similar image	XX - 2X	et al. 2004		10
Awareness	Were you aware of this sponsorship before today?	Yes/No	This study	23	10
Respondent	Please indicate your gender.	Categorical values:	This study	11-17	17-20
Profile	Please indicate your age.	Female/male			
	Please indicate your household status.	5 age categories			
	Do you have children living at home?	5 income categories			
	What is your Country of Birth?	Open questions			
	What is your occupation?				

* Questions Numbers for Versions 1 and 3 (SLP) # Question Numbers for Versions 2 and 4 (NOSLP)

Finally, in the next section sponsorship [leveraged] packaging was explained using the words "Sponsorship packaging is where the logo or pictures of a sponsored group are pictured on the sponsoring grocery brands packaging (e.g. Coca-Cola & Olympics)". Respondents were asked to list any grocery brands that they could remember that use sponsorship packaging (*including the grocery brand and the sponsored organisation*): this question had an open response format.

Section 4 of the SLP version, commenced with a pictorial representation of the selected product packaging (Version 1 Sanitarium Weetbix, Version 3 Sanitarium Light 'n' Tasty) accompanied by the instruction "for this section, think about [Sanitarium Weetbix/ or Sanitarium Light 'n' Tasty - representing the sponsoring brand] and the sponsorship of [Cricket Australia or National Breast Cancer Foundation representing the sponsored property]". Respondents were asked if they were aware of the sponsorship before today (1 = yes, 2 = no). Respondents who answered yes were asked to indicate where they had seen the sponsorship before.

Following on from this, respondents were asked if they had purchased the product before and if not, would they try the product because of the sponsorship: this question had a dichotomous response format (1 = yes, 2 = no). An open response item then asked respondents what else would influence them to try the product. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood of purchasing the sponsored product on a 5-point scale (1 = very likely and 5 = not at all) (see table 4.1 for details these items).

Respondents were then asked to review a number of statements in three separate sections that dealt with: buying the sponsored product; the sponsorship arrangement (including perceived fit); and attitude toward the sponsor. For these ten items, respondents were required to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with the statements using 5-point Likert scales (a rating of '1' denoted strong agreement and a rating of '5' denoted strong disagreement) (see table 4.1 for details these items). These statements were sourced from Cornwell and Coote (2005); Gwinner and Swanson (2003); and Speed and Thompson (2000) (see table 4.1 for details).

Operationisation of Versions 2 and 4 (NOSLP) of Questionnaire

Versions 2 and 4 (NOSLP) of the questionnaires used in the study were divided into five sections over four pages and included 57 questions (a copy Versions 2 and 4 is provided in Appendix 2). The measurement items for each section of the questionnaire will be discussed and a summary of each of these, with their original sources, is provided in table 4.1.

The first section of the NOSLP questionnaires was designed to profile the general shopping behaviour of the respondent. Questions in this section relating to shopping behaviour and breakfast cereal category involvement replicated those in the SLP questionnaires. Table 4.1 shows the items used and their sources. Brand attitude and loyalty questions were included in section 2 of the NOSLP versions to enhance the flow of the questionnaire.

The second section of the NOSLP versions showed the pictorial representation of the selected product (same product as SLP versions) but without the corresponding sponsored property logos, symbols or pictures. The picture was accompanied by the instruction "for this section, think about [Sanitarium Weetbix/ or Sanitarium Light 'n' Tasty]". Respondents were then asked if they were aware of the product before today with a dichotomous response format (1 = yes, 2 = no). Respondents who answered yes were then asked where they had seen the product before.

Following on from this, respondents were asked if they had purchased the product before and if not would they try the product, this question had a dichotomous response format (1 = yes, 2 = no). An open response item then asked respondents what would influence them to try the product. Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood of purchasing the product on a 5-point scale (a rating of '1' denoted very likely and a rating of '5' denoted not at all) (see table 4.1 for details these items).

Following on from the likelihood of purchase questions, six items measured the respondents' brand attitude and loyalty. These questions replicated those asked in

Section 1 of the SLP versions where respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the statements on 5-point Likert scales (a rating of '1' denoted strong agreement and a rating of '5' denoted strong disagreement).

The third section of the NOSLP questionnaires was concerned with the collection of demographic information such as age, gender, family status, occupation, income and nationality. This demographic information will be used to validate the sample's representativeness. Also in this section were questions relating to involvement with the corresponding SLP property (either sport or cause) (see table 4.1 for details of these items). These questions replicated those in the SLP questionnaire and were asked in order to test differences between the SLP/NOSLP groups.

The fourth section of the NOSLP questionnaires commenced with an open response question "*What is your opinion of sponsorship in general?*" The section also contained questions relating to attitude towards sponsorship in general. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with three statements on 5-point Likert scales (a rating of '1' denoted strong agreement and a rating of '5' denoted strong disagreement). These statements were sourced from (Johnson & Summers 2005).

Respondents were then asked questions relating to their involvement of the corresponding SLP property from the selected brand (either National Breast Cancer Foundation, or Cricket Australia). The questions corresponded with the construct 'Sponsored Property Identification' and replicates those asked in the SLP questionnaire (see table 4.1 for details). These questions were asked in order to test differences between the SLP/NOSLP groups.

The fifth section of the NOSLP questionnaires commenced with an explanation of sponsorship [leveraged] packaging with the wording "Sponsorship packaging is where the logo or pictures of a sponsored group are pictured on the sponsoring grocery brands packaging (e.g. Coca-Cola & Olympics)". Respondents were asked to list any grocery brands that they could remember that use sponsorship packaging (*including*

the grocery brand and the sponsored organisation): this question had an open response format.

Respondents were then asked to review a number of statements in two sections that dealt with: brands that use SLP and buying products that use SLP. For these seven items, respondents were required to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with the statements using 5-point Likert scales (a rating of '1' denoted strong agreement and a rating of '5' denoted strong disagreement) (see table 4.1 for details these items).

It is important to note that these questions differed from those in the SLP questionnaires in that respondents were not exposed to the SLP and the questions relating to 'brands that use SLP' and 'buying products that use SLP' were questions surrounding the SLP concept but not applied to any particular product. These statements were adapted from the corresponding statements in the SLP questionnaire. These questions were asked in order to test differences between the groups.

Step 4 – Prepare questionnaire pretest, revise and final draft.

The purpose of pre-testing the questionnaire was to identify problems with the questionnaire and to ensure the questions would accomplish what was expected of them (Burns & Bush 2003). The questionnaire was pre-tested on a sub-sample of the population of interest (Alreck & Settle 1985; Churchill 1991) and colleagues familiar with the background to the study (Dillman 1978). The questionnaire for Study 2 was pre-tested with a convenience sample (staff and students of the University of Southern Queensland) that also met the population characteristics. That is, household shoppers over the age of 18 years. A total of 75 respondents participated in the pre-test using the same methodology as intended for Study 2. That is, respondents were randomly assigned to experiment groups and respondents were given the questionnaire, its purpose was explained and respondents were then asked to complete it. The questionnaire took between 10 minutes and 12 minutes for the respondents to complete. On completion a debriefing occurred to address any problems with wording, layout or sequencing of the questionnaire. As a result of this pre-test some minor changes were made to question wording, and layout.

Step 5 – Questionnaire administration

The main issue to be considered was the selection of community groups through which the questionnaire was to be administered. It has been reported that 81 per cent of Australian adults (Woods & Walker 2007) and 91 per cent of Australian children (MJA 2000) regularly eat breakfast cereals. With this in mind, a judgment was made by the researcher that this target market could be accessed through schools. Therefore, it was decided that local schools would be approached to assist in the administration of the questionnaire. Questionnaires were administered to each family represented at the schools with an instruction to return the completed questionnaire back to the school within one week. An incentive to complete the questionnaire was offered (\$3 for each completed survey was donated to the School Parents and Friends Association).

Step 6 – **Assessment of reliability and validity of the instrument.**

It is important that any measurement instrument used in research is accurate and consistently measures what it is supposed to measure. It should therefore be valid and reliable. A measurement scale is considered to be valid when it measures what it is intended to measure and reliable if the score from the measurement scale is consistent and stable (Davis & Consenza 1988; Churchill 1992). Table 4.2 summarises the common measures of validity and strategies used to assess them.

	Definition	Assessment strategies
Validity	A measure is valid when the differences in observed scores reflect true differences on the characteristic (Churchill 1979) or it measures what it is supposed to measure	structured approach taken in scale development use of existing and pre-tested measurement scales
	(Bollen 1989)	factor analysis
Content (face) Validity	The degree to which the scale items represent the domain of the concept under study (Davis & Consenza 1988).	Literature review Pre-testing of questionnaire Structural equation modeling
Construct Validity	The degree to which a construct achieves empirical and theoretical meaning (Steenkamp & van Trijp 1991) If all the proposed measures correlate highly with one another it can be concluded that they measure the same thing (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994).	Literature review Factor analysis Revising and retesting empirically the results over time

-1 able $4.2 - v$ and v and κ enables v	Table 4.2 –	Validity	and R	eliability
--	--------------------	----------	--------------	------------

	Definition	Assessment strategies		
Convergent Validity	The degree of association between two different measurement scales which are supposed to measure the same concept	Evidence based on correlations among factors.		
Discriminant Validity	(Davis & Consenza 1988). The degree to which the measurement scale is different form other scales designed to measure different concepts (Davis & Consenza 1988)	Evidence based on correlations among factors.		
Criterion Validity	The degree of correspondence between a measure and a criterion variable, usually measured by their correlation (Bollen 1989)	SEM and regression		
Reliability	A measure is reliable to the extent that independent but comparable measures of the same trait or construct agree (Churchill 1979).	Pre-testing of the questionnaire Write items clearly Easily understood instructions Ensure prescribed conditions for administration Approach to scale development (Churchill 1979) Reliability analysis		

(Source: developed for this program of research)

A number of steps were incorporated into the research design to assist in the establishment of validity and reliability of the measurement scales used. These included a thorough literature review, exploratory research, the use of an established process to develop and adapt measures, following standard principles for questionnaire design, pre-testing the questionnaire and planned data collection procedures. Strategies undertaken in this research to ensure validity are included below.

External Validity. Using this method of experiment helped to control for other confounding variables such as point-of-purchase advertising and displays, sales promotions, and broadcast and event advertising that are found in 'real life' marketing environment and had the ability to impact Consumer Response to SLP. This method allows the researcher to isolate relationships that existed as a result of the communication vehicle (SLP) in isolation of other factors. Although helpful to ensure control, future replications of this research may be able to examine the combined effects of other promotional activities of sponsorship arrangements as a whole, thus providing greater external validity.

Construct validity can be ensured by the triangulation of preliminary research methods to define and examine the construct of SLP. The literature review, together with input obtained from consumers in exploratory research allowed for as much completeness of understanding of the phenomenon as possible. The information gained in the exploratory stages of the research guided the questionnaire development for the experimental stage, thus ensuring construct validity for the research as a whole.

Content (face) validity. The information obtained from the exploratory stage, coupled with the information gained from the literature review guided the measurement scale development, thus ensuring that scales are representative of the concepts. Further the pre-testing of the questionnaire by marketing academics and marketing research experts assists in providing content validity.

Convergent validity can be determined by examining the correlations between the items for each scale. Convergent validity reflects the extent to which attitude measures adequately represent a characteristic or variable if it correlates or 'converges' with other measures of that variable. Correlations between items in each scale are examined in each scale in sections 5.5.1 - 5.5.4. Unfortunately, an attitude measure may also converge with measures of other variables in addition to the one of interest. Thus it is also necessary to establish discriminant validity.

Discriminant validity can be ascertained through exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis (Anderson and Gerbing 1988). Discriminant validity reflects the extent to which the constructs in a model are different from each other. Assessing discriminant validity is especially important where constructs are interrelated. Large correlations between latent constructs (greater than 0.80 or 0.90) suggest lack of discriminant validity. Each scale is assessed for discriminant validity with the results of these tests being reported in sections 5.5.1 - 5.5.4.
Nomological validity and criterion-related validity can be validated by updating the literature review throughout the course of the research. In addition, the use of structural equation modeling and regression analysis ensured the scales demonstrated the relationships that were revealed in the literature review (Hair et al. 2006).

Having designed the data collection instrument and considered its administration, the next issue of research design is sampling strategy.

4.3.3 Sampling

The process of sampling involves using a small number of the population to make conclusions about the whole populations (Zikmund 2003). The sampling methodology employed here was used to provide the most efficient, cost effective and timely access to a sample of the population of interest. The population for this study can be defined as '*All grocery shoppers in Australia*'.

The *sampling frame* that was determined to allow the most efficient, cost effective access to a sample of the population of interest was to contact schools in one city in Queensland, Australia. With the majority of Australian children regularly eating breakfast cereals, and the majority of breakfast cereal promotion being targeted at children (Chapman et al. 2006), a judgment was made that school networks would provide access to a considerable number of families (and thus household shoppers). It was expected that mothers, fathers and careers of school age children would fall into the population for the study defined as *"All grocery shoppers in Australia"*. Representativeness of the sample is discussed further in section 5.3.

The *sample size* of 200 was required for this study in order to conduct structural equation modeling. Researchers also suggest that between four and ten times the number of variables to be analysed (Hair et al. 1992; Sekaran 2000) is usually appropriate. Therefore, the sample size determined appropriate for this research was at least 200. The ethical issues raised in this sampling method were also considered and these are discussed in detail in the following section.

4.3.4 Ethical Considerations

Consideration was given to the ethical issues inherent in this research at each stage of the process. The guidelines from the Marketing Research Society of Australia's (1995) Code of Professional Behaviour were used as a checklist at each stage of the research process. Notably these guidelines expressed the importance of responsibilities to respondents, responsibilities to the administrators and responsibilities of the researcher. These will now be discussed.

Respondents to the research have the right to anonymity, the right not to be harmed, the right to check without difficulty the bona fides and identity of researchers and the right to voluntary co-operation (Market Research Society of Australia 1995). Other research authors also confirm respondent's rights to privacy, confidentiality and having sufficient information about the procedures of the study (Bagozzi 1994). Respondents were not given the opportunity to divulge their names on the questionnaire, hence assuring anonymity. Care was taken in the questionnaire design to avoid questions that may be psychologically harmful or stressful to respondents.

Participants were given a brief outline at the beginning of the questionnaire including contact details of the researcher and the university's ethical clearance number. This gave respondents the opportunity to find more information or to have a formal means of redress if they felt threatened, harmed or unhappy with the process. The participants were also informed that they had the option to withdraw from completing the survey at any time. Respondents were given the opportunity to provide informed consent to participate in the study at the commencement of the questionnaire.

Finally, the researcher ensured that care was taken to remain professional in all undertakings with respondents and that the research was designed to be as cost effective and efficient as possible. This meant ensuring that the objectives for the research were strictly adhered to. In summary, considerable care and attention was given to the ethical issues at all stages of the research design and administration.

4.3.5 Data Analysis Strategies

A suitable data analysis strategy was selected based on the characteristics of the data and suitability of the statistical techniques (Malhotra et al. 1996). In this study, the research had three main purposes. These were: (1) to develop a valid and reliable measurement model for the construct of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP; (2) to validate the scales for Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsoring Brand Loyalty, and Perceived Fit; and (3) to test the relationships of Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsoring Brand Loyalty, and Perceived Fit in the model of factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP.

Hence, any model depicting these proposed relationships can be considered multivariate in nature and would contain both a *measurement component* – are the constructs Consumer Response to SLP, Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsor Brand Loyalty, and Perceived Fit, accurately measured: and a *structural component* – how do Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsor Brand Loyalty, Perceived Fit Impact Consumer Response to SLP.

Summary statistics for each of the variables in the model will be reported first. The means and standard deviations for the variables will be discussed and any irregularities explained. In addition, tests of differences will be conducted to determine differences in responses between the NOSLP (control groups) and the SLP groups (experiment). Having determined what differences (if any) exist between the experiment and control groups, the rest of the study will then focus on the experiment groups only. It is important to note that given that the purpose of this research is to determine the factors that impact Consumer Response to SLP, the data analysis procedures will from this point on, focus on the SLP group only with a view to determining any structural relationships amongst the variables in the model.

In this study, due to the exploratory nature of the scale development process, the measurement model will first be determined using exploratory factor analysis. The resulting factor structure will then be confirmed using confirmatory factor analysis in a

popular structural equation-modeling package (AMOS 16) (Arbuckle & Wothke, 2007). This ordered progression from exploratory factor analysis to confirmatory factor analysis in developing a measurement model has been supported by a number of researchers (Gerbing & Hamilton 1996; Ambler, Styles & Xiucum 1999). Data treated in this manner using both exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis; generally result in models with good fit statistics (Mueller 1997). The structural portion of this analysis will utilise structural equation modeling to determine if Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsor Brand Loyalty, and Perceived Fit impact Consumer Response to SLP. This technique will now be explained.

Structural Equation Modeling. Structural equation modeling (SEM) is an advanced multivariate technique, which extends several other multivariate techniques i.e. factor analysis and regression (Diamantopoulos 1994). SEM is a family of statistical models that seek to explain the structural relationships among multiple measures or factors (Hair et al. 2006). This program of research aims to test a model that examines the structural relationships between Consumer Response to SLP and the factors that impact that response. SEM provides an estimation of multiple and interrelated dependence relationships and has the ability to represent unobserved concepts in these relationships and correct for measurement error in the estimation process; and it defines a model to explain the entire set of relationships (Hair et al. 2006). The statistical package used for the structural equation modeling in this research was AMOS 16 (Arbuckle & Wothke, 2007). This package was chosen because of its ease of use, advanced graphics capability and the convenience of directly importing data from SPSS (Arbuckle 1999).

The three major underlying assumptions of structural equation modeling are: the sample size should be large enough; the data should be multivariate normal and the discrepancy function chosen should be appropriate (Bentler & Dudgeon 1996). This study was expected to return a sample size that was sufficient for structural equation modeling, given the sampling methodology.

The data were collected on five-pint Likert scales suitable for use in structural equation modeling and the maximum likelihood discrepancy function (ML) was considered to be appropriate for the nature of the data collection owing to its robustness against possible violations of assumptions of multivariate normality (Anderson & Gerbin 1988; Diamantopoulos 1994). Further, the ML based fit indices are known to outperform others in evaluating model fit (Hu & Bentler 1999).

Estimating Model Fit. Structural equation modeling (SEM) has become a widely used tool in many scientific disciplines and is particularly relevant when investigating the plausibility of theoretical models explaining the interpretations among a set of variables (Hu & Bentler 1999). SEM begins with the specification of a model to be estimated and thus its primary goal becomes assessment of goodness of fit and the estimation of parameters of the hypothesised model (Hu & Bentler 1999). The most popular ways to evaluate model fit involve the Chi square (χ^2) goodness-of-fit statistic and various other fit indices that have been developed to overcome the weakness in Chi square (χ^2) with very small and very large samples.

The Chi square (χ^2) goodness-of-fit statistic assesses the magnitude of discrepancy between the sample and the fitted covariance matrices and is the product of the sample size minus one and the minimum fitting function (Hu & Bentler 1999). Thus, the Chi square (χ^2) measure tests the null hypothesis that the estimated variance-covariance matrix deviates from the sample variance-covariance matrix only due to sampling error. Hence, a non-significant Chi square (χ^2) is an indication of good fit.

The issue of fit assessment in structural equation modeling has been the subject of both theoretical and empirical papers for several decades (Tanaka 1993; Hu & Bentler 1999) resulting in multiple perspectives on fit of observed data to structural equation models and a large number of fit indices available. As it has been common practice to use at least the Chi square (χ^2) goodness-of-fit statistic and the RMSEA index, these two measures of fit will be used in this study. In addition, a number of other measures

have been proposed to aid in determination of whether the data support a hypothesized model in SEM.

The Chi square per degrees of freedom (CMIN/DF) will also be reported as this statistic takes into account the relative size of the model as it divides the Chi-square value by the degrees of freedom. These measures will be supplemented by the SRMR (Standardised Root Mean Square Residual) (Steiger & Lind 1980) and TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index) (Tucker and Lewis 1973).

The cut-off criteria that will be used for each measure will be as follows:

- χ^2 goodness-of-fit statistic a non-significant p value (Hu & Bentler 1999)
- CMIN/DF should be in the range from 2 to 5 (Arbuckle 1999)
- SRMR < 0.08 (Hu & Bentler 1999)
- TLI > 0.95 (Hu & Bentler 1999)
- RMSEA < 0.06 (Browne & Cudeck 1993; Hu & Bentler 1999)

Item Parceling in Structural Equation Modeling

One approach to the treatment of ordinal data sets is the parceling of items. Parcels were constructed from summing and averaging a number of item responses. Regression coefficients and measurement error variances were calculated using Munck (1979) formulae based on the standard deviations and Cronbach alpha for each scale. These parceled items were used as indicator variables of constructs of interest in SEM. In addition to generating less coarse measurements, item parceling also reduces the degree of non-normality in the data and hence the data are more likely to meet the underlying assumptions of SEM. A further advantage is that the parameter estimates obtained from the analyses when item parceling is used are more stable and therefore the results have greater generalizability. Item parceling increases the ratio of parameters estimated to sample size, an appropriate technique when sample sizes are small (Bandalos 2002; Little et al. 2002). Therefore, in the interests of increasing the stability of the data and reducing the degree of non-normality of the data, item parceling will be used in the final measurement model SEM.

Other Statistical Techniques. As the hypotheses suggest, an area to be examined in this study is the impact of a number of moderating variables including: awareness of the sponsorship; frequency of purchase; type of sponsored property; and respondent characteristics. Initially, the sample will be divided into the various groups (i.e. aware/ not aware; frequent/ not frequent; sport/ cause sponsorship; demographic groups e.g. gender). If the group sizes are large enough, multi-group analyses will be conducted using the AMOS software. Multi-group modeling techniques in structural equation modeling allow for factor analysis to be conducted on data from several populations simultaneously and tests whether the same model holds for each of the populations. Alternatively, should the group sizes not be large enough, regression using SPSS will be conducted as there are no assumptions about the sample size or distribution of the predictor variable (either continuous, discrete or dichotomous).

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the methodology used for Study 2 in this program of research. The chapter commenced with a rationale for using an experiment methodology and mapped the development of the experiment design. Following on from this, questionnaire development was discussed. The questionnaire instrument used a combination of existing and newly developed measurement scales to collect the data required to answer the research problem. Thorough pre-testing and subsequent revision of the questionnaire was carried out to ensure it was as reliable as possible. The process followed in the research design also aided in establishing the validity and reliability of the instrument used.

The target population for the research was defined as household shoppers residing in Australia over the age of 18 years. The sampling frame used was schools in Toowoomba, Queensland. A non-probability judgment sampling method was used to collect the required responses. The major data analysis technique to be used i.e. structural equation modeling using AMOS was described. Ethical issues concerning respondents were considered at each stage of the process and research design. The next chapter outlines the results of the data analysis for Study 2.

Chapter 5 – Study 2 Results

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter justified the methodology used for Study 2. This chapter will commence with a revision of the conceptual model and hypotheses that were put forward at the conclusion of Chapter 3. Following on from the review of the research model and hypotheses, the chapter will then profile and provide an analysis of the respondents of Study 2. The next section will report the preliminary analysis undertaken to ensure the data were suitable for structural equation modeling and also establishes the descriptive elements of the data and provides a detailed description of the dependent variable in the study. The measurement component of the conceptual research model is tested with measurement scales for the four constructs being validated. The structural component of the conceptual model is then tested along with the hypotheses that underpin the model. Figure 5.1 below provides an outline of Chapter 5.



Figure 5.1 – Chapter Outline

5.2 Development of Conceptual Model and Hypotheses

Based on the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, the components of a preliminary model of factors impacting consumer responses to sponsorship leveraged packaging were developed along with a series of propositions that were used to guide Study 1 (section 2.5). The literature suggested that the constructs Sponsored Property Identification, Perceived Fit, and Brand Experience should all be relevant factors that would play a role in Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging.

After conducting exploratory research (Study 1) the conceptual model was revised to incorporate those findings. The revised conceptual model proposed that Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging would be impacted equally by Sponsored Property Identification and Sponsoring Brand Loyalty.

As Sponsored Property Identification captures the degree to which a person identifies with the sponsored property, it was considered to be of particular importance in influencing a consumer's awareness of a particular sponsorship leveraged arrangement. It was proposed that Sponsored Property Identification would also impact a consumer's attitudes toward the sponsor and further, direct the likelihood of that consumer purchasing the sponsor's product. Thus, the model proposes that when Sponsored Property Identification is high, there is likely to be a strong positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP. The results from the literature review also suggest that this relationship is likely to be moderated by the Perceived Fit between the sponsoring brand and the sponsored property.

The other important variable in the proposed model is Sponsoring Brand Loyalty. This variable captures the degree to which a consumer is loyal to the sponsoring brand. Results from the literature review and study one suggest that when Sponsoring Brand Loyalty is low, there is likely to be a positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP. Alternatively, when Sponsoring Brand Loyalty is high there will be little or no impact on Consumer Response to SLP.

Furthermore, the results of Study 1 in particular indicated that the way that consumers respond to sponsorship leveraged packaging will be moderated by type of sponsored property, awareness of sponsorship, frequency of purchase of the sponsored product and individual respondent characteristics.

In summary then, the relationships proposed by the hypotheses can be considered diagrammatically in the form of a conceptual model as shown in figure 5.2. Table 5.1 provides a summary of the hypotheses to be tested in Study 2. The next section will present the profile and analysis of respondents for Study 2.

Figure 5.2 – Conceptual Model - Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP



Table 5.1 – Research Hypotheses

H1	That there is a positive relationship between sponsored property identification and consumer response to SLP. That is: as the degree of sponsored property identification increases, there will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP
H2	That there is a positive relationship between perceived fit and consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. That is: as the degree of perceived fit increases, there will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP.
Н3	That there is a negative relationship between sponsoring brand loyalty and consumer response to SLP. That is: in cases of low sponsoring brand loyalty, there will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP.
H4	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by perceived fit. That is there will be a difference in consumer response depending on the extent of perceived fit.
H5	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by type of sponsored property. That is there will be a difference in consumer response depending on the type of sponsored property.
H6	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by awareness of the sponsorship. That is in cases where the respondent is aware of the sponsorship; there will be a positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP.
H7	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by frequency of purchase of the sponsoring brand. That is in cases where the respondent frequently purchases the sponsoring brand; there will be a positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP
H8	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by respondent characteristics. That is consumer response to SLP will vary depending on age, income, household status & respondent gender.

5.3 Profile and Analysis of Respondents

The data set for this study was collected from residents of Toowoomba, Queensland, an inland city with a population exceeding 100 000 people. The main survey was carried out between 1 September and 1 November, 2008. For this study, respondents completed a written survey that was self administered through schools. As a result, a total of 256 surveys were completed and 251 were retained for data analysis. The demographic profile of the respondents for Study 2 is shown in table 5.2.

Table 5.2 – Demographic Profile of Respondents

	SLP	NO SLP
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Gender	n = 206	n = 50
• Female	175 (85)	39 (78)
• male	31 (15)	11 (22)
Age	n = 197	n = 49
• 18-25 yrs	26 (13)	2 (4)
• 26-35 yrs	47 (24)	22 (44)
• 36-50 yrs	96 (49)	18 (37)
• 51-65 yrs	24 (12)	7 (14)
• over 65 yrs	4 (2)	0
Household Status	n = 201	n = 50
• Single	45 (23)	11 (22)
Couple	156 (77)	39 (78)
Children living at home	n = 201	n = 50
• Yes	151 (75)	33 (66)
• No	50 (25)	17 (34)
Occupation	n = 197	n = 50
 Managerial/Professional 	23 (12)	7 (14)
 Semi-professional 	58 (29)	18 (36)
Tradesperson/ sales	19 (9)	3 (6)
Administration	31 (16)	11 (22)
• Student	41 (21)	10 (20)
Home Duties	21 (11)	1 (2)
Retired/ Unemployed	4 (2)	-
Household Income	n = 144	n = 32
• Under \$25000	20 (14)	5 (15)
• \$25000 & under \$50000	26 (18)	9 (28)
• \$50000 & under \$75000	42 (29)	12 (38)
• \$75000 & under \$100000	29 (20)	6 (19)
• \$100000 or over	27 (19)	

The data shows that of the 206 respondents in the SLP group, 85 per cent were female (n=175) and 15 per cent (n=31) were male. The majority of the respondents were between 36 and 50 years. Most in the sample belonged to a household that consisted of a couple with children living at home. The largest occupational group in the sample was semi-professionals with (n=58, 29 per cent). Household income varied with the largest group being between \$50 000 and \$75 000 (n=42, 29 per cent). To establish the representativeness of the sample, two strategies were used. Firstly, the response rate was reviewed and then the profile of the sample was compared to that of the sample population.

5.3.1 Response Rate

Due to the sampling process, a response rate of approximately 30 per cent was expected. Four schools were involved in Study 2 with 440 families being represented. The final number of responses was 256, which translated into a response rate of 58 per cent. There were 5 incomplete questionnaires returned and thus the final sample size was 251. This represented a response rate of 57 per cent. In summary, this response rate is good for self-administered questionnaires (Aaker et al. 2007).

5.3.2 Assessment of Profiles

The demographic profiles of the respondents as summarised in table 5.2 can be compared to the known population parameters for the sample population (main grocery buyers) in order to gauge representativeness. Publicly available statistics for grocery shoppers (Roy Morgan Research 2009) indicate that this sample differs somewhat in relation to gender and children living at home (this study 85 per cent female, Roy Morgan 63 per cent female; this study with children living at home 75 per cent, Roy Morgan 37 per cent). However, given that the sampling method was specifically chosen to capture families with children, this difference is not surprising. In spite of the differences between the sample and the target population, when patterns in the data were examined, similarity was noted between the two groups.

5.4 Preliminary Analysis

The rationale and general approach to be undertaken in the analysis of this data was outlined in Chapter 4. Hence, the preliminary analysis will focus on the actual outcomes in each of these areas for Study 2. The preliminary analysis consisted of three sections: 1) cleaning and screening of the data (specifically in regard to missing data, examination of outliers and normality); 2) generation of descriptive statistics for all variables included in the model; and 3) examination of correlations of all variables included in the model.

5.4.1. Cleaning and Screening

The first step in the preliminary analysis was to clean and screen the data to increase accuracy and ensure that none of the assumptions for data analysis techniques had been violated. The data were cleaned and screened for missing data, outliers and normality.

Data Cleaning. The data were entered into SPPS, and were checked for accuracy by running frequency distributions and any out of range values were checked. In addition, a random check of every 10 entries was also performed. During this process the item *'the sponsorship would not influence my purchase decision in any way'* which was negatively phrased was reverse coded to allow for ease of interpretation. This item is marked 'reversed' in the table of means and standard deviations table 5.3.

The question relating to respondent's willingness to try the sponsored product appeared to be problematic. Although respondents were directed to skip the question if they had purchased the sponsored product previously, there were a number of respondents who completed the question (10 per cent) despite indicating they had already purchased the product. It was therefore decided to eliminate this question from the analysis due to the possible inaccuracies in its measurement.

As an alternative, two other items were used to determine the respondent's willingness to try the sponsored product. The frequency of purchase variable was used to group the respondents into two groups, those who had previously purchased the sponsoring brand and those who had not. These groupings were then used to ascertain significant differences between the groups and the likelihood of purchasing the sponsored product (see section 5.7.3).

Missing Data. SPSS was used to check for missing data. During this process, there were 85 cases, which were missing responses to the household income question. This could have been a result of the questionnaires being administered and collected by families from schools, where respondents may have been concerned about privacy of the information. Although an important variable, it was not considered critical to the

research question, and as such, these cases were retained for further analysis. Apart from this question, there were ten other cases found to have missing data, particularly in regard to the variables in the full measurement model. Five of these cases, had missing variables in excess of 15 per cent and were removed from the data set. Following the principles of Cohan and Cohan (1983), the remaining 5 cases with missing variables were replaced using a Expectation-Maximisation (EM) algorithm method, as they were less than 5% of the total number of questions.

Outliers. In order to check for outliers in the data, SPSS was used to generate frequencies and histograms. Whilst some cases showed the presence of outliers, none were deemed to be inconsistent and therefore all were retained in the analysis. A further check using AMOS and the Mahalanobis distance was carried out. Twelve cases were noted with multivariate outliers and these were reviewed. In all cases it was judged that the responses were reasonable, and thus they were retained in the analysis.

Normality. Normality was considered at both the univariate and multivariate levels, as non-normality will affect the choice of estimation method used for structural equation modeling. First, all variables were tested at a univariate level for skewness and kurtosis using AMOS. Skewness reflects the symmetry of a distribution and distributions in which most of the scores are piled up on the left or on the right are respectively referred to as positively or negatively skewed distributions. For scores that are normally distributed, the skewness values will equal zero and the further the departure from zero, the greater the amount of skewness of the distribution (West, Finch, & Curran 1995). Kurtosis is the degree of heaviness of the tails of the distribution. For scores that are normally distributed, the kurtosis value will equal zero, with values greater than or less than zero denoting different degrees of heaviness of the tails. West, Finch, and Curran (1995) recommend that absolute values of skewness and kurtosis respectively exceeding 2 and 7 are indicative of moderately non-normal distributions.

In the scale for Sponsoring Brand Loyalty, no variables showed significant skewness or kurtosis. In the scale for Sponsored Property Identification, the variable 'good idea' showed considerable skewness (skewness=5.6) and kurtosis (kurtosis=3.6). In the Consumer Response to SLP scale, the variable 'buy more' showed kurtosis (kurtosis=-3.10). In the Perceived Fit scale, the variable 'logical fit' showed mild skewness (skewness=2.56) and mild kurtosis (kurtosis=2.059). Thus it can be seen that the data for this study, violates a key assumption underlying the use of maximum likelihood (ML) estimation that of a normal univariate distribution.

Corrections have been developed to adjust ML estimation to account for nonnormality. AMOS produces the "Bollen-Stine bootstrap p" (which is a post-hoc adjustment to account for non-normality) (Mathieu et al. 1992). The Bollen-Stine bootstrap p is a bootstrapped modification of the model chi-square used to test model fit, adjusting for distributional misspecification of the model. Therefore, given the non-normality of the data, the Bollen-Stine bootstrap p will be used to test model fit in this study.

The nineteen variables to be used in the model were then tested for multivariate normality, by the two different methods of Mardia's (1974) coefficient and examination of the distribution of residuals using AMOS. The Mardia's coefficient of multivariate normality for the variables in the final measurement model was 56.9 with a critical ratio of 17.89 indicating that there was non-normality in the data. Specifically the data appeared to be mildly skewed and kurtotic. As a further indication of normality the residuals were examined with a large number of variables returning a standardized residual value of greater than 2.5 (Joreskog & Sorbom 1996). This confirmed the non-normality of the data.

On the basis of the univariate and multivariate tests of normality discussed, most of the variables used in the model were moderately non-normal (Finch, West & MacKinnon 1997). Within structural equation modeling, previous studies have confirmed that maximum likelihood estimation is robust to moderate violations of the normality assumption with estimates of parameters generally unaffected by the non-

normality. Therefore, it was decided to use the maximum likelihood estimation method and not to transform the variables.

Summary. The data cleaning ensured that the observations were accurately entered for analysis. The data screening identified and addressed the issues of missing data, outliers and non-normality. Having explained the data cleaning and screening procedures, the next section considers descriptive statistics.

5.4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Evaluation of the descriptive statistics of the data allows the researcher to become familiar with the data set before proceeding with bivariate and multivariate analysis (Hair et al. 1995). Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for the items to be considered in each of the constructs are reported in table 5.3. The means and standard deviations for the variables show no unexpected results.

For the purposes of this research, the term [sponsoring brand] is used to represent the sponsoring brand in the experiment groups i.e. either Sanitarium Weetbix or Sanitarium Light 'n' Tasty breakfast cereals. Furthermore, the term [sponsored property] is used to represent the corresponding sponsored property i.e. in the case of Sanitarium Weetbix, the sponsored property is Cricket Australia; in the case of Sanitarium Light 'n' Tasty, the sponsored property is National Breast Cancer Foundation. For example, the item 'The [sponsored property] logo on the package is a good way to show the sponsorship arrangement between [sponsoring brand] and [sponsored property]' will be reported in this way to improve readability.

	Μ	Mean*		St. Deviation	
Construct/Variable	SLP	NOSLP	SLP	NOSLP	
Sponsored Property Identification	n=201	n=50	n=201	n= 50	
I am a strong supporter of [sponsored property]	2.65	2.92	1.11	1.12	
I am interested in [sponsored property]	2.66	2.88	1.05	1.17	
If a company sponsored [sponsored property], it would positively	2.94	3.26	1.09	1.26	
influence how I felt about that company					
It is good that companies sponsor [sponsored property]	2.21	2.26	0.92	0.89	
I am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor	2.97	3.16	1.06	1.16	
[sponsored property]					
Sponsoring Brand Loyalty					
I like this brand	2.55	2.43	0.95	0.91	
This brand is reliable	2.43	2.34	0.88	0.97	
I would recommend this brand to others	2.61	2.56	0.90	0.88	
I have a favourable opinion of this brand	2.57	2.45	0.91	0.84	
I am loyal to this brand	2.99	3.07	0.99	1.06	
I would buy this brand even if comp. prices were lower	3.06	3.15	1.06	1.26	
Consumer Response to SLP					
I like this sponsorship pictured on this package	2.54	NA	0.88	NA	
The [sponsored property] logo on the package is a good way to	2.18	2.28	0.83	0.64	
show the sponsorship arrangement between [sponsoring brand] and					
[sponsored property]					
This sponsorship improves my perception of [sponsoring brand]	3.03	NA	.991	NA	
This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the	3.04	3.39	1.02	0.917	
[sponsoring brand]					
This sponsorship of [sponsored property] makes me like	3.30	3.06	0.96	1.01	
[sponsoring brand] more than before					
I would buy more of SLP product than un-sponsored	3.47	3.58	1.10	0.66	
How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product?	2.91	NA	1.42	NA	
I would purchase this SLP product even if competitors prices were	3.28	3.58	1.10	0.66	
lower					
This sponsorship would not influence my purchase decision in any	3.65	2.78	1.08	1.17	
way (reversed) **					
Perceived Fit					
Its logical for [sponsoring brand] to sponsor [sponsored property]	2.75	2.48	0.831	0.66	
[Sponsoring brand] and [sponsored property] have a similar image	2.90	NA	0.80	NA	

Table 5.3 – Means and standard deviation of variables used in Study 2

*All ratings from 1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Strongly disagree 3 = neutral

** Significant differences determined between SLP and NO SLP groups (p=.000 at 0.01 level)

In relation to the Sponsored Property Identification scale, all of the means of the items in the measure were below the neutral position (items rated on a 5 point Likert scale with the mid point of 3 indicated neutrality: a score of 1 indicated strong agreement and a score of 5 indicated strong disagreement). This suggested that respondents, generally held some level of agreement with each of the statements. In particular, the statement '*I think it is good that a company sponsors [sponsored property]*' which had

a moderately high mean score (mean=2.21: a score of 1 indicated strong agreement) suggests that most respondents considered that sponsorship of the property was a good idea. Respondents considered themselves to be supporters of the identified properties (Cricket Australia and National Breast Cancer Foundation) (mean=2.65: a score of 1 indicated strong agreement).

The mean scores for the items included in the scale to measure Sponsoring Brand Loyalty were consistent with expectations. Most of the items exhibited a moderately low mean score (lowest mean = 2.43 where 1 indicated strong agreement). As most of these statements were worded such that agreement indicated strong loyalty to the sponsoring brand, this result supported the notion that most respondents had some loyalty to the sponsoring brand.

In relation to the Consumer Response to SLP scale, many of the means of the items in this measure were below the neutral position (items rated on a 5 point Likert scale with the mid point of 3 indicating neutrality and a score of 1 indicating strong agreement and a score of 5 indicating strong disagreement). This suggested that respondents generally held some level of agreement with each of the statements. In particular, the statement '*The [sponsored property] logo on the package is a good way to show the sponsor arrangement*', had a low mean score (mean = 2.18 - a score of 1 indicated strong agreement) suggesting that most respondents considered the SLP marketing strategy favourably.

Generally, respondents indicated their attitudes towards the sponsor were ambivalent with three items in the scale having means close to the midpoint or neutral position (mean=3.03 for item '*This sponsorship improves my perception of [sponsoring brand]*'; mean = 3.04 for item '*This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the [sponsoring brand]*'; and mean = 3.30 for item '*This sponsorship of [sponsorship of for the sponsor brand]*'; makes me like [sponsoring brand] more than before').

The mean scores for the items included in the scale to measure Perceived Fit were consistent with expectations. The items exhibited a neutral mean score (mean=2.75 and mean=2.90 - where 1 indicated strong agreement) indicating that respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with these statements.

In summary, the means and standard deviations reported in table 5.3 show no unexpected results based on the findings and discussion of the earlier studies and the literature. The next stage of the research was to conduct t-tests to determine any differences between the SLP and the NO SLP groups. The results are as follows.

The results of the t-tests indicate that there were significant differences between the groups for one variable, *'This sponsorship would not influence my purchase decision in any way'* (p =.000). The SLP group had a mean of 3.65 for this item, whilst the NOSLP group had a mean of 2.78. In considering these results it should be noted that the item scores had been reversed for the purposes of analysis with other positively worded items. Taking this into consideration, the NOSLP group mean of 2.78 is close to the midpoint (i.e. score of 3) indicating a neutral position, whilst the SLP group mean of 3.65 would indicate agreement with the statement. In effect, this would indicate that the SLP group believes the sponsorship *would* influence their purchase decision whilst the NOSLP group was rather ambivalent about this statement.

This result was not surprising particularly when we consider that the NOSLP group was not exposed to the SLP examples. Rather, SLP was explained to this group using the wording, "Sponsorship packaging is where the logo or pictures of a sponsored group are pictured on the sponsoring grocery brands packaging (e.g. Coca-Cola & Olympics)". Furthermore, the questions in the NOSLP questionnaire related to the concept of SLP in general and sponsored properties were not specified. Thus, the significant difference between the SLP and NOSLP groups and their response to this item is logical given the nature of the items and exposure conditions.

Having determined that differences exist between the experiment and control groups and as the purpose of this research is to determine the factors which impact Consumer Response to SLP, the data analysis procedures will from this point on, focus on the SLP group only with a view to determining any structural relationships amongst the variables in the model from their perspective.

The next stage of the research was to validate the measures that were to be used in testing of the conceptual models as discussed in section 5.2. The analysis will be conducted in two stages, firstly the measurement models will be tested and then the structural model will be tested.

5.5 Measurement Models

Exploratory factor analysis incorporating all 22 items was the first technique to be used to assess the validity of the proposed item groups. Some researchers suggest that exploratory factor analysis should be followed by confirmatory factor analysis using structural equation modeling (Anderson & Gerbing 1998; Ambler, Styles & Xiucun 1999). This process was followed in this study where all 22 items were investigated firstly with exploratory factor analysis and then with confirmatory factor analysis.

To conduct the exploratory factor analysis, an exploratory maximum likelihood factor analysis was used with an oblimin rotation, which allows correlation between the factors. The data were considered suitable for factor analysis as the Bartlett Test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 3687.77$; df = 231; p = 0.00). This indicates that there are sufficient non-zero inter-correlations amongst the measured variables to warrant an Exploratory Factor Analysis. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy (KMO = 0.870) indicates that over 80% of variance in the measured variables is common variance. KMO values exceeding 0.6 are recommended for Exploratory Factor Analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell 1996). Using the root one criterion (Tabachnick & Fidell 1996), each item was examined and the corresponding factor loadings and pattern matrix are shown in table 5.5. The factor correlation matrix is provided in table 5.4 and the item correlation matrix is shown in appendix 3. The results of the exploratory factor analysis as shown in table 5.5, suggest some factorial complexity with the majority of the items showing no cross-loadings. Two items did however show some cross loadings and these will be fully discussed in section 5.5.4. The four factor model explained 70% of the variance in the items and the percentage of variance accounted for by each factor individually is shown in table 5.5. In summary it was determined that a four factor model explained the relationships in these items quite well.

Factor	1	2	3	4
1	1.00			
2	-0.25	1.00		
3	0.51	-0.06	1.00	
4	0.36	-0.21	0.23	1.00

 Table 5.4 – Exploratory Factor Analysis - Factor Correlation Matrix

The exploratory factor analysis suggested that the 22 items captured four factors (see table 5.5). The results indicated that the measures for Sponsored Property Identification and Sponsoring Brand Loyalty were uni-dimensional as proposed, but that three items were not captured under the constructs initially proposed.

The three items not captured under the original constructs were:

- 'I like this sponsorship pictured on this package'
- 'The [sponsored property] logo on the package is a good way to show the sponsorship arrangement between [sponsoring brand] and [sponsored property]'
- 'How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product?'

The first and second items were initially proposed under the Consumer Response to SLP construct. However, the items were shown in this exploratory factor analysis to fall into the Perceived Fit construct. Thus it was necessary to carefully consider where the items belonged and revisit the wording and intent of the measures.

Originally, the items were modified from existing measures to account for this context specifically i.e. sponsorship promotion on packaging and were intended to reflect a consumer response to SLP. However, closer examination of the wording of these items confirms that they may in fact be also capturing elements of respondent's views about matching in relation to the sponsorship and the packaging. Thus, it is reasonable that these items may better reflect measures of Perceived Fit rather than just Consumer Response to SLP. Given the indication of the exploratory factor analysis, the two items were grouped in the Perceived Fit factor for the confirmatory factor analysis and these results are discussed more fully in section 5.5.4.

The remaining item '*How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product?*' was initially proposed to fit into the Consumer Response to SLP construct. However, the exploratory factor analysis indicated that this item should be grouped with the Sponsoring Brand Loyalty scale. Given that Sponsoring Brand Loyalty represents the consumer's attitude and purchase habits toward the unsponsored product, it is reasonable that the item '*How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product?*' could capture elements of this construct. However as this particular item represents the consumer's purchase intention toward the sponsored product (after exposure to SLP), theoretically, the item belongs as a Consumer Response to SLP and therefore it was retained in that measurement scale (section 5.5.3).

Having established that the model captures four factors as initially proposed, the next step was to examine the individual factors. With this in mind, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on each measurement scale in the model with a view to attempting to purify the measures in terms of uni-dimensionality. Each scale will now be addressed in turn commencing with the Sponsored Property Identification scale.

Table 5.5 – Pattern Matrix Study 2

Proposed Item Membership	1	2	3	4
Sponsored Property Identification				
I am a strong supporter of [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]	-0.021	0.046	0.894	-0.044
I am interested in [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]	-0.091	0.041	<u>0.937</u>	0.029
If a company sponsored [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation], it would positively influence how I felt about that company	0.249	0.042	<u>0.670</u>	0.034
I think it is good that companies sponsor [Cricket Australia/Breast Cancer Foundation]	-0.089	-0.022	0.668	0.300
I am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor [Cricket Australia/Breast Cancer Foundation]	0.169	0.066	<u>0.772</u>	-0.037
Sponsoring Brand Loyalty				
I like this brand	-0.015	<u>-0.931</u>	-0.076	0.013
This brand is reliable	0.033	<u>-0.894</u>	-0.159	0.013
I would recommend this brand to others	-0.057	<u>-0.949</u>	-0.071	0.064
I have a favourable opinion of this brand	-0.049	<u>-0.920</u>	-0.064	0.007
I am loyal to this brand	-0.128	<u>-0.807</u>	0.072	0.036
I would buy this brand even if competitors prices were lower	-0.019	<u>-0.713</u>	0.102	0.002
Consumer Response to SLP				
I like this sponsorship pictured on the package	0.184	-0.017	<u>0.327</u>	<u>0.426</u>
The logo on the package is a good way to show the sponsorship	0.246	-0.049	0.019	<u>0.442</u>
This sponsorship improves my perception of [Sponsored property]	<u>0.839</u>	-0.032	-0.011	0.201
This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the [Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T brand]	<u>0.939</u>	0.014	-0.067	0.151
This sponsorship of [Cricket Australia/National Breast Cancer Foundation] makes me like [Sanitarium Weetbix	<u>0.784</u>	0.048	-0.009	0.157
brand / Sanitarium L & T brand] more than before				
Sponsorship would not influence purchase (R)	<u>0.333</u>	-0.113	0.278	-0.155
Likelihood of purchasing product	0.201	<u>-0.595</u>	-0.007	0.024
I would buy more of SLP product than an un-sponsored product	<u>0.514</u>	-0.086	0.261	-0.107
I would purchase this SLP product even if competitors prices were lower	<u>0.253</u>	<u>-0.312</u>	<u>-0.240</u>	0.007
Perceived Fit				
Its logical for [Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T] to sponsor [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]	0.028	-0.025	.078	<u>0.834</u>
[Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T] and [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation] have a similar image	0.036	-0.085	016	<u>0.772</u>
Percentage of variance accounted for by each factor	34%	22%	8%	6%

5.5.1 Sponsored Property Identification Scale

All of the items included in this measure were sourced from the literature (see section 2.4.3). The initial exploratory factor analysis of the original five items supported the unidimensionality of this scale. The factor loadings for these items were considered to be good to excellent (0.70 to 0.88) (Churchill 1979) and the resulting Cronbach alpha was also good (α = 0.91). In the early stages of basic research, alphas of 0.7 and above have been considered acceptable (Nunally 1997; Churchill 1979). Table 5.6 shows the factor analysis results for the initial confirmatory model and the adjusted measurement model.

Variable	Confirmatory factor loadings initial model	Confirmatory factor loadings adjusted model
Sponsored Property Identification	$\alpha = 0.913$	$\alpha = 0.884$
I am a strong supporter of [sponsored property]	0.87	0.71
I am interested in [sponsored property]	0.88	-
If a company sponsored [sponsored property], it would	0.81	0.89
positively influence how I felt about that company		
I think it is good that companies sponsor [sponsored property]	0.70	0.66
I am more likely to purchase products of companies that	0.85	0.91
sponsor [sponsored property]		

 Table 5.6 – Sponsored Property Identification Scale

In the confirmatory analysis using AMOS, all of the items were shown to contribute to the measure of Sponsored Property Identification as the critical ratios were above 1.96. The betas (standardised regression weights) for the five variables were all above 0.7, which are considered to be very good (Churchill 1979; Hulland et al. 1996). An analysis of residuals is also recommended as a means of assessing overall fit, with those residuals with a standardised value greater than 2.58 indicating a possible specification error (Joreskog & Sorbom 1996). In this measure, there were no standardised residuals higher than 1.

Although the five items were shown to have very good regression weights and a good alpha (α = 0.91), it can be seen that two pairs of items were highly correlated (see table 5.7). These high correlations suggest that there may be some item redundancy. Therefore it was decided to assess the scale with the removal of each item in turn.

Item	Interested	Strong Supporter	Positively Influence	Good to Sponsor	Likely Purchase
I am interested in [sponsored property]	1.00				
I am a strong supporter of [sponsored property]	0.83	1.00			
If a company sponsored [sponsored property] it would positively influence how I felt about that company	0.65	0.68	1.00		
It is good that companies sponsor [sponsored property]	0.65	0.58	0.57	1.00	
I am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor [sponsored property]	0.72	0.70	0.82	0.59	1.00

 Table 5.7 – Item Correlations Sponsored Property Identification Scale

As can be seen from table 5.6, if the item '*I* am interested in [sponsored property]' was removed from the measure, the coefficient alpha was sightly reduced but still acceptable (α = 0.88). However, when the subsequent items were removed, the coefficient alpha dropped to α = 0.830 (*Positively Influence*), and α = 0.821 (*Likely Purchase*). In order to evaluate the scale with as high an alpha as possible, all the items except the item '*I* am interested in [sponsored property]' were retained and the scale tested for goodness of fit.

The adjusted model had improved multivariate normality with Mardia's coefficient reduced to 4.72 and no large residuals. In addition when the two factor structures were compared, the adjusted model (with 1 item deleted) appeared to be a better fitting model than the initial model for measuring Sponsored Property Identification (χ^2 =4.85, p = 0.087 df =2). Five measures of goodness of fit were used to evaluate the measurement models as discussed in section 4.3.5 and these results are shown for this scale in table 5.8.

Table 5.8 – Measures of Fit for the Sponsored Property Identification Scale

	Initial measurement scale	Adjusted measurement scale
Mardia's coefficient	9.126	4.72
Standardised residuals above 2.57	None	None
Chi Square	$\chi^2 = 70.36 \text{ p} = 0.00$	$\chi^2 = 4.85, p = 0.087$
	df = 5	df = 2 bp = 0.582
CMIN/DF	14.07	2.44
TLI	0.82	0.98
SRMR	0.04	0.02
RMSEA	0.26	0.08

In relation to the fit of both the initial and adjusted measurement models, the adjusted measurement model was superior to that of the initial model. The fit indices for the initial measurement model (five items) showed a poor fit to the data (significant Chi Square statistic p = .000; CMIN/DF well above acceptable range of 2-5; TLI below acceptable 0.95 range, and RMSEA well above 0.08 acceptable range).

For the adjusted scale (four items) the Chi Square statistic was not significant. However, given the non-normality of the data, the Bollen-Stine bootstrap p was a more appropriate statistic for the evaluation of fit for this factor. The Bollen-Stine bootstrap (p = 0.58) suggests the adjusted model has good fit. In addition, the CMIN/DF was well within the 2 to 5 range considered to be acceptable, an acceptable TLI statistic over the 0.95 desired level, and the SRMR was well below 0.08. The RMSEA value was within the 0.05 to 0.08 range, which is considered to be mediocre (Browne & Cudeck 1993). This would suggest that the adjusted measurement model for Sponsored Property Identification with 4 items has a better fit with the data than the initial model with 5 items.

Despite the improved fit of the adjusted model, the initial model showed higher factor loadings, higher coefficient alpha and a lack of cross-loadings in the exploratory factor analysis. With this in mind, it was decided to retain all the items in the measure at this stage as proposed (five items) for testing in the structural stage of the analysis. In retaining the item *"I am interested in [sponsored property]*, the high correlations suggest possible item redundancy, which is reflected in the less than desirable model fit.

5.5.2 Sponsoring Brand Loyalty scale

All of the items included in this measure were sourced from the literature (see section 4.3.2). The factor loadings for these items were considered to be good to excellent (0.70 to 0.89) (Churchill 1979) and the resulting Cronbach alpha was also good (α = 0.91). The results are shown in table 5.9. The initial exploratory factor analysis of the original six items supported the uni-dimensionality of this scale. However, the exploratory factor analysis suggested that an additional item '*How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product*?' belonged to the Sponsoring Brand Loyalty scale. As explained in

section 5.5, it was determined that this item theoretically belongs to the Consumer Response to SLP scale. Therefore for the confirmatory factor analysis the item was included in the Consumer Response to SLP scale and not here (see section 5.5.3).

Variable	Confirmatory factor loadings initial model	Confirmatory factor loadings final model
Sponsoring Brand Loyalty	$\alpha = 0.939$	$\alpha = 0.949$
I like this brand	0.92	0.92
This brand is reliable	0.90	0.91
I would recommend this brand to others	0.95	0.95
I have a favourable opinion of this brand	0.92	0.92
I am loyal to this brand	0.78	0.77
I would buy this brand even if comp. prices were lower	0.69	-

 Table 5.9 – Sponsoring Brand Loyalty Scale

In the confirmatory analysis using AMOS, all of the six items were shown to contribute to the measure of Sponsoring Brand Loyalty as the critical ratios were above 1.96. The betas for the six variables were all at an acceptable level (above 0.5) and five out of the seven variables were above 0.7, which is considered to be very good (Churchill 1979; Hulland et al. 1996). In this measure, there were no standardised residuals higher than 2.5.

	× 17	N II I I		r 11
	s sponson	21010 20	<i>yy</i>	•

Table 5.10 – Item Correlations Sponsoring Brand Loyalty Scale

Item	Like Brand	Reliable Brand	Recommend Brand	Favourable Opinion	Loyal to Brand	Buy Brand
I like this brand	1.00					
This brand is reliable	0.86	1.00				
I would recommend this brand to others	0.87	0.85	1.00			
I have a favourable opinion of this brand	0.83	0.84	0.88	1.00		
I am loyal to this brand	0.71	0.64	0.75	0.71	1.00	
I would buy this brand even if	0.62	0.54	0.68	0.60	0.75	1.00
competitors prices were lower						

There were high correlations between a number of items in this scale, however the exploratory factor analysis showed no cross-loadings for the items. The modification indices for these variables suggested that the fit of the model could be improved if the following items were removed from the scale: '*This brand is reliable' and 'I would buy this brand even if competitor's prices were lower'*.

In relation to the item "*this brand is reliable*' there were high correlations between this item and three other sponsoring brand loyalty items (see table 5.10) indicating possible item redundancy. However, despite these high correlations, the item was shown to have a high factor loading (beta = 0.90) with no standardised residuals higher than 2.5. As such, the item was retained in this measure for testing in the structural stage of the analysis.

In considering the item 'I would buy this brand even if competitor's prices were lower', the item had a reasonable factor loading (beta = 0.69). This item was initially included in the scale on the premise that consumers who were loyal to a particular brand would purchase the product regardless of price. However, in FMCG markets, although consumers might be loyal to particular brands, they are also generally very price sensitive (Silayoi & Speece 2004). Therefore, even though a consumer may be loyal to a particular brand, the literature suggests that they can be influenced to switch brands if a competitor's price was cheaper (Pickton & Broderick 2005). As the mean for this item is marginally over the middle point of the scale (mean = 3.06) indicating a neutral position, there is also evidence that the item may not be adding much richness of interpretive data to the scale. Therefore, it was decided to assess the scale with the removal of the item.

When comparing the two measurement models, an adjusted measurement model (5 items) had a better model fit ($\chi^2 = 22.2$, p = 0.00 df = 5 bp = 0.09) than did the initial model with 6 items ($\chi^2 = 82.68$; p = 0.00; df = 9). In the adjusted model the coefficient alpha was improved ($\alpha = 0.949$). The adjusted model had much improved multivariate normality with Mardia's coefficient reduced to 30.81 and no large residuals. The Bollen Stein p statistic was not significant suggesting reasonable fit given the non-normality of the data. The CMIN/DF was between the accepted 2 to 5 range, again suggesting reasonable fit to the model. The TLI statistic was acceptable (TLI > 0.95), and the SRMR was well below 0.08. However, the RMSEA statistic was above the 0.06 level (Hu & Bentler 1999; Hulland et al. 1996). Thus, the measurement model for Sponsoring Brand Loyalty with five items could be said to have a reasonable fit with the data. The fit statistics are shown in table 5.11.

With the improved model fit once the item '*I would buy this brand even if competitor's prices were lower*' was removed from the scale and considering the items neutral mean, it was decided to remove the item from the 'Sponsoring Brand Loyalty' scale. The five item scale for 'Sponsoring Brand Loyalty' will be used in the structural stage of the analysis.

	Initial Measurement scale	Final measurement scale
Mardia's coefficient	37.53	30.81
Standardised residuals above 2.57	None	None
Chi Square	$\chi^2 = 101.31 \text{ p} = 0.00$	$\chi^2 = 22.2, p = 0.00$
	df = 14	df = 5 bp = 0.09
CMIN/DF	7.23	4.44
TLI	0.90	0.97
SRMR	0.05	0.02
RMSEA	0.18	0.13

Table 5.11 – Measures of Fit for the Sponsoring Brand Loyalty Scale

5.5.3 Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging (SLP) scale

All of the items included in this measure were sourced from the literature (see section 2.6). The factor loadings for these items were considered to be fair to excellent (betas ranged from 0.35 to 0.96) (Churchill 1979) and the Cronbach alpha was good (α =0.855). The results are shown in table 5.12 below. The initial exploratory factor analysis of the original seven items supported the uni-dimensionality of this scale, with the exception of the item *'How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product?'* The exploratory factor analysis indicated that this item might belong to the construct, 'Sponsoring Brand Loyalty'. As this item represents the consumer's purchase intention toward the sponsored product (after exposure to SLP), it was included in this scale.

 Table 5.12 – Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging Scale

Variable	Confirmatory factor loadings initial model	Confirmatory factor loadings final model
Consumer Response to SLP	$\alpha = .855$	$\alpha = .892$
This sponsorship improves my perception of [sponsored property]	0.92	0.92
This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the	0.96	0.96
[sponsoring brand]		
This sponsorship of [sponsored property] makes me like [sponsoring	0.85	0.84
brand] more than before		
How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product?	0.35	-

Variable	Confirmatory factor loadings initial model	Confirmatory factor loadings final model
This sponsorship would not influence my purchase decision in any way (reversed)	0.42	-
I would buy more of SLP product than unsponsored	0.61	0.59
I would purchase this SLP product even if compet. prices were lower	0.46	-

All of the items were shown in the confirmatory analysis using AMOS to contribute to the measure of Consumer Response to SLP as the critical ratios were above 1.96. The variable '*I would buy more of SLP product than un-sponsored*' had a beta of 0.61 and three of the seven variables were above 0.7, which are considered to be very good (Churchill 1979; Hulland et al. 1996). However, the betas (standardised regression weights) for three of the seven variables were below the acceptable level of 0.5.

Furthermore, four of the seven variables had large standardised residuals (see table 5.14), suggesting a possible specification error (Joreskog & Sorbom 1996). The exploratory factor analysis showed no cross-loadings for the items, except for the item '*I would purchase this SLP product even if competitors' prices were lower'*. However, there were high correlations between a number of items in this scale (see table 5.13). This indicates that there may be item redundancy in the scale and it was necessary to examine the individual items.

Item	Improves Perception	Favour Sponsor	Like Sponsor more	Likelihood of Purchase	Buy more	Purchase Competitors Price	Not Influence
This sponsorship improves my perception	1.00						
of [sponsored property]							
This sponsorship makes me feel more	0.89	1.00					
favourable toward the [sponsoring brand]							
This sponsorship of [sponsored property]	0.78	0.81	1.00				
makes me like [sponsoring brand] more							
than before							
This sponsorship would not influence my	0.35	0.38	0.37	1.00			
purchase decision in any way (reversed)							
How likely is it that you would purchase	0.26	0.31	0.29	0.17	1.00		
this particular product?							
I would buy more of SLP product than un-	0.50	0.58	0.54	0.57	0.28	1.00	
sponsored							
I would purchase this SLP product even if	0.40	0.42	0.39	0.33	0.49	0.53	1.00
competitors prices were lower							

Table 5.13 – Item Correlations Consumer Response to SLP scale

Although the item 'I would buy more of the SLP product than an un-sponsored product' had a large standardised residual, it did have a reasonable factor loading (beta = 0.61). This item was considered particularly important for the research question, as it represents the respondent's intention to purchase the sponsored product, above what would normally be purchased, thus providing an indication of the impact of SLP. It was therefore retained in the measure for testing in the model.

The remaining three items 'How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product?', 'I would purchase this SLP product even if competitors prices were lower' and 'This sponsorship would not influence my purchase decision in any way' had large standardised residuals, and low factor loadings. This suggests possible item redundancy. Correlations between these items were also quite low suggesting problems with convergent validity. Taking these factors into consideration, it was decided to assess the scale with the removal of these items.

Item	Likelihood of Purchase	Buy more than unsponsored	Purchase Competitors Price	Not Influence
How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product?			4.77	
I would buy more of SLP product than un-sponsored			3.49	4.30
I would purchase this SLP product even if competitors prices were lower	4.77	3.49		
This sponsorship would not influence my purchase decision in any way (reversed)		4.30		

Table 5.14 – Large Standardised Residuals Consumer Response to SLP Scale

When these items were removed from the measure, the coefficient alpha was slightly improved and acceptable ($\alpha = 0.89$). The adjusted model had much improved multivariate normality with Mardia's coefficient reduced to 9.63 and no large residuals. When the two factor structures were compared, the final model (with items deleted) appeared to be a better fitting model than the initial model for measuring Consumer Response to SLP ($\chi^2 = 6.26$ df = 2, p = 0.045; bp = 0.53). The fit statistics for the scale are shown in table 5.15.

	Initial Measurement scale	Final measurement scale
Mandia's coefficient	16.036	6 10
Muraia's coefficient	10.930	0.19
Standardised residuals above 2.57	Three	None
Chi Square	$\chi^2 = 135.19 \text{ p} = 0.00$	$\chi^2 = 6.26, p = 0.045$
	df = 14 bp = 0.01	df = 2 bp = 0.53
CMIN/DF	9.66	3.00
TLI	0.78	0.98
SRMR	0.11	0.02
RMSEA	0.21	0.10

Table 5.15 – Measures of Fit for the Consumer Response to SLP Scale

Given the non-normality of the data, the Bollen-Stine bootstrap p would be a more appropriate statistic for the evaluation of fit for this factor. The Bollen-Stine bootstrap (p = 0.532) suggests the final model has good fit. The CMIN/DF was between the 2 to 5 range considered to be acceptable (CMIN/DF = 3.1), the TLI statistic was over the 0.95 desired level, and the SRMR was well below 0.08. However, the RMSEA statistic was slightly above the acceptable 0.06, though Brown and Cudeck (1993) suggest RMSEA indices in the range from 0.08 to 0.1 indicate a mediocre fit. Thus, the measurement model for Consumer Response to SLP with four items could be said to have a moderate fit with the data and will be used in the structural stage of the analysis.

5.5.4 Perceived Fit Scale

Based on the exploratory factor analysis conducted earlier, the four variables 'I like this sponsorship pictured on this package', 'The logo on the package is a good way to show the sponsorship arrangement', 'Its logical for [Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T] to sponsor [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]' and '[Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T] and [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation] have a similar image' were included in this scale in the confirmatory factor analysis. Two of the items included in this measure were sourced from the literature (section 2.4.4). The items relating to SLP were developed for this research.

The factor loadings for these items were considered to be fair to good (betas ranged from 0.56 to 0.72) (Churchill 1979) and the resulting Cronbach alpha was also good (α = 0.823). In the confirmatory analysis, all of the items were shown to contribute to the

measure of Perceived Fit as the critical ratios were above 1.96. The betas for the four variables were all at an acceptable level (betas > 0.5) (Churchill 1979; Hulland et al. 1996). The results are shown in table 5.16.

Variable	Confirmatory factor loadings initial model	Confirmatory factor loadings final model
Perceived Fit	$\alpha = 0.823$	$\alpha = 0.840$
I like this sponsorship pictured on the package	0.56	-
The [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation] logo on the package is a good way to show the sponsorship arrangement between [Sanitarium Weetbix brand / Sanitarium L & T brand] and [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]	0.50	-
Its logical for [Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T] to sponsor [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]	0.72	0.89*
[Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T] and [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation] have a similar image	0.64	0.81*

Table	5.16 –	Perceived	Fit	Scale
-------	--------	-----------	-----	-------

*As it is not possible to perform CFA with two items, these items were tested in the four factor measurement model.

In this measure, there was one standardised residual higher than 2.5 between the items '*I like this sponsorship pictured on this package*' and '*The logo on the package is a good way to show the sponsorship arrangement*' (3.91). The exploratory factor analysis showed cross-loadings for the first item, suggesting it might be problematic (see table 5.5). Considering the cross-loadings, marginal factor scores, and high-standardised residuals, it was decided to assess the scale with the removal of the items.

As can be seen by the measures of fit for the initial measurement scale (see table 5.17), the four item scale had very poor fit to the data. When the first item was removed from the scale, the coefficient alpha was considerably reduced ($\alpha = 0.77$). When both the first and second items were removed from the scale, the factor scores for the two remaining items were much improved (betas = 0.89 and 0.81) and the coefficient alpha was acceptable ($\alpha = 0.84$).

Taking into consideration the problematic nature of the first two items and the improved scale reliability once the items were removed, it was decided that the first two items would be removed from the scale and the remaining two items would be retained for testing in the structural stage of the analysis. As it is not possible to perform a confirmatory factor analysis when only two items are included in a scale, the remaining two items in the Perceived Fit scale were tested in the next stage of the process, an examination of the correlations between the constructs. This is discussed next.

	Initial Measurement scale	Final Measurement Scale (Four Factor Model)*
Mardia's coefficient	15.49	56.9
Standardised residuals above 2.57	One	two
Chi Square	$\chi^2 = 65.32, p = 0.00$	$\chi^2 = 164.76, p = 0.00$
	df = 2	df = 84 bp = 0.003
CMIN/DF	32.66	1.96
TLI	0.44	0.96
SRMR	0.11	0.05
RMSEA	0.40	0.07

Table 5.17 – Measures of Fi	for the Perceived Fit Scale
-----------------------------	-----------------------------

*It is not possible to perform CFA with two items therefore the scale was tested in the four factor measurement model.

5.5.5 Four Factor Measurement Model

The measurement model was assessed via confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using Analysis of Moment Structure (AMOS) 16 (Arbuckle & Wothke, 2007) with a maximum likelihood estimation method. Goodness of fit of the measurement model and the factor structures and dimensionalities of these constructs were examined. Further, relationships between observable indicators and their latent constructs, specifically: Sponsored Property Identification (SPI); Sponsoring Brand Loyalty (SBL); Consumer Response to SLP (CRSLP); and Perceived Fit (PFIT) were examined.

Four Factor Measurement Model	Confirmatory factor loadings initial model	Confirmatory factor loadings final model
Sponsored Property Identification		
I am a strong supporter of	0.85	0.77
[Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]		
If a company sponsored [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer	0.84	0.90
Foundation], it would positively influence how I felt about that co.		
I am interested in [Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]	0.86	-
It is good when company's sponsor [Cricket Australia/ Breast	0.70	0.66
Cancer Foundation](supporter)		
I am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor	0.88	0.90
[Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]		
Sponsoring Brand Loyalty		
I like this brand	0.92	0.92
I think this brand is reliable	0.91	0.91
I would recommend this brand to others	0.95	0.95
I have a favourable opinion of this brand	0.92	0.92
I am loyal to this brand	0.76	0.76
Consumer Response to SLP		
This sponsorship improves my perception of	0.92	0.92
[sponsoring brand]		
This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the	0.96	0.96
[sponsoring brand]		
This sponsorship of [sponsored property] makes me like	0.85	0.85
[sponsoring brand] more than before		
I would buy more of SLP product than unsponsored	0.59	0.59
Perceived Fit		
Its logical for [Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T] to sponsor	0.89	0.89
[Cricket Australia/ Breast Cancer Foundation]		
[Sanitarium Weetbix /Sanitarium L & T] and [Cricket Australia/	0.81	0.81
Breast Cancer Foundation] have a similar image		

Table 5.18 – Four Factor Measurement Model

In the confirmatory analysis using AMOS, all of the items were shown to contribute to the measure of factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP as the critical ratios were above 1.96. The betas (standardised regression weights) for the items were all at an acceptable level (beta > 0.5). Thirteen out of the fifteen factor loadings were considered to be good to excellent (betas ranged from 0.76 to 0.95) (Churchill 1979; Hulland et al. 1996). In this measure, there were two standardised residual higher than 2.5 between two pairs of items. Table 5.18 shows the factor loadings for the items in the Four Factor Measurement Model. Table 5.19 shows the high standarised residuals.
Item	Confirmatory factor loadings	Good to Sponsor	Likely to Purchase
It is good that companies sponsor [sponsored property]'	0.66		
Its logical for [specified sponsor] to sponsor [sponsored property]	0.89	2.90	
I would buy more of SLP product than un-sponsored	0.59		2.90
I am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor [sponsored property]	0.90		

1 a D C 3.17 - D a I g C D canual ulscu Acsiluals I vul I actor Micasul chicht Mouch
--

In relation to the first standardised residual, the beta values for these items are reasonable (beta= 0.66 & 0.89). An examination of the Cronbach alpha results, suggest that the Sponsored Property Identification scale reliability would increase only marginally if the item '*I think it is good that companies sponsor [sponsored property]*' was deleted (α increased from 0.88 to 0.89). Similarly, with no other variables highly correlated to the item '*It is logical for [sponsoring brand] to sponsor [sponsored property]*, there is insufficient evidence to warrant the removal of the item. In spite of the large standardised residuals, there was theoretical justification for the items to be retained in the model.

The second standardised residual involved the item '*I* would buy more of an SLP product than an un-sponsored product' which had an acceptable factor loading (beta = 0.59). As there were no high correlations with other items, or cross-loadings in the factor analysis, careful consideration was given to whether there was sufficient justification to remove the item. Given that one of the central tenants of this thesis is whether SLP has the capacity to impact attitude towards the sponsoring brand and purchase intention towards the sponsor's products, this item is particularly important to the research question. As such, the item was retained for testing in the structural model.

In addition, the modification indices suggested that the model fit could be improved if either of the items '*I am interested in [sponsored property]*' or '*I am a strong supporter of [sponsored property]*' was removed from the scale. It was shown in section 5.5.1 that there was high correlation between these items. Examination of the wording of these two items suggests that the statements are capturing much of the same meaning i.e. the degree to which a respondent is involved with the sponsored property. A review of the

correlation table indicated that the item '*I* am interested in [sponsored property]' showed higher correlations with other items in the scale, than did the item '*I* am a strong supporter of [sponsored property]'. Therefore, in the interests of improving the model fit, it was decided that the item '*I* am interested in [sponsored property]' would be removed from the scale.

Overall model fit indices suggest that the final measurement model explains the data reasonably well. Although the Chi Square statistic was significant, ($\chi^2 = 164.76$, p = 0.00, df = 84; bp = 0.003), the CMIN/DF (1.96) was below the suggested range of 2 – 5 indicating a very good fit to the model. The TLI statistic was over the 0.95 desired level, the SRMR was well between the .05 and .08 accepted range, and an RMSEA statistic was acceptable at 0.05 (Hu & Bentler 1999; Hulland et al. 1996). Composite reliabilities for each construct exceeded 0.80, with the highest being for Sponsoring Brand Loyalty ($\alpha = 0.95$) and the lowest being for Perceived Fit ($\alpha = 0.84$). Therefore, the measurement model was deemed acceptable. Fit statistics are shown in table 5.20.

	 Initial Measurement Model	Final Measurement Model
Mardia's coefficient	61.43	56.9
Standardised residuals above 2.57	two	two
Chi Square	$\chi^2 = 254.72, p = 0.00$	$\chi^2 = 164.76, p = 0.00$
	df = 98 bp = 0.000	df = 84 bp = 0.003
CMIN/DF	2.59	1.96
TLI	0.93	0.96
SRMR	0.06	0.05
RMSEA	0.09	0.07

 Table 5.20 – Measures of Fit for the Four Factor Measurement Model

It is noted that in these analyses the fit indices in the majority of cases showed good or reasonable fit. As χ^2 has little power to detect a miss-specified model, particularly in cases of non-normal data and small samples, the Bollen-Stine p statistic is a preferable statistic to determine model fit (Mathieu et al. 1992). In each of the scales, with the exception of the Four Factor CFA, the Bollen-Stine p was not significant, suggesting good model fit for each of the four scales. In all cases the CMIN/DF was within the 2 – 5 range, which is deemed to be acceptable for each scale. The TLI was within the suggested range (TLI > 0.95) in each of the four scales.

The RMSEA for two of the scales (i.e. Sponsored Property Identification Scale & Consumer Response to SLP scale) were within the acceptable range for mediocre fit (between 0.6 and 1.00). However, the RMSEA for the Sponsoring Brand Loyalty scale was outside the acceptable range for mediocre fit. As RMSEA has been found to over-reject the true model in small samples such as is the case in the study, the RMSEA may not be the most appropriate measure of fit in this instance (Hu & Bentler 1995).

The SRMR was acceptable for each of the four scales with SRMR statistics close to zero indicating very good fit (Hu & Bentler 1995). In considering the non-normality of the data, and the small sample size, the acceptable Bollen-Stine p, and the acceptable CMIN/DF, TLI and SRMR indices suggest the measurement scales have reasonable fit to the data. The poorer fit for the Four Factor Model can be explained by the two large standardised residuals retained in the model with theoretical justification.

The exploratory factor analysis (EFA table 5.5) clearly identified factors associated with Consumer Response to SLP, Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsoring Brand Loyalty and Perceived Fit. Not all items in the exploratory factor analysis loaded on their respective factors, but most did and the CFAs on each of the subscales supported the overall factorial structure of the questionnaire, albeit with some items deleted. The resulting reliability estimates for the subscales were all satisfactory.

Validity and Reliability

Having examined the measurement models for the four constructs, the reliability and validity of the measures also needed consideration. Assessing the measurement model has provided a confirmatory assessment of convergent validity and discriminant validity by allowing examination of the correlations among the factors (Anderson & Gerbing 1988). The factor loadings on the scales met the test of both convergent and discriminant validity.

Overall, the data suggested that evidence of validity and reliability for the survey scale exists. The results suggested that the items used showed high internal consistency in

measuring the variables. For all four constructs, the indicators are sufficient in terms of how the measurement model is specified (Hair et al. 1998; table 5.18). Assessing the measurement model for each factor has provided a confirmatory assessment of convergent validity and discriminant validity by allowing examination of the correlations among the items for each scale.

The factor loadings on the four scales and the reported model fit indices, indicate that each of the four scales met the test of both convergent validity and discriminant validity. In addition, the internal consistency and reliability of the scales has been examined through the use of Cronbach alpha, where all the scales exhibited alphas greater than 0.70 as recommended by Nunnally (1978). Having satisfied the measurement requirements, the structural relationships of the variables were tested using structural equation modeling. In this process the seven hypotheses proposed in section 3.6 will be tested.

5.6 Analysis of the Structural Models and Tests of Hypotheses

Now that the measures to be used in the conceptual models have been tested for their validity and reliability, the specific research hypotheses and research models posed in section 3.6 can be tested. As discussed in section 4.3.5, one approach to the treatment of ordinal data sets is the parceling of items. This method reduces the degree of non-normality in the data (such as is the case in this study) and increases the ratio of parameters estimated to sample size. Given these advantages, item parceling was used in the final measurement model. This section will commence with a review of the descriptive statistics for the constructs in the model.

5.6.1 Descriptive Statistics

The summary statistics for each of the constructs in the model are reported in table 5.21. The scales for each of the constructs are those reported from the previous section with coefficient alphas, means and standard deviations. These scales used 5 point Likert scales where a score of 1 indicated strong agreement, 3 indicated neutrality, and 5 indicated strong disagreement in the measure. These means and standard deviations show no unexpected results in relation to the scales.

These results indicate that respondents generally considered themselves supporters of the sponsored property (47% agreed/ 22% disagreed) and not loyal to the sponsoring brand (mean of 3.27 where a score of 1 indicates high brand loyalty). When considering Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP, respondents indicated they agreed with statements in the scales with means of 2.58 (CRSLP) and 2.81 (Perceived Fit) scale. The next stage in the analysis was to explore the correlations between the constructs and dependent variables.

n = 201	α	Mean	Std. Deviation
*Sponsored Property Identification	0.884	2.94	0.787
*Sponsoring Brand Loyalty	0.949	3.27	0.906
*Consumer Response to SLP	0.892	2.58	0.850
*Perceived Fit	0.841	2.81	0.966

Table 5.21 – Construct Descriptive Statistics

*The lower the mean the more the respondent indicated agreement with statements

5.6.2 Correlation Analysis

The next step in the analysis was to consider the correlations between the constructs. The results show that Sponsored Property Identification is correlated with Consumer Response to SLP. This is expected following the evidence provided in the literature and in Study 1. Sponsoring Brand Loyalty is also correlated with Consumer Response to SLP, although only slightly. This is not surprising given that Sponsoring Brand Loyalty was proposed to have little impact on Consumer Response to SLP.

As can be seen in table 5.22, Sponsored Property Identification is correlated with Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging. Similarly, Sponsoring Brand Loyalty is correlated with Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP. In addition, Perceived Fit is correlated with Consumer Response to SLP. This is consistent with the literature, which suggests that Perceived Fit is extremely important in predicting consumer response to sponsorship and logically is related to associations about the brand and property. These results suggest that these measures are capturing the dimensions of the constructs as intended. The correlations for all of the constructs are consistent with the a priori assumptions and they reflect the expected pattern of relationships amongst the variables in the study. Table 5.22 provides correlations between the variables.

	FIT	SPI	SBL	CRSLP
Perceived Fit	1.00			
Sponsored Property Identification	0.28	1.00		
Sponsoring Brand Loyalty	0.25	0.00	1.00	
Consumer Response to SLP	<u>0.49</u>	<u>0.54</u>	0.20	1.00

Table 5.22 – Correlation Table for Constructs in the Model

*Underlined correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed).

5.6.3 Structural Equation Model Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP

The conceptual model of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP using the four measurement scales validated in the previous sections of this chapter was tested using AMOS 16 (Arbuckle & Wothke, 2007). As discussed in section 4.3.5 in the interests of increasing the stability of the data and reducing the degree of non-normality of the data, item parceling was used in the final measurement model SEM.

The relationship between Sponsored Property Identification and Consumer Response to SLP was significant (beta= 0.357; t=5.087; p<0.01). The relationship between Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP was significant (beta= 0.516; t=3.908; p=<0.01). However, the relationship between Sponsoring Brand Loyalty and Consumer Response to SLP was not significant (beta=0.131; t=1.605; p=.109).

These results indicate that consumer's identification with the sponsored property and the perceived fit between the sponsored property and sponsoring brand are important factors that influence Consumer Response to SLP. Thus, hypotheses 1 and 2 were supported. However, the results also indicated that consumer's loyalty to the sponsoring brand had little impact on their response to SLP, therefore Hypothesis 3 was not supported. The structural model of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP explained 43% of the variance in the model. The SEM results for the conceptual model relating to the Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP (Hypothesis 1-3) are shown in Figure 5.3. They show that the variables Sponsored Property Identification, and Perceived Fit are contributing significantly to the prediction of Consumer Response to SLP and the fit statistics are indicative of a good fit ($\chi^2(df 1) = 0.053$, bp=.466; TLI = 1.02, RMSEA 0.00 and SRMR .02).



Figure 5.3 – Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP

5.6.3.1 The Role of Perceived Fit in the Model

The role of Perceived Fit has been widely discussed in sponsorship literature with the current debate reviewed in chapter 2 of this thesis (section 2.4.4). As discussed in this section, Perceived Fit has been shown consistently to play an important role in relation to consumer response to sponsorship. However whether this role is as a moderator or as a mediator, or as an independent variable appears to be reliant on the combination of variables in the study and there is no real consensus amongst the researchers in this field.

In addition to the importance of different variables in the models proposed to test consumer response to sponsorship, the decision making context is also important. What is known from prior research, is that consumers behave differently in low involvement decision making contexts than they do in high involvement contexts (Summers et al. 2005). Further, there is also some evidence to suggest that the relationships between variables in traditional models of marketing and consumer behavior change with different levels of complexity and involvement by consumers (high versus low decision making contexts) (Belch & Belch 2009). This led the researcher to question the roles of all variables in the conceptual model during the exploratory phase of the research.

Indeed, the exploratory results (reported in Chapter 3) supported this approach with a number of the factors in the preliminary conceptual model being adapted (see section 3.8). In relation to Perceived Fit specifically, respondents indicated that they placed little importance on the match between the sponsored property and sponsoring brand in their decisions to purchase Fast Moving Consumer Goods. Further investigation suggested that Perceived Fit appeared to be acting more as an independent variable in its own right in this relationship in the low involvement decision making context than as a moderating or mediating variable as suggested by some prior research.

Thus, the research model (figure 3.2) which was subsequently tested for this research (and results reported in the previous section) placed the factor, Perceived Fit, in this role. The results of the analysis (see previous section) also supported the placement of Perceived Fit in the role of an Independent Variable (beta=0.516;t=3.908; p=<0.01) with a positive influence on Consumer Response to SLP.

In spite of these findings and this theoretical reasoning, it was decided to perform a statistical check of the role of Perceived Fit, in order to counter potential claims from other researchers who may argue that the placement of Perceived Fit as an independent variable was the result of serendipity rather than rigorous statistical testing and critical theoretical analysis. Thus, a multi-group analysis was conducted in six stages as follows:

Step 1 - The variable Perceived Fit was removed as an independent variable.

Step 2 - As the Perceived Fit Scale had two items, it was necessary to sum the scores and then average the scores. Based on this average score, the data were split into two files, those with a score of 1 or 2 on the Perceived Fit (Group 1) and the second file, those with a score between the range of 3 and 5 on the Perceived Fit Scale (Group 2).

Step 3 - Using a multi-group analysis with structural equation modeling, the two separate files were identified and the appropriate files attached. The data analysis properties were then specified to examine the five different models of: unconstrained, measurement weights, structural weights, structural covariances, and structural residuals.

Step 4 - The SEM multi-group analysis was run and the results indicated that the models fit the data well: unconstrained (bp=0.098), structural weights (bp=0.283), and structural covariances (bp=0.072). However, the model for measurement residuals was significant (bp=0.047), indicating that the residuals were not equal across the groups. Measures of fit for the models are provided in Table 5.23 below.

Step 5 - It was discussed in section 5.5.5 that the Four Factor Measurement Model had a number of large standardised residuals. The items associated with these large standardised residuals were retained in the analysis of the model with theoretical justification. However, it can be seen by the measurement residual model that the standardised residuals were not equal across the groups. Therefore, the constraint on measurement residuals was freed which enables the residuals to be calculated for each group. The results of this test (bp=.098) indicate that the residuals are different for each group.

Step 6 - The unstandardised regression weights were examined for both groups. The results suggest that the positive relationship between Sponsored Property Identification and Consumer Response to SLP is significant for Group 1 (beta 0.451; t= 3.896; p<0.01) and also significant for Group 2 (beta=0.304; t=2.426; p=.015). However, the relationship between Sponsoring Brand Loyalty was significant for Group 1 (beta = 0.138; t=1.366; p=.172), but not significant for Group 2 (beta=.138, t=1.366; p=.172).

These results confirm that Perceived Fit in this model of low involvement processing in FMCG does act as a moderator in the relationship between Sponsoring Brand Loyalty and Consumer Response to SLP. The regression coefficients, t values and p values are provided in Table 5.24. However, when Perceived Fit is tested in the model as a moderator, the overall variance accounted for is lower (35%) than when Perceived Fit is tested as an independent variable (43%). Therefore, the pattern of relationships in the model of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP in a FMCG context is best explained when Perceived Fit acts as an independent variable rather than as a moderator. Following on from this analysis, the moderating hypotheses can now be tested and results reported in the next section.

	Model	Unconstrained	Measurement	Structural	Structural	Structural
			Weights	Weights	Covariances	Residuals
Bollen Stine p	0.463	0.098	0.098	0.283	0.072	0.047
CMIN/DF	(1) 0.53	(2) 4.209	(2) 4.209	(4) 5.249	(6) 12.312	(7) 14.760
GFI	0.998	0.986	0.986	0.983	0.96	0.953
AGFI	0.989	0.918	0.918	0.949	0.919	0.920
TLI	1.022	0.857	0.857	0.960	0.864	0.856
RMSEA	0.000	0.075	0.075	0.040	.073	0.075
SRMR	0.023	0.006	0.006	0.030	0.046	0.043
Variance explained %	0.35	0.28	0.28	0.25	0.33	0.33

Table 5.24 – Regression Coefficients – Multi-group Analysis Perceived Fit

	Unconstrained		nconstrained Measurement Weights		Structural Weights			Structural Covariances			Structural Residuals				
Group 1	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =
$SPI \rightarrow CRSLP$.451	3.89	**	.451	3.89	**	.451	7.11	***	.449	7.25	**	.449	7.17	**
SBL→ CRSLP	.304	2.42	.015	.304	2.42	.015	.205	2.59	.009	.204	2.60	.009	.192	2.41	.016
Group 2															
$SPI \rightarrow CRSLP$.442	5.86	**	.442	5.86	**	.451	7.11	***	.449	7.25	**	.449	7.17	**
SBL→ CRSLP	.138	1.36	.172	.138	1.36	.172	.205	2.59	.009	.204	2.60	.009	.192	2.41	.016

** significant at 0.01

5.7 Moderating Hypotheses

In order to test the remaining hypotheses, a number of multi-group analyses were conducted. These included comparing the Types of Sponsored Property, the Frequency of Purchase of the sponsoring brand, awareness of the sponsored product, and respondent characteristics to determine if there are differences between the groups. The hypothesis tests for Type of Sponsored Property, Frequency of Purchase and Awareness of the Sponsorship were tested using the same procedure previously outlined for the moderating the role of Perceived Fit (see section 5.6.3.1). The moderating hypothesis for Respondent Characteristics was tested using linear regression analysis to determine if Consumer Response to SLP is related to the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Each of these tests will be discussed in more detail.

5.7.1 Type of Sponsored Property

To determine the impact of the Type of Sponsored Property on Consumer Response to SLP, the sample was divided into two groups. Group 1 comprised respondents who completed questionnaire 1 where the sponsored property was that of Cricket Australia sponsored by Sanitarium Weetbix. Group 2 comprised those respondents who completed questionnaire 3 where the sponsored property was that of National Breast Cancer Foundation sponsored by Sanitarium Light 'n' Tasty. Group 1 consisted of 100 respondents and Group 2 consisted of 101 respondents. Following the same process outlined in section 5.3.6.1, the type of sponsored property was subjected to a multi-group analysis.

The results of the multi-group analysis for Type of Sponsored Property indicated that the models fit the data well for the unconstrained (bp=0.466) and structural weights (bp=0.644) models. However, the models for structural covariances (bp=0.072) and measurement residuals were significant (bp=0.047), indicating that the covariances residuals were not equal across the groups. Measures of fit for the models are provided in Table 5.25.

	Model	Unconstrained	Measurement	Structural	Structural	Structural
			Weights	Weights	Covariances	Residuals
Bollen Stine p	0.466	0.644	0.644	0.200	0.023	0.032
CMIN/DF	$\chi^2(df 1)$	χ^2 (df 2)	$\chi^2(\mathrm{df}2) =$	$\chi^2(\mathrm{df}6) =$	χ^2 (df 10) =	χ^2 (df 11) =
	=0.053	=0.805	0.805	7.579	23.08	23.09
GFI	0.999	0.998	0.998	0.981	0.947	0.947
AGFI	0.987	0.980	0.980	0.925	0.893	0.903
TLI	1.02	1.059	1.059	0.949	0.871	0.892
RMSEA	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.051	0.081	0074
SRMR	0.0196	0.0264	0.0265	0.0549	0.0606	0.0603
Variance explained %	0.43	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.41	0.41

Table 5.25 – Measures of Fit – Multi-group Analysis Type of Sponsored Property

The constraints on the covariances and measurement residuals were freed which enabled the residuals to be calculated for each group. The results of this test (structural covariances bp=.644; structural residuals bp=0.032) indicated that the covariances and residuals are different for each group. Table 5.26 provides details of the measures of fit.

	Model	Unconstrained	Measurement	Structural	Structural	Structural
			Weights	Weights	Covariances	Residuals
Bollen Stine p	0.466	0.644	0.644	0.200	0.644	0.644
CMIN/DF	$\chi^2(df 1)$	χ^2 (df 2)	$\chi^2(\mathrm{df}2) =$	$\chi^2 (\mathrm{df} 6) =$	$\chi^2(\mathrm{df}2) =$	χ^2 (df 2) =
	=0.053	=0.805	0.805	7.579	0.805	0.805
GFI	0.999	0.998	0.998	0.981	0.998	0.998
AGFI	0.987	0.980	0.980	0.925	0.980	0.989
TLI	1.02	1.059	1.059	0.949	1.059	1.059
RMSEA	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.051	0.000	0.000
SRMR	0.019	0.026	0.026	0.055	0.026	0.026
Variance explained %	0.43	0.45	0.45	0.46	0.41	0.41

Table 5.26 – Measures of Fit Constraints freed – Type of Sponsored Property

The p values and unstandardised regression weights were examined for both groups and the results suggested that the positive relationship between Sponsored Property Identification and Consumer Response to SLP is significant for both groups (Group 1 b=0.337, p=0.01) (Group 2 b=0.337, p=0.15). Similarly, the relationship between Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP was significant for both groups (Group 1 b=0.509, p<0.01) (Group 2 b=0.502, p=0.45). However the relationship between Sponsoring Brand Loyalty and Consumer Response was significant only for Group 2 (beta=0.372; t=2.710; p=0.007) (Group 1 beta=-0.023; t=-0.288; p=0.820).

This inverse relationship between these variables indicates that in the case of a sport related sponsorship, loyalty to the sponsoring brand has little impact on Consumer Response to SLP. Alternatively, in the case of cause related sponsorship, loyalty to the sponsoring brand does impact Consumer Response to SLP. Furthermore, the impact of Sponsoring Brand Loyalty had as much impact on Consumer Response (b=0.372) as the consumers identification with the cause (b=0.337). This suggests a heightened importance for the sponsoring brand itself when it is associated with a cause. The regression coefficients, t values and p values are provided in Table 5.27.

	Unconstrained		Measurement Weights		Structural Weights			Structural Covariances			Structural Residuals				
	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =
Group 1															
SPI → CRSLP	.377	4.263	**	377	4.263	**	.358	4.763	**	.36	4.77	**	.360	3.86	**
SBL→ CRSLP	023	288	.820	023	288	.820	.128	1.555	.120	.133	1.61	.106	.131	1.59	.110
FIT → CRSLP	.509	332	**	.509	332	**	523	3.967	**	.514	3.86	**	.515	3.86	**
Group 2															
SPI → CRSLP	.337	2.424	.015	.337	2.424	.015	358	3.967	.120	.36	4.77	.106	.360	4.77	**
SBL→ CRSLP	.372	2.710	.007	.372	2.710	.007	.128	4.763	**	.133	1.61	**	.131	1.59	**
$FIT \rightarrow CRSLP$.502	2.001	.045	.502	2.001	.045	.523	1.555	**	.514	3.86	**	.515	3.86	.110

 Table 5.27 Regression Coefficients Multi-group Analysis Type of Sponsored Property

** significant at 0.01

This provides evidence that the Type of Sponsored Property (a cause or a sport in the case of this research) moderates the relationship between Sponsoring Brand Loyalty and Consumer Response to SLP. Thus, the results of this analysis show that in a FMCG context, consumer response to SLP in the case of sponsorship of a cause comes from a combination of the consumer's loyalty to the sponsoring brand, the perceived match between the sponsoring brand and sponsored cause and identification with the sponsored property. Whereas in the case of sponsorship of sport, consumer response comes from a combination of the consumer's perception of match between the sponsoring brand and sponsored cause and identification with the sponsored property. Whereas in the case of sponsorship of sport, consumer response comes from a combination of the consumer's perception of match between the sponsoring brand and sponsored cause as well as the consumer's identification with the sponsored sport. Therefore, H5 was supported.

5.7.2 Prior Awareness of Sponsorship

To determine the impact of Awareness of Sponsorship on Consumer Response to SLP, the sample was divided into two groups. Group 1 comprised respondents who indicated they were aware of the selected sponsorship and Group 2 comprised the respondents who indicated they were not aware of the selected sponsorship. Group 1 consisted of 66 respondents (33% of the sample) and Group 2 consisted of 135 respondents (67% of the sample). The results of the multi-group analysis for Awareness of the Sponsorship, indicated that the models fit the data well for the unconstrained (bp=0.956), structural weights (bp=0.960) structural covariances (bp=0.825) and measurement residuals models (bp=0.857), indicating support for both configural invariance and metric invariance. Measures of fit for the models are provided in Table 5.28.

	Model	Unconstrained	Measurement	Structural	Structural	Structural
			Weights	Weights	Covariances	Residuals
Bollen Stine p	0.466	0.956	0.956	0.960	0.825	0.857
CMIN/DF	$\chi^2(df 1)$	χ^2 (df 2)	χ^2 (df 2)	χ^2 (df 5)	χ^2 (df 10)	χ^2 (df 11)
	=0.053	=0.82	=0.82	=1.11	= 6.75	= 6.82
GFI	0.999	1.00	1.00	0.997	0.982	0982
AGFI	0.987	0.998	0.998	0.989	0.966	0.967
TLI	1.02	1.096	1.096	0.107	1.033	1.038
RMSEA	0.00	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
SRMR	0.02	0.011	0.011	0.022	0.025	0.025
Variance explained %	0.43	0.40	0.40	0.44	0.41	0.42

Table 5.28 – Measures of Fit – Awareness of the Sponsorship

The p values and unstandardised regression weights were examined for both groups. The results suggest that there was no difference between the groups for the relationship between Sponsored Property Identification and Consumer Response to SLP (Group 1 b=0.310, p=.019) (Group 2 b=0.405, p<0.01). The relationship was significant for both groups. Similarly, there results suggest that there was no difference between the groups for the relationship between Sponsoring Brand Loyalty and Consumer Response (Group 1 b=0.177, p=.178) (Group 2 b=0.082, p=0.447). The relationship was not significant for both groups. However, the relationship between Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP was significant for Group 2 (b=0.499, t=3.109; p=.002) but not significant for Group 1 (b=0.490; t=1.687; p=.092). Table 2.67 provides the regression coefficients for these relationships.

This indicates that for consumers who were not aware of the sponsorship prior to participating in this study, the perceived fit between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property had a much bigger impact on Consumer Response to SLP, than for those consumers who were aware of the sponsorship. Thus, Awareness plays a moderating role the relationship between Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP. Therefore, H6 was supported.

However, it should be noted that this sample size comes close to violating a principal assumption in SEM. It has been proposed that an optimal ratio of the number of participants to number of parameters to be estimated should be between 10:1 and 20:1,

with a ratio of less than 5:1 indicating that the parameter estimates may be unstable (Kline 1998). Group 1 for this study had a ratio of 66:9, which equates to roughly 7:1. Therefore, these results need to be interpreted with caution as the small group size may have influenced the parameter estimates and therefore the measures of fit have a higher chance of being serendipitous rather than a result of statistical significance.

Future research needs to consider this relationship further, with careful consideration given to the sampling frame to ensure sufficient responses are collected from people who were aware of the sponsorship prior to the study to allow a ratio of between 10:1 and 20:1. The regression coefficients, t values and p values for the multi-group analysis of frequency of purchase are provided in Table 5.29.

	Unconstrained			Meas Weig	sureme ghts	ent	Struc Weig	ctural ghts		Structural Covariances			Structural Residuals		
	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	T =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =
Group 1															
SPI → CRSLP	.310	2.353	.019	.310	2.353	.019	368	4.983	**	.368	4.98	**	.367	4.97	**
SBL→ CRSLP	.177	1.347	.178	.177	1.347	.178	.122	1.463	.144	.121	1.46	.144	.123	1.47	.140
$FIT \rightarrow CRSLP$.490	1.687	.092	.490	1.687	.092	.496	3.527	**	.496	3.51	**	.495	3.50	**
Group 2															
SPI → CRSLP	.405	4.473	**	.405	4.473	**	368	4.983	**	36	4.98	**	367	4.97	**
SBL→ CRSLP	.082	.760	.447	.082	.760	.447	.122	1.463	.144	.121	1.46	.144	.123	1.47	.140
$FIT \rightarrow CRSLP$.499	3.109	.002	.499	3.109	.002	.496	3.527	**	.496	3.51	**	.495	3.50	**

Table 5.29 – Regression Coefficients –Awareness of the Sponsorship

** significant at 0.01

5.7.3 Frequency of Purchase

To determine the impact of Frequency of Purchase of the sponsoring brand on Consumer Response to SLP, the sample was divided into two groups. Group 1 comprised respondents who indicated they regularly purchased the sponsoring brand (weekly, fortnightly or monthly) (frequent purchasers) and Group 2 comprised those respondents who either occasionally purchased the sponsored brand or did not purchase the sponsoring brand (non-frequent purchasers). Group 1 consisted of 41 respondents (20% of the sample) and group 2 consisted of 160 respondents (80% of the sample).

The results of the multi-group analysis for Frequency of Purchase, indicated that the models fit the data well for the unconstrained (bp=0.728), structural weights (bp=0.475)

structural covariances (bp=0.291) and measurement residuals models (bp=0.330), indicating support for both configural invariance and metric invariance. Measures of fit for the models are provided in Table 5.30.

	Model	Unconstrained	Measurement	Structural	Structural	Structural
			Weights	Weights	Covariances	Residuals
Bollen Stine p	0.466	0.728	0.728	0.475	0.291	0.330
CMIN/DF	$\chi^2(df 1)$	χ^2 (df 2)	χ^2 (df 2)	χ^2 (df 5) =	χ^2 (df 10) =	χ^{2} (df 11)
	=0.053	=0.667	=0.667	4.700	13.71	=13.96
GFI	0.999	0.998	0.998	0.989	0.966	0.966
AGFI	0.987	0.983	0.983	0.956	0.930	0.937
TLI	1.02	1.062	1.062	1.006	0.965	0.975
RMSEA	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.043	0.037
SRMR	0.019	0.052	0.052	0.056	0.125	0.130
Variance explained%	0.43	0.37	0.37	0.39	0.42	0.42

Table 5.30 – Measures of Fit – Multi-group Analysis Frequency of Purchase

The p value and unstandardised regression weights were examined for both groups. The results suggest that the positive relationship between Sponsored Property Identification and Consumer Response to SLP is significant for both groups, (Group 1 b=0.361, p<0.01) (Group 2 b=0.361, p<0.01). The relationship between Sponsoring Brand Loyalty and Consumer Response was not significant for both groups (Group 1 b=0.108, p=0.249) (Group 2 b=0.108, p=0.249). The relationship between Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP was also significant for the both groups (Group 1 b=0.519, p=<0.01) (Group 2 b=0.519, p=<0.01).

These results indicate the Frequency of Purchase of the sponsoring brand does not moderate any of the relationships in the model. This indicates that in a FMCG context, whether a person frequently uses the sponsoring brand or not has little impact on Consumer Response to SLP. Therefore, H7 was not supported.

However, it should be noted that this sample size comes close to violating a principal assumption in SEM. As mentioned in the previous section, the optimal ratio of the number of participants to number of parameters to be estimated should be between 10:1 and 20:1, with a ratio of less than 5:1 indicating that the parameter estimates can be unstable (Kline 1998). Group 1 for this study had a ratio of 44:9, which equates to

roughly 5:1. Therefore, these results need to be interpreted with caution as the small group size may have influenced the parameter estimates and impact the reliability of the fit indices. Future research needs to consider this relationship further, with careful consideration given to the sampling frame to ensure sufficient respondents were sampled who frequently purchased the product to allow a ratio of between 10:1 and 20:1. The regression coefficients, t values and p values are provided in Table 5.31 below.

	Unconstrained			Mea Weig	sureme ghts	ent	Structural Weights			Structural Covariances			Structural Residuals		
	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =	Est.	t =	p =
Group 1															
SPI → CRSLP	.361	5.106	**	.361	5.106	**	.352	4.961	**	.350	5.08	**	.361	5.10	**
SBL→ CRSLP	.108	1.152	.249	.108	1.152	.249	.090	.970	.332	.098	1.04	.296	.108	1.15	.249
$FIT \rightarrow CRSLP$.519	3.916	**	.519	3.916	**	.556	4.267	**	.532	4.01	**	.519	3.91	**
Group 2															
$SPI \rightarrow CRSLP$.361	5.106	**	.361	5.106	**	.352	4.961	**	.350	5.08	**	.361	5.10	**
SBL→ CRSLP	.108	1.152	.249	.108	1.152	.249	.090	.970	.332	.098	1.04	.296	.108	1.15	.249
$FIT \rightarrow CRSLP$.519	3.916	**	.519	3.916	**	.556	4.267	**	.532	4.01	**	.519	3.91	**

Table 5.31 – Regression Coefficients – Frequency of Purchase

** significant at 0.01

Trial Intention In order to determine intention to trial the sponsored product, the sample was sorted into respondents who had indicated that they either purchase the product (weekly, fortnightly, monthly or occasionally) or do not purchase the product. A frequency count showed that 48% of the sample had not previously bought the sponsoring brand's product (n= 99). Of those respondents who had not previously bought the sponsoring brand's product, 15% (n=15) indicated they would be likely to purchase the sponsored product following their exposure to the SLP.

A MANOVER test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the respondents who currently purchase the sponsoring brand (either regularly or occasionally) and respondents who did not purchase at all and their purchase intentions toward the sponsored product as a result of the SLP they were exposed to. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between those who do purchase the brand and those who do not (p=0.00).

These findings suggest that a small percentage of respondents, who do not normally purchase the sponsoring brand, indicated that they would be likely to purchase the sponsored product following exposure to the SLP on that product. These results are worthy of interest (even if the numbers are low) as this supports the theoretical notion of sponsorship, and SLP in particular, being capable of inducing trial in consumers.

5.7.4 Demographic Groups

To determine if any individual respondent characteristics influenced Consumer Response to SLP in this study, tests of difference were carried out for each of age, income and household status (whether children lived at home). The results of these tests showed that there were no significant differences between the different income groups for any of the variables in the model. However significant differences did exist between gender, age and household status and the variables in the model. Each of these are now discussed.

Significant differences existed between the males and females in their response to SLP in this study, particularly for the variable '*This sponsorship improves my perception of* [sponsored property]' (p = 0.046). Females had a lower mean (mean= 2.98), than males (mean= 3.37) (where a score of 1 = strongly agree) indicating that females were neutral about this statement whereas males disagreed with the statement. The linear regression results showed that respondent gender was positively related to the attitude toward the sponsor variable '*This sponsorship improves my perception of* [sponsored property]' (beta = 0.141; p = 0.046). These results indicate that females were more likely to have improved attitude toward the sponsor because of seeing the SLP and thus were more likely to be influenced by sponsor messages on FMCG, than were males in this study.

Significant differences also existed between the various age groups in this study, particularly for the variable '*I think it is good that companies sponsor* [*Cricket Australia*/ *Breast Cancer Foundation*]' (p = 0.00). This item formed part of the Sponsored Property Identification scale, and when age was regressed onto this scale, there was a positive relationship (beta = 0.23; p = 0.00). These results show that the age group 25-36 years had a lower mean than the other age groups, which suggests that those in this age group were more likely to support sponsorship of a favourite property than other age groups.

There were also significant differences for households with children for the variables, '*I* think it is good that companies sponsor [sponsored property]' (p = 0.000); and '*I* am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor [sponsored property]' (p= 0.038). These items formed part of the Sponsored Property Identification scale and subsequent regression analysis showed a positive relationship between this scale and household status (beta = 0.226; p = 0.001). Means and standard deviations are included in Table 5.28. These findings indicate that families with children at home are likely to have more strongly felt Sponsored Property Identification than families without children at home.

These findings provide support that respondent characteristics impact Consumer Response to SLP. In particular, it was found that gender impacts the consumer's attitude toward the sponsoring brand. Furthermore, age and household status impacts consumer's Sponsored Property Identification. Therefore, H8 was supported.

Variable	Group	Mean	SD	В	Р
This sponsorship improves my perception of	Female	2.98	0.96	0.14	0.05
[sponsored property]	Male	3.37	1.02		
I think it is good that companies sponsor [sponsored	18-25 years	2.62	0.98	-	0.002
property]	26-35 years	1.79	0.81		
	36-50 years	2.30	1.07		
	51-65 years	2.25	0.58		
	over 65 years	2.50	1.01		
	18-25 years	2.84	0.92		
Sponsored Property Identification	26-35 years	2.42	0.95	0.23	0.00
	36-50 years	2.94	0.88		
	51-65 years	2.87	1.19		
	over 65 years	3.75	0.96		
If a company sponsored [sponsored property], it would	Children	2.81	1.05	0.21	0.00
positively influence how I felt about that company	No Children	3.34	1.04		
I am more likely to purchase products of companies	Children	2.88	1.05	0.15	0.04
that sponsor [sponsored property]	No Children	3.24	1.04		

 Table 5.32 – Moderating Hypotheses – Respondent Characteristics

Figure 5.4 shows the final model of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP including moderating variables of age, gender, household status, type of sponsored property, frequency of purchase and awareness of the sponsorship.



Figure 5.4 – Final Model of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP

5.8 Conclusions

This chapter reported the results of the data analysis for the major study of this thesis. The chapter commenced with a revision of the conceptual model and hypotheses that were put forward at the conclusion of the exploratory research (Chapter 3). The chapter then presented a profile of sample respondents, confirming that the sample was sufficiently representative of Australian household shoppers. Next, a preliminary analysis of the data set was conducted to ensure that it was clean and that any outliers or missing values were noted and dealt with according to the data analysis guidelines discussed in Chapter 4. The few outliers that were identified were examined and retained as being legitimate responses. The data were tested for normality and descriptive statistics were examined. The data were identified as being non-normal and hence maximum likelihood estimation techniques were adopted for the more detailed data analysis stage. The descriptive statistics and the correlation matrices showed no unexpected results.

The next stage of the data analysis used three distinct methods. Firstly, the measurement models underlying the conceptual model were tested and validated. This analysis began

with an exploratory factor analysis to examine the underlying factor structures of all the variables and followed by confirmatory factor analysis using structural equation modeling to validate and confirm the factor structures. The second stage of the testing examined the structural models hypothesised to impact Consumer Response to SLP. Structural equation modeling was used to test the factors impacting Consumer Response to SLP model, and multiple regression was used to test the moderating hypotheses.

The analysis suggested that when a respondent was highly involved with the sponsoring property, there was positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP. Furthermore, when the respondent perceived a match between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property, there was a positive impact on Consumer Response. These relationships were moderated by awareness of the sponsorship, the type of sponsored property and the demographic characteristics of the respondent. Specific hypotheses tested in this chapter through the structural equation analysis and multiple regression are summarised in table 5.29. The implications of these will be discussed in the next chapter.

H1	That there is a positive relationship between sponsored property identification and consumer response to SLP. That is: as the degree of sponsored property identification increases, there will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP	SUPPORTED
H2	That there is a positive relationship between perceived fit and consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. That is: as the degree of perceived fit increases, there will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP.	SUPPORTED
Н3	That there is a negative relationship between sponsoring brand loyalty and consume response to SLP. That is: in cases of low sponsoring brand loyalty, there will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP.	NOT SUPPORTED
H4	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by perceived fit. That is there will be a difference in consumer response depending on the extent of perceived fit.	SUPPORTED
H5	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by type of sponsored property. That is there will be a difference in consumer response depending on the type of sponsored property.	SUPPORTED
H6	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by awareness of the sponsorship. That is in cases where the respondent is aware of the sponsorship; there will be a positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP.	SUPPORTED
H7	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by frequency of purchase of the sponsoring brand. That is in cases where the respondent frequently purchases the sponsoring brand; there will be a positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP	NOT SUPPORTED
H8	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by respondent characteristics. That is consumer response to SLP will vary depending on age, income, household status & respondent gender.	SUPPORTED

Table 5.33 – Results of Hypotheses Tests 1 – 8

Chapter 6

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter reported the results of the analysis of data gathered for the major study of this thesis. This chapter will draw conclusions and implications based on these results.

This chapter has six sections as shown in figure 6.1. It will begin by summarizing the earlier stages of the research (section 6.1). The conclusions regarding the hypotheses tested in Chapter 5 will then follow in section 6.2 with conclusions relating to the research aim in section 6.3. Following this, conclusions and implications for theory (section 6.4) and for practice (section 6.5) will be presented. Finally, limitations of the research will be addressed and future research directions will be proposed (section 6.6).



Figure 6.1 – Chapter Outline

The purpose of this program of research was to develop and test a model of factors proposed to impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging, specifically addressing the roles of Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsoring Brand Loyalty, Perceived Fit and Type of Sponsored Property.

Specific objectives addressed in this program of research were:

- 1. to determine the factors that impact consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging in a FMCG context
- 2. to develop and test a structural model that describes the network of relations among these variables.

In Chapter 1, the research objectives were outlined in section 1.2 and a brief discussion of the increasing economic and marketing importance of sponsorship was presented to set the scene for this research. The importance and justification for the research was discussed in terms of the lack of prior research in the area of consumer behaviour relating to sponsorship generally, and in terms of Australian fast moving consumer goods specifically (section 1.3). A three-stage research design was proposed to be the most suitable to address the research purpose (section 1.4). These stages consisted of: 1) a literature review; 2) exploratory research comprising focus groups, in-depth interviews and a qualitative study; and 3) a major study with data gathered in the form of a self-administered questionnaire (section 1.4.3). The scope of the thesis was limited to Australian consumers who were responsible for the household shopping.

Following this, Chapter 2 reviewed the literature relating to the research objectives and identified gaps in the theory. This chapter commenced with an introduction of the marketing communications literature (section 2.2) and then moved onto a discussion of the definition and application of sponsorship (section 2.3). The theoretical foundation for the research was then outlined, particularly considering low level processing (given the FMCG context) and brand image transfer. Two key constructs relevant to sponsorship were also introduced in this section: Sponsored Property Identification and Perceived Fit (section 2.4). The combined discipline areas of sponsorship leveraging and packaging were then discussed to justify their relevance in marketing communications (section 2.5).

Following this, a review of the consumer behaviour literature was conducted including justification of the constructs to be examined in this program of research (section 2.6). Key findings from the literature that related to the research purpose were developed into a number of propositions and into a conceptual model (section 2.7).

Chapter 3 presented the methodology and results of Study 1, which was designed to inform the theory generation process, to assist in the identification of constructs and the development and purification of measures. The chapter commenced with a discussion of the theoretical foundation and relevant research paradigm (section 3.2). This was followed by a discussion of the rationale for the exploratory research (section 3.3) before moving into an outline and discussion of the methodological issues involved in this study. The results were then presented (section 3.4) for the focus groups, in-depth interviews and the qualitative survey. A discussion of the findings (section 3.5) was presented, together with hypotheses and a revised conceptual model (section 3.6). Conclusions for the chapter were then drawn (section 3.7).

Chapter 4 presented the rationale for the methodology chosen for the main study (section 4.2). As part of this discussion of the research design (section 4.3), the experimental design (section 4.3.1), the questionnaire design and administration (section 4.3.2), the sampling strategy (section 4.3.3), ethical consideration (section 4.3.4) and the data analysis strategies were detailed (section 4.3.5). Conclusions for the chapter were presented which summarized the methodological approach taken (section 4.4).

Chapter 5 reported the results from the analysis of data from Study 2. The chapter commenced with a discussion of the results of Study 2 in relation to the hypotheses and conceptual model proposed at the conclusion of Study 1, the exploratory study (section 5.2). From this, a profile and analysis of respondents was presented in section 5.3. The results of the preliminary analysis including details of data cleaning and screening, descriptive research and correlations were presented in section 5.4. Next, the conceptual model was tested in three stages. Section 5.5 detailed the testing of the measurement model with the scales used to measure the four constructs validated with both exploratory

and then confirmatory factor analysis. Section 5.6 detailed the testing of the structural portion of the model and the first three hypotheses proposed. Finally, in section 5.7 moderating hypotheses were tested using tests of multi-group analysis and multiple regression. The chapter concluded with a discussion of the findings (section 5.8) and figures and tables were used to present the data.

In this chapter, conclusions will be drawn for each of the hypotheses and for the research aims (section 6.2). The findings from Chapter 5 will be compared to the literature with particular reference made to the contributions of the research in understanding the research purpose (section 6.3). The chapter concludes with implications of the findings for theory (section 6.4) and practice (section 6.5) followed by a discussion of the limitations of the study and implications for future research (section 6.6)

6.2 Implications of Results of Study 2

This study was conducted to examine the Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP and to develop a structural model, which would explain the relationships among Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsoring Brand Loyalty, Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP. Results of the structural equation analysis generally support the hypothesized relationships. Table 6.1 provides a summary of the hypotheses results.

Table 6.1 – Results of Hypotheses Tests 1 - 8

H1	That there is a positive relationship between sponsored property identification and consumer response to SLP. That is: as the degree of sponsored property identification increases, there will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP	SUPPORTED
H2	That there is a positive relationship between perceived fit and consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. That is: as the degree of perceived fit increases, there will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP.	SUPPORTED
H3	That there is a negative relationship between sponsoring brand loyalty and	
	consumer response to SLP. That is: in cases of low sponsoring brand loyalty, the	NOT
	will be a positive impact on consumer response to SLP.	SUPPORTED
H4	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by perceived fit. That is there will	
	be a difference in consumer response depending on the extent of perceived fit.	SUPPORTED
H5	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by type of sponsored property. That is there will be a difference in consumer response depending on the type	SUPPORTED

H6	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by awareness of the sponsorship.	
	That is in cases where the respondent is aware of the sponsorship; there will be	SUPPORTED
	a positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP.	
H7	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by frequency of purchase of the	
	sponsoring brand. That is in cases where the respondent frequently purchases the	NOT
	sponsoring brand; there will be a positive impact on Consumer Response to SLP	SUPPORTED
H8	That consumer response to SLP is moderated by respondent characteristics.	
	That is consumer response to SLP will vary depending on age, income,	SUPPORTED
	household status & respondent gender.	

Conclusions regarding each of these hypotheses will now be drawn by briefly summarising the results of each hypothesis and explaining these results in relation to earlier findings from stages one and two of the research.

Sponsored Property Identification - Hypothesis 1

The results from this study indicate that consumers who identify highly with a sponsored property are likely to report greater response to the Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging than consumers who did not identify with the sponsored property. Specifically, this research identified a positive relationship between Sponsored Property Identification and Consumer Response to SLP. This indicates that SLP, particularly in a FMCG context, has the capacity to influence consumer response towards the sponsoring brand when sponsored property identification is high. This finding is consistent with previous studies that indicate that when consumers are emotionally involved with a sponsored property and identify with it, this can lead to a strong sense of attachment with related sponsored brands (Sirgy et al. 2007; Gwinner and Swanson 2003; Gwinner and Eaton 1999; Madrigal 2000; Meenaghan 1991, 2001).

This finding is also consistent with previous studies generally conducted in high involvement product contexts (Gwinner & Swanson 2003; Smith et al. 2008; Lardinoit & Derbaix 2001; McDaniel 1999; Madrigal, 2000; Cornwell & Coote 2005). The results of this study provide evidence that a consumer's identification with a favoured property plays an important role in consumer response to SLP, even in a FMCG context. This finding then, when combined with findings from previous sponsorship studies, indicates that sponsored property identification is likely to impact consumer response to a sponsorship regardless of the level and intensity of the decision-making context.

These findings lend considerable support to the process of Brand Image Transfer outlined by authors such as Grohs and Gwinner in a number of studies (Grohs et al. 2004; Grohs & Reisinger 2005; Gwinner & Eaton 1999; Gwinner & Swanson 2003). The Brand Image Transfer Process discussed in these studies, suggest that favorable attitudes toward a sponsored property can transfer to a sponsoring brand with little cognitive elaboration (Pracejus 2004). The results of this study show that communication of the sponsorship arrangement via product packaging under low involvement conditions, can lead to improved consumer response. Although brand image was not specifically tested in this study, the findings still provide some evidence of the Brand Image Transfer Process, in particular, with little cognitive elaboration, as is the case in a FMCG context. Future research should also examine brand image (and the associated brand image transfer) as a consumer response to SLP to confirm these speculations (see section 6.6 Limitations and Future Research).

Sponsoring Brand Loyalty - Hypothesis 3

This finding that loyalty to the sponsoring brand has little impact on consumer response to SLP (except in the case of cause related sponsorship), is in contrast to the majority of previous sponsorship research suggesting that positive attitudes toward a sponsor are associated with favourable perceptions and intentions to purchase a sponsor's product (Smith et al. 2008; Pope & Voges, 1999; Speed and Thompson 2000). The literature reported in Chapter 2 suggests that attitudes and opinions are important precursors to behavioral intentions in general, yet authors have found that particularly in FMCG, positive opinions about the brand have a weak or limited impact on purchase intentions of the sponsor's brand (Hoek 1999; Lacey et al. 2007). This would suggest that although sponsorship can reinforce beliefs already held by consumers, it is unlikely to instill new beliefs and it is even less likely to induce entirely new behaviour patterns in the context of low involvement decision making and FMCG.

It was hypothesized that loyalty to the sponsoring brand would result in consumers devoting little cognitive effort in processing SLP and as a result, there would be no change in consumer response as a result of exposure to SLP. This proposition was developed from Study 1 where focus group respondents indicated that their purchase decision in an FMCG context was particularly dependent on how loyal they were to the brands involved. In the exploratory research, respondents indicated that where they were loyal to a brand, little time would be spent in making purchase decisions and that alternative brands would be were given little or no consideration regardless of marketing communications on SLP.

The results of this study, confirmed generally that loyalty to the sponsoring brand had little influence on consumer response to SLP, in this FMCG context. However, this relationship was shown (in the moderating hypothesis) to vary depending on a number of conditions. These are discussed further in Hypotheses 4 - 8.

In this study, whilst there was some impact from the independent variables on Consumer Response to SLP, the majority of this impact came from sponsored property identification, not an a priori attitude toward the sponsor. This finding supports previous studies in low involvement contexts that suggest this lack of impact may be a consequence of the nature of the purchase decision process in FMCG. In these contexts, consumers are generally price sensitive, expend little effort in considering various alternatives, and often switch between brands (Silayoi & Speece 2004). This finding is of particular importance to FMCG manufacturers who may be using SLP as a strategy to specifically retain existing customers. These results indicate that SLP may be more effective at influencing the purchase intentions of consumers only under quite specific conditions. The first of these conditions uncovered in this study is perceived fit, and this is discussed next.

Perceived Fit - Hypotheses 2 and 4

Perceived fit between a sponsoring brand and a sponsored property has been shown to have a significant influence on variables such as attitude toward the sponsor and purchase intentions in previous sponsorship research (Koo et al. 2006; Roy & Cornwell 2003; Coppetti et al. 2009; Speed & Thompson 2000; Grohs et al. 2004; Smith et al. 2008). However as reported in Chapter 3 much of this research was conducted in high

involvement purchase contexts and in relation to the purchase of shopping goods. This research aimed to investigate whether perceived fit maintained its relevance in consumer decision making in relation to sponsorship activity in low involvement decision contexts particularly FMCG.

The results reported in Chapter 5 indicate that perceived fit did indeed play a role in how consumers responded to SLP in a FMCG context. Specifically, there was evidence that Perceived Fit had a positive moderate influence on Consumer Response to SLP. These results provide evidence that a consumer's perception of the fit between the sponsored property and sponsoring brand continues to play an important role in their response to SLP even in a low involvement decision context. Literature to date (Speed & Thompson 2000; Becker-Olsen & Simmons 2002; Pracejus & Olsen 2004; Fleck & Quester 2007) supports this finding by consistently reporting that effectiveness of sponsorship is contingent on the fit between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property.

Specifically, studies of consumer responses to corporate sponsorships reveal that the closer the perceived fit between a sponsor and a property the more accurate will be the sponsor identification (Johar & Pham 1999). Further this relationship will also result in more favorable attitudes toward the sponsor (Speed & Thompson 2000; Koo et al. 2006), and there will be a strong image transfer from property to sponsor (Gwinner & Eaton 1999). Indeed, perceived fit between the brand and the property has been regarded as critical for sponsorship success (Coppetti 2009). Yet despite considerable research conducted into perceived fit, much of the research has focused on outcomes of fit rather than on those variables that might influence fit (Gwinner & Bennett 2008). This study looked at several variables in particular that were hypothesized to influence perceptions of perceived fit in a FMCG context.

The findings reported in the previous chapter indicated that the level of sponsored property identification affects consumer response to SLP. Furthermore, it was determined that the level of perceived fit impacted consumer response to SLP. Results also indicated that perceived fit moderated the relationship between sponsoring brand loyalty and

consumer response to SLP. These findings are important because they support prior research by re-emphasizing the vital role that perceived fit plays in sponsor-related evaluations (Dardis 2009). This will be an important finding for FMCG managers who are considering the use of sponsorship leveraged packaging in their marketing activity. If these marketing managers are able to increase the degree of perceived fit between their brands and those sports or causes that they sponsor, there is likely to be a resultant increase in consumer responses to the sponsorship. This reinforces the need for careful and strategic selection of sponsorship alliances and associations for retail organizations.

Type of Sponsored Property - Hypothesis 5

It was hypothesised that the type of sponsored property would influence how a consumer responded to SLP. The results of the focus group discussions suggested that some causes (such as breast cancer) appeared to generate stronger positive emotions in consumers, more so than their reactions and emotional attachment to sports. This lead the researcher to hypothesize that cause related sponsorship may engender stronger responses in consumers to SLP than would the same types of associations with a sport sponsorship.

The results reported in chapter 5 indeed supported this proposition. These results suggest that the sponsorship of a cause (particularly a popular and well known one such as breast cancer) appears more likely to engender favourable attitudes and purchase intentions towards the sponsor than does sponsorship of a sport. Objectives of such sponsorship arrangements are generally to associate the company with a charity, suggesting that the business is fulfilling a societal obligation and to generate goodwill by enhancing the image of the organisation (Dean 2002). Given that cause related sponsorship is generally associated with humane causes it is unsurprising that these associations would create strong positive emotions among consumers.

A number of authors previously have suggested that cause related sponsorship will endear more positive attitudes toward sponsors than would corporate sponsorship (Becker-Olsen & Simmons 2002; D'astous & Bitz 1995) and this research has supported these findings. What was not previously known was whether this relationship would be maintained in a low involvement FMCG context? This study has confirmed this to be the case. Further, these results show the importance of determining the target markets' emotional attachment to potential sponsorship properties, whether causes or sports, in order to gain the most benefit from sponsorship arrangements by selecting properties that the target audience value highly and feel an emotion connections to.

Awareness of the Sponsorship - Hypothesis 6

It was hypothesized that consumers who were aware of the sponsorship arrangements prior to be exposed to the SLP would be more likely to have a more positive response to SLP than those who were not previously aware. The results reported in Chapter 5 suggest that prior awareness of the sponsorship moderated the relationship between Perceived Fit and Consumer Response to SLP. This means that when a consumer is aware of the sponsorship relationship prior to exposure to SLP, that their perception of the match between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property has a greater impact on their response to that SLP.

In previous studies awareness of sponsorship has been shown to be impacted by strong levels of property identification (Meenaghan 2001; Grohs et al. 2004) and perceived fit between the sponsoring brand and the sponsored property (Crimmins & Horn 1996; Johar & Pham 1999; Speed & Thompson 2000; Stipp & Schiavone 1996; Grohs et al. 2004). Several studies have supported that sponsorship is an effective tool in increasing brand awareness levels (Johar & Pham 1999; Rifon et al. 2001; Speed & Thompson 2000; Apostolopoulou & Papadimitriou 2004; Chadwick & Thwaites 2005). In contrast, other studies have demonstrated that the impact on consumers' attitudes or behaviours towards a sponsoring brand as a result of exposure to sponsorship advertising can sometimes be very weak (Grohs et al. 2004), and this can be more prominent in the case of high familiarity brands such as found in FMCG contexts (Carrillat et al. 2005).

These results should also be considered in light of the discussion by sponsorship researchers concerning the importance of brand familiarity. In this study, the brands chosen for the questionnaire instrument were well known brands. Some research has indicated that sponsorships are more effective for improving attitudes and purchase intentions when the sponsoring brand is unfamiliar (Carrillat et al. 2005). According to Pope and Voges (2000), consumers' intention to purchase can be derived from two predominant influences: a positive attitude towards the brand; and brand familiarity, which is obtained from brand exposure and prior use. This study demonstrated that in a FMCG context, for those consumers who already are aware of the sponsorship, the impact of the perceived fit or match between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property was greater as a result of exposure to SLP, than for those who were not aware of the sponsorship prior to exposure.

Given that the majority of companies who are involved with sponsorship, or sport sponsorship in particular, have a primary objective of increasing brand awareness (Koo 2006), the findings from this study are particularly important. By increasing consumer awareness of sponsorship relationships, sponsors try to influence the development and depth of brand association and increase the chance that consumers will select a particular brand or product (Crompton 2004). This would suggest that FMCG managers would benefit from selecting those properties for which consumers already have a strong affinity or identification and where they perceive a high level of fit with the sponsoring brand.

Frequency of Purchase - Hypothesis 7

The results reported in Chapter 5 suggest that frequency of purchase of the sponsoring brand does not impact Consumers Response to SLP. The findings from this study are in contrast to Pope and Voges (2000) who found that intention to purchase was significantly related to the frequency of purchase of the sponsoring brand. This study found that in a FMCG context, even if the consumer regularly purchased the un-sponsored product, this did not positively impact their intention to purchase the sponsored product as a direct result of SLP. This indicates that in FMCG product categories, the fact that a consumer regularly purchases a product, does not necessarily guarantee that they would purchase the same product with sponsored leveraged packaging.

Respondent Characteristics - Hypothesis 8

It was hypothesised that the characteristics of the respondents would moderate their responses to SLP. The results of this study showed that for gender, age and household status that this was the case. Gender was shown to moderate the respondent's response to SLP and age and household status moderated the degree of Sponsored Property Identification felt. These results suggest that demographics do play a role in determining how consumers are likely to respond to SLP in a FMCG context.

In summary, sponsors who target 25-36 year old females with children living at home might have an easier task in improving consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging. Furthermore, the results of this study show that household status moderates sponsored property identification. That is: families with children are more likely to identify with the sponsored property, particularly in a FMCG context, than families without children living at home.

These findings indicate that in FMCG markets, managers should carefully consider the demographic profile of the sponsored properties and sponsoring brand's target market and segment the market accordingly. As a result, sponsorship leveraged packaging can then be fine tuned to meet both the sponsoring brand and sponsored property's target markets needs, creating a more effective and cost effective sponsorship arrangement.

6.3 Conclusions about the Research Purpose

The purpose of this program of research was to develop and test a model of Factors Impacting Consumer Response to Sponsorship Leveraged Packaging, specifically addressing the roles of Sponsored Property Identification, Sponsoring Brand Loyalty, Perceived Fit and various moderating variables including: Type of Sponsored Property; Frequency of Purchase; Awareness of the Sponsorship; and Respondent Characteristics.

Specific objectives to be addressed in this program of research were:

- 1. to determine the factors that impact Consumer Response to SLP in a FMCG context
- 2. to develop and test a structural model that describes the network of relationships among these variables.

In sum, the key finding of this research is that sponsorship leveraged packaging can improve attitude and purchase intentions towards the sponsoring brand's products in a FMCG context. This improvement in attitudes and purchase intention is based on two key factors i.e. sponsored property identification and sponsoring brand loyalty.

In particular, when a consumer is highly involved with the sponsored property, there is a corresponding increase Consumer Response to SLP. Of particular importance, is that when the sponsored property is a cause, the impact on Consumer Response is likely to be greater than for a sport related sponsorship alliance.

Furthermore, gender, age and the presence of children in the home are all likely to impact how strongly a consumer will identify with the sponsored property and ultimately respond to SLP. Specifically, female respondents exhibited higher improvement in attitudes towards the sponsor than did male respondents as a direct result of exposure to SLP. In addition, respondents aged between 25 - 36 years were more likely to support sponsorship of a favourite property than other age groups. This highlights the importance of careful selection of sponsorship properties based on the target market profile and their identification with the potential sponsorship property. The second key factor in understanding consumer response to SLP is the role played by sponsoring brand loyalty.

Traditional marketing literature has long supported the belief that as brand loyalty increases vulnerability to competitive promotion is reduced (Aaker 1991). This study showed that loyalty to the sponsoring brand had little impact on Consumer Response to SLP in a FMCG context, except in the case of cause sponsorship, where loyalty to the sponsoring brand moderated the impact of sponsoring brand loyalty on consumer response to SLP. This suggests a heightened importance for the brand itself when it is associated with a cause particularly in a FMCG context.

An important component in this relationship between sponsored property identification, sponsoring brand loyalty and consumer response to SLP is the association between the sponsored property and the sponsoring brand. This study found that when the sponsored

property and sponsoring brand were well matched in terms of image and logical fit, the consumer's response improved when exposed to SLP.

The findings discussed in section 6.2 have both implications for theory (section 6.4) as well as practical implications (section 6.5). These implications are considered next.

6.4 Theoretical Contribution

In recent years considerable research has been undertaken toward a better understanding of how consumers process sponsorship messages. Many of these studies have sought to discover theoretical explanations related to the cognitive processing of sponsorship stimuli and the effects on response outcome. Cornwell et al. (2005) developed a comprehensive model to explain consumer response to sponsorship, and suggested that various theories explain how sponsorship works in consumers' minds (i.e. processing mechanics). Their work also indicated that these processing mechanics are influenced by both individual and group-level factors, market factors and management factors. This study found support for this proposition in that individual factors such as sponsored property identification, and demographic characteristics were found to influence consumer response to SLP.

Specifically, the findings from this study indicate that a high level of sponsored property identification improved consumer response toward the sponsor in an FMCG low involvement context. In addition, respondent age and household status moderated sponsored property identification and consumer response was higher for female respondents than male. Furthermore, management factors such as the type of property sponsored and the perceived fit between the sponsored property and sponsoring brand were also shown to have an impact on how consumers responded to SLP. In particular, sponsorship of a cause was found to have greater positive impact on consumer response than sponsorship of a sport when exposed to SLP. In addition, consumer response was higher when respondents perceived a high fit between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property in the SLP.

Overall, this study provides support that various theoretical approaches such as low-level processing, congruence and image transfer can be used together to complement each other and to improve the outcomes of sponsorship alliances as suggested by Cornwell et al. (2005). For example, the low-level processing theory explains that in the context of this study (i.e. FMCG), little cognitive effort is expended in making purchase decisions. There was evidence in the findings of this study of the image transfer process despite the low involvement context (see section 6.2 Hypothesis 1). Furthermore, despite the finding in the exploratory stage of the research that perceived fit had little impact on consumer response to SLP, this study found a significant positive relationship between perceived fit and consumer response to SLP. This indicates that although it may not be a conscious decision to consider perceived fit in a low involvement context, its role is still important in explaining the way that consumers respond to sponsorship leveraged packaging. This demonstrates that the theories of low-level processing, congruence and image transfer should not be used in isolation; rather elements of all three are needed to fully explain how consumers are likely to respond to SLP in a FMCG context.

The nature of low involvement processing where little cognitive effort is expended in purchase decisions, has led researchers to consider whether sponsorship has the capacity to influence consumer response: be it awareness, attitudes, purchase intention or purchase behaviour. Whilst previous research has advanced our understanding of factors that impact consumer response to sponsorship, this study explains those factors in a new context: that of sponsorship leveraged packaging in FMCG.

Specifically, the results of this study indicate that whilst some respondents had progressed to the first stage of the hierarchy i.e. awareness; there was not in all cases, a corresponding impact on attitudes or purchase intention. Importantly, researchers suggest that it is critical to reinforce awareness of the relationship between the sponsoring brand and sponsored property (Fullerton 2007), given that if awareness is not achieved, it is difficult for the other stages of the hierarchy (such as attitudes and purchase behaviour) to be achieved. Moreover, while sponsorship has been shown to be capable of creating awareness (Johar and Pham 1999; Pham and Johar 2001; Rifon et al. 2004; Speed and
Thompson 2000; Apostolopoulou & Papadimitriou 2004; Chadwick & Thwaites 2005), there has been inconclusive evidence that awareness or the subsequent development of positive attitudes toward the sponsor, will prompt trial. In this study, a small percentage of respondents who did not regularly purchase the product indicated intention to try the product. This suggests that SLP does have some although small capacity to induce trial. This capacity to induce trial could be explored in future research (see section 6.5).

Until now, few sponsorship studies have taken into account the respondent's brand usage behaviour, and even fewer have considered sponsorship's capacity to induce trial in their sponsorship research studies. The findings of this study are particularly important for today's market place, where many consumers shop under high time pressure and products are often bought without prior planning (Siloyai and Speece, 2004), this is especially true for products in the FMCG context. Sponsorship leveraged packaging is just one tool amongst a proliferation of marketing tools used by FMCG managers to create differentiation in a very competitive marketplace. Having established that sponsorship leveraged packaging has the capacity to improve consumer attitudes and purchase intentions towards the sponsoring brand, as well as induce trial (in a limited capacity), this study provides evidence of the capacity of SLP to impact consumer attitudes and purchase intentions, particularly in a FMCG context.

There is insufficient evidence to determine whether SLP in a FMCG context operates under a hierarchy of effects model or an ATR model. This program of research has initiated work in this area by determining Factors that Impact Consumer Response to SLP. However, more work is needed to further explore the relationship between SLP has and consumers trial intention. Whether SLP is more or less effective than other FMCG marketing communication tools in this regard could also be a topic for future research.

In summary, the findings from this study have advanced knowledge of consumer response to sponsorship. The understanding provided in this study has advanced sponsorship theory, in particular, the processing of sponsorship messages and their capacity to impact consumer response in a FMCG context. In addition to the theoretical contributions, this research also has implications for practice. These are discussed next.

6.5 Implications for Practice

The findings from this research are of importance to both FMCG brand managers and property managers. This study provides understanding of the role of sponsored property identification in consumer response to sponsorship leveraged packaging in FMCG. This is relevant to two key elements of the sponsorship process: (1) the sponsorship selection decision; and (2) the development of the sponsorship-leveraging strategy.

In the sponsorship selection decision, managers must choose between alternative properties as vehicles for sponsorship. The results of this study show the importance of sponsored property identification, indicating that managers need to have a good understanding of the attitudes held by their target audience. In this way, sponsoring firms may focus on the highly identified consumer due to their propensity for greater sponsor recognition and higher levels of purchase intentions. Furthermore, brand managers should target properties that their target market value highly. This will allow brand managers and property managers to assess new and existing sponsorship arrangements to maximize the benefit gained from such opportunities and to avoid costly mistakes.

Secondly, in developing the sponsorship-leveraging strategy, the findings provide support for incorporating sponsorship leveraged packaging, particularly in a FMCG setting. Sponsorship leveraged packaging provides opportunity to further engage the consumer with the sponsor's product by reinforcing the link between the favoured property and the sponsor. While providing a way to communicate the sponsorship arrangement to consumers at a point closer to purchase than traditional sponsorship promotion (i.e. venue and media advertising), marketers should also consider the role of sponsoring brand loyalty in consumer response to SLP.

A further contribution this study makes is the identification of the inverse relationship between loyalty to the sponsoring brand and consumer response to SLP. Specifically, the findings from this study indicate that in cases of low loyalty to the sponsoring brand, there was an improvement in consumer attitudes and purchase intention towards the sponsor, as a result of SLP. Therefore, managers of lesser known brands would be well advised to use sponsorships with a highly familiar property to counterbalance the high awareness and high brand loyalty of well-known competitors' brands. Managers of lesser known brands may decide to leverage their sponsorship agreements based not only on the association with the property, but also on the association with the other sponsoring brands. Alternatively, for prominent or familiar brands, sponsorship may be a good preemptive strategy since it may limit *direct* competitors' access to popular properties.

Finally, the strongest managerial implication from this research is that it is not enough to consider awareness alone when selecting and evaluating sponsorships. This study clearly indicated that awareness alone does not result in improved purchase intention. For sponsorship managers, this means that measuring awareness alone is not enough when evaluating the effectiveness of sponsorship. For property managers, this means that understanding the attitudes and brand loyalty of consumers towards possible sponsor brands is crucial in selecting which sponsors to partner with.

Despite the aforementioned theoretical and practical contributions, there is a need for further research on the impact of sponsorship leveraged packaging both with immediate and long term effects. Limitations of this study and avenues for future research follow.

6.6 Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations exist in the current study. First, this study concentrated on a one off treatment of the experiment condition i.e. exposure to sponsorship leveraged packaging from a real world example. A longitudinal study considering the change of consumer response over time would be beneficial to provide further insights into the area. It would also be interesting to determine whether SLP is more or less effective than other FMCG marketing communication tools. A study examining the effectiveness of SLP compared to other tools (such as competitions, celebrity endorsement, licensing), and their capacity to create awareness, improve brand attitudes and purchase intentions and induce trial, will determine SLP's commercial value for FMCG managers.

Second, the product category chosen for this study (i.e. breakfast cereals) is one in which considerable promotional activity occurs (e.g. sales promotions, free gifts with purchase, competitions); the cereal category is a dynamic, quickly changing environment. As this study specifically examined the breakfast cereal category, generalization to other FMCG categories is tenuous. Future research could examine different FMCG categories and determine whether the findings from this study hold strong for other product categories.

The use of a non-probability, self-administered questionnaire could also have affected the result of this research for a number of reasons. Firstly, social desirability error is common in self-reported surveys, where respondents will answer questions in a way that will be socially acceptable, rather than a true and accurate record of their feelings and behaviours (or in this case intentions). If such was the case in this study, respondents may have overstated their attitudes and purchase intentions and therefore a less than accurate measure of the consumers' response to SLP was given. On the other hand, respondents may be reluctant to admit that promotion influences their decision-making process, and again, a less than accurate answer is given.

Moreover, the female skewed sample may have contributed to the preference for the breast cancer cause and a simple random sample of brand users could yield different results. With regard to the characteristics of the sample, the cell counts of some of the variables were not to the desired size and therefore, prediction of the impacts of SLP on this basis is tenuous. In addition, the cell sizes for two of the moderating variables, Awareness of the Sponsorship and Frequency of Purchase, were not large. Interpretation of these results in particular should be exercised with caution.

Thirdly, as highlighted in the discussion area, this study measured behavioural intention rather than actual behaviour. While it attempted to clarify this intention-behaviour link, a study that followed actual consumer purchases in a controlled experiment would provide most significant results. This could be achieved through a choice modeling experiment to examine whether consumers do in fact behave as they have indicated in the survey. Alternatively, behavioural measures (such as: competitions, merchandise, free gifts redemption), may be used to enable researchers and practitioners to obtain better insights into the behavioural consequences of sponsorships they might undertake. The examination of scan data would also enable calculation of whether the investment in the sponsorship was offset by the increase in sales that resulted.

Additionally, this study examined Perceived Fit and its impact on other variables important to this study. The subjects for the study (i.e. Weetbix/CA and Light 'n' Tasty/ NBCF) were current real market campaigns and thus the fit in each case would likely be high. Future research may use fit as an experimental condition to determine whether cases of low, medium or high fit perform better under similar conditions as this study.

Finally, the key finding of this research is that SLP can improve consumer response to sponsorship. This improvement is based on two key factors i.e. sponsored property identification and perceived fit. Theoretically and practically, this change in attitudes and purchase intention occurs because of the brand image transfer process. It is not known, whether in this process, if the brand image of the sponsored property is also transferred to the sponsor as this was outside the scope of this program of research. Furthermore, it is not known if a reciprocal transfer occurs where the image of the brand is transferred to the sponsored property. Future research could determine if this is the case in a FMCG context, where brand image of either the sponsoring brand or sponsored property is transferred as a result of SLP.

Although sponsorship has become an increasingly important and popular means of promotion, previous research has not considered its contribution in a packaging context. This program of research has provided empirical evidence of the factors that impact consumer response to SLP in a FMCG context. The key finding of this research is that SLP can improve consumer response to the sponsoring brand. The outcomes from this research contribute to a better understanding of sponsorship effects on consumer behaviour and provide managers with the means to develop more effective sponsoring leveraging.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Aaker, D 1991, Managing Brand Equity, The Free Press, New York, U.S.

Aaker, D, Kumar, V, Day, G, Lawley, M, & Stewart, D 2007, *Marketing Research*, 2nd Edition, John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd.

Abratt, R & Grobler, T 1989, The evaluation of sports sponsorship, *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 351-62.

Ahluwalia, R, Burnkrant, RE & Unnava, R 2000, Consumer response to negative publicity, the moderating role of commitment, *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 37 (May), pp.203–214.

Ailawadi, KL, Neslin, SA & Gedenk, K 2001, Pursuing the value-conscious consumer; store brands versus national brand promotions, *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 65 (1), pp. 71 – 89.

Aitken, PP, Leather, DS & Squair, SI 1986, Children's awareness of cigarette brand sponsorship of sports and games in the UK, *Health Education Research*, vol. 1(3), 203-211.

Alexandris, K. Douka, S, Bakaloumi, S & Tsasousi, E 2008, The influence of spectators' attitudes on sponsorship awareness: a study in three different leisure events, *Managing Leisure*, vol. 13, January.

Ali, C, Cornwell, TB, Nguyen, D & Coote, L 2006, 'Exploring the usefulness of a consumer activity index in the sponsorship-linked marketing context', *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, January, Vol. 7, Issue 2, pp 115-123.

Alreck, PL & Settle, RB 1985, The survey research handbook, Irwin, USA.

Alwin, D & Hauser, R 1975, The decomposition of effects in path analysis, *American Sociological Review* 40 (February): 37–47.

Ambler, T, Styles, C & Xiucum W 1999, The Effect of Channel Relationships and Guanxi on the Performance of Inter-Province Export Ventures in the People's Republic of China, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, vol. 16, 75-87.

Amis, J, Slack, T & Berrett, T 1999, Sport sponsorship as distinctive competence, *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 33, pp. 14-25.

Anderson, JC & Gerbing, DW 1988, Structural equation modeling Practice: a review and recommended two-step approach, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 103, No. 3, pp. 411 - 423.

Angenendt, C 1993, Image transfer and acceptance sport sponsoring, *Planning and Analysis*, 2, pp. 5–9.

Apostolopoulou, A & Papadimitriou, D 2004, 'Welcome home': motivations and objectives of the 2004 Grand National Olympic sponsors, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 13 No.4, pp.180-92.

Arbuckle, J, 1999, Amos users' guide version 4.01, Smallwaters Corporation, USA.

Arbuckle, JL & Wothke, W, 2007 AMOS 16 User's Guide, Chicago, IL: SPSS.

Bagozzi, R, 1994, *Measurement in Marketing Research: Basic Principles of Questionnaire Design*, in Principles of Marketing Research, ed. Bagozzi, R.P. Blackwell, USA.

Baron, RB & Kenny, DA 1986, The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychology research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 51, No. 6, pp 1173-1182.

Beck, A 1990, 'But Where Can We Find Heineken?' Commercial Sponsorship of the Arts on Merseyside, *The Political Quarterly*, 61 (4), 393-401.

Bandalos, DL, 2002, The effects of item parceling on the goodness-of-fit and parameter estimate bias in structural equation modeling *Structural Equation Modeling*, 9, 78-102.

Becker-Olsen, K & Simmons, CJ 2002, When Do Social Sponsorships Enhance or Dilute Equity? Fit, Message Source, and the Persistence of Effects, *Advances in Consumer Research* vol. 29, pp. 287-289.

Belch G & Belch M 2009, Advertising and Promotion, an Integrated Marketing Communications Perspective, 8th edition, McGraw Hill, New York.

Bennett, G, Cunningham, G & Dees, W 2006, Measuring the Marketing Communication Activations of a Professional Tennis Tournament, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, vol. 15, pp.91-101.

Bennett, R 1999, Sport sponsorship spectator recall and false consensus, *European Journal* of Marketing, vol. 33, pp. 291–313.

Bentler, PM & Dudgeon, P 1996, Covariance structure analysis: statistical practice, theory and directions, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 47, pp. 563 – 592.

Berlson, B 1971, Content Analysis in Communication Research, Hafner Company, New York.

Blaikie, N 1993, Approaches to social enquiry, Polity Press, Cambridge

Bloxham, M 1998, Brand affinity and television program sponsorship, *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 17(1), pp. 89–98.

Blythe, J 2003, *Essentials of Marketing Communications* 2nd ed, Pearson Education, England.

Bollen, KA 1989, A new incremental fit index for general structural equation models, *Sociological methods and research*, Vol. 17, pp. 303-316.

Browne, MW & Cudeck, R 1989, Alternative ways of assessing model fit, in *Structural equation models*, eds, K.A. Bollen and J.S. Long, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, pp. 136–162.

Burns, AC & Bush, RF 1998, Marketing Research, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Burns, AC & Bush, RF 2003, Marketing Research 4th Edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Busser, J, Benson, T & Feinstein, A, 2002, The Impact of Sponsorship Type and Exposure on Spectator Recognition, *HTL Science* – Article 2002-1.

Campo, K, Gijsbrechts, E & Nison, P, 2000, Towards understanding consumer response to stock-outs, *Journal of Research*, 79 (2), pp. 219 -242.

Carrillat, FA, Lafferty, B A & Harris, EG, 2005, Investigating sponsorship effectiveness: Do less familiar brands have an advantage over more familiar brands in single and multiple sponsorship arrangements? *Journal of Brand Management*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 50-65.

Carson, D, Gilmore, A, Perry, C & Gronhaug, K 2001, Qualitative marketing research, Sage Publications, London.

Cégarra, JJ 1985, La communication par l'action. In Proceedings of the First Congress of the French Marketing Association (AFM), April, pp. 253–270. LeTouquet: Association Française de Marketing.

Cégarra, JJ 1986, L'utilisation du parrainage sportif par les collectivités publiques: l'exemple de la course de l'Europe à la voile. In Proceedings of the Second Congress of the French Marketing Association (AFM), April, pp. 323–342. Grenoble: Association Française de Marketing.

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

Chapman, K, Nicholas, P, Banovic, D and Supamaniam, R, 2006 *The extent and nature of food promotion directed to children in Australian supermarkets*, Health Promotion International, Vol. 21 No. 4.

Cheng, PST & Stotlar, DK 1999, Successful sponsorship: a marriage between sport and corporations for the next millennium, *Cyber–Journal of Sport Marketing* (online), Vol. 3(3), available at <u>www.cjsm.com.vol3/cheng&stotlar33.htm</u>.

Chien, PM, Cornwell, TB & Stokes, R 2005, A theoretical framework for analysis of image transfer in multiple sponsorships, Proceedings of the 2005 ANZMAC Conference: Advertising/Marketing Communication, in Fremantle Australia.

Churchill, GA 1979, A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. XVI (February), pp.64-73.

Churchill, GA 1991, Marketing Research: Methodological Foundations, Dryden Press, USA.

Churchill, NC 1992, 'Research issues in entrepreneurship', in D.L. Sexton & J.D. Kasarda eds, *The State of the Art of Entrepreneurship*, PWS-Kent Publishing, Boston, Massachusetts, pp. 579-596.

Close, GA, Finney RZ, Lacey, RZ & Sneath JZ 2006, Engaging the consumer through event marketing: linking attendees with the sponsor, community and brand, *Journal of Advertising Research*, December, Vol. 46, Issue 4, pp.420-434.

Cohen, I & Cohen, P 1983, Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Coppetti, CF 2004, Building brands through event sponsorships: providing on-site audiences with a vivid brand experience, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of St Gallen.

Coppetti, C, Wentzel, D, Tomczak, T &Henkel, S, 2009, Improving incongruent sponsorships through articulation of the sponsorship and audience participation, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol. 15:Issue 1, pp.17 — 34

Cornwell TB & Coote LV 2005, Corporate sponsorship of a cause: the role of identification in purchase intent, *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 58, p.268-276.

Cornwell, TB & Maignan, I 1998, An international review of sponsorship research, *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 27, pp. 1-27.

Cornwell, TB, Maignan, I & Irwin, RL 1997, Long-term recall of sponsorship sources, *Asia-Australia Marketing Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1, December, pp. 45-57.

Cornwell, TB, Pruitt, SW & Van Ness, R 2001, An exploratory analysis of the value of winning in motor sports: sponsorship-linked marketing and shareholder wealth, *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 1-15.

Cornwell, TB, Roy, DP & Steinard, EA 2001, Exploring managers' perceptions of the impact of sponsorship on brand equity, *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 30, pp. 41-51.

Cornwell, BT 2008, State of the Art and Science in Sponsorship-Linked Marketing, *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 37, no. 3 (Fall), pp. 41–55.

Cornwell, TB, Humphreys, MS, Maguire, AM, Weeks, CS, & Tellegen, CL 2006, Sponsorship-linked marketing: the role of articulation in memory, *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 33, 312–321.

Cornwell, TB, Humphreys, MS, Maguire, CS, & Tellegen, CL 2003 The Role of Articulation in Sponsorship-linked Marketing in Proceedings of the 2003 Advertising and Consumer Psychology Conference, Lynn R. Kahle and Chung-Hyun Kim, eds, Seoul: Society for Consumer Psychology, 8-9.

Cornwell, TB, Weeks, CS, & Roy, DP 2005. Sponsorship-Linked Marketing: Opening the Black Box, *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 34(2), 23-45.

Crabble, BD & Pinkerton, KA 1992, Sources of Bias in Health Commission and Tobacco Industry Surveys in Australia, *Australian Psychologist*, Vol. 27(2) 103-108.

Crawford, CT 1992, IRS Attacks Exempt Organization Income from Corporate Sponsorship Fees, *The Journal of Taxation*, (April), 230-234.

Creswell, J.W. 1994, *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Sage Publications, California.

Crimmins, J & Horn, M 1996, Sponsorship: From Management Ego Trip to Marketing Success, *Journal of Advertising Research*, July/August, 11-21.

Crompton, J 2004, Conceptualization and alternate operationalizations of the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness in sport, *Leisure Studies*, Vol. 23(3), 267-281.

Crompton, JL 1993, Sponsorship of Sport by Tobacco and Alcohol Companies: A Review of the Issues, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, (December), 148-167.

Crowley, M 1991, Prioritising the sponsorship audience, *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 25, pp. 11-21.

Cunningham, P, Taylor, S, & Reeder, C 1993, Event marketing: the evolution of sponsorship from philanthropy to strategic promotion, Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Historical Research in Marketing and Marketing Thought, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, .

D'Astous A & Bitz, P 1995, Consumer Evaluations of Sponsorship Programmes. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 29 (12), pp. 6-22.

Dahl, D, Manchanda, RV & Argo, JJ 2001, Embarrassment, in consumer purchase, the roles of social presence and purchase familiarity, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 28 (December, pp. 473 – 481.

Danaher, P, Bonfrer, A & Dhar, S 2008, The Effect of Competitive Advertising Interference on Sales for Packaged Goods *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 211 Vol. XLV (April 2008), 211–225

Daneshvary, R, Schwer, RK 2002, The Association Endorsement and Consumers' Intention to Purchase, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, vol. 17(3), 203-213.

Dardis, FE 2009, Attenuating the Negative Effects of Perceived Incongruence in Sponsorship: How Message Repetition Can Enhance Evaluations of an "Incongruent" Sponsor, *Journal of Promotion Management*, Vol. 15, pp. 36–56.

Davis, D and Cosenza, R, 1988, Business Research for Decision Making, PWS Kent Publishing, USA.

Davis, S 2000, Brand Asset Management, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, U.S.

Davis, D 2000, Business Research for Decision Making, 5th Ed. Duxbury Thomson Learning, Central.

De Pelsmacker, P, Geuens, M & Van Den Bergh J 2004, *Marketing Communications - a European Perspective*, Harlow: FT Prentice Hall.

De Pelsmacker, P, Geuens, M & Van Den Bergh J 2001, *Marketing Communications - a European perspective*, 3rd edition. Harlow, Prentice Hall.

De Pelsmacker, P, Geuens, M & Van Den Bergh J 2007, *Marketing Communications - a* Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.

Dean, DH 1999, Brand endorsement, popularity, and event sponsorship as advertising cues affecting consumer pre-purchase attitudes, *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 1-12.

Dean, DH 2002, Associating the Corporation with a Charitable Event through Sponsorship: Measuring Effects on Corporate Community Relations. *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 31(4),77-87.

Diamantopoulos, A 1994, Modeling with LISREL: a guide for the uninitiated, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 10, no. 1 - 3, pp. 105 - 136.

Dillman, DA 1978, Mail and telephone surveys – the total design method, Wiley, New York.

Dudzik, T & Groppel-Klein, A 2005, The efficiency of integrated sponsorship advertising, *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, October, Vol. 7, Issue 1 pp.57-67.

Ehrenberg, A 1974, Repetitive advertising and the consumer, *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 25-34.

Ehrenberg, A 1988, Repeat Buying - Facts, Theory and Applications, Aske, London.

Erdogan, B & Kitchen, P 1998, Managerial mindsets and the symbiotic relationship between sponsorship and advertising, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, vol. 16, no. 6.

Farrelly, F & Quester, P 2003, The effects of market orientation on trust and commitment. The case of the sponsorship business-to-business relationship, *European Journal of Marketing* Vol. 37(3/4), 530-553.

Farrelly, F & Quester, P 2005, Examining important relationship quality constructs of the focal sponsorship exchange, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 34(3), 211-219.

Farrelly, F & Quester, P & Burton, R 2005, Changes in sponsorship value: competencies and capabilities of successful sponsorship relationships, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 35 (8), 1016-1026.

Fahy, J, Farrelly, F & Quester, P 2004, Competitive advantage through sponsorship, *European Journal of Marketing* Vol. 38(8), 1013-1030.

Farrelly, F & Quester, P 1997, In the name of the game, *Asia-Australia Marketing Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1, December, pp. 5-7.

Farrelly, F, Quester, P & Smolianov, P 1998 The Australian Cricket Board: mapping corporate relations, *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 3(4), pp. 150–155.

Fenton, W, 2009, The global sponsorship market, *Journal of Sponsorship* vol. 2 no. 2. 120–130

Finch, J, West, SG & MacKinnon, DP 1997, Effects of sample size and non-normality on the estimation of mediated effects in latent variable models, *Structural equation modeling*, Vol. 4. No. 2, pp. 87 - 107.

Fishbein, M & Ajzen, I, 1975, *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behaviour: an introduction to theory and research*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc. USA.

Fleck, N.D & Quester P 2007, Birds of a feather flock together ... definition, role and measure of congruence: an application to sponsorship, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 24(11), 975-1000.

Fullerton, S, 2007 Sports Marketing, McGraw-Hill, Boston.

Fullerton, S, 2010 Sports Marketing, McGraw-Hill, Boston.

Fullerton, S, Johnson Morgan, M & Garland, R, 2008, A Contemporary Snapshot of Consumer Attitudes to Sport Sponsorship in Australia, Sport Marketing Association 6th Annual Conference: Bridging the Gap: Bringing the World Down Under, 17-19 July 2008, Gold Coast, Australia.

Furlong, R 1994, Tobacco Advertising Legislation and the sponsorship of sport, *Australian Business Law Review*, 22 (3) 159-189.

Gardner, MP, Schuman, PJ 1988, Sponsorship and Small Business, *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 26(4), 44-52.

Geldard, E & Sinclair, L 2002, *The Sponsorship Manual: Sponsorship Made Easy*, The Sponsorship Unit Pty Ltd, Upper Ferntree Gully, Victoria.

Gephart, R 1999, Paradigms and Research Methods, *Research Methods Forum*, Vol. 4, http://division.aomonline.org/rm/1999_RMD_Forum_Paradigms_and_Research_Methods. htm [available 5 August 2008].

Gerbing, DW & Hamilton, JG 1996, Validity of exploratory factor analysis as a precursor to confirmatory factor analysis, *Structural Equation Modeling*, Vol. 3, No. 1., pp. 62 -72.

Gilbert, J 2005, Jazz, Gestalt, and the Year Ahead for Marketers, *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 34 (3), 294–295.

Godfrey, P & Hill, CWL 1995, The problem of unobservables in strategic management research, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 16, pp.519-533.

Gordon A, 2007, How a small charity with small properties works with big sponsors, Journal of Sponsorship, Volume 1, Issue 1, pp. 1-9.

Grimes, E & Meenaghan, A 1998, Focusing commercial sponsorship on the internal corporate audience, *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 51-74.

Grohs, R & Reisinger, H 2005, Image transfer in sports sponsorships: an assessment of moderating effects, *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, October Vol. 7, Issue 1, pp.42-48.

Grohs, R. Wagner, U. & Vsetecka, S 2004 Assessing the effectiveness of sport sponsorships – an empirical examination, *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 56, pp.119-138.

Gross, B, Traylor, MB & Schuman, PJ 1987, Corporate sponsorship of art and sports events in North America, paper presented to ESOMAR Congress.

Guba, EG & Lincoln, YS 1994, Competing paradigms in qualitative research in Denzin, Norman K and Lincoln, Y.S (eds), *Handbook of qualitative research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks California, pp. 105-117

Gwinner, K 1997, A Model of Image Creation and Image Transfer in Event Sponsorship. *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 14(3), 145-158.

Gwinner K & Swanson SR 2003, A model of fan identification: antecedents and sponsorship outcomes, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Volume 17, Issue 3, pp.275-294.

Gwinner, K & Eaton, J 1999, Building Brand Image Through Event Sponsorships: The Role of Image Transfer, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 28(4), 47-57.

Gwinner, K 1997, A Model of Image Creation and Image Transfer in Event Sponsorship, *International Marketing Review* 14(3), 145-158.

Gwinner, K & Bennett, G 2008, The Impact of Brand Cohesiveness and Sport Identification on Brand Fit in a Sponsorship Context, *Journal of Sport Management*, 2008, 22, 410-426.

Hair, JH, Anderson, RE, & Tathan, RL 1992, *Multivariate Data Analysis: with readings*, Maxwell MacMillian International.

Hair, JH, Black, WC, Babin, BJ, Anderson, RE, & Tatham, RL 2006, *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hamlin, RP & Wilson, T, 2004, The impact of cause branding on consumer reactions to products: Does product/cause 'fit' really matter? *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 20, 663-681.

Hansen, F & Scotwin, L 1995, An experimental enquiry into sponsoring: what effects can be measured? *Marketing and Research Today*, August, pp. 173-81.

Harris, T 2000, In-Store Buying Habits Exposed, Professional Marketing, April/May p.25

Harvey, B 2001, Measuring the effects of sponsorships, *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 59-65.

Helmig, B, Huber, JA & Lefeflang, P, 2006, *Explaining behavioural intentions toward cobranded products*, Working Paper Series Marketing WP MK No. 1 Chair of Nonprofit Management & Marketing University of Fribourg Switzerland

Hermanns, A 2000, *Sponsoring Trends 2000* cited in Grohs & Stephan, Correct Sponsor Memorisation: Drivers And Moderators presented at the ANZMAC 2005 Fremantle WA.

Hoek J & Gendall, P 2001, Sponsorship Evaluation: Integrating Robust Research with Wishful Thinking, New Zealand Market Research Conference 2001: Conference proceedings [CD-ROM], October 3-5, Wellington, NZ. Auckland, NZ: Market Research Society of New Zealand.

Hoek J & Gendall, P 2003, *How does sponsorship work?* Australia New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference: Conference proceedings [CD-ROM], December 1-3, Adelaide, Australia.

Hoek, J, Gendall, P & Sanders, J 1993, Sponsorship management and evaluations: Are managers' assumptions justified?' *Journal of Promotion Management* 1, 53-66.

Hoek, J, Gendall, P, Jeffcoat, M & Orsman, D 1997, Sponsorship and advertising: a comparison of their effects, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, vol. 3, pp. 21-32.

Hoek, J, Gendall, P, & Theed, K 1999, Sports sponsorship evaluation: A behavioural

How Message Repetition Can Enhance Evaluations of an "Incongruent" Sponsor, *Journal of Promotion Management*, 15:36–56.

Hu, L & Bentler, PM 1999, Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives, *Structural equation modeling*, Vol. 6, pp. 1-55.

Hulland, J, Chow, YH & Lam, S, 1996, Use of causal models in marketing research: a review, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, vol. 13, pp. 181 – 197.

IEG (International Event Group) 1999, IEG's Complete guide to sponsorship, IEG, Chicago.

IEG (International Event Group) 2007, Sponsorship growth to increase for fifth straight year. Chicago.

IEG (International Event Group) 2009, Sponsorship Spending Revised, Growth Cut in Half. Chicago.

Irwin, RL, Lachowetz, Cornwell, TB & Clark, J 2003 Cause-related sport sponsorship: an assessment of spectator beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions, *Sport Marketing Quarterly* Vol. 12 (3), 131-139.

Irwin, RL & Asimakopoulos, MK 1992, An approach to the evaluation and selection of sport sponsorship proposals, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 43-51.

Javalgi, RG, Traylor, MB, Gross, AC & Lampman, E 1994, Awareness of Sponsorship and corporate image: An empirical investigation, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 23(4), 47-58.

Johar, GV & Pham, MT 1999, Relatedness, Prominence and Constructive Sponsor Identification, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 36(3), 299-312.

Joreskog, KG & Sorbom, D 1981, *LISREL 8 user's reference guide*, Scientific Software International, Uppsala.

Joyce, T 1967, What do we know about how advertising works?, Walter Thompson Company, London.

Kearney, AT 2003, Corporate Logos for Sale [viewed 12 May 2005].

Keller, KL 1998, Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Keller, KL 1993, Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity, *Journal of Marketing* 57(January), 1-22.

Keller, KL 1993, Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57(January), 1-22.

Keller, KL 2001, Mastering the marketing communications mix: micro and macro perspectives on integrated marketing communication programs, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 17 (7/8), 819-847.

Kennedy, R & Ehrenberg, A 2000, *Competitive brands' user-profiles hardly differ*, paper presented to MRS Conference (ed S.Broadbend), London.

Kitchen, PJ, Brignell, J, Li, T & Spickett Jones, G 2004, The Emergence of IMC: A Theoretical Perspective, *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 44 (March), 19-30.

Ko, YJ, Kyoungtae, K, Laussen, CL & Kim, TH 2008, The effects of sport involvement, sponsor awareness and corporate image on intention to purchase sponsors' products, *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, January.

Kohl, F & Otker, T 1985, 'Sponsorship - some practical experiences in Philips Consumer Electronics', in proceedings of the ESOMAR seminar on below-the-line and sponsoring: The use of promotion and sponsorship in the marketing mix, Milan, Italy, 6-8 November.

Koo, Gi-Yong, Quarterman, J & Flynn L, 2006, Effect of Perceived Sport Event and Sponsor Image Fit on Consumers' Cognition, Affect, and Behavioral Intentions, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 15, 80-90,

Lacey, R, Sneath, J, Finney, Z & Close A, 2005, The Impact of Repeat Attendance on Event Sponsorship Effects, *Journal of Marketing Communications* Vol. 13, No. 4, 243–255, December

Lardinoit, T & Quester, P 2001, Attitudinal effects of combined sponsorship and sponsor's prominence on basketball in Europe, *Journal of Advertising Research*, January/February.

Lardinoit, T 1997, Réaction attitudinale des téléspectateurs aux campagnes de parrainage: étude de l'incidence de la conjonction des parrainages terrain et T.V. In Proceedings of the 13th Congress of the French Marketing Association (AFM), May, pp. 668–697. Toulouse: Association Française de Marketing.

Lardinoit, T 1998, *Effet modérateur de limplication durable sur l'efficacité mémorielle de la conjonction des parrainages terrain et T.V.* In Proceedings of the 14th Congress of the French Marketing Association (AFM), May, pp. 261–276. Bordeaux: Association Française de Marketing.

Lardinoit, T 1999, *Interaction des parrainages terrain et TV: impact sur deux niveaux de memorization*, In Proceedings of the 15th Congress of the French Marketing Association (AFM), 19–21 May, pp. 585–602. Strasbourg: Association Française de Marketing.

Lavidge, RJ & Steiner, GA 1961, A model of predictive measurements of advertising effectiveness, *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 25, no. October, pp. 59-62.

Leaderman, LC 1990, Assessing educational effectiveness: the focus group interview as a technique for data collection, *Community Education*, Vol. 39, pp.117-127.

Ledwith, F 1984, Does Tobacco Sports Sponsorship on Television Act as Advertising to Children? *Health Education Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 85-88.

Lee, S 2005, *The influence of product involvement and fan identification on response to team sponsor's products*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Ohio State University.

Little, TD, Cunningham, WA, Shahar, G & Widaman, KF, 2002, To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits, *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*, 151-173.

Lyberger, MR & McCarthy, L 2001, An assessment of consumer knowledge of, interest in, and perceptions of ambush marketing strategies, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp.130-7.

Madrigal, R 2000, The Influence of Social Alliances with Sports Teams on Intentions to Purchase Corporate Sponsor's Product, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 29(4), 455-469.

Madrigal, R 2001, Social Identity Effects in a Belief-Attitude-Intentions Hierarchy: Implications for Corporate Sponsorship, *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 18(2), 145-165.

Malhotra, NK, Hall, J, Shaw, M & Crisp, M 1996, *Marketing Research: an applied orientation*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Mardia, KV 1974, Applications of some measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis in Testing normality and robustness studies, *Sankhya*, series B, Vol. 36, pp. 115 – 128,

Marketing Research Society of Australia, 1995, Code of Professional Behaviour, Sydney.

Marshall, DW & Cook, G 1992, The corporate (sports) sponsor, *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 11, pp. 307-24.

Martinez, M & Cardona, M, 1997, Study Shows POP Gaining Ground as Medium, *Advertising Age* 24 November, p.43.

Mason, RB & Cochetel, F, 2006, Residual Brand Awareness Following the Termination Long-term Event Sponsorship and the Appointment of a New Sponsor, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 125–144.

Mathieu, JE, Tannenbaum, SI & Salas, E, 1992, Influences of individual and situational characteristics on measures of training effectiveness, *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 828-847.

McCracken, G, 1989, Who Is the Celebrity Endorser? Cultural Foundations of the Endorsement Process, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 16(3), 310-321.

McDaniel, SR, 1999, An Investigation of Match-Up Effects in Sport Sponsorship Advertising: The Implications of Consumer Advertising schemas, *Psychology & Marketing* 16(2), 163-184.

McDaniel, SR & Mason, DM, 1999, An exploratory study of influences on public opinion towards alcohol and tobacco sponsorship of sporting events, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 13(6), pp. 481–499.

McDaniel, SR & Kinney, L 1998, The implications of recency and gender effects in consumer response to ambush marketing, *Psychology and Marketing*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 385-403.

McDonald, C 1991, Sponsorship and the image of the sponsor, *European Journal of Marketing* Vol. 25(11), pp. 31-38.

Meenaghan, A 1983, Commercial sponsorship, *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 5-73.

Meenaghan, A 1998, Current developments and future directions in sponsorship, *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 35-47.

Meenaghan, T & Shipley, D 1999, Media Effect in Commercial Sponsorship, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 33(3/4), 328-347.

Meenaghan, T 1991, Role of Sponsorship in the Marketing Communications Mix, *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 10(1), 35-47.

Meenaghan, T 1996, Ambush marketing: a threat to corporate sponsorship, *Sloan Management Review*, vol. 38, pp. 103-14.

Meenaghan, T 2001, Understanding Sponsorship Effects, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 18, pp. 95 – 122.

Meenaghan, T 2005, Evaluating sponsorship effects, in Amis, J & Cornwell, TB (eds), Global Sport Sponsorship, Oxford: Berg.

Miles, MB & Huberman, A.M. 1984, *Qualitative Data Analysis*, 2nd Edition., Sage, Thousand Oaks, C.A.

MJA 2000, What are Australian children eating and how does this compare with public health guidelines? *Medical Journal of Australia*, 173, Supplement 7 August: S4-S5

Mueller, RO 1997, Structural Equation Modeling: Back to basics, *Structural Equation Modeling*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 353 – 369.

Nancarrow, C, Wright, LT, Brace, I 1998, Gaining competitive advantage from packaging and labelling in marketing communications, *British Food Journal*, Vol. 100(2), 110-118.

Neuman, WL 2003, *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*, 5th Edition, Allyn and Bacon.

Nicholls JAF & Roslow, S 1999, Brand recall and brand preference at sponsored golf and tennis tournaments, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 33 No. 3/4, 1999, pp. 365-386.

Nunnally, JC & Bernstein, IH 1994, Psychometric Theory, New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Nunnally, JC 1978, *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd Edition, McGraw Hill, New York.

Olivier, AJ & Kraak, E 1997, Sponsorship effectiveness: what is driving consumer response? paper presented to 210th ESOMAR "*New Ways for Optimising Integrated Communications*", Paris, France, April 16-18.

Olkkonen, R 2001 Case study: the network approach to international sport sponsorship arrangement, *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 16(4), pp.309–329.

Olkkonen, R & Tuominen, P 2006, Understanding relationship fading in cultural sponsorship. *Corporate Communications: an International Journal* 11 (1), 64-77.

Olson, EL, Thjømøe, HM 2003, The Effects of Peripheral Exposure to Information on Brand Performance, *European Journal of Marketing* 37(1/2), 243-255.

Orth, UR & Malkewitz, K 2006, Packaging design as resource for the constructions of brand identify, Conference Proceedings, 3rd International Wine Business Marketing Conference, Montpelier, France, July.

Otker, T 1988, Exploitation: the key to sponsorship success, *European Research*, vol. 16, no. 2.

Otker, T & Hayes, P 1987, Judging the efficiency of sponsorship: experience from the 1986 soccer World Cup, *European Research*, Vol. 15 (4), 3-8.

Peracchio, LA, Tybout, AM 1996, The Moderating Role of Prior Knowledge in Schema-Based Product Evaluation, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Dec., 1996), pp. 177-192

Perry, C, Reige, A & Brown, L, 1998, *Realism Rules OK: Scientific Paradigms in Marketing Research about networks*, ANZMAC, Dunedin, 29th November – 3 rd December.

Petty, RE, Cacioppo, JT 1986, Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change, Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Petty, RE, Cacioppo, JT, Schumann, D 1983, Central and Peripheral Routes to Advertising Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Involvement, *Journal of Consumer Research* 10 (September), 135-146.

Pham, MT & Johar, GV 2001, Market prominence biases in sponsorship identification: processes and consequentiality, *Psychology & Marketing*, 18(2), pp.123–143.

Pham, MT 1991, The Evaluation of Sponsorship Effectiveness: A Model and Some Methodological Considerations, *Gestion* 2000, 47-65.

Pham, MT & Vanhuele, M 1997, Analysing the Memory Impact of Advertising Fragments, *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 8(4), 407-417.

Pickton, D and Broderick, A 2005, *Integrated Marketing Communications*, 2nd Ed, Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Pitts, BG, & Stotlar, DR 2002, *Fundamentals of sports marketing* 2nd Edn. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Polonsky, MJ, & Speed, R 2001, Linking Sponsorship and Cause-Related Marketing: Complementarities and Conflicts, *European Journal of Marketing* 35(11/12), 1361-1385.

Poon, DTY & Prendergast, G 2006, A new framework for evaluating sponsorship opportunities, *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 25 (4), pp. 471-87.

POPAI Europe 1998, The POPAI Europe Consumer Buying Habits Study, Co-ordination by Retail Marketing In-Store Services Limited, Watford, Herts: POPAI Europe cited in De Pelsmacker 2001.

Pope, N 1998, Consumption values, sponsorship awareness, brand and product use, *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 124-36.

Pope, N & Voges, KE 1994, Sponsorship evaluation: Does it match the motive and the mechanism? *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 38-45.

Pope NKL & Voges, KE 1999, Sponsorship and image: a replication and extension, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 5, 17-28.

Pope, NK & Voges, KE 2000, The impact of sport sponsorship activities, corporate image, and prior use on consumer purchase intention, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, vol. 9, no. 2.

Pracejus, JW & Olsen, GD 2004, The Role of Brand/Cause Fit in the Effectiveness of Cause-Related Marketing Campaigns, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 57(6), 635-640.

Pracejus, JW & Olsen, GD 2004, Seven Psychological Mechanisms Through Which Sponsorship Can Influence Consumers, in *Sports Marketing and the Psychology of Marketing Communications*, Lynn R. Kahle and Chris Riley, eds., Mahwah, NJ

Quester, P & Thompson, B 2001, Evidence of the impact of advertising and promotion leverage on arts sponsorship effectiveness, *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 33-47.

Quester, PG & 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), pp. 539–556.

Quester, PG, Farrelly, F & Burton, R 1998, Sports sponsorship management: a multinational comparative study, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol. 4, pp.115–128.

Rajaretnam, J 1994, The long-term effects of sponsorship on corporate and product image: findings of a unique experiment, *Marketing and Research Today*, February, pp. 62-74.

Rifon, NJ, Choi, SM, Trimble, CS & Li, H 2004, Congruence effects in sponsorship:

The mediating role of sponsor credibility and consumer attributions of sponsor motive, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 33(1), 29–42.

Rifon, NJ, Choi, SM, Trimble, C & Li, H 2001, 'Consumer attributions of corporate sponsorship motive and the development of attitude toward the sponsor of health information on the World Wide Web', paper presented to Annual Conference - American Academy of Advertising, Salt Lake City, April.

Roper, S & Parker, C 2006, How (and where) the mighty have fallen: branded litter, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 22, 473-487.

Roy Morgan 2008, Roy Morgan Supermarket Monitor, cited in *Supermarket Insights Woolworths Shopper Behaviour*, Torchmedia, [online] <u>www.torchmedia.com.au</u> available: 19 January, 2009.

Roy, DP, Cornwell, TB 2004, The Effects of Consumer Knowledge on Responses to Event Sponsorships, *Psychology & Marketing* 21(3), 185-207.

Royd-Taylor, L 2007, Cause-related marketing: a new perspective on archiving campaign objectives amongst fast moving consumer goods, *Journal of Strategic Change*, Vol. 16 (1) pp.79-86.

Ruth, JA & Simonin, BL 2003, Brought to you by brand A and brand B, *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 32, no. 3, Fall.

Sandler, DM, and Shani, D 1989, Olympic sponsorship vs. "ambush" marketing: who gets the gold? *Journal of Advertising Research* 29 (August/September), 9-14.

Séguin, B 2003, *Représentations d'acteurs sociaux sur les relations entre le marketing et les Jeux olympiques*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université Marc Bloch (Strasbourg II), Strasbourg, France.

Séguin, B 2007, Sponsorship in the Trenches: Case Study Evidence of Its Legitimate Place in the Promotional Mix, *The Sport Journal* Vol 10, No 1, Winter 2007-08-22

Sekaran, U 2000 Research Methods for Business; A skill business approach, John Wiley and Sons, New York

Sen, S, Gurhan-Canli, Z & Morwitz, V 2001, Withholding consumption: a social dilemma perspective on consumer boycotts, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (December) pp. 399 -417.

Shimp, T. A. (2000). Advertising, promotion, and supplemental aspects of integrated

Silayoi, P, Speece, M 2004, Packaging and purchase decisions: An exploratory study on the impact of involvement level and time pressure, *British Food Journal*, Vol. 106 (8), 607-628.

Smith, G 2004, Brand Image Transfer through Sponsorship: a Consumer Learning Perspective, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 20, 457-474

Smith, A; Graetz B and Westerbeek H, 2008, Sport sponsorship, team support and purchase intentions, Journal of Marketing Communications, 14:5, 387 — 404.

Sneath, JZ, Finney, RZ, & Close, AG 2005, An IMC Approach to Event Marketing: The Effects of Sponsorship and Experience on Customer Attitudes, *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 45, pp.373-381.

Speed, R & Thompson, P 2000, Determinants of Sports Sponsorship Response, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 28(2), 226-238.

Steenkamp, J & van Trijp, CM 1991, The use of LISREL in Validating Marketing Constructs, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 8, pp. 223-299.

Steiger, & Lind, JC 1981, Statistically based tests for the number of common factors, paper presented at the annual meeting of the Psychometric Society, May Iowa.

Stipp, H 1998, The impact of Olympic sponsorship on corporate image, *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 17(1), pp. 75–87.

Stipp, H & Schiavone, N 1996, Modeling the impact of Olympic sponsorship on corporate image. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36, no. 4:22-28.

Stokes, D & Bergin, R 2006, Methodology or "methodolatry"? An evaluation of focus groups and depth interviews' Qualitative Market Research Vol. 9 No. 1.

Stotlar, DK & Johnson DA 1989, Stadium ads get a boost, *Athletic Business*, Vol 13, No. 9 pp. 49-51.

Stotlar, DK 1993, Sponsorship and the Olympic Winter Games, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 35-47.

Suchard, HT & Scott, D 1992, Sponsorship practices in Australia, *Management Research News*, vol. 15, no. 4.

Sujan, M & Bettman, JR 1989, The Effects of Brand Positioning Strategies on Consumers' Brand and Category Perceptions: Some Insights from Schema Research, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Nov., 1989), pp. 454-467.

Summers, J, Gardiner, M, Lamb, CW, Hair, JF, & McDaniel, C 2005, *Essentials of Marketing*, 2nd Edition, Thomson Learning, Australia.

Tabachnick, BG & Fidell, LS 1996, Using multivariate statistics, Harper Collins Publishers, USA.

Tanaka, JS 1993, Multi-faceted conceptions of fit in structural equation models, in Testing structural equation models, eds, K.A. Bollen and J.S. Long, Sage publications, Newbury Park, pp. 10-37.

Thompson, B 2005, Sponsorship as Bilateral Relationship: the benefits of applying relationship marketing principles in the sponsorship exchange, *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management*, 3 (1), 188-203.

Thwaites, D 1995, Professional football sponsorship – Profitable or profligate? *International Journal of Advertising* 14(2), 149-164.

Thwaites, D, Aguilar-Manjarrez, R, & Kidd, C 1998, Sports sponsorship development in leading Canadian companies: issues and trends, *International Journal of Advertising* 17 (1), 29-49.

Tripodi, JA 2001, Sponsorship – a confirmed weapon in the promotional armoury, *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship* 3(1), 95-116.

Tripodi, JA, Hirons, M, Bednall, D & Sutherland, M 2003, 'Cognitive evaluation: prompts used to measure sponsorship awareness', *International Journal of Market Research*, vol. 45, no. Quarter 4, pp. 435 - 55.

Tucker, LR & Lewis, C1973, A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis, Psychometrika, Vol. 38, pp. 1 - 10.

Uncles, M, Ehrenberg, A & Hammond, K 1995, 'Patterns of buyer behaviour: regularities, models and extensions', *Marketing Science*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 671-8.

Underwood, RL 2003, The communicative power of product packaging: creating brand identify via lived and mediated experience, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Winter 11(1).

Underwood, RL, Klein, NM 2002, Packaging as Brand Communication: Effects of Product Pictures on Consumer Responses to the Package and Brand, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* Fall, Vol. 10, Part 4, pages 58-68.

Varadarajan IR and Menon A 1988, Cause-related Marketing: A Co-alignment of marketing strategy and Corporate Philanthropy, *Journal of Marketing* 52 July 58-74.

Vignali, C 1997, The MIXMAP-model for international sport sponsorship, *European Business Review*, 97(4), pp. 187–193.

Wakefield, KL, Becker-Olsen, K & Cornwell. TB 2007, I Spy A sponsor: the effects of sponsorship level, prominence, relatedness and cueing on recall Accuracy, *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 36. no. 4 (Winter), pp.61-74.

Walliser, B 2003, An International Review of Sponsorship Research: Extension and Update, *International Journal of Advertising* 22(1).

Walliser, B 1996, Le rôle de l'intensité des émotions éprouvées par le téléspectateur dans la mémorisation des parrains. Recherche et Applications en Marketing, 11(1), pp. 6–19.

Walliser, B 1997, A comparison of the effectiveness of perimeter and outdoor advertising. What sponsorship can learn from outdoor advertising, *Asia–Australia Marketing Journal*, Vol. 5(1), pp. 21–31.

West, SG, Finch, JF & Curran, PJ, 1995, Structural equation models with nonnormal variables. In RH Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications (pp. 56-75).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Westberg, K & Pope, N 2005, An examination of cause-related marketing in the context of brand attitude, purchase intention, perceived fit and personal values, in Proceedings of 2005 ANZMAC Conference: Social, Not-for-Profit and Political Marketing in Fremantle Australia, 5-7 December.

Wilson, GA 1997, 'Does sport sponsorship have a direct effect on product sales? The Cyber Journal of Sports Marketing, Vol. 1, October.

Witcher, B, Craigen, JG, Culligan, D, Harvey, A 1991, The links between objectives and function in organisational sponsorship, *International Journal of Advertising* 10(1), 13-33.

Woods J & Walker K 2007 Choosing breakfast: How well does packet information on Australian breakfast cereals, bars and drinks reflect recommendations? *Nutrition & Dietetics*, Vol. 64: 226–233

Zajonc, RB 1980, Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need no Inferences, *American Psychologist* Vol. 35(2), 151-175.

Zikmund, W 1997, Exploring Marketing Research 6th ed., the Dryden Press, Fort Worth, TX.

Zikmund, W 2003, Essentials of Marketing Research, USA: Thompson South-Western.

APPENDIX 1 – EXPLORATORY RESEARCH PROTOCOLS

- Focus Group Protocol
 - Interview Protocol
 - Qualitative Survey

Focus Group Protocol

Screening question - Do you do the grocery shopping in your household?

Orientation to grocery shopping

- Q. Do you enjoy grocery shopping? Why/ why not? How often do you do grocery shopping? Who uses a shopping list?
- Q. Does any body buy things not on their shopping list? What sorts of things do you buy not on the shopping list?
- Q. When you are buying groceries do you look at the advertising you might find around the store? What types of advertising do you see (add hint if necessary: e.g. product demonstrations, signs or tickets on the shelves, displays etc)? What do you think of these?
- Q. Does anybody look at the product itself? What things do you look at? (size, price, packaging)
- Q. I now want you to consider a couple of different types of products that are frequently purchased. This will help me to understand consumer behaviour a bit better. Who buys breakfast cereals? Who buys bars such as cereal or muffin bars? When you purchase these products, how do you decide which one to buy?

Image of Brand

- Q. What do you think of when I mention Kelloggs? What are your thoughts, perceptions, and images of Kelloggs? What do you think of when I mention Sanitarium? What are your thoughts, perceptions, and images of Sanitarium? How do you see them in relation to competitors? Who buys these products? Do you feel loyal to Kelloggs or Sanitarium?
- Q. Do you think the Kelloggs brand is strong or weak? Do you have a positive or negative image of Kelloggs? Why? Do you think the Sanitarium brand is strong or weak? Do you have a positive or negative image of Sanitarium? Why?

Packaging

- Q. Getting back to when we talked about the things you look at when buying a product, do you look at the packaging before you buy? Do you look at the packaging at home? Perhaps while you are eating breakfast/ preparing lunches?
- Q. What do you think of the packaging? Have you noticed that sometimes they have other things on the packaging (if necessary give hint: e.g. competitions, giveaways, recipes on them? What do you think of these?
- Q. Have you noticed that sometimes the packaging has sponsorship on it? Can you think of any examples?

Q. Do you recognise any of these packages? (show examples – then ask specifically about SLP examples)

Perceptions of Sponsorship

- Q. How would you define sponsorship? What is your opinion of sponsorship in general?
- Q. Do you think is a good match with?
- Q. Has the presence of (sponsor)..... influenced your perceptions of the(property)?
- Q. Do you have any involvement with the (property) (give hint if necessary) e.g. play the sport, watch on t.v., favourite team to support?
- Q. Do you think the (property) has influenced your perceptions of (sponsor)?
- Q. Who buys this brand/s? How do you think the sponsoring of(property) affects your feelings toward (sponsor)?
- Q. Do you think the sponsorship influences your opinion of the sponsor? Do you think the sponsorship influences whether you buy the product or not?
- Q. Do you think you benefit from these/ this sponsorship in any way? Do you think the sponsorships has added value to you as customer?
- Q. Why do you think the sponsor participates in this sponsorship arrangement?

Interview Protocol

Screening question - Do you do the main grocery shopping in your household? **yes no** *Orientation to grocery shopping* Do you enjoy grocery shopping? Why/ why not?

How often do you do grocery shopping?

Where do you do the majority of grocery shopping?

When you are buying groceries, do you look at the product itself?

When choosing grocery products, what things do you consider to be important?

What things do you look at?

Why do you think you look at these features?

How do you think they influence you?

Do you buy store brands? Woolworths/ IGA homebrands)

Image of Brand Can you tell me some products or brands that are favourites?

Why do you favour them?

Do you think other members of your family/ or friends influence what you buy?

How do they influence you?

Do you buy breakfast cereals or muesli and muffin bars?

When you purchase these products, how do you decide which one to buy?

Do you think other members of your family/ or friends influence what you buy?

What do you think of when I mention (Kelloggs)? What are your thoughts, perceptions, and images of Kelloggs?

What do you think of when I mention (Kleenex)? What are your thoughts, perceptions, and images of Kleenex?

What do you think of when I mention (Kleenex)? What are your thoughts, perceptions, and images of Kleenex?
How do you see them in relation to competitors?

How do you see them in relation to competitors?

Do you feel loyal to Kelloggs or Kleenex?

Packaging

Do you look at the packaging before you buy? Yes No Sometimes

I now want you to think about a typical shopping trip when you are not too pressured for time. For the following types of products, do you look at the packaging:

Cereals/muesli b	baking ingredients	personal care	bathroom/laundry	fresh
food/meat				
yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	
yes no				
rice/pastas	recipe blends	snack foods	coffee/tea	
yes no	yes no	yes no	yes no	

Do you look at the packaging at home? Perhaps while you are eating breakfast/ preparing lunches? _What do you notice?

What do you think of the packaging?

Have you noticed that sometimes they have other things on the packaging (e.g. celebrity endorsement, causes, sponsorship, gift promotions

Please list packaging promotions that you can remember What do you think of these?

Have you noticed that sometimes the packaging has sponsorship on it? Can you think of any examples? How would you define sponsorship?

Do you recognise any of these packages? (show examples – then ask specifically about SLP examples)

What is your opinion of sponsorship in general? Has the presence of (sponsor)...... influenced your perceptions of the(property)?

Do you have any interest in the (property) e.g. play the sport, watch on t.v., support Do you think the (property) has influenced your perceptions of (sponsor)?

How do you think it has influence your perceptions? Do you think the sponsorship influences your opinion of the property? Do you think the sponsorship influences whether you buy the product or not? Why do you think this is? When do you think sponsorship packaging might be effective? Do you think you benefit from these/ this sponsorship in any way? Why do you think the sponsor participates in this sponsorship arrangement?

APPENDIX 2 – STUDY 2 QUESTIONNAIRE VERSIONS

- Version 1 Sanitarium Weetbix/ Cricket Australia
- Version 2 Sanitarium Weetbix (NO SLP)
- Version 3 Sanitarium Light 'n' Tasty/ NBCF
- Version 4 Sanitarium Light 'n' Tasty/ (NO SLP)

APPENDIX 3 – CORRELATION MATRIX

Correlation Matrix – Factors Impacting Consumer Response to SLP

	I am a strong supporter of . [property]	I am interested in [property]	If a company sponsored [property]	I think it is good that companies sponsor [property]	I am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor [property]	How often do you purchase [sponsor brand]	I like this brand	This brand is reliable	I would recommend this brand to others	I have a favourable opinion of this brand	I am loyal to this brand	I would buy this brand even if competitors prices were lower	This sponsorship improves my perception of [sponsor brand]	This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the sponsor	This sponsorship of [] makes me like [sponsor brand]more	SLP not influence (reversed)	How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product	I would buy more of this product with the sponsorship than non- sponsored	I would purchase this product with this sponsorship even	I like this sponsorship pictured on the package	Its logical for [sponsor brand] to sponsor []	[sponsor brand] and [property] have a similar image	the [property] logo on the packaging is a good way to show
I am a strong supporter of [property]	1.000	.831	.675	.575	.701	144	074	139	086	071	032	.059	.364	.348	.375	.321	.052	.407	.266	.406	.195	.112	.205
I am interested in [property]	.831	1.000	.653	.647	.723	101	079	136	084	071	.014	.064	.373	.338	.327	.314	.074	.393	.293	.475	.245	.139	.221
If a company sponsored [property] it would positively influence how I felt about that co.	.675	.653	1.000	.572	.815	069	031	054	014	006	.055	.128	.548	.547	.456	.402	.105	.463	.345	.486	.320	.226	.245
I think it is good that companies sponsor [property]	.575	.647	.572	1.000	.587	084	.024	010	.083	.034	.042	.046	.395	.360	.361	.251	.067	.284	.254	.483	.417	.330	.288
I am more likely to purchase products of companies that sponsor	.701	.723	.815	.587	1.000	092	062	091	073	091	.033	.076	.462	.477	.415	.413	.050	.497	.372	.434	.246	.177	.182
How often do you purchase Sanitarium?	144	101	069	084	092	1.000	.616	.561	.537	.525	.545	.461	.007	.030	.039	.042	.558	.019	.287	097	.062	.039	035
I like this brand	074	079	031	.024	062	.616	1.000	.863	.869	.829	.708	.623	.145	.172	.113	.141	.581	.124	.305	.119	.152	.203	.185
This brand is reliable	139	136	054	010	091	.561	.863	1.000	.846	.840	.641	.540	.155	.170	.101	.097	.498	.091	.241	.096	.126	.191	.218
I would recommend this brand to others	086	084	014	.083	073	.537	.869	.846	1.000	.880	.749	.680	.154	.176	.132	.108	.498	.134	.317	.114	.208	.266	.148
I have a favourable opinion of this brand	071	071	006	.034	091	.525	.829	.840	.880	1.000	.708	.599	.141	.159	.072	.091	.424	.107	.257	.090	.167	.183	.172
I am loyal to this brand	032	.014	.055	.042	.033	.545	.708	.641	.749	.708	1.000	.746	.080	.128	.091	.155	.519	.144	.366	.137	.177	.235	.097
I would buy this brand even if competitors prices were lower	.059	.064	.128	.046	.076	.461	.623	.540	.680	.599	.746	1.000	.171	.194	.169	.156	.538	.243	.554	.151	.185	.219	.069
This sponsorship improves my perception of [sponsor brand]	.364	.373	.548	.395	.462	.007	.145	.155	.154	.141	.080	.171	1.000	.887	.781	.349	.260	.500	.399	.529	.479	.409	.466
This sponsorship makes me feel more favourable toward the [sponsor brand	.348	.338	.547	.360	.477	.030	.172	.170	.176	.159	.128	.194	.887	1.000	.807	.382	.308	.576	.411	.531	.457	.416	.472
This sponsorship of [sponsored property] makes me like [sponsor] more than before	.375	.327	.456	.361	.415	.039	.113	.101	.132	.072	.091	.169	.781	.807	1.000	.369	.285	.538	.385	.426	.436	.378	.343
SLP not influence (reversed)	.321	.314	.402	.251	.413	.042	.141	.097	.108	.091	.155	.156	.349	.382	.369	1.000	.173	.569	.325	.261	.122	.066	.154
How likely is it that you would purchase this particular product	.052	.074	.105	.067	.050	.558	.581	.498	.498	.424	.519	.538	.260	.308	.285	.173	1.000	.275	.491	.160	.264	.220	.198
I would buy more of this product with the sponsorship than non-sponsored	.407	.393	.463	.284	.497	.019	.124	.091	.134	.107	.144	.243	.500	.576	.538	.569	.275	1.000	.534	.366	.202	.197	.229
I would purchase this product with this sponsorship even if competitors' prices were lower	.266	.293	.345	.254	.372	.287	.305	.241	.317	.257	.366	.554	.399	.411	.385	.325	.491	.534	1.000	.325	.250	.254	.178
I like this sponsorship pictured on the package	.406	.475	.486	.483	.434	097	.119	.096	.114	.090	.137	.151	.529	.531	.426	.261	.160	.366	.325	1.000	.507	.436	.681
Its logical for [sponsor brand] to sponsor [sponsored property]	.195	.245	.320	.417	.246	.062	.152	.126	.208	.167	.177	.185	.479	.457	.436	.122	.264	.202	.250	.507	1.000	.722	.466
[sponsor brand] and [sponsored property] have a similar image	.112	.139	.226	.330	.177	.039	.203	.191	.266	.183	.235	.219	.409	.416	.378	.066	.220	.197	.254	.436	.722	1.000	.400
the [sponsored property] logo on the packaging is a good way to show the sponsorship arrangement	.205	.221	.245	.288	.182	035	.185	.218	.148	.172	.097	.069	.466	.472	.343	.154	.198	.229	.178	.681	.466	.400	1.000