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Abstract

This study is an exploration of sponsor awareness, including its antecedents and outcomes. Five research questions were explored in the context of three professional sports franchises in Auckland, New Zealand. More specifically, the aim was to explore (i) sponsor awareness within the contexts of three elite sport franchises; (ii) any sponsor awareness differences across the three contexts; (iii) any attitude or behaviour differences between full members and non-full members (iv) any attitude or behaviour differences between males and females; and (v) the relationships amongst loyalty, awareness, attitudes and intentions. Two focal sponsors (Barfoot & Thompson for the Blues as well as the Northern Mystics contexts and Suzuki in the New Zealand Warriors context) were associated with the measurement of attitudes towards the sponsor and sponsor purchase intentions. Across the three contexts, 495 questionnaire respondents took part in this quantitative study. Of the 495 respondents, 303 were classified as full-members (members who have access to all home games) and the remaining were identified as non-full members (other members or fans of the team) of each of the three franchises. The sample was obtained via an electronic questionnaire disseminated using the email database of each of the three franchises.

The constructs tested within this study were; behavioural loyalty, attitudinal loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions towards the sponsor. High levels of aided sponsor recognition were apparent in all three contexts. Overall, the sample also reported high levels of attitudinal loyalty, neutral levels of attitudes towards the sponsor and low levels of purchase intentions towards the focal sponsor in each of the contexts. Significant differences were found between full-members and non-full members in all three contexts. Significant differences were also found between full members and non-full members on all five constructs. The only significant difference between males and females was on behavioural loyalty. All
correlations among the constructs were statistically significant except for the relationship between sponsor awareness and sponsor purchase intentions. Attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions had the strongest relationship in all three contexts. Findings of the study reinforce the existence of relationships amongst these constructs reported in previous literature. Insights have also been generated that will be useful for both sponsors and sponsee’s in sport contexts.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

Sport is well and truly ingrained within the culture of New Zealanders, from participating in grassroots sport to supporting and spectating elite sport. This is exemplified with the 2015 Rugby World Cup final between New Zealand and Australia which was the second most watched television programme in 2015 among New Zealanders (Wisniewksi, 2016). Sport Sponsorship in New Zealand is worth over US$145 million, which is comparable to many larger nations on a per capita basis (Winton, 2013). In addition, New Zealanders generally have positive attitudes towards organisations who support New Zealand sport (Wisniewksi, 2016).

There is a large array of sport marketing research pertaining to sport sponsorship, its effectiveness and how effectiveness is measured (Dees, Bennett, & Villegas, 2008; Hickman, 2015; Kim, Lee, Magnusen, & Kim, 2015; Maxwell & Lough, 2009; Zaharia, Biscaia, Gray, & Stotlar, 2016). Many studies have explored relationships between loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards the sponsor and sponsor purchase intentions (Biscaia, Correia, Rosado, & Ross, 2013; Eagleman & Krohn, 2012). Each of these concepts are interrelated and are important to the effectiveness of sport sponsorship. With the growth of professional sport within New Zealand it is important to understand the sponsorship market beyond the value of sponsorships which are circulated within mainstream media. This study uses the work of Biscaia et al. (2013) as a framework to implement a similar study, as a study of this magnitude has not been undertaken within New Zealand.

1.2 Research Context

This research is primarily an exploration of sponsorship awareness across three professional sport contexts. Consumer attitudes and purchase intentions of sports fans towards one of their team’s major sponsors are also explored, and specifically the
relationships of those constructs with awareness. The impact of loyalty upon these constructs are another focus of the study. The three professional sports teams are the Blues, the Northern Mystics and the New Zealand Warriors. The Blues play in the Super Rugby competition. The Northern Mystics are based in Auckland and play in the Trans-Tasman Netball Championship. The New Zealand Warriors are also based in Auckland and play in the National Rugby League (NRL). Two sponsors were selected for the study to explore antecedent and outcome variables associated with sponsor awareness - the central construct of the study. Barfoot & Thompson, Auckland’s biggest real estate firm, is a primary sponsor both the Blues and the Northern Mystics. Suzuki is the world’s ninth largest automobile manufacturer and sponsor the New Zealand Warriors.

1.3 Rationale for this Study

The work of Biscaia et al. (2013) was the first to explore the interrelationships between loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards the sponsor and sponsor purchase intentions. The authors found that sponsor awareness was not a predictor of purchase intentions, which was contrary to the findings of Barros and Silvestre (2006), Bauer, Stokburger-Sauer, and Exler (2008) and Kuzma, Veltri, Kuzma, and Miller (2003). They also found that positive attitudes towards the sponsor are related to purchase intentions of sponsor offerings (Madrigal, 2001; Speed & Thompson, 2000). The current study differs from Biscaia et al. (2013) as it explores the attitudes and purchase intentions of a single sponsor in two contexts. However, both studies were undertaken within a team sport environment. Such research has not been undertaken within the New Zealand context and will bring to light the attitudes and behaviours of sports fans in New Zealand. The rationale for the study is that these important constructs must be explored in this country in order to both advance our knowledge but also to provide useful insights for New Zealand sport sponsorship administrators.
1.4 Constructs and Variables

Several important constructs are used to explore sport sponsorship in New Zealand and are now more broadly introduced. The loyalty constructs were measured in terms of each of the three teams. Sponsor awareness was measured in each context for six authentic and six foil sponsors, while attitudes and purchase intention related to one of the two focal sponsors - Barfoot & Thompson, for the Blues and Northern Mystics context and Suzuki, for the New Zealand Warriors context.

1.4.1 Attitudinal Loyalty towards the team. Attitudinal Loyalty can be summarised as the intentions of an individual to undertake a behaviour. In the sport management literature attitudinal loyalty has been further developed to encompass the intention to attend future fixtures, recommend attending fixtures to others and to buy products and services of the team (Bodet & Bernache-Assollant, 2011). These measures cover both the team identification and fan involvement (Chen & Zhang, 2011) aspects of attitudinal loyalty. Attitudinal loyalty is not driven by the performance of the team (Biscaia, Correia, Rosado, Maroco, & Ross, 2012; Yoshida, James, & Cronin, 2013). However, satisfaction (Biscaia et al., 2012), nostalgia, the logo and the product itself also have a significant impact upon attitudinal loyalty (Doyle, Filo, McDonald, & Funk, 2013).

Attitudinal loyalty is believed to be antecedent to behavioural loyalty (Back & Parks, 2003; Park & Kim, 2000), sponsor awareness (Cornwell, Maignon, & Irwin, 1997; Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001; Lee, Harris, & Lyberger, 2011; Maxwell & Lough, 2009; McAlister, Kelly, Humphreys, & Cornwell, 2012), attitudes towards the sponsor (Dees et al., 2008; Degaris, 2015; Levin, Joiner, & Cameron, 2001; Madrigal, 2001; Meenaghan, 2001) and purchase intentions towards the sponsor (Choi, Tsuji,
Hutchinson, & Bouchet, 2011; Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Meenaghan, 2001). Therefore, attitudinal loyalty is a construct of interest in this study.

1.4.2 Behavioural Loyalty towards the team. Behavioural loyalty is the actual behaviours previously undertaken by a fan (Doyle et al., 2013; Park & Kim, 2000), such as repeat purchases of the same product (Back & Parks, 2003). Behavioural loyalty can be measured in various ways including wallet share, attendance at fixtures throughout a season, being a season ticket holder (Doyle et al., 2013; Matsuoka, Chelladurai, & Harada, 2003) and the number of years they have been a fan (Kaynak, Salman, & Tatoglu, 2008).

Similar to attitudinal loyalty, behavioural loyalty is considered an antecedent to other constructs in this study including awareness, attitudes and intentions (Bodet & Bernache-Assollant, 2011). Several studies have linked behavioural loyalty to sponsor awareness (Cornwell et al., 1997; Dekhil, 2010; Lee, Shin, Park, & Kwon, 2010; Levin et al., 2001; Walraven, Bijmolt, & Koning, 2014), attitudes towards the sponsor (Koronios, Psiloutsikou, Kriemadis, Zervoulakos, & Leivaditi, 2016; Nassis, Theodorakis, Aftihinos, & Kolybalis, 2014) and purchase intentions (Hong, 2011; Madrigal, 2001; McAlister et al., 2012).

1.4.3 Sponsor Awareness. Sponsor awareness is one of the key factors leading to sponsorship effectiveness (Davies, Veloutsou, & Costa, 2006; Fransen, Rompay, Muntinga, van Rompay, & Muntinga, 2013; Jalleh, Donovan, Giles-Corti, & Holman, 2002; Sangkwon Lee et al., 2011; Walraven et al., 2014). If potential consumers are not aware of the sponsorship, they are unlikely to be able to create attitudes that could lead to positive outcomes for the firm (Bauer et al., 2008; Kuzma et al., 2003). Sponsor awareness can be measured through two different methods – recall or recognition. Recall methods require the respondents to identify or name sponsors without a stimuli (Walsh, Kim, & Ross, 2008). In contrast, recognition methods provide the respondent
with a stimuli such as a logo to select from (Boshoff & Gerber, 2008). Sponsor awareness is a construct of interest for this study as it is an antecedent for attitudes towards the sponsor (Kuzma et al., 2003; Wells, 2000) and purchase intentions (Barros & Silvestre, 2006; Bauer et al., 2008).

1.4.4 **Attitudes towards the sponsor.** Attitudes towards a sponsor differ from an individual’s feelings towards a brand. Feelings towards a brand are usually transitory and diminish quickly however, attitudes remain with an individual for a longer period of time (Spears & Singh, 2004). Attitudes towards a brand (or sponsor) are made up of judgements and evaluations of the brand-related information (Keller, 2003). Attitudes towards the sponsor are measured using traditional brand aspects such as impressions of how good the respondent believes the brand is, whether they like the brand and if they are favourably disposed towards the brand (Gwinner & Bennett, 2008). In the current research, attitudes were measured towards either Barfoot & Thompson or Suzuki – the two focal sponsors. The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991) provides a theoretical underpinning for measuring attitudes towards the sponsor. The TPB suggests that an individual’s attitudes can impact behavioural intentions (Ajzen, 1991). Thus, attitudes towards the sponsor are an antecedent of sponsor purchase intentions (Gwinner & Bennett, 2008; Kim et al., 2015; Speed & Thompson, 2000) and are important within this study.

1.4.5 **Purchase Intentions towards the sponsors.** Purchase intentions refer to the intentions of an individual to purchase a good or service, while in comparison, purchase behaviours are the actual behaviours undertaken to purchase a good or service (Dees et al., 2008). Importantly, behaviours are strongly linked to an individual’s intentions (Ajzen, 2001). Therefore, purchase intentions can be used as indicator of sponsorship effectiveness (Naidenova, Parshakov, & Chmykhov, 2016) and can be interpreted as representative of future sales (Crompton, 2004; Gwinner & Bennett,
2008). Purchase intentions are therefore an important construct to explore within this study as sponsors have specific objectives they want to achieve through sponsorship and return on investments can be one of those objectives. As with attitudes, purchase intentions were measured in conjunction with either Barfoot & Thompson or Suzuki in each of the three professional sport contexts.

1.5 Research Questions

A case has now been made that sponsor awareness, attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions are interrelated with behavioural and attitudinal loyalty. With only one previous study exploring the interrelationships among these concepts (Biscaia et al., 2013), this study is positioned as exploratory (McNabb, 2013) and the following research questions are proposed:

RQ1: What are the sponsor awareness levels of Blues’, Warriors’ and Mystics’ fans?

RQ2: How do behavioural and attitudinal loyalty, attitude towards the sponsor, and purchase intentions differ amongst the three contexts?

RQ3: What are the differences between full members and non-full members in behavioural and attitudinal loyalty, attitude towards the sponsor, sponsor awareness and purchase intentions?

RQ4: What are the differences between men and women in behavioural and attitudinal loyalty, attitude towards the sponsor, sponsor awareness and purchase intentions?

RQ5: What are the correlations between behavioural loyalty, attitudinal loyalty, attitude towards the sponsor, sponsor awareness and purchase intentions?

Research questions 1 and 2 explore awareness of six official and six foil sponsors in each of the three contexts. The analysis related to these two questions explore awareness levels and contextual differences among the three contexts.
Questions 3, 4 and 5 are centred around a focal sponsor for each of the three contexts. These questions explore the interrelationships of all five constructs. Attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions for each context are measured in conjunction with a focal sponsor.

1.6 Structure of Dissertation

This dissertation is structured as follows: Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study, briefly introducing the key concepts - behavioural and attitudinal loyalty, attitudes towards the sponsor, sponsor awareness and purchase intentions. Chapter 2 reviews previous studies of sport sponsorship, attitudinal loyalty, behavioural loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions. Chapter 3 is a description of the research methods, including procedures, participants, instrumentation and data analysis. Chapter 4 is a presentation of the results of the study. Chapter 5 is a discussion of the research which is broken up into four sections. First, the results presented in Chapter 4 are discussed in terms of sponsor awareness, contextual differences, the role of membership, the role of gender and the relationships between the constructs. Second, managerial implications are offered which are followed by limitations and finally, directions for future research. The dissertation concludes with Chapter 6 which is a presentation of the conclusions of this study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter 2 is a review of relevant literature. The literature review starts by broadly describing and defining sport sponsorship before focussing on specific aspects of sport sponsorship. This is followed by a review of the constructs measured in this study - attitudinal loyalty, behavioural loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions towards the sponsor. Which also featured in the Biscaia et al. (2013) study.

2.1 Sport Sponsorship

Sport sponsorship can be thought of as a series of advertising hoardings and logos upon playing kits and endorsements of individual moments of the game. Sponsorship is important to the survival of both grassroots and elite level sports because it provides a source of funding that allows sport entities to focus on a variety of tasks central to their survival including improving team quality and increase functionality of the management staff in other facets of the organisation (Chen & Zhang, 2011; Yang, Sparks, & Li, 2008). For elite sports organisations, sponsorship is one of the most important revenue streams next to broadcasting, match day and merchandising revenues (Bühler, Heffernan, & Hewson, 2007). Therefore, initial sponsor acquisition and ongoing management of sponsors is essential for an effective sport organisation.

Sponsorship is defined as a commercial organisation providing financial assistance in order to achieve their own objectives (Cobbs, 2011; Yang et al., 2008). Assistance can also be in kind, where the sponsor provides goods or services in lieu of cash (Giannoulakis, 2014). This relationship allows the sponsor to exploit the commercial potential that a sponsee (i.e., the property being sponsored) has within their market (Apostolopoulou & Papadimitriou, 2004; Degaris, 2015).

Sponsorship is normally strategic and linked to organisational objectives. Therefore, sponsorship should not be confused with acts of corporate philanthropy

8
whereby the sponsor is not looking for a return on their investment (Bühler et al., 2007). Corporate philanthropy is still prevalent in grassroots sport (Giannoulakis, 2014). Elite sport sponsorship has moved away from the model of corporate philanthropy with a view of generating a return on investment thus making sponsorship attractive.

Exchange theory is central for understanding the relationship between a sponsor and a sponsee (Cousens, Babiak, & Bradish, 2006; Giannoulakis, 2014; Naidenova et al., 2016; Olkkonen, 2001). Exchange theory suggests that two or more parties must exchange resources and that the exchange between the parties must be of equal but reciprocating value (Crompton, 2004). However, in some cases the relationship can be biased towards a single party. This can occur when the sponsee is more dependent on the sponsor than vice versa (Maxwell & Lough, 2009). This further reinforces the idea that although most spectators, fans and the general public see a sponsor aligning with a sports team or event to fulfil corporate needs, the outcomes are usually dyadic and both parties have a vested interest in ensuring the sponsorship is successful.

Sponsorship is either customer based or relationship based. Customer based sponsorships focus on customer outcomes such as business to customer relationships, whereas relationship based sponsorship agreements focus on the sponsee accessing other organisations within the network (Chadwick & Thwaites, 2004; Cobbs, 2011) and a business-to-business dynamic. A relationship based sponsorship should be seen as continual dialogue between both sponsor and sponsee (Farrelly & Quester, 2005). This method is usually used by businesses that operate in the business-to-business industry. Thus sponsorship of large organisations such as Formula One teams can be seen as relational assets for the sponsor (Cobbs, 2011). Formula One is able to attract such sponsors that allows them to fulfil both their needs of a revenue stream and also enables the sponsor to grow and develop their business.
In contrast, consumer based sponsorships have three potential outcomes - cognitive, affective or conative (Kim et al., 2015). Cognitive refers to the thought processes the individual undertakes regarding the sponsorship. Affective refers to the individual’s feelings towards the sponsor. Conative refers to the actual behaviours the individual makes towards the sponsor (Degaris, 2015). Objectives for sponsorship can include creating brand awareness (Lee, Harris, & Lyberger, 2011; Lyberger & McCarthy, 2001; Naidenova et al., 2016), increasing brand image (Koo, Quarterman, & Flynn, 2006), bringing the brand of the sponsor closer to the target thus decreasing the brand proximity (O’Reilly, Nadeau, Séguin, & Harrison, 2007), increasing sales (Chen & Zhang, 2011; Radicchi, 2014; Yang et al., 2008), increasing market share, to match or outdo the actions of their competitors, showing corporate responsibility (Bovaird, Löffler, & Parrado-Díez, 2002), attaining hospitality opportunities to entertain potential new or current customers (Apostolopoulou & Papadimitriou, 2004; Chadwick & Thwaites, 2004), breaking down cultural barriers and establishing relations with the media (Cousens et al., 2006).

Marketers are likely to undertake sponsorship if they perceive that sponsorship can help the organisation achieve objectives in ways that other forms of marketing cannot (Breuer & Rumpf, 2011). Since sponsorship can achieve a vast array of objectives, sponsorship is an attractive option for corporate organisations. It allows them to access a sector of the market they may not have previously been able to access or target.

Sponsorship has been posited by scholars as advertising through sport (Radicchi, 2014). Although not true to the definition of advertising, which states that the primary role of advertising is to persuade consumers (McAlister, Srinivasan, Jindal, & Cannella, 2016). Sponsorship is a multi-faceted marketing tool that incorporates PR, advertising, sales promotions and sponsorship (Degaris, 2015). Sponsorship is generally subtle and
does not necessarily prompt the receiver of the message to buy the product (Breuer & Rumpf, 2011; Dees et al., 2008; Meenaghan, 2001). Sponsorship is often perceived to be more credible than advertising because sponsorships are predominantly linked with a well-respected property (Degaris, 2015). Sponsorships allow the sponsor to tap into segments of the market, especially specific demographics, including lifestyles of sports fans (Meenaghan, 1998; Roy & Cornwell, 2004). Sponsorship does illicit some similar benefits to advertising such as increasing awareness and increasing potential sales (McAlister et al., 2016) and can be used as a tool to persuade consumers.

One benefit of sponsorship in comparison to advertising is that the exposure of the sponsorship may be ongoing through the course of a sporting event. Advances in technology allow spectators to record live sport at home and consume it at a more convenient time. Advertisements are usually ignored as they are fast-forwarded through to get back to the action as quick as possible, while sponsorship is often immersed in the match that the spectator is watching (Degaris, 2015; Levin et al., 2001).

An increased number of sponsorships shown on screen or at the venue dilute the amount of information a spectator can process (Breuer & Rumpf, 2011; Wakefield & Bennett, 2010). However, sponsorships work similar to product placements in music videos. In music videos, brands are not explicitly selling their product but are used as a vehicle to showcase their brands (Burkhalter & Thornton, 2014). Products are placed in prominent positions and become embedded in an individual’s memory thereby eliciting positive attitudes towards the sponsor through association. This represents another benefit of sponsorship over advertising. Although there are many ways both parties can ensure that a sponsorship is successful, the following sections outline the literature predominantly from the sponsor’s perspective.

2.1.1 Leveraging Sponsorship. For a sponsorship to be most effective it is important that sponsors leverage the sponsorship using other marketing tools (Degaris,
Sponsors should build upon the signage they have present at the venue or on the equipment (Jalleh et al., 2002). Leveraging a sponsorship is using collateral marketing strategies to exploit the commercial potential of the sponsorship agreement (Weeks, Cornwell, & Drennan, 2008). Leveraging the sponsorship leads to an increase in top of mind awareness and creates a greater link between the sponsor and the event or team (Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Herrmann, Kacha, & Derbaix, 2016; McAlister, Kelly, Humphreys, & Cornwell, 2012; Walraven, Bijmolt, & Koning, 2014; Yang et al., 2008). Leveraging strategies such as advertising during a broadcast of a live fixture or during half time can positively impact sponsor awareness (Keller, 2003; Levin et al., 2001). Levin, Joiner and Cameron (2001) deduced that when a sponsorship was leveraged with a television commercial during the event it led to increased levels of brand memorisation compared to solely relying upon the sponsorship or solely running a commercial during the broadcast.

Leveraging a sponsorship through activities, as outlined above, can increase emotional connection towards a brand thus increasing the relevance towards an individual (Degaris, 2015). Another method of leveraging a sponsorship is using field or television sponsorship. Field sponsorship, is classed as sponsorship that is undertaken at the venue or around the field of play. This includes on field brand placement, brands on sports equipment and brands advertised on hoardings around the perimeter of the field of play. In contrast, television sponsorship generally involves sponsoring the broadcast itself but it can also include in game activations (Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001). Levin et al (2001) suggested that leveraging strategies alone do not lead to sponsor recognition but rather a combination of activations (Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001). The importance of leveraging sponsorships leads into a discussion of the wider benefits that come with sponsorships.
2.1.2 By-products of Sponsorship. Sponsorship is most commonly used to influence the target market regarding the products and services of the sponsor (Radicchi, 2014). Economic benefit received from the sponsorship of a property positively impacts the commitment shown from the sponsor towards the sponsee to continue their relationship (Farrelly & Quester, 2005). Thus, a sponsee who helps a sponsor achieve economic returns on their investment is likely to retain the sponsor. For sponsors entering the market to achieve awareness it is recommended that they look to sponsor either a league, national team or venue instead of a team to reduce negative sentiments from extreme fans of rival teams (Bergkvist, 2012; Martinez & Janney, 2015). It is also recommended that retail organisations should use sport marketing, especially sponsorship, to increase sales and visibility (Chen & Chen, 2012; Naidenova et al., 2016). Large and privately owned companies are more likely to sponsor sports teams in comparison to financial institutions (Naidenova et al., 2016). Sponsorship does not always have sales based outcomes. In Nippon Professional Baseball Championships, where teams are owned and sponsored by large corporations, winning post-season fixtures was seen as a significant predictor of whether stock prices increased (Chen & Chen, 2012; Sung, Nam, Kim, & Han, 2016). In contrast, losing, especially in knockout fixtures, was seen to negatively impact stock prices of sponsors of soccer in Europe (Hanke & Kirchler, 2012).

Brands that already have a large market share are likely to align themselves with prominent properties to ensure congruency (Levin et al., 2001; Wakefield & Bennett, 2010; Walraven et al., 2014). This allows the sponsor to benefit from their sponsorship activities (Breuer & Rumpf, 2011; Kim et al., 2015; Roy & Cornwell, 2004). Large organisations choose to sponsor large or prominent teams as they naturally tend to achieve greater television exposure and the team is usually more successful (Jensen & Cobbs, 2014). As media coverage generates most of the value (Breuer & Rumpf, 2011),
teams with significant media coverage can engage in premium pricing (Jensen & Cobbs, 2014).

When sponsored teams win championships or consecutive fixtures it creates a stronger brand name not only for the team but also for the sponsors. This in turn creates loyalty towards the team and this effect flows onto the sponsors (Kaynak et al., 2008; Radicchi, 2014; Sung et al., 2016). Positive or outstanding performances in the previous or current season can also be a reasoning behind why a sports organisation becomes attractive for sponsors to align with (Chadwick & Thwaites, 2004; Jensen & Cobbs, 2014). Therefore, for a sponsor to reap the most rewards from their sponsorship deal, it is important to ensure they sponsor a team that is either highly successful or have a highly committed group of fans. Although, contrary to popular beliefs poorly performing teams do not negatively impact the sponsorship effectiveness (Naidenova et al., 2016). However, it can be seen as a reason why a sponsor may not want to continue being associated with the team. Therefore, it can be a rationale as to why sponsors may terminate their agreements (Yang et al., 2008). Sponsorship is about aligning your organisation with one that carries the same values as your organisation.

2.2 Sponsor Awareness

Sponsor awareness is widely utilised as a metric for sponsorship effectiveness (Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006; Walsh et al., 2008) and is important to sponsorship effectiveness (Maxwell & Lough, 2009). Recipients of the target message need to interpret and absorb the message to create awareness (Levin et al., 2001). If the sponsor’s message makes the intended recipient curious than this would motivate the spectator to process the information regarding the sponsorship (Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001). Therefore, if the intended recipients do not find the message appealing it is more likely to be ignored (Crompton, 2004).
Fit is an important aspect of sponsor-event or sponsor-team congruency. Fit is where the spectator perceives there to be a logical or reasonable link between the sponsor and the sponsee (Close & Lacey, 2013; Koronios et al., 2016; Olson & Thjømøe, 2011). Fit is an important factor for sponsor recall and recognition. The greater the perceived fit between the sponsor and the sponsee the greater the levels of recall and recognition (Koo et al., 2006; Walraven et al., 2014). As such, sponsorship is not only about displaying logos for intended customers but engaging potential customers with the messages about the sponsor. Top of mind awareness is heightened for spectators who view activated sponsorships in contrast to non-activated sponsorships (Eagleman & Krohn, 2012). Brand awareness is therefore an important outcome of sponsorship (Fransen et al., 2013) as it can increase brand prominence (Grohs, Wagner, & Vstecka, 2004).

Brand awareness impacts brand equity positively (Aaker, 1996). Brand knowledge must be present to increase brand equity, which is the “marketing effects uniquely attributable to the brand” (Keller, 1993, p. 1). Brand knowledge is made up of brand awareness and brand associations. For sponsors their brand is a reflection of their organisation. An individual has brand awareness when they are able to correctly identify a brand in a chosen category (Keller, 2003). Brand recognition is the ability of a consumer to remember a brand they have previously been exposed to (Aaker, 1996), when presented with the brand as a cue (Keller, 2003). This is known as aided recognition, but is also referred to as aided recall in other studies (Biscaia et al., 2013). Aided techniques give the respondent cues or hints towards who the sponsor may be. In aided recognition individuals are asked to select as many brand that they recognise, through their brand mark, logo or other necessary cues, which they believe they are the correct sponsors (Boshoff & Gerber, 2008).
Brand recognition can also be measured using unaided techniques, a situation in which consumers are expected to generate responses without the benefit of a stimulus (Walsh et al., 2008). Therefore, sponsorship can be seen as a method to improve brand recognition and thus sponsor awareness (Boshoff & Gerber, 2008). Sponsors that are more prominent than others are likely to have greater identification than less prominent sponsors (Keller, 2003; Wakefield & Bennett, 2010; Walraven et al., 2014). For example, sponsors with logos in highly visible areas (e.g., big screen scoreboards) were recognised more than sponsors with less prominent signage (Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006).

In the study of Maxwell and Lough (2009), they were able to deduce that in a women’s collegiate basketball game sponsor identification increased, when fans were subjected to signage at the fixture. In these experimental conditions one group attended a women’s collegiate basketball fixture with sponsor signage whereas another group attended the fixture with no signage present. This finding was consistent with that of Quester (1997) who found that signage around the venue increases sponsor recognition.

Media also plays an important role in sponsor awareness. For every second a sponsors logo was televised, a fan is more likely to memorise the sponsor than a sponsor not televised (Breuer & Rumpf, 2011). Therefore, sponsors that leverage or promote their sponsorship during the broadcast of a tournament have greater recall rates than those sponsors that do not (Barros & Silvestre, 2006). Teams that are performing well are likely to receive more media coverage (Sung et al., 2016). Through the role of the media paired with the ability of a fan to follow their team, top of mind sponsors were identified as being sponsors who were displayed on the team shirts (Biscaia, Correia, Ross, & Rosado, 2014). This means that sponsors that tend to pay more for premium sponsorship agreements are likely to reap the rewards through awareness of their sponsorship (Jensen & Cobbs, 2014).
An increased number of sponsors negatively affects sponsor memorisation. The presence of multiple sponsors dilutes the amount of information received and time a fan can give towards a sponsor (Breuer & Rumpf, 2011; Wakefield & Bennett, 2010). This can cause the sponsorship to come across as noise and be completely ignored (Crompton, 2004; Lardoinot & Derbaix, 2001; Maxwell & Lough, 2009). Therefore, it is important that sports marketers leverage sponsorships making a real impact with their sponsorship activations, thus increasing sponsorship awareness (Herrmann et al., 2016).

Sponsor awareness is integral for achieving the sponsor’s objectives. Brand awareness is imperative for understanding the perceptions of the sponsor and the event (Kuzma et al., 2003; Wells, 2000). If brand awareness is not present potential customers cannot create brand associations and thus purchase intentions towards the brand are unlikely (Bauer et al., 2008; Kuzma et al., 2003). Therefore, sponsor awareness impacts a fans intentions to purchase a sponsors products (Barros & Silvestre, 2006). Sponsor awareness is the central construct in the current research, but other constructs are measured alongside it, so a review of these constructs is provided next.

2.3 Spectator Loyalty towards the Team

Loyalty comprises the interactions between an individual’s internal psychological connection and negative external changes (Heere & Dickson, 2008). Although considered as a two-dimensional construct in the present day, loyalty was not always viewed in this manner. Day (1969) posited that loyalty should be studied as a two-dimensional construct that encompasses attitudinal and behavioural loyalty individually. Therefore to ensure that the whole loyalty construct is measured, both attitudinal and behavioural loyalty must be measured (Bauer et al., 2008). Collectively, attitudinal and behavioural loyalty are a rigorous representation of consumer loyalty (Bodet & Bernache-Assollant, 2011).
Customers go through stages of loyalty. Initially they are cognitively loyal through ascertaining brand attributes. From there they become affectively loyal, this is derived from pleasure through performance of the brand. This leads to being conatively loyal as they commit to a specific brand (Lee, Shin, Park, & Kwon, 2010). Loyal customers are often considered those who continuously attend fixtures through repeatedly purchasing tickets which benefits the organisation (Bee & Havitz, 2010; Stevens & Rosenberger, 2012). Therefore, the greater the investment by the fan the greater the emotional attachment towards the team (Park & Kim, 2000), which makes sponsoring the team more attractive (Hong, 2011).

2.3.1 Attitudinal Loyalty. Attitudinal loyalty in the context of sport is defined as the persistent and committed attitudes a fan shows towards a team (Doyle et al., 2013). Fans with attitudinal loyalty are resistant to change as a result of the interaction between negative external changes and their developed attitudes (Heere & Dickson, 2008), thus becoming psychologically attached to a team (Park & Kim, 2000). Intention to attend future fixtures (Bodet & Bernache-Assollant, 2011), attendance recommendations to others and purchasing goods and services from the team (Biscaia et al., 2012) are related to an individual’s attitudinal loyalty. For an attitudinally loyal fan, the intention to attend future fixtures is not significantly impacted by the performance of the team they support (Biscaia et al., 2012; Yoshida et al., 2013). Measuring attitudinal loyalty is important in the context of a sport sponsorship study because of the potential relationship between it and sponsors awareness, attitudes and intentions. For the purpose of this study attitudinal loyalty is defined as the attitudes shown by a fan to commit and identify with a sports team for the future.

2.3.2 Behavioural Loyalty. Behavioural loyalty is the actual behaviours a fan has exhibited previously (Doyle et al., 2013), such as repeated purchases of the same product (Back & Parks, 2003). Behavioural loyalty can be measured by wallet share that
has been reserved towards a particular team, how often they attend or view the team throughout a season, whether they are a season ticket holder (Doyle et al., 2013; Matsuoka et al., 2003) and the number of years as a fan (Kaynak et al., 2008). An example of a fan that exhibits behavioural loyalty is a fan that may purchase licenced apparel which contains both the team and the sponsors logos (Martinez & Janney, 2015). Thus, behavioural loyalty for this study can be defined as being the previous behaviours shown by a fan towards the team.

2.3.3 The Relationship of Attitudinal and Behavioural Loyalty. Attitudinal loyalty can have a direct influence on behavioural loyalty (Back & Parks, 2003; Park & Kim, 2000). However, a spectator with high levels of behavioural loyalty may actually have low levels of attitudinal loyalty (Day, 1969). For example, a person may attend matches because they receive free tickets or accompany family members. Thus to be truly loyal a consumer should have high levels of both attitudinal and behavioural loyalty towards a particular team (Day, 1969; Kaynak et al., 2008). Therefore to understand the concept of loyalty in the context of sport sponsorship both attitudinal and behavioural loyalty must be considered (Bodet & Bernache-Assollant, 2011; Kaynak et al., 2008).

By measuring loyalty as a two-dimensional construct, Day (1969) was able to label certain groups of loyal consumers and further explained their characteristics. Consumers who show high levels of both attitudinal loyalty and behavioural loyalty were characterised as showing high loyalty. Consumers who portrayed high attitudinal loyalty but low levels of behavioural loyalty were characterised as showing spurious loyalty. Consumers who portrayed high attitudinal loyalty but low behavioural loyalty were characterised as showing latent loyalty and finally consumers who portrayed low levels of both attitudinal and behavioural loyalty were characterised as showing low loyalty.
High loyalty fans identify with the team and are unlikely to alter their behaviour or commitment towards the team (Park & Kim, 2000), these fans would be expected to possess an intense and extreme feeling of importance towards the team along with extensive knowledge and experiences with the team (Kaynak et al., 2008). Strong commitment to a brand will in turn increase the purchasing frequencies over other competing brands (Lee et al., 2010). Spuriously loyal fans are likely to drop out or discontinue their behaviour as they are only showing high levels of behavioural loyalty because their loyalty has been by socialising agents. They are likely attending because of incentives such as free or cheap tickets, other socialising agents such as peer group involvement or for entertainment purposes (Mahony, Madrigal, & Howard, 2000). Latently loyal fans are described as being fans who have the intention to spectate but are unable to due to means such as money, time or other personal factors. Low loyalty fans are not loyal to the team or sport (Day, 1969).

2.3.4 The Outcomes of Loyalty. Having established that loyalty has two important dimensions, it is now vital to understand the outcomes of loyalty. Loyal fans of sports teams can show goodwill and gratitude towards their teams sponsors (Choi et al., 2011; Madrigal, 2001; Meenaghan, 2001). Loyalty, operationalised as frequency of home game attendance, has been shown to positively impact correct sponsor identification (Cornwell, Maignan, & Irwin, 1997; Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001; Lee et al., 2011; Maxwell & Lough, 2009; McAlister et al., 2012). Therefore the more knowledgeable and involved the fan the greater the ability of the fan to process the sponsorship messages (Dekhil, 2010; Wakefield & Bennett, 2010; Walliser, Kacha, & Mogos-Descotes, 2005; Walraven et al., 2014). Season ticket holders are likely to show more knowledge of sponsoring brands in comparison to casual spectators (Biscaia et al., 2014). Hence, repeated exposures (Cornwell et al., 1997; Dekhil, 2010; Lee et al., 2010; Levin et al., 2001; Walraven et al., 2014) and regular attendance of games at the venue
rather than on television lead to increased levels of sponsor awareness (Dekhil, 2010; Koronios et al., 2016).

Highly committed and loyal fans are likely to evaluate sponsorships more carefully and thus are more likely to create positive attitudes towards the sponsor (Hong, 2011; McAlister et al., 2012). The more highly involved an individual is with the team the higher the likelihood that the individual will have positive attitudes towards the sponsor (Dees et al., 2008; Degaris, 2015; Levin et al., 2001; Madrigal, 2001; Meenaghan, 2001). Therefore, through repeat attendance, association with the team (Koronios et al., 2016; Nassis et al., 2014), and increased exposures a fan has to a sponsors brand the greater the attitude they are likely to have towards the sponsor. The Theory of Gratitude suggests that if a consumer perceives the sponsorship to be beneficial to the sponsee, gratitude perhaps in the form of a perceived obligation to reciprocate and other affective outcomes will result (Bergkvist, 2012; Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Kim, Ko, & James, 2011; Kim et al., 2015; Meenaghan, 2001), this has also been found to be true for fans of specific NASCAR drivers (Dalakas & Levin, 2005).

Loyal fans are likely to switch to or purchase the brand of a sponsor because of their sponsorship of the individuals favourite team (Dees et al., 2008; Meenaghan, 2001). Social Identity Theory suggests that actions such as purchasing sponsors goods may not bring the individual closer to the team but it shows a sense of loyalty towards the team and an appreciation for the good the sponsor does for the team (Dees et al., 2008). The more committed an individual is towards the team the more strongly they may feel that it is their job to purchase the goods of the sponsors as a form of goodwill or appreciation towards the sponsor (Choi et al., 2011; Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Meenaghan, 2001). Both attitudinal and behavioural loyalty impact purchase intentions.
of sponsors products. In the sport sponsorship literature, it is also clear that loyalty towards a team has a significant impact on attitudes towards a sponsor.

2.4 Attitudes towards the Sponsor

Although, it is not commonly measured by sports marketers, attitudes towards the sponsor must be understood (Pak, Yoh, Choi, & Olson, 2011). The brand management literature is key to understanding the attitudes an individual may have towards a sponsor or their brand which can be summarised as an individual’s judgements and evaluations of the brand-related information (Keller, 2003). Attitudes towards a brand differ to feelings towards a brand. Feelings towards a brand are usually transitory and diminish over time. In contrast, attitudes towards a brand are more enduring and can remain with an individual for a long period of time (Spears & Singh, 2004). Attitudes towards a sponsor can be seen as the way a potential consumer perceives a brand that sponsors an event (Keller, 2003) or even seen as a favourable tendency shown towards a sponsor (Meenaghan, 2001). The literature has suggested that positive attitudes towards the sponsor are instrumental in the overall effectiveness of a sponsorship (Chen & Zhang, 2011; Speed & Thompson, 2000).

The TPB (Ajzen, 1991) provides a theoretical underpinning for the role of attitudes towards the sponsor in the overall effectiveness of a sponsorship. The TPB suggests that an individual’s attitude towards an object, in the case a sponsor, should be interpreted as a proximal indicator of an individual’s behavioural intentions, (Ajzen, 1991).

Consumers who perceive fit between the sponsor and the sponsee are likely to elicit positive thoughts towards the sponsor which may ultimately impact attitudes (Bergkvist, 2012; Chavanat et al., 2009; Chen & Zhang, 2011; Close & Lacey, 2013; Gwinner & Bennett, 2008; Kim et al., 2015; Koo et al., 2006; Roy & Cornwell, 2004; Tribou, 2011; Zaharia, Biscaia, Gray, & Stotlar, 2016). Actions such as sponsor
giveaways (Kim et al., 2015) may positively impact attitudes towards the sponsor. Therefore fans that receive a brand experience are likely to create positive attitudes towards the sponsor (Eagleman & Krohn, 2012; Fransen et al., 2013). If a fan perceives that the sponsorship is favourable towards their team they are likely to foster positive attitudes towards the sponsors (Barros, de Barros, Santos, & Chadwick, 2007; Levin et al., 2001).

The positive meanings or images a consumer holds towards a sponsee can be transferred towards the sponsor as a result of a schematic linkage (Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Degaris, 2015; Kim et al., 2015; Koo et al., 2006; Roy & Cornwell, 2004; Tribou, 2011). A schema is the cognitive strategy that is stored within an individual’s memory. This is made up of the aggregated information an individual has towards the sponsored property (Keller, 1993).

In contrast, misfit between sponsor and the sponsee is not always a bad outcome. Incongruence can create positive or negative attitudes towards the sponsor (Close & Lacey, 2013). Should a sponsor be incongruent with the team or event, fans of the team or event are likely to attempt to understand the sponsorship and should they deem the sponsorship congruent they are likely to hold positive attitudes towards the sponsor. In contrast, if the sponsor is deemed incongruent it will be rejected by the fans (McDaniel & Heald, 2000; Tribou, 2011), incongruence is further amplified when an unhealthy product is paired with a healthy event (McDaniel & Heald, 2000). Therefore, the market position of a sponsor can impact how consumers think of and react towards a new sponsorship (Kim et al., 2015), also if a sponsor has multiple sponsorships this is not likely to breed negative attitudes towards the sponsor (Chavanat et al., 2009). It is important that the fan has an understanding and knowledge of both parties to be able to effectively judge congruence (Meenaghan, 1998).
If a fan perceives a sponsor positively it can have a significant influence on their likelihood to purchase products of the sponsors (Barros & Silvestre, 2006; Kim, Ko, et al., 2011; Koo et al., 2006; Nassis et al., 2014; Pak et al., 2011; Zaharia et al., 2016). Attitudes towards the sponsor have been found to play a mediating role in the relationship between perceived sponsor fit and purchase intentions (Gwinner & Bennett, 2008; Kim et al., 2015). Having now provided an overview of loyalty, awareness and attitudes towards sponsors, the intent to purchase goods and services from a sponsor must be reviewed next as the stage is set for the current project in which the relationships between these constructs is ultimately explored.

2.5 Purchase Intentions

In the current research purchase intentions are defined as an individual’s conscious plan to exert effort or carry out the behaviour of purchasing from the sponsor (Chen & Zhang, 2011; Spears & Singh, 2004). Purchase intentions and actual purchasing behaviours are distinguishable. Purchase intentions refer to the intentions of the consumer whereas the purchase behaviours are the actual behaviours undertaken by the consumer to purchase a product or service (Dees et al., 2008). However, it is important to note that behaviours are driven from the intentions of the consumer (Ajzen, 2001). Thus, for sponsors, consumer purchase intentions act as a powerful indicator on the effectiveness (Naidenova et al., 2016) of their sponsorship as it can provide an accurate representation of future sales (Crompton, 2004; Gwinner & Bennett, 2008).

Schema Theory suggests that when fans go to a stadium to watch their favourite team they absorb the information around the stadium. Thus when they go to purchase a product they use the schema they have of known sponsors. Fans then usually gravitate towards the sponsor in their schema when having to choose between the sponsors brand and a competing brand (Dees et al., 2008). Fans who are sponsor loyal feel that they are personally contributing towards their team when purchasing goods or services of a
sponsor (Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006) and also supporting the sponsor (Hickman, 2015). When a fan portrays positive affective behaviour towards the sponsor they are more likely to purchase the sponsors products or services (Wang, 2013). Purchase intentions are also increased when the team is performing well (Lings & Owen, 2007; Ngan, Prendergast, & Tsang, 2011).

Sponsors who choose to pay premium a top tier sponsorship are likely to achieve greater return on their investment in contrast to sponsors who are at lower levels of the sponsorship hierarchy within a team (Jensen & Cobbs, 2014). As such, if a sponsor has multiple sponsorships it may have less impact on the purchase intentions of fans (Chavanat et al., 2009). Thus, it has been indicated that sponsorship can lead to an increase in sales, through positive attitudes towards the sponsor and sponsor awareness (Degaris, 2015), for sponsoring organisations however, it was also found that sponsorship decreases market capitalisation (McAlister et al., 2012; Naidenova et al., 2016).

Through a thorough search of the literature it is evident that both attitudinal and behavioural loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions are interrelated (Biscaia et al., 2013). Sponsor awareness is the central focus of the project and explored in most depth, but it’s antecedents and outcomes are also statistically examined in this project. Figure 1 represents the relationships between each of the five constructs explored in this study.
Figure 1: Relationship between the constructs of interest
Chapter 3: Methods

The preceding chapters introduced the study and provided an overview of the literature. Chapter 3 will delve into the methods utilised within this study. Researcher access and the participants are outlined within this chapter. Following on from this the items used within the questionnaire instrument will be discussed. Finally, the data analytic approach for this study is outlined. Although a qualitative project would have potentially allowed for an alternate and possibly deeper understanding of fan psychology in this context, ultimately a quantitative design was chosen in order to advance the work of Biscaia et al. (2013) which featured validated data collection instruments (Johnson & Christensen, 2008).

3.1 Procedures

3.1.1 Researcher access. The focal sponsors (i.e., Barfoot and Thomson and Suzuki) facilitated access to potential questionnaire respondents. Barfoot & Thompson were initially contacted by the researcher via email, and a meeting was subsequently held with their sponsorship manager. Barfoot & Thompson facilitated access to fans of the Blues and the Northern Mystics. Contact with Suzuki was initially made via telephone by the researcher. Suzuki approached two of their sponsorship partners, the New Zealand Warriors and the Central Pulse, a Wellington-based netball franchise. The New Zealand Warriors agreed to participate in the study.

3.1.2 Blues. The Blues rugby questionnaire was disseminated via an email containing the questionnaire link to their membership database in mid-April 2016. The membership base for the Blues in 2016 was 8,499 however, the survey was disseminated to approximately 2,500 members. This was approximately one month after their season began. The survey was open for two weeks and no reminder email was sent.
3.1.3 New Zealand Warriors. The New Zealand Warriors disseminated their questionnaire via an email containing the questionnaire link to their membership database in early May of 2016. The membership base for the New Zealand Warriors in 2016 was approximately 18,000 members (LeagueUnlimited Media, 2016). The survey was open for two weeks, which were Rounds 9 and 10 of the NRL season. A reminder email was sent to Warriors members, which perhaps explains the higher number of respondents in this context.

3.1.4 Northern Mystics. The Northern Mystics questionnaire was disseminated to their membership database via an email containing the questionnaire link in early May of 2016. The membership base for the Northern Mystics in 2016 was 511 members. The questionnaire was disseminated approximately one month after their season began. The survey was open for two weeks. No email reminders were sent to Mystics members.

3.2 Participants

Members of the Blues, the Mystics and the Warriors were selected for this research as they are the most important customer segment for team-sport clubs (Bauer et al., 2008), as they usually have high levels of involvement (Maxwell & Lough, 2009) and because access to them had been made possible. Questionnaire respondents in the current research are best characterised as a convenience sample (Neuman, 2014).

3.2.1 Blues. Of the 135 completed questionnaires, 127 were deemed useable. Six questionnaires were excluded because of missing data. Another questionnaire was excluded because the respondent was under the age of 16.

3.2.2 Warriors. Of the 367 completed questionnaires, only 316 were deemed useable. Exclusions were due to missing data and a small number of respondents who indicated that they were under the age of 16.
3.2.3 Northern Mystics. Of the 65 completed questionnaires in this context, 55 were deemed useable. The ten questionnaires were discarded because of missing data.

3.3 Instrumentation

3.3.1 Demographics. Three demographics variables, collected to establish “characteristics of living individuals” (Weinstein & Pillai, 2016, p. 5), featured on the questionnaire - age, gender and type of membership. This data allowed the researcher to analyse sub-groups within the population (Carmichael, 2016) and explore group differences on the constructs of interest. The remaining questionnaire items reflect the constructs of interest and the Biscaia et al. (2013) framework.

3.3.2 Attitudinal Loyalty. Three items were used to measure attitudinal loyalty which were taken from Biscaia, Correia, Rosado, Maroco, and Ross (2012). The items were: ‘The probability of attending future games of my team’, ‘The likelihood to recommend my team games to other people’ and ‘The likelihood to purchase other products and services of my team’. To ascertain a clearer understanding of attitudinal loyalty encompassing both team identification and fan involvement aspects of attitudinal loyalty (Chen & Zhang, 2011), the items were adapted to become; ‘I intend to attend future home games of <team name>’, ‘I would recommend <team name> games to others’ and ‘I would purchase merchandise of <team name>’. All these items were tested using a 7-point Likert scale anchored by strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (7).

3.3.3 Behavioural Loyalty. In the work of Biscaia et al. (2013) the following items measured behavioural loyalty: ‘Number of <team name> games attended per season’, ‘number of <team name> games attended in the current season’ and ‘length in years as a season ticket holder to the <team name>’. The first two items were used in this study without change. However, the final item was changed to become, ‘How many seasons have you held your current membership for?’ The change reflected the
different types of season ticket memberships available. Participants entered a number in response to each of these items.

3.3.4 Sponsor Awareness. Sponsor awareness was assessed through aided recognition (Walsh et al., 2008). Use of recognition generates evidence as to whether the consumer has had a previous experience or exposure to the brand (Aaker, 1996). Unaided recall was rejected as a credible option because there was no way of ensuring that participants would not conduct their own search while completing an online questionnaire to find the correct sponsor. It is recognised that respondents could well have conducted their own search within a recognition framework as well, but it was considered less likely for aided recognition.

The six official sponsors of the Blues (with foil sponsors in parentheses) were: Barfoot & Thompson (Ray White), NIB (Southern Cross), SKYCITY (Hilton), Bank of New Zealand (ANZ Bank), Speights (Heineken), Westie Pies (Big Ben Pies). The six official sponsors of the New Zealand Warriors were (with foil sponsors in parentheses): Suzuki (Holden), Vodafone (Spark), Woodstock Bourbon and Cola (Jim Beam), SKYCITY (Hilton), Flava (Mai FM) and Westie Pies (Big Ben Pies) The six official sponsors of the Northern Mystics were (with foil sponsors in parentheses): Barfoot & Thompson (Ray White), SKYCITY (Hilton), Air New Zealand (Qantas), West City Holden (Albany Toyota), The Hits (More FM) and Delmaine (San Remo). An expert panel of marketing researchers reviewed the foils carefully considering their appropriateness in the research design. For some analyses, an aggregate (continuous level) variable was necessary with applicability across the three contexts. This was calculated by giving one point for every correct sponsor identified and one point for correctly not identifying a foil sponsor. Thus, a score out of 12 for sponsor awareness was generated for each participant in the research (Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001).
3.3.5 Attitudes towards the Sponsor. Three items from Gwinner and Bennett (2008) were used to measure the attitudes of the participants towards the focal sponsor (either Barfoot & Thompson or Suzuki). The items measured traditional attitude-based aspects of a brand such as liking and being favourably disposed towards the brand (Gwinner & Bennett, 2008). The items were: ‘I like the <sponsor name> brand’, ‘<sponsor name> is a very good brand of <product category>’ and ‘I have a favourable disposition towards <sponsor name>’. All these items were measured using a 7-point Likert scale anchored by strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (7).

3.3.6 Purchase Intentions. The four items used to measure purchase intentions were derived from the work of Gwinner and Bennett (2008) and Hong (2011). The two items from Gwinner and Bennett (2008) were used verbatim; ‘I would buy <sponsor name> products’ and ‘next time I need to buy a <product category>, I would consider buying <sponsor name>’. The two items from Hong (2011) were; ‘When making a purchase I am more likely to consider a company’s product because it sponsors the team’ and ‘I would be more likely to buy the products of a team’s sponsor over its competitors’. The Hong (2011) items were adapted in the current study to read; ‘the <sponsor name> sponsorship to <team name> makes me more likely to buy <product category> from this brand’ and ‘I would be more likely to buy <product category> of <sponsor name> over its competitors’. All these items used a 7-point Likert scale anchored by strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (7).

The decision to use actual sponsors names allows for a more robust test of the relationship of purchase intentions (Biscaia et al., 2013). In this study purchase intention items for the Blues and Mystics samples were altered to reflect Barfoot & Thompson’s interest in using their services to help sell (rather than buy) homes they have listed.
3.4 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics including frequencies, mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for each of the constructs using The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). This was undertaken for each of the three datasets and also a combined dataset which was created to explore the research questions. The combined data was created on the basis of the benefits of a larger total sample, the benefits of collecting data in multiple contexts and for the purpose of “digging deeper” with alternate analyses.

Independent means $t$-tests were used to explore group differences for members, non-members and based on gender for all constructs. Composite variables can assist in reaching general conclusions (Grace & Bollen, 2008), so scores for each of the items from each construct except sponsor awareness were summed then divided by the number of items that were in each construct. As noted previously, the calculation of the awareness composite variable was a little different, in that correct identification and non-incorrect identification were taken into account on a score out of 12.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for each relationship amongst the five constructs. The composite variables were used. Correlations measure “the strength and direction of the linear association between two quantitative variables” (Utts & Heckard, 2007, p. 151). Effectively a correlation shows how similarly the means of the two variables correlated behave (Sharpe, De Veaux, & Velleman, 2012). The Pearson correlation coefficient was computed via SPSS using the degree of freedom and $t$-statistic values (Field, 2009). Pearson’s correlation coefficient, $r$, indicates the effect size of the result. The effect size of the difference between the means of each of the variables is represented by $r$ (Cohen, 1988, 1992). These effect sizes are categorised as small ($r = .20$), medium ($r = .50$) and large ($r = .80$) (Liu, 2014).
Chapter 4: Results

4.1 Participant Characteristics

The mean age of all respondents across all three contexts was very similar, although the Warriors participants were slightly younger (M = 47.35, SD = 13.95) compared to the Blues (M = 47.58, SD = 12.51) and the Northern Mystics (M = 49.93, SD = 12.97) (Table 1).

Table 1
Age of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blues</td>
<td>47.58</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Warriors</td>
<td>47.35</td>
<td>13.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mystics</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>12.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender of questionnaire respondents among the three contexts were vastly different (Table 2). With 55.9% male and 44.1% female participants in the study, the New Zealand Warriors’ sample was the closest to an even distribution. The Blues’ participants were predominantly male (79.5%) and questionnaire respondents in the Northern Mystics’ context were predominantly female (92.7%).

Table 2
Gender of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Male Frequency</th>
<th>Male Percentage</th>
<th>Female Frequency</th>
<th>Female Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blues</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Warriors</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mystics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 summarises the membership types for each the three contexts. Each of the three franchises offered at least two and as many as five different membership packages. To facilitate comparability, membership packages were categorised as either full memberships (i.e., tickets to all home games) or non-full memberships (tickets to some
home games). Full members accounted for 94.0% of questionnaire respondents in the Mystics context, 79.5% in the Blues context and 47.3% in the New Zealand Warriors context. It is important to note that just over a quarter of the New Zealand Warriors respondents (26.4%) were not current members of the New Zealand Warriors. This could be attributed to the fact that the email database used to disseminate the questionnaire was not the most current database.

Table 3
Membership Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Full Member</th>
<th>Non-Full Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blues</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Warriors</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mystics</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 303 61.0% 194 39.0%

4.2 Sponsor Awareness

A mean score measuring a member’s sponsorship awareness for each franchise was calculated. As noted earlier, a point was given for the correct identification of an official sponsor and the correct non-identification of a foil sponsor. With a maximum possible score of 12, overall sponsor awareness levels were quite high (M = 9.62, SD = 1.79). Of the three franchises, New Zealand Warriors respondents’ sponsor awareness was highest (M = 10.32, SD = 1.93). In contrast, Northern Mystics respondents had the lowest levels of sponsor awareness (M = 8.85, SD = 1.60, Table 10). The following section of the results is an in-depth presentation of correct identification of official sponsors and incorrect identification of foil sponsors in each of the three contexts.

4.2.1 Blues. NIB and Barfoot & Thompson (a focal sponsor for the subsequent phases of the research) had the highest percentage of official sponsor recognition in the Blues context, 87.4% and 81.9% respectively. Of the foil sponsors, ANZ had the
highest percentage of incorrect identification as an official sponsor of the Blues (7.1%, Table 4).

Table 4
Blues Sponsor Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIB*</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barfoot &amp; Thompson*</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKYCITY*</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNZ*</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westie Pies*</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speights*</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZ†</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray White†</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heineken†</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cross†</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton†</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ben Pies†</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Official Sponsor; †Foil Sponsor

4.2.2 New Zealand Warriors. Vodafone received the highest level of recognition amongst New Zealand Warriors fans (96.5%). Suzuki, a focal sponsor for the subsequent phases of the research, had the third highest recognition levels with 82.4%. Mai FM (16.9%) and Holden (12.1%) were the only foil sponsors to be incorrectly identified as sponsors by over 10% of participants (Table 5).
Table 5  
*New Zealand Warriors Sponsor Identification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vodafone*</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKYCITY*</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki*</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock*</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flava*</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westie Pies*</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mai FM†</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden†</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Beam†</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spark†</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ben Pies†</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton†</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Official Sponsor; †Foil Sponsor*

**4.2.3 Northern Mystics.** SKYCITY (96.4%) and Barfoot & Thompson (a focal sponsor for the subsequent phases of the research) (85.5%) received the highest levels of sponsor recognition in the Northern Mystics context. Surprisingly, only 12.7% of respondents identified Air New Zealand as the official sponsor that they are. Approximately one quarter of the Northern Mystics members incorrectly identified San Remo as an official sponsor (Table 6).
4.3 Loyalty, Attitudes and Intentions

Along with sponsor awareness - attitudinal loyalty, behavioural loyalty, attitudes towards the sponsor and sponsor purchase intentions were measured. Attitudes and intentions were measured in terms of the two focal research sponsors – Barfoot & Thompson and Suzuki that were applicable to each context. Table 7 outlines the results for each of the constructs in the three contexts and Table 10 outlines the results of the composite variables created, along with the combined results from all three contexts. Overall, participants in all three contexts reported a high level of intention to attend future games and this was indicated in the combined data (M = 6.12, SD = 1.62). The intention to recommend their teams games to others was also high in the combined data (M = 5.72, SD = 1.68). However, the New Zealand Warriors respondents indicated they were more likely to purchase team merchandise (M = 5.39, SD = 1.89) when compared to the respondents in the Northern Mystics context who reported the lowest intentions to purchase team merchandise (M = 3.18, SD = 2.59).
Across all three contexts attitudes towards the sponsor were similar. Blues (M = 4.62, SD = 1.38) showed the most positive attitudes towards the sponsor, followed by the New Zealand Warriors (M = 4.61, SD = 1.51) and the Northern Mystics showed the lowest least positive attitudes towards the sponsor (M = 4.44, SD = 1.58).

The descriptive statistics show that the Blues’ context respondents (M = 4.27, SD = 1.53) reported higher levels of purchase intentions for Barfoot & Thompson services, a sponsor of both the Blues and the Northern Mystics, in comparison to the New Zealand Warriors’ context respondents (M = 3.60, SD = 1.74), towards Suzuki. The Blues context respondents reported the highest likelihood to use the services of Barfoot & Thompson because they are a sponsor of the Blues (M= 4.02, SD = 1.83) and were also most likely to choose Barfoot & Thompson over its competitors (M = 4.13, SD = 1.75).

Of the three contexts the New Zealand Warriors fans showed the greatest levels of attitudinal loyalty (M = 5.74, SD = 1.58). However, they showed the lowest levels of sponsor purchase intentions (M = 3.60, SD = 1.74). Overall, in the combined data, it was established that the sample showed high levels of attitudinal loyalty (M = 5.57, SD = 1.51) but showed low levels of sponsor purchase intentions (M = 3.82, SD = 1.70, Table 10).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Blues</th>
<th>New Zealand Warriors</th>
<th>Northern Mystics</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal</td>
<td>I intend to attend future games of &lt;team name&gt;</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>I would likely recommend &lt;team name&gt; games to other people</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I intend to purchase merchandise of &lt;team name&gt;</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately how many &lt;team name&gt; games do you attend per season</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many &lt;team name&gt; games have you attended in this current season</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long have you held your current membership for &lt;brand category&gt;</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like the &lt;sponsor name&gt; brand</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Sponsor name&gt; brand is very good brand of &lt;brand category&gt;</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a favourable disposition towards &lt;sponsors name&gt; brand</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>I would buy/(sell) &lt;product category&gt; from &lt;sponsor name&gt;</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next time I buy /(sell) a &lt;product category&gt;, I would consider buying/(selling with) &lt;sponsor name&gt;</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The &lt;sponsor name&gt; sponsorship to &lt;team name&gt; makes me more likely to buy/(sell) &lt;product category&gt; from this brand</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would more likely buy/(sell) &lt;product category&gt; over its competitors</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the following sections of the results chapter, Barfoot and Thompson, in the Blues and Northern Mystics contexts, and Suzuki for the New Zealand Warriors context are central to measure of attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions constructs.

4.4 The Role of Membership

Table 8 presents the results of the independent means $t$-tests for full and non-full memberships across all three contexts (as well as the combined dataset). In the Blues context, there were two significant findings. The $t$-tests indicate that full members showed higher levels of behavioural loyalty ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.07$) than non-full members ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.97$). This was statistically significant ($t(118) = -2.22$, $p < .05$) and suggests that full members report more previous behaviours that show loyalty towards the Blues compared to non-full members. A similar result was found for the purchase intentions construct. Full members ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 1.50$) were more likely to report purchase intentions towards Barfoot and Thompson than non-full members ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.51$). This was also statistically significant ($t(125) = -2.68$, $p < .01$).

In the New Zealand Warriors context, there were four statistically significant findings. Full members ($M = 6.05$, $SD = 1.32$) reported higher levels of attitudinal loyalty towards the New Zealand Warriors than non-full members ($M = 5.46$, $SD = 1.74$). Full members are more likely to attend, recommend and purchase merchandise of the New Zealand Warriors than non-full members. These results were statistically significant ($t(311) = -3.36$, $p < .001$). Second, full members of the New Zealand Warriors ($M = 7.45$, $SD = 2.72$) showed higher levels of behavioural loyalty than non-full members ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 1.75$). This was also statistically significant ($t(292) = -20.36$, $p < .001$). Third, the New Zealand Warriors’ full members ($M = 10.91$, $SD = 1.68$) showed greater levels of sponsor awareness in comparison to non-full members ($M = 9.80$, $SD = 2.00$), which was statistically significant ($t(311) = -5.26$, $p < .001$).
Table 8

**Group Differences for Full Members and Non-Full Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Full Members</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Full Members</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>-2.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-2.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand Warriors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-3.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-20.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-5.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-2.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Mystics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-1.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-3.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-15.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>-2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-2.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-2.89**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .05 ; **p < .01; *** p < .001

In the Northern Mystics context, both attitudinal loyalty and behavioural loyalty were significantly different between full members and non-full members. Full members (M = 4.94, SD = 1.44) showed greater levels of attitudinal loyalty than non-full members (M = 3.22, SD = 2.17). The independent means t-test was statistically significant (t(53) = -1.97, p < .05). This indicates that full members are more likely to attend, recommend and purchase merchandise of the Northern Mystics than non-full members. Similarly, a mean difference was found between members and non-full members for behavioural loyalty. Full members (M = 4.63, SD = 0.92) showed greater levels of behavioural loyalty than non-full members (M = 2.56, SD = 1.58). The independent t-test was statistically significant (t(49) = -3.65, p < .001).
In the combined data, the differences were statistically significant between full members and non-full members for all four constructs. The greatest means difference between full members and non-full members was found for behavioural loyalty. Full members (M = 5.83, SD = 2.63) are more likely to show greater levels of behavioural loyalty than non-full members (M = 2.23, SD = 1.71), this was statistically significant (t(463) = -15.98, p < .01). Full members showed a slightly greater means difference with regard to sponsor awareness. Full members (M = 9.76, SD = 1.82) were able to correctly identify official sponsors and foil sponsors than non-full members (M = 9.41, SD = 1.73). This was statistically significant (t(493) = 2.17, p < .05). Overall, full-members showed higher mean scores than non-full members in all contexts for all constructs except for non-members of the Blues who showed slightly greater levels of sponsor awareness.

4.5 The Role of Gender

Table 9 is the results of the independent means t-tests for males and females across all three contexts, as well as the combined dataset. No significant differences were evident for any of the measures in the individual contexts. However, when the data was combined, behavioural loyalty was significantly higher (t(463) = -2.15, p < .05) for females (M = 4.77, SD = 2.95) than males (M = 4.19, SD = 2.89). Of the remaining statistically insignificant gender-based construct differences, the largest difference anecdotally noted was between males (M = 9.04, SD = 1.61) and females (M = 9.65, SD = 1.33) on the correct identification of sponsors.
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>101 5.44 1.24</td>
<td>26 5.68 1.21</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>96 3.66 1.33</td>
<td>24 4.11 1.3</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>101 9.04 1.61</td>
<td>26 9.65 1.33</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>101 4.53 1.40</td>
<td>26 4.96 1.25</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>101 4.20 1.53</td>
<td>26 4.56 1.54</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand Warriors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>175 5.73 1.53</td>
<td>138 5.75 1.64</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>166 4.44 3.50</td>
<td>128 4.99 3.57</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>175 10.15 2.03</td>
<td>138 10.54 1.79</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>175 4.55 1.50</td>
<td>138 4.69 1.53</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>175 3.58 1.77</td>
<td>138 3.62 1.71</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Mystics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>4 4.92 1.69</td>
<td>51 4.84 1.52</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>4 4.08 0.74</td>
<td>47 4.54 1.08</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>4 8.75 0.96</td>
<td>51 8.86 1.65</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>4 4.08 1.71</td>
<td>51 4.47 1.58</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>4 3.75 2.22</td>
<td>51 4.05 1.56</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>280 5.61 1.44</td>
<td>215 5.53 1.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>266 4.19 2.89</td>
<td>199 4.77 2.95</td>
<td>-2.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>280 9.52 1.82</td>
<td>215 9.76 1.75</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>280 4.54 1.46</td>
<td>215 4.67 1.51</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>280 3.81 1.71</td>
<td>215 3.83 1.68</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .05 ; **p < .01; *** p < .001

4.6 Relationships amongst the Constructs

Table 10 outlines correlations between the constructs of interest for each of the three contexts. Correlations were also computed for the combined sample.

In the Blues’ context, significant correlations were found between three pairs of variables. The strongest significant correlation was between attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions ($r = 0.85, p < .001$). This is considered a strong effect. Significant correlations were also found between attitudes towards the sponsor ($r = 0.36, p < .001$) and attitudinal loyalty, as well as purchase intentions ($r = 0.33, p < .001$) and attitudinal loyalty. Both of these are considered weak effects.

For the New Zealand Warriors, the only correlations that were not found to be significant were the correlations between purchase intentions and attitudinal loyalty and
between purchase intentions and sponsor awareness. The strongest correlation in this context was between attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions \((r = 0.57, p < .001)\) which is a moderate effect. Both attitudinal \((r = 0.26, p < .001)\) and behavioural loyalty \((r = 0.30, p < .001)\) had significant positive correlations with sponsor awareness. For both these correlations the effect was considered weak.

For the Northern Mystics, a strong correlation was found between attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions \((r = 0.81, p < .001)\). It was also found through the correlation analysis that attitudinal loyalty was positively and significantly related to both attitudes towards the sponsor \((r = 0.45, p < .001)\) and purchase intentions \((r = 0.43, p < .001)\). Both of these correlations were relatively weak.

In the combined data, the only relationship that was not significant was between sponsor awareness and purchase intentions. All relationships except the relationship between attitudes towards the sponsor and sponsor awareness, the relationship between purchase intentions and attitudinal loyalty, and the relationship between purchase intentions and behavioural loyalty had significance levels less than .001. Much like the three contexts, the largest correlation was a moderate effect found between attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions \((r = 0.65, p < .001)\).
Table 10  
Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlation Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand Warriors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Mystics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioural Loyalty</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sponsor Awareness</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attitudes towards the Sponsor</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore sport sponsorship in a New Zealand context. More specifically, the aim was to explore (i) sponsor awareness within the contexts of three elite sport franchises; (ii) any sponsor awareness differences across the three contexts; (iii) any attitude or behaviour differences between full members and non-full members (iv) any attitude or behaviour differences between males and females; and (v) the relationships amongst loyalty, awareness, attitudes and intentions. Overall, the study generated evidence of high levels of sponsor awareness across the three contexts and many positive correlations amongst the constructs of interest.

This section of the dissertation is a discussion of many of the results presented in the previous chapter. The discussion section largely follows the format of the results section in that it is organised around the five research questions. Results relating to sponsor awareness are discussed first. Next, membership-based and gender-based group differences are discussed and finally the analysis exploring relationships amongst the constructs are discussed. The sponsor awareness section involves the six official sponsors and six foil sponsors in all three contexts. In the membership, gender and construct relationships sections, Barfoot and Thompson for the Blues and Northern Mystics contexts, and Suzuki, for the New Zealand Warriors context feature as focal sponsors. The chapter closes with an acknowledgement of limitations of the research, a provision of managerial implications and ideas for future research.

5.1 Sponsor Awareness

The level of correct and incorrect sponsor identification is one of the most fundamental aspects of this research and thus this section of the discussion will explore RQ1. In two out of the three contexts the percentage of respondents incorrectly identifying a foil sponsor, was lower than the lowest percentage of correct sponsor identification. The number of sponsors identified in this study were significantly higher than that of the
Biscaia et al. (2013) study. In all three contexts, questionnaire respondents were extremely accurate in their identification of sponsors. However, the rate of correct official sponsor identification was very high for the sponsors who appeared prominently on the playing apparel of each of the three contexts (Biscaia et al., 2014). The high levels of sponsor awareness found by of Bennett, Cunningham, and Dees (2006), Biscaia et al. (2014) and Lough, Pharr, and Owen (2014, Table 11) is consistent with the findings of this research. The top three most identified official sponsors in the studies ranged from 73.6% to 100% compared to 63.6% to 96.5% in this research. The findings of all three studies aforementioned along with the current study are comparable because they studied individuals who were either spectators of a sports event or team (Bennett et al., 2006; Biscaia et al., 2014, Current Study) or participants of an event (Lough et al., 2014). As the samples were comparable it provides support for the notion that the more exposed an individual is with the sport the more likely they are to identify sponsors correctly (Lee et al., 2010; Levin et al., 2001; Maxwell & Lough, 2009; Walraven et al., 2014).

In contrast, the findings of this research are contrary to those of Bennett, Henson, and Zhang (2002) in which the most recognised official sponsor was only identified by 49% of the sample. This finding can be attributed to the study using secondary and tertiary students as a sample and the study was focussed on sponsors of a major event rather than that of a team. A similar low level of sponsor identification was found in the study of Hickman (2015) who studied the general population within the metropolitan area of an NFL team. These findings would suggest that to ascertain true levels of sponsor awareness samples should be used relevant to the product. Therefore, ascertaining levels of sponsor awareness from the general populous does not provide rich information for the sponsor nor the literature.
It has been noted that when teams are successful fans are more likely to be distracted from the messages of the sponsors and thus have lower levels of sponsor identification (Walraven et al., 2014). All three teams had a winning percentage of less than 50% prior to the dissemination of the questionnaires. This study provides empirical evidence which supports the notion that sponsor awareness could be higher for teams that are not performing well. This study would suggest that fans are no longer interested in the efforts of the team when they are losing and absorb more peripheral information leading to increased sponsor awareness.

Table 11
Sponsor Identification Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Mean % of top 3 sponsors</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biscaia et al. (2014)</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>Spectators of Lisbon based football team (Portugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Cunningham, and Dees (2006)</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>Spectators of a men’s tennis tournament (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>Fans of three elite sports franchises (New Zealand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough et al. (2014)</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>Participants of a Marathon (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hickman, 2015)</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>General population within the metropolitan area of an NFL team (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett et al. (2002)</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>Action Sports event (USA) – Secondary and Tertiary students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although most commonly used for venues and stadia sponsorship, the popularity of selling team naming rights is increasing. The naming rights sponsor also typically features prominently on the front of the playing apparel. A prominent naming rights sponsor was the case for two of the three contexts in this study – the Vodafone Warriors and the SKYCITY Northern Mystics. Both Vodafone and SKYCITY received the highest level of identification compared to other sponsors. This finding is consistent with the work of scholars such as Dekhil (2010) and Quester (1997) who suggest that naming rights sponsors enjoy higher levels of sponsor identification. Therefore, a sponsor investing more money for naming rights can lead to increased sponsor
awareness. For the New Zealand Warriors, the team is often not referred to as the New Zealand Warriors or the Warriors but as the Vodafone Warriors. The Vodafone name and logo are presented to fans ubiquitously on signage, websites and social media profiles.

Although anecdotally known by many, it is interesting to report that the top two correctly identified sponsors from each context were the sponsors who appeared most prominently on the playing apparel of all three teams. This suggests that paying the extra money to be a top tier sponsor, rather than a second tier sponsor, can help increase brand awareness amongst spectators of the sports teams (Biscaia et al., 2014; Jensen & Cobbs, 2014). Thus, fans usually pay more attention to the sponsor that is presented on the playing apparel of their favourite team (Gilaninia, Mousavain, & Rezvani, 2011). This empirical evidence in the New Zealand sporting landscape is consistent with the findings of Jensen and Cobbs (2014) who posited that paying extra for top tier sponsorship in Formula One racing allowed sponsors to gain maximum return on investment. In all three contexts the sponsors who appeared most prominently on the front of the playing apparel (NIB – Blues, Vodafone – New Zealand Warriors and SKYCITY – Northern Mystics) achieved the greatest level of sponsor identification. This finding is noteworthy for Barfoot & Thompson as they were the second most identified correct sponsor for the Blues and the Northern Mystics. The investment made by Barfoot & Thompson to be a sponsor that features prominently on the playing apparel of both the Blues (top back of jersey) and the Northern Mystics (bottom back of dress) may therefore be justifiable.

Suzuki feature on the playing apparel of the New Zealand Warriors but it is on the back of the shorts not on the front of the playing jersey. Generally, the back of players’ shorts do not feature frequently on television and it can be more difficult to identify sponsors that are presented on this part of the playing apparel. This may explain
why Suzuki was the third most identified official sponsor following Vodafone and SKYCITY, who occupy prominent positions on the front and back of the New Zealand Warriors jerseys. Suzuki was correctly identified more than Woodstock Bourbon and Cola, who’s logo appears on the sleeve of the New Zealand Warriors playing jersey. This is an interesting finding as Independent Liquor, the parent company of Woodstock, acquired rights to be the sole alcohol supplier at all New Zealand Warriors home games since 2015 (New Zealand Warriors, 2014). This type of leveraging and activation strategy is used by many different food and beverage sponsors of sport. Spectators are obligated to consume these product and it may lead to increased brand awareness and the increased likelihood of selecting their brand in other environments (Jalleh et al., 2002). This is consistent with the finding of Quester (1997) which found that Balfours, a pie company, became sole pie supplier of the 1993 Australian Grand Prix and achieved increased brand awareness compared to previous events as they were available at and around the event.

In the Blues context, the finding of ANZ being the most identified foil sponsor was noteworthy. BNZ, another bank with a similar name, have decreased their sponsorship arrangement with the Blues this year, but have been a major sponsor of all five Super Rugby franchises since 2010 (Cleaver, 2009). Therefore, incorrect identification of ANZ as a sponsor, may be due to brand confusion. A lack of cognitive application or concentration from questionnaire respondents may explain the confusion, but there are implications for the banks themselves to work hard at differentiating themselves from competitors with similar sounding brand names that may cause brand confusion (Howard, Kerin, & Gengler, 2000).

In the New Zealand Warriors context, confusion of Mai FM as an official sponsor was also apparent. Both Flava and Mai FM are national radio stations that specifically play Hip Hop and RnB music (Mediaworks, n.d.; New Zealand Media and
Entertainment, 2015). Although in this case the competitors don’t have similar sounding names, respondents in the New Zealand Warriors context may have confused Mai FM for Flava as their offerings are widely known to be very similar, even among those who aren’t listeners of either station.

Air New Zealand had the lowest level of sponsor identification among the respondents in the Northern Mystics context. Air New Zealand have been a sponsor of the Northern Mystics for four years and their level of sponsorship has not changed over this period of time. This would suggest that Air New Zealand have not leveraged their sponsorship of the Northern Mystics as it is not listed on their website under the entities they sponsor, which is in contrast to their sponsorship of New Zealand Rugby and the All Blacks which is heavily leveraged. Low sponsor identification and a lack of apparent leveraging is consistent with the findings of Eagleman and Krohn (2012), Fransen et al. (2013) and Herrmann, Kacha, and Derbaix (2016) who found that fans who are presented with sponsor activations are more likely to correctly identify them as a sponsor.

In the Northern Mystics context, another noteworthy result was the incorrect identification of San Remo as a sponsor which raises the issue of sponsor confusion within a sport community and the potential impact on sponsorship awareness. In this case, Delmaine, a competitor of San Remo, is the Mystic’s official sponsor. San Remo is a sponsor of the competition the Northern Mystics compete in, the Trans-Tasman Netball Championships (ANZ Championship, 2016), and has been since 2008 (Bowling, 2013). San Remo’s ANZ Championship presence could explain why members of the Northern Mystics may have confused San Remo as an official sponsor. San Remo are also a long-term sponsor of the Australian Diamonds, the national netball team of Australia (Bowling, 2013) which has strengthened the brand’s netball presence even further. Therefore, fans of the Northern Mystics, who are likely to be fans of the
Silver Ferns (the New Zealand national netball team) as well, would have even further exposure to the San Remo brand, in the wider netball community.

The low recognition of Delmaine as a sponsor of the Mystics raises again the issue of effective activation. Of the three contexts, Mystics respondents reported the highest frequency of attendance, which leads to more exposure to sponsor activation and therefore also impacts sponsor recognition (Cornwell et al., 1997). While in attendance, Mystics fans would have seen San Remo branding appearing prominently on LED advertising displays around the court which constitutes effective leveraging by a competitor and which may have led to confusion. This notion is supported by Breuer and Rumpf (2011) who posited that for every second of a sponsor’s logo being televised the likelihood of a fan memorising the sponsor was enhanced.

The misidentification of San Remo as a Mystics sponsor in this study also brings to the forefront potential differences between recall and recognition methods of testing sponsor awareness. Field sponsorship (or in this case, San Remo’s similar LED displays) can leave superficial memory traces of the sponsor that can resurfaced in subsequent recognition tests (Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001). Low levels of recognition for Delmaine may also be explained by the fact that this season was their first sponsoring the Northern Mystics (Walraven et al., 2014).

Contrasting evidence emerged from the New Zealand Warriors context on the issue of within-community sponsor confusion. Suzuki, an official Warriors sponsor, had a higher rate of identification than Holden - a within-community foil sponsor and competitor. Holden took over as an NRL sponsors from Toyota in 2013 by obtaining the naming rights to the State of Origin series, the Kangaroos (Australian national rugby league team) and the U20’s premiership (Dowling, 2013). In contrast to Delmaine in the Mystics’ context, who were unsuccessful in fostering greater sponsor identification than their within-community competition sponsor San Remo, Suzuki were able to
resoundingly generate higher sponsor identification than Holden. This could be due to the multi-faceted leveraging strategy that Suzuki implement for their sponsorship. A more comprehensive sponsee website presence is one aspect of Suzuki’s leveraging strategy. This is in line with the findings of Eagleman and Krohn (2012) who found that consumers of Mag 7 racing showed greater levels of correct sponsor identification in conjunction with sponsee website leveraging. Evidence was found through this project supporting the conclusion that sponsors who leverage and activate their sponsorship effectively enjoy greater sponsor recognition that those who don’t (Miloch & Lambrecht, 2006).

An interesting result from the research was the poor performance of Westie Pies as a sponsor for both the Blues and New Zealand Warriors contexts. In each context Westie Pies had the lowest level of identification as an official sponsor with results of 30.7% and 32.6% respectively. This may be explained by the fact that they aren’t a top tier sponsor and are not on the playing apparel of either team. Westie Pies can be described as development sponsor who focus their resources on development teams rather than the main team in each context. They are sponsors of the Blues Under 20’s team, Intrust Super Premiership and Under 20’s side of the New Zealand Warriors. Westie Pies have therefore possibly undertaken their sponsorship for community involvement reasons (Cornwell et al., 1997) rather than to generate mass exposure and market penetration. Therefore, parents, fans and spectators of development teams of both organisations may well be more aware of the sponsorship, than those who participated in the research. Furthermore, it was also posited by Walraven et al. (2014) that a sponsorship attracts greatest levels of awareness in the second year of their sponsorship agreement. In the case of Westie Pies this is the second year they have been involved with the Blues but due to the community related objectives alluded to above, the organisation may be on a slower pathway to increased sponsorship awareness.
5.2. Loyalty, Attitudes and Intentions

In this section, discussion about loyalty is focussed on the team. Whereas, attitudes and intentions are focussed upon the focal sponsors of this study. This section will explore RQ2. Out of the three contexts, New Zealand Warriors fans reported the highest levels of attitudinal loyalty (operationalised as team related purchase intentions) and were most likely to purchase merchandise of the team they support, and the Northern Mystics the least likely. Another factor that can be attributed to this finding is the range of merchandise offered by both the teams. The New Zealand Warriors, much like the other NRL teams, have an extensive range of merchandise available to their fans. Individuals may report higher levels of aspects within attitudinal loyalty, such as intending to purchase merchandise, because they may want to purchase merchandise at a later date instead of indicating their true intentions at the time of questioning (Carson, Flores, & Meade, 2001). In comparison, the Northern Mystics online merchandise store only has 16 items available to purchase (Sports Technology Group, n.d.). The actions of the marketing team of the Northern Mystics can be attributed to the low levels of intentions to purchase merchandise. This finding would suggest that the larger the range of merchandise offered to fans the more likely fans are to show intentions to purchase merchandise.

Attitudes towards the sponsor in all three contexts were generally neutral, which was confirmed by the combined data. Which was in stark contrast to the findings of Biscaia et al. (2013), which demonstrated increased positive attitudes towards the sponsor. The findings of this study were interesting as both Barfoot & Thompson (20 years for the Blues and 9 years for the Northern Mystics) and Suzuki (10 years for the New Zealand Warriors) have been sponsors of their respective teams for a long period of time. The findings of this study challenges the findings of (Levin et al., 2001) who found that increased exposure to sponsors fostered positive attitudes towards the
sponsor. With both organisations having sponsored their respective teams for at least nine years it would be fair to assume that fans would have been exposed to the sponsor for extended periods of time. However, this could be explained as the combined data presented that the members within the sample had not been members for a very long period of time. Behavioural loyalty is an antecedent of attitudes towards the sponsor through repeated attendance of home games and association with the team (Koronios et al., 2016; Nassis et al., 2014).

Purchase intentions although not the same as purchase behaviours, is an effective proxy, and provides an indication of a consumers’ future purchases. Purchase intentions are one’s conscious plan to exert effort or carry out a behaviour (Chen & Zhang, 2011; Spears & Singh, 2004). In the case of this study Barfoot & Thompson sponsored teams, the Blues and the Northern Mystics, showed significantly higher purchase intentions than the team sponsored by Suzuki, the New Zealand Warriors. This finding could be attributed to the current housing market in Auckland where prices are increasing exponentially. Therefore, purchase intentions for Barfoot & Thompson were higher compared to Suzuki, as vehicles depreciate over time. As both sponsors products are high involvement (purchasing cars and selling homes) the findings of this research are not consistent with Meenaghan (2001), who suggested that purchase intentions of low involvement products were mostly followed through upon. In contrast, he was able to posit that for high involvement products, such as a car, respondents showed a positive disposition towards the sponsor however no purchases were made because of the sponsorship.

5.3 The Role of Membership
The results of independent $t$-tests indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between full members and non-full members which helps the exploration of RQ3. A statistically significant means difference was found for the Blues for purchase intentions towards their sponsor, Barfoot & Thompson. Barfoot & Thompson have been a sponsor of the Blues since their inaugural season in 1996. Therefore, the stronger purchase intentions of members in this context could be explained by feelings of gratitude towards the sponsor as a result of this long standing association (Choi et al., 2011; Madrigal, 2001; Meenaghan, 2001). Another factor may be that full members’ have greater exposure to Barfoot & Thompson’s leveraging activities game after game, compared to non-full members (Hong, 2011) who attend less fixtures. It is also important to consider that this report of stronger purchase intent may also be attributed to the notion that members of elite sports teams have high levels of involvement with the team (Maxwell & Lough, 2009) and are therefore the most likely to develop positive attitudes towards the sponsor and ultimately purchase intentions (Hong, 2011). Another plausible explanation for the heightened purchase intentions of members relates to the performance of the team which has been shown to be less important for members than casual fans (Ngan et al., 2011).

Although attitudes toward the sponsors were different between members and non-full members in the New Zealand Warriors context, the difference was minimal. An explanation for this may come from Social Identity Theory which suggests that individuals choose to hold positive associations towards the sponsors to feel accepted amongst members (Bee & Dalakas, 2013; Bennett, 1999). Therefore, both full members and non-full members may report similarly positive attitudes towards the sponsor in an effort to portray or forge a positive association with the fan group (Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Kim, Ko, et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2015; Koo et al., 2006; Roy & Cornwell, 2004; Tribou, 2011).
In two out of the three contexts there was a large difference in behavioural loyalty between full members and non-full members. This finding was supported by a large means difference between full members and non-full members in the combined data. This provides empirical evidence to support the assumption that full members are individuals who are most committed to their team. Mahony et al. (2000) noted that individuals who have high levels of behavioural loyalty can sometimes be due to socialising agents. This can include being given free tickets or attending because of peers or other environmental factors rather than to support the team itself. Full members in the combined sample reported an increased level of behavioural loyalty, so they are likely to illicit high levels of both attitudinal and behavioural loyalty as outlined by Day (1969) and are unlikely to alter their behaviour or commitment towards the team (Park & Kim, 2000).

In two of the three contexts, full members who had a means difference were better at identifying official sponsors and foil sponsors correctly in comparison to non-full members. This was especially true in the New Zealand Warriors context where a very pronounced difference was noted. This is perhaps attributable to the fact that just over 50% of the non-full members in the New Zealand Warriors context were not members of the New Zealand Warriors at all. Full-members – those that attend most games - have been shown in many previous studies, to have higher correct sponsor recognition levels (Biscaia et al., 2014; Cornwell et al., 1997; Dekhil, 2010; Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001; Lee et al., 2011; Levin et al., 2001; Maxwell & Lough, 2009; McAlister et al., 2012). This finding was also present in the Northern Mystics contexts and across the three contexts when combined, although not to the extent that was reported among New Zealand Warriors context respondents.

5.4 The Role of Gender
In the combined data, it was found that females reported higher levels of behavioural loyalty than males, helping explore RQ4. This finding is consistent with much of the loyalty literature but adds to the body of knowledge in sport specific contexts. Mahony et al. (2000) posited that individuals may show high levels of behavioural loyalty because of socialising agents. Socialising agents such as peers, the venue, and the concessions offered could be a reasoning for their previous behaviours. In this study, where a slight majority of the respondents were males it could be deduced that the females that did report high levels of behavioural loyalty may have done so because of the association their partner may have with the team.

Although, not found to be statistically significant in all three contexts and in the combined sample females showed slightly higher levels of sponsor awareness than their male counterparts. As noted earlier, females may be attending fixtures, especially in the Blues and New Zealand Warriors contexts because of their partners, peers or other socialising agents rather than attending for the on-field action. This may also explain the slightly higher levels of sponsor awareness. Females may absorb more of the information around the venue than their male counterparts who could be more focused on the game itself. However, this rationale seems inapplicable in the Northern Mystics context as netball fans (including the participants in this research) were predominantly female. Previous literature suggests that men identify sponsors more accurately than females (Walraven et al., 2014) so this finding raises questions about the role of gender in terms of sport sponsor awareness.

There were no other significant differences on the constructs of interest between men and women. This finding challenges traditional beliefs about segmenting sport fan markets based on gender. Traditionally, rugby and rugby league are targeted towards males and netball is targeted towards females. However, the findings of this study
suggest that the target markets for all three sports may not be defined by gender and that it may be wise to consider gender-neutral marketing tactics.

5.5 Relationships amongst the Constructs

One of the objectives of this research project was to explore the relationships between loyalty, attitudes toward the sponsor, sponsor awareness and purchase intentions. Correlations were run to test the relationships. Compared to the New Zealand Warriors and Northern Mystics data, the correlation between sponsor awareness and attitudes towards Barfoot & Thompson in the Blues’ data was slightly smaller and was insignificant. Zaharia et al. (2016) found that sponsor awareness is not necessarily linked to positive attitudes towards the sponsor. The finding of this study and that of Zaharia et al. (2016) would suggest that with increased levels of sponsors awareness derived through apparel, field and television, sponsorship cannot be solely relied upon to ascertain positive attitudes towards the sponsor.

In the New Zealand Warriors context, sponsor awareness was not related to an intent to purchase Suzuki vehicles. That finding differs from conclusions drawn by other scholars that sponsor awareness is an integral part of the development of purchase intentions (Barros & Silvestre, 2006). The literature suggests that if an individual is not aware of the sponsor, they are unable to create brand associations and thus purchase intentions are unlikely to be formed (Bauer et al., 2008; Kuzma et al., 2003). In this study, New Zealand Warriors respondents had the highest mean score of official sponsors correctly identified and foil sponsors not identified, which included Suzuki. Although respondents were aware of Suzuki’s sponsorship, it did not translate into purchase intentions as one may have expected. At least one recent study found that sponsor awareness was not a significant indicator of purchase intentions (Zaharia et al., 2016) so perhaps it can be deduced that the link between these two constructs has become increasingly tenuous. Sponsors may well have to do more than just activate
logos within a fan community in an effort to generate sponsor awareness and other downstream marketing outcomes like purchase intentions.

In the Northern Mystics context, the relationship between attitudinal loyalty and both attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions was noteworthy. A relationship between attitudinal loyalty and attitudes towards the sponsor presupposes that the relationship between the fan and the sport property can be an indicator of the attitude towards a sponsor (Kim, Ko, et al., 2011). Therefore the more a fan is involved with the team, the higher the likelihood that they will have positive attitudes towards the sponsor (Dees et al., 2008; Degaris, 2015; Levin et al., 2001; Meenaghan, 2001). A fan who is loyal to their team and is likely to be loyal in the future could repay the sponsor because of a sense of gratitude for supporting the team that he or she is loyal to (Bergkvist, 2012; Choi et al., 2011; Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Kim, Ko, et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2015; Meenaghan, 2001). Barfoot & Thompson have been a sponsor of the Northern Mystics for nine years and 96% of the respondents in the Mystics’ sample were full members, so it is perhaps unsurprising that strong relationships were uncovered among loyalty, attitudes and purchase intentions.

Respondents in the context of the two teams that are sponsored by Barfoot & Thompson, had a stronger correlation between attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions in comparison to those in the Suzuki/New Zealand Warriors context. Although there is plenty of evidence in the literature that attitudes towards the sponsor are related to purchase intentions (Kim, Ko, et al., 2011; Madrigal, 2001; Nassis et al., 2014; Pak et al., 2011), little is known about any variations in the strength of that relationship or what fan characteristics may be related to that variation. Barfoot & Thompson do not only sponsor elite sporting organisations but they also sponsor non-profit/grassroots sport organisations such as college rugby, regional referee organisations and regional sport organisations. Therefore, it stands to reason that the
presence of Barfoot & Thompson’s sponsorship at a grassroots level, where many of the fans of the Blues and Northern Mystics may be deeply rooted, could possibly be the comparative strength of the relationship between attitudes and purchase intentions. Suzuki’s suite of sport sponsorship is focused on elite sporting contexts where positive attitudes may exist, but the intention to purchase sponsors’ products in the spirit of reciprocation may be less pronounced than in conjunction with the community focus espoused by Barfoot & Thompson.

The TPB can be drawn upon to emphasise the importance of the attitude-intention relationship observed in this study. The TPB suggests that an individual’s attitude towards an object, is an antecedent of behavioural intentions (Ajzen, 1991). Positive attitudes towards a sponsor is known to be an important factor that can influence consumer purchase intentions which can invariably lead to purchase behaviours (Ajzen, 2001; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). The TPB, and the results of this study reinforce the fact that sponsors should focus on engendering positive attitudes towards their brand through sponsorship activity, as purchase intentions can result. Another strategy sponsors can use to foster positive attitudes towards their brand is to align themselves with a sport entity’s fan base that has enduringly positive views towards the team. A schematic linkage may mean that positive images or meanings held towards the sponsee are passed on to the sponsor (Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Degaris, 2015; Kim et al., 2015; Koo et al., 2006; Roy & Cornwell, 2004; Tribou, 2011).

Exploration of RQ5 was able to confirm that interrelationships amongst the five constructs of interest do exist.

5.6 Limitations

One limitation of this study is the sample size. The Northern Mystics’ sample was smaller than the others and this limited the analyses that could be done, particularly those comparing results in the three contexts. Furthermore, full members and females
were disproportionately represented in the Northern Mystics sample meaning that it may not have been representative of the whole Northern Mystics fan base. using a nonprobability sampling technique such as convenience sampling can mean that it is not appropriate to generalise the findings of the study for the whole population (de Leeuw, Hox, & Dillman; 2008). A stratified random sampling method would have made for a more rigorous research design. Stratified random sampling ensures that different groups within the population are sampled and represented in subsequent analyses (Gray, 2009). This method would not have only allowed for a more stringent analysis of gender but also age and membership types.

An online questionnaire using the web based application Qualtrics was chosen as the data collection procedure. Although using an online questionnaire was the most efficient and cost effective (Mesch, 2012) method of disseminating the questionnaire there are some associated limitations. Limitations of using an online questionnaire can include low response rates and higher coverage errors where there is no control over who completes the questionnaire (Anfreda & Vehovar, 2008). Using an online questionnaire may have been the reason why sponsor identification levels were so high. It may be that some respondents answered the questionnaire untruthfully by undertaking their own information search for the correct sponsors in answer to awareness queries.

Like this study, many sport consumer behaviour research projects published in the leading sport management journals are cross-sectional in nature. A cross-sectional study allows for data to be collected only at one period in time rather than undertaking multiple data collections at different time points. Studies with multiple sets of data collection at different points in time can lead to a more rigorous analysis of constructs and ideas (Funk, Lock, Karg, & Pritchard, 2016). Cross-sectional studies can potentially be effected by social desirability and demand effect bias (Herrmann et al., 2016). The low levels of purchase intentions that were reported in this study may be attributable to
the cross-sectional design. Data was collected early in each of the three seasons, so ongoing sponsor activation throughout the season may have increased purchase intentions if they were queried later on (Lings & Owen, 2007; Ngan et al., 2011). In the Northern Mystics context for example, respondents may have reported greater levels of sponsor awareness later towards first year sponsor Delmaine as the fans become more acquainted with the brand later in the season.

Socio-economic factors could be attributed to specific findings within this study however, socioeconomic data was not collected. An individual’s race, income and education are socio-economic factors that are usually used to segment the market. Although race is not a determinant of purchase intentions, ascertaining information regarding income and education would have been insightful for drawing conclusions. Higher educated individuals show greater levels of purchase intentions (Slama & Tashchian, 1985), whereas low income individuals are likely to show lower levels of purchase intentions in comparison to higher income individuals (Claxton, Fry, & Portis, 1974). As this study measures the outcome of sponsorship awareness through purchase intentions these insights would have helped expand the knowledge within the sport sponsorship literature drawing from marketing scholars.

5.7 Managerial Implications

The first aspect of this study was focussed on sponsor awareness in the three contexts. It was evident that in all three contexts naming rights and prominent apparel sponsors received the greatest levels of sponsorship awareness. This would suggest that organisations who are new to their industry and are using sponsorship as a marketing tool should carefully consider increasing their budget to gain access to prominent playing apparel activation opportunities.

For sport managers it is important to no longer assume that men are more likely to demonstrate loyalty towards the team. In this study evidence emerged that females
were in fact more loyal than males in several cases. This would suggest that sport marketers should consider the spectator market as more homogenous than conventional wisdom might suggest.

The results of this study reinforce the notion that the most important indicator of purchase intentions are positive attitudes towards the sponsor. There are many ways in which positive attitudes can be formed towards a sponsor. However, one of the most important managerial implications of this study is that organisations sponsoring sport for the first time must carefully seek out a sports property whose fans are committed and loyal towards their team as this could be transferred to the sponsor and can lead to positive outcomes.

5.8 Directions for Future Research

The model in this study could be more rigorously analysed using factor analysis and structural equation modelling (SEM). Furthermore, if the Northern Mystics sample was larger, it would have facilitated a more robust comparison of one sponsor in two sport contexts as had been intended. A fourth professional franchise also dropped out of the study which again limited the quality of the comparative analysis. Therefore, scholars ought to carefully consider how to secure access to fans in multiple contexts that would facilitate this kind of cross-context comparison.

Another direction for future research would be to further explore the behavioural and attitudinal loyalty constructs in the context of sponsorship. This could be done by fans who are out of the Auckland area. Although these fans are rarely physically present at the home stadium, their loyalty should nonetheless be of interest to both the Warriors and their sponsors. This kind of inquiry would add another important layer to our understanding of loyalty and sponsorship because many sponsors service regions in outlying areas where loyal out-of-town fans may reside and purchase sponsor products.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

In this study sport sponsorship research questions were presented, explored and discussed in the context of three elite sport franchises in Auckland, New Zealand. The dissertation will conclude with a brief summary of the results.

6.1 Sponsor Awareness

Across the three contexts sponsor awareness levels were high. This finding was consistent with comparable research including Bennett, Cunningham, and Dees (2006), Biscaia et al. (2014) and Lough, Pharr, and Owen (2014). Sponsors awareness was higher in the current research of mostly members and fans than that reported by Hickman (2015) and Bennett et al. (2002) who used samples more representative of a general population. Although intuitive, the finding is helpful in confirming the importance of members in the context of sport sponsorship.

Results of the study led to the suggestion that sponsorship arrangements including prominent playing kit activations ought to be a priority. This study has generated evidence consistent with Biscaia et al. (2014), Dekhil (2010), Gilaninia et al. (2011), Maxwell and Lough (2009) and Quester (1997) that undertaking such sponsorship strategies may be linked to higher levels of sponsor recall in comparison to lower tiered sponsors with less comprehensive activation (Jensen & Cobbs, 2014). This finding suggests that sponsorship managers should aim to attain prominent sponsorships that include brand placement upon the playing apparel or within the team name of the sponee.

As expected, contextual differences emerged from this study related to sponsorship awareness. A couple of noteworthy findings that were outlined in the discussion section were the low levels of sponsor identification for Westie Pies in the Blues and New Zealand Warriors contexts, and Air New Zealand for the Northern Mystics. Westie Pies sponsorship outcomes may have been more community oriented.
Westie Pies sponsor development teams of both organisations and run activations that can help individuals win money for their school or sports club. For Air New Zealand, it can be surmised that their lack of leveraging strategies undertaken within the Northern Mystics contexts could explain low levels of identification (Eagleman & Krohn, 2012).

Brand confusion was apparent in the Blues and New Zealand Warriors contexts which may explain sponsor awareness nuances. Some Blues fans suggested that ANZ was a sponsor when the correct sponsor was BNZ. In the New Zealand Warriors context, some fans indicated that Mai FM was a sponsor of the New Zealand Warriors when in fact Flava was the official sponsor. It may be that similarity between the two radio stations led to brand confusion in this instance. Suzuki, in the New Zealand Warriors context, were able to hold off their competitor and within-community sponsor, Holden, effectively in terms of sponsor identification while in comparison Delmaine, in the Northern Mystics context, did not appear to hold off San Remo as effectively.

6.2 Loyalty, Attitudes and Intentions

Overall, respondents across the three contexts reported high levels of attitudinal loyalty, indifferent levels of attitudes towards the sponsor and low levels of purchase intentions. The high levels of attitudinal loyalty bode well for the fan base of each of the three contexts. It suggests that the sample is likely to attend future fixtures, recommend fixtures to others and purchase merchandise of their team. Although both Barfoot & Thompson and Suzuki, are long term sponsors, attitudes towards the sponsor were neutral and purchase intentions were low which suggests that a sense of sponsor gratitude had not necessarily been fostered (Bergkvist, 2012; Crimmins & Horn, 1996; Kim et al., 2015; Kim, Smith, & James, 2011; Meenaghan, 2001). This finding would suggest that the sponsorship managers of the sponsoring and sponsored organisations should work together to create value for both the sponsor and the sponsored organisation.
6.3 The Role of Membership

Overall full members reported higher levels of attitudinal loyalty, behavioural loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards the sponsor and purchase intentions towards the sponsor in contrast to non-full members. This finding is consistent with conventional wisdom which would suggest that full members are more likely to show gratitude towards the focal sponsor in contrast to non-full members as they are more committed to the team (Maxwell & Lough, 2009). The findings of this study suggests that sponsors should aim most their activation strategies towards full members of the teams they sponsor.

6.4 The Role of Gender

Unlike the role of membership, differences between males and females were subtle. Females were able to identify official and foil sponsors slightly more accurately than their male counterparts. Other than that awareness difference and the fact that females did report higher levels of behavioural loyalty than males, the genders were not substantively different on any of the other constructs of interest. This would suggest that the spectator market in this study is more homogeneous than was expected and that traditional gender based, sponsorship differences are either eroding generally or are less pronounced in the New Zealand marketplace.

6.5 Relationships amongst the constructs

In this study attitudinal loyalty had a significant and positive effect on attitudes towards the sponsor in all three contexts and in the combined data. This supports previous studies in the sport sponsorship literature which suggests that fans who show high levels of loyalty are likely to have positive attitudes towards the sponsor (Biscaia et al., 2013; Dees et al., 2008; Degaris, 2015; Levin et al., 2001; Meenaghan, 2001) which can lead to desirable outcomes for the sponsor. Managerial implications of this study is that organisations sponsoring sport should carefully seek out a sports property
whose fans are committed and loyal towards their team as this could be transferred to the sponsors brand and can lead to positive outcomes.

Attitudes towards the sponsor is an indicator of purchase intentions (Biscaia et al., 2013). This relationship was supported in this current study for all three contexts. Results in this study also support the notion that attitudinal loyalty is an indicator of attitudes towards the sponsor that, in turn, is related to purchase intentions which may be the result of gratitude towards the sponsors (Hermann et al., 2016; Kim, Smith, et al., 2011; Meenaghan, 2001). Purchase intentions are commonly used as a measure of sponsorship effectiveness (Naidenova et al., 2016), and this study has helped to shed light on the aspects of consumer psychology which are related to it. As mentioned earlier, attitudes towards the sponsor levels were neutral this correlated with the low purchase intentions shown. Therefore, fostering positive attitudes towards the sponsor will reap positive rewards for the sponsor.
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Appendix C: Blues Questionnaire Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet

Participant information sheet for Blues rugby team members.

Date Information Sheet Produced:
28 Jan 2016

Project Title
The Relationship between Team Loyalty, Sponsorship Awareness, Attitude toward the Sponsor, and Purchase Intentions: A New Zealand context.

An Invitation
I would like to invite you to participate in this research project by completing a survey. Completing this survey is purely voluntary and optional, should you decide to begin you are more than welcome to withdraw from the research project before completing and submitting the survey. My name is Jawed Ali and this research project is a compulsory requirement for me to attain my Master of Business. The data collected from this survey may possibly be used to aid future research projects.

What is the purpose of this research?
The purpose of this research is to test fan loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards a sponsor and purchase intentions of the sponsors goods or services. This research project will result in a dissertation but it also may result in a journal article as well.

How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this research?
You have been selected to partake in this research project as you are a paid member of the Blues. The Blues together with Barfoot & Thompson support this research project. Your contact details will be held by the Blues and at no point in time will I have access to this information. This survey is measuring purchase intentions therefore your intentions are measured not your actual behaviour. If you are under the age of 18 unfortunately you are unable to complete the survey.

What will happen in this research?
Should you agree to participate in this research project you will be required to complete an online based survey. The data from this survey will look to inform consumer behaviours of members of elite sports teams such as yourself.

What are the benefits?
The benefits for you, as the participant of the research project, is that you are aiding the sponsors of the Blues rugby team to ascertain how successful their sponsorship with the Blues is. Also, individually you go into the draw to win a 2016 home Blues jersey.

How will my privacy be protected?
Participants in this research project will remain anonymous at all times as no identifiable information will be passed onto the researcher. Once the survey has been completed it will be stored in a locked cupboard as outlined by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee.

What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?
You have two weeks from the original email notification of the survey.

How do I agree to participate in this research?
To agree to participate in this research project you will select agree at the bottom of this information sheet.

Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?
As the participant of this research you will not get individual feedback regarding the research however, Barfoot & Thompson will receive information regarding the results of this research project.

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?
Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Michael Naylor, michael.naylor@aut.ac.nz, 64 9 321 5999 Ext 6627.
Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of AUTEC, Kate O’Connor, 09999 Ext 5038.

Whom do I contact for further information about this research?

Please keep this Information Sheet and a copy of the Consent Form for your future reference. You are also able to contact the research team as follows:

**Researcher Contact Details:**

Javed Ali  
nbn7521@aut.ac.nz

**Project Supervisor Contact Details:**

Michael Naylor  
michael.naylor@aut.ac.nz  
+64 9 321 9599 Ext 6627

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 20 February 2020, AUTEC Reference number 18/17.
Appendix D: New Zealand Warriors Questionnaire Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet

Participant information sheet for New Zealand Warriors members.

Date Information Sheet Produced:
28 Jan 2016

Project Title
The Relationship between Team Loyalty, Sponsorship Awareness, Attitude toward the Sponsor, and Purchase Intentions: A New Zealand context.

An Invitation
I would like to invite you to participate in this research project by completing a survey. Completing this survey is purely voluntary and optional, should you decide to begin you are more than welcome to withdraw from the research project before completing and submitting the survey. My name is Jakeed Ali and this research project is a compulsory requirement for me to attain my Master of Business. The data collected from this survey may possibly be used to aid future research projects.

What is the purpose of this research?
The purpose of this research is to test fan loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards a sponsor and purchase intentions of the sponsors goods or services. This research project will result in a dissertation but it also may result in a journal article as well.

How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this research?
You have been selected to participate in this research project as you are a paid member of the New Zealand Warriors. The New Zealand Warriors together with Suzuki support this research project. Your contact details will be held by the New Zealand Warriors and at no point in time will I have access to this information. This survey is measuring purchase intentions therefore your intentions are measured not your actual behaviours. If you are under the age of 16 unfortunately you are unable to complete the survey.

What will happen in this research?
Should you agree to participate in this research project you will be required to complete an online based survey. The data from this survey will look to inform consumer behaviours of members of elite sports teams such as yourself.

What are the benefits?
The benefits for you, as the participant of the research project, is that you are aiding the sponsors of the New Zealand Warriors rugby team to ascertain how successful their sponsorship with the New Zealand Warriors is.

How will my privacy be protected?
Participants in this research project will remain anonymous at all times as no identifiable information will be passed onto the researcher. Once the survey has been completed it will be stored in a locked cupboard as outlined by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee.

What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?
You have two weeks from the original email notification of the survey.

How do I agree to participate in this research?
To agree to participate in this research project you will select agree at the bottom of this information sheet.

Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?
As the participant of this research you will not get individual feedback regarding the research however, Suzuki will receive information regarding the results of this research project.

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?
Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Michael Naylor, michael.naylor@aut.ac.nz, +64 9 321 9599 Ext 6627.
Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of AUTEC, Kate O'Connor, on 921 9999 Ext 16018.

Whom do I contact for further information about this research?

Please keep this information sheet and a copy of the Consent Form for your future reference. You are also able to contact the research team as follows:

**Researcher Contact Details:**
Jaaved Ali
nbn7921@aut.ac.nz

**Project Supervisor Contact Details:**
Michael Naylor
michael.naylor@aut.ac.nz
+64 9 921 9999 Ext 6627

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 30 February 2006, AUTEC Reference number 16/27
Appendix E: Northern Mystics Questionnaire Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet

Participant information sheet for Northern Mystics members.

Date Information Sheet Produced:
28 Jan 2016

Project Title
The Relationship between Team Loyalty, Sponsorship Awareness, Attitude toward the Sponsor, and Purchase Intentions: A New Zealand context.

An Invitation
I would like to invite you to participate in this research project by completing a survey. Completing this survey is purely voluntary and optional; should you decide to begin you are more than welcome to withdraw from the research project before completing and submitting the survey. My name is Jason Ai and this research project is a compulsory requirement for me to attain my Master of Business. The data collected from this survey may possibly be used to aid future research projects.

What is the purpose of this research?
The purpose of this research is to test for loyalty, sponsor awareness, attitudes towards a sponsor and purchase intentions of the sponsors' goods or services. This research project will result in a dissertation but it also may result in a journal article as well.

How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this research?
You have been selected to partake in this research project as you are a paid member of the Northern Mystics. The Northern Mystics together with Barfoot & Thompson support this research project. Your contact details will be held by the Northern Mystics and at no point in time will I have access to this information. This survey is measuring purchase intentions therefore your intentions are measured not your actual behaviours. If you are under the age of 16 unfortunately you are unable to complete the survey.

What will happen in this research?
Should you agree to participate in this research project you will be required to complete an online based survey. The data from this survey will look to inform consumer behaviours of members of elite sports teams such as yours.

What are the benefits?
The benefits for you, as the participant of the research project, is that you are aiding the sponsors of the Northern Mystics rugby team to ascertain how successful their sponsorship with the Northern Mystics is. Also, individually you go into the draw to win a 2016 Northern Mystics shirt.

How will my privacy be protected?
Participants in this research project will remain anonymous at all times as no identifiable information will be passed onto the researcher. Once the survey has been completed it will be stored in a locked cupboard as outlined by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee.

What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?
You have two weeks from the original email notification of the survey.

How do I agree to participate in this research?
To agree to participate in this research project you will select agree at the bottom of this information sheet.

Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?
As the participant of this research you will not get individual feedback regarding the research however, Barfoot & Thompson will receive information regarding the results of this research project.

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?
Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Michael Naylor, michael.naylor@aut.ac.nz, +64 9 321 9899 Ext 6887.
Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of AUTEC, Kate O'Connor, on 921 5999 Ext 6018.

Whom do I contact for further information about this research?

Please keep this information sheet and a copy of the Consent Form for your future reference. You are also able to contact the research team as follows:

Researcher Contact Details:
Javed Ali
nbn7621@aut.ac.nz

Project Supervisor Contact Details:
Michael Naylor
michael.naylor@aut.ac.nz
+64 9 921 5999 Ext 6627

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 26 February 2006, AUTEC Reference number 06/27
Appendix F: Blues Questionnaire

Sponsorship Research Questionnaire

Information Sheet Question Block

The support of corporate partners in professional sport is invaluable. On behalf of one of their key loyal partners, the Blues would like to invite you to participate in this short anonymous research questionnaire. The questionnaire will provide an understanding of the value of the relationship between Blues fans and their loyal partner.

Upon completion of this survey you enter a draw to be in to win one of five 2016 Blues Home Jerseys.

*Please answer the questions as openly and honestly as possible*

For information regarding this questionnaire please click on the 'Information Sheet' link below.

Should you have any queries, contact information can be found on the information sheet.

Information_Sheet

By clicking agree, you consent to participate in the survey.

Demographics

Please enter your year of birth

____
Please select your gender

- Male
- Female

Please select the type of membership you currently hold

- 8 Game
- Flexi
- No Membership

Atitudinal Loyalty

To what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I intend to attend future games of the Blues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would likely recommend Blues games to other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to purchase merchandise of the Blues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavioural Loyalty

Approximately how many Blues games do you typically attend per season?

How many Blues games have you attended in the current season?
How many seasons have you held your current membership for?

Sponsor Awareness

Please select Blues sponsors from the following:

(Check all that apply)

- Hilton
- Barfoot & Thompson
- Ray White
- BNZ
- Speights
- Westies
- Big Ben
- Sky City Auckland
- Heineken
- nib
- ANZ
- Southern Cross Healthcare Group
Attitudes towards the sponsor

We would now like your thoughts on this key partner, Barfoot & Thompson.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like the Barfoot &amp; Thompson brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barfoot &amp; Thompson is a very good brand in the Real Estate industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a favourable disposition towards Barfoot &amp; Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purchase Intentions

If you currently own a property, or hypothetically if you owned a property, to what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would sell my property with Barfoot &amp; Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next time I sell my property, I would consider selling with Barfoot &amp; Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barfoot &amp; Thompson sponsorship with the Blues, makes me more likely to sell my property with Barfoot &amp; Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You

Thank you for taking part in this survey.

If you would like to enter the draw to win a 2016 Blues Home Jersey, please click here.

(Click finish to complete the questionnaire)
Appendix G: New Zealand Warriors Survey

New Zealand Warriors Sponsorship Questionnaire

Information Sheet Question Block

The New Zealand Warriors values the support of their corporate partners.

This short, anonymous questionnaire will provide us with an understanding of the relationship between the fans and the sponsors of the New Zealand Warriors. Upon completion of this survey you can choose to go into the draw to win a $150 online voucher to warriorsstore.co.nz. Please answer the questions as openly and honestly as possible.

For information regarding this questionnaire please click on the 'Information Sheet' link below.

Should you have any queries contact information can be found on the information sheet

Information Sheet

By clicking agree, you consent to participate in the survey.

Demographics

Please enter your year of birth

[Input Field]
Please select your gender

- Male
- Female

Please select the type of membership you currently hold

- Full Season Ticketed
- Proud Membership
- Scarf Membership
- Australian Membership
- Flexi-Pass Membership
- No Membership

Attitudinal Loyalty

To what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to attend future games of the New Zealand Warriors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would likely recommend New Zealand Warriors games to other people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to purchase merchandise of the New Zealand Warriors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavioural Loyalty

Approximately how many New Zealand Warriors games do you typically attend per season?
How many New Zealand Warriors games have you attended in the current season?

How many seasons have you held your current membership for?

Sponsor Awareness

Please select New Zealand Warriors sponsors from the following:

(Check all that apply)
### Attitudes towards the sponsor

**To what extent do you agree with the following statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the Suzuki brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki is a very good brand in the automotive industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a favourable disposition towards Suzuki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purchase Intentions

**To what extent do you agree with the following statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to purchase a new vehicle within the next 12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to purchase a used vehicle within the next 12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would buy a vehicle from a Suzuki dealer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next time I buy a vehicle, I would consider buying a Suzuki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be more likely to buy a Suzuki vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
over its competitors

The Suzuki sponsorship with the New Zealand Warriors, makes me more likely to buy a Suzuki vehicle.
Appendix II: Northern Mystics Questionnaire

Northern Mystics Sponsorship Questionnaire

Information Sheet Question Block

The Northern Mystics values the support of their corporate partners.

This short, anonymous questionnaire will provide us with an understanding of the relationship between the fans and the sponsors of the Northern Mystics. Upon completion of this survey you can choose to go into the draw to win one of four 2016 Northern Mystics Polos. Please answer the questions as openly and honestly as possible.

For information regarding this questionnaire please click on the 'Information Sheet' link below.

Should you have any queries please contact the relevant people on the Information Sheet

By clicking agree, you consent to participate in the survey.

Demographics

Please enter your year of birth

Please select your gender
Please select the type of membership you currently hold.

- Premium Gold Season Pass
- Gold Season Pass
- Red Season Pass
- 4 Game Pass - Mystics Mondays
- 4 Game Pass - Superpass
- No Membership

Attitudinal Loyalty

To what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I intend to attend future games of the Northern Mystics
- I would likely recommend Northern Mystics games to other people
- I intend to purchase merchandise of the Northern Mystics

Behavioural Loyalty

Approximately how many Northern Mystics games do you typically attend per season?
How many Northern Mystics games have you attended in the current season?

How many seasons have you held your current membership for?

Sponsor Awareness

Please select the brands you believe are the sponsors of the Northern Mystics

(Check all that apply)
## Attitudes towards the sponsor

To what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the Barfoot &amp; Thompson brand</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barfoot &amp; Thompson is a very good brand in the Real Estate industry</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a favourable disposition towards Barfoot &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Purchase Intentions

If you currently own a property or if you hypothetically owned a property, to what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would sell my property with Barfoot &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next time I sell my property, I would consider selling with Barfoot &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barfoot &amp; Thompson sponsorship with the Northern Mystics, makes me more likely to sell my property with Barfoot &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be more likely to sell my property with Barfoot &amp; Thompson than its competitors</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>