



International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications (IJEBA)

www.iasir.net

An Investigation into Measurement of Sport Sponsorship Effectiveness by Indian Companies

Gurpartap Singh¹ and Dr. Ambika Bhatia²

¹Gian Jyoti Institute of Management and Technology, Mohali, Punjab, INDIA

²PURCITM, Sector 61, Mohali, Punjab, INDIA

Abstract: Sponsorship of sports events is a commonly used marketing communication tool for many business organisations. The success of sport sponsorship is dependent upon attainment of the objectives. However, measuring the effectiveness of any sponsorship exercise is not easy and only a few organizations make any attempts to evaluate it. Sponsorship may be evaluated by measuring awareness generated, effects of sport sponsorship on brand image and brand equity, media coverage and several other tools/techniques. Considerable research is available in other countries, but not much is known about what and how the Indian companies do about measuring sport sponsorship effectiveness. Therefore, this study was conducted to understand the measurement of sport sponsorship effectiveness by Indian companies. A total of 248 companies participated in the survey. It has been found that, on an average, the sponsoring companies do not consider it very important to set measurement details and schedules and to measure sponsorship effectiveness. The six most important tools/techniques for measuring the effectiveness of sport sponsorship are: spectator figures, cost accounting of sponsorship elements, cost per thousand of audience delivered, media reach, rupee value of publicity expressed in advertising rates, and post-event media coverage.

Keywords: sport sponsorship, tools/methods for measuring effectiveness, evaluation of sport sponsorship, Indian companies

I. Introduction

Sponsorship of sports events is a commonly used marketing communication tool for many commercial organisations and its effectiveness has been well documented [1]. However, sponsorship success is dependent upon whether or not the objectives are reached, and few organizations make any attempts to evaluate the effectiveness, as the true costs is difficult to determine [2]. The authors of another study [3] opine that sponsorship may be evaluated by measuring exposures of the brand name generated, or customer knowledge of the sponsorship relationship as awareness, interest and attitude are relatively difficult for the sponsor to observe. A study on sport sponsorship in China [4] examined the effects of sport sponsorship on brand image and brand equity of a business. This study found that sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand image and brand equity.

In the past, measuring the benefits of sponsorship was cumbersome, making many companies consider sponsorship as 'soft spending' and allocating funds from the meagre corporate community or philanthropic budgets. Many companies even shied away from measuring the effectiveness at all. However, with the increase in opportunities for sponsorship, especially sport sponsorship, companies woke up to its potential and started allocating the funds from marketing and allied budgets. This led to increase in demand for accountability from management and stakeholders. Sponsorship returns are now compared against competitive advertising costs and value, where the amount of 'free' publicity received is measured and then ascribed a monetary value equivalent to paid advertising exposure – usually adjusted to 25-30 per cent of the full advertising rate card value [5]. Sales increase has also been advocated as a measure of sponsorship effectiveness. However, such measures are complicated by both theoretical and practical considerations as sales are a function of many variables [6]. Nevertheless, there is scope to link sponsorships directly to some form of sales activity [7]. An Indian study [8] investigated the effectiveness of sponsorship of the ICC World Cup 2003 on the parameter of 'creating awareness', which is measured through recall and recognition measures.

Thus, it can be seen that different authors have indicated different aspects of checking sponsorship effectiveness. However, no single evaluation tool/method can measure the entire gamut of the sponsorship activities, but several methods may work as support to each other [9]. As far as the timing of the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness is concerned, it can take place either before (for the previous sponsorship activity), during or after the actual sponsorship has taken place [9]. Therefore, it was decided to investigate and describe the methods, if any, used by the Indian companies to measure the outcome of sponsoring in terms of increased sales, brand awareness etc.

II. Objectives

This study has the following specific objectives:

- (i) To find the sponsors' opinion regarding measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship.
- (ii) To find about the importance attached by the sponsors to the tools/techniques for measuring sponsorship effectiveness and the frequency of their use.

III. Literature Review

Existing literature on sport sponsorship was reviewed to find the research available on the objectives of the study.

A. Measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship

An international comparative study [10], found that the establishment of measurement details and schedules were considered less significant by the respondent companies. A South African study [11] found that although the companies did attempt to evaluate sponsorships in terms of their marketing goals, few of the companies had formal systems or procedures for doing so. In a case study of the electronics industry [12] it was concluded that only a minority of companies attempted any form of sponsorship evaluation. Obviously, a lack of post-event evaluation will make it difficult for managers to determine if an adequate return on investment has been achieved and whether sponsorship relationships should be continued in the future. Regarding measuring of sponsorship effectiveness, a Norwegian study [13] asked the firms directly whether they used appropriate research methods to determine if they achieved their sponsorship goals. Only about 15% of the companies said that they studied brand perceptions before and after sponsorship.

It has been seen [9] that demand for accountability has grown as the use of sponsorship has increased. Since the need for accountability in sponsorship has increased and the practice has achieved credibility as a marketing communication tool, measurement and evaluation have become even more important to all parties involved in sponsorship activities. However, a study [14] has found that despite both its obvious role in the context of validating the legitimacy of the exchange and all the lip-service given to the importance of sponsorship evaluation, 40% of 200 sponsoring companies with major sponsorship investments reported spending nothing on research to measure the impact of their investments, while an additional 35% reported spending 1% or less of their sponsorship budget on impact evaluation.

Regarding evaluation by in-house personnel or external consultant, it has been suggested [15] that evaluations are likely to be especially credible if they are done by an external consultant, rather than in-house. The demand for impartial, third party, analyses has created a niche for companies that specialize in doing these assessments.

On the basis of the indications available from the literature review, it was decided to include direct statements and ask the respondents about their opinion on the statements regarding measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship. The selected statements related to setting measurement details and schedules, measuring sponsorship effectiveness, using available tools/ techniques of measuring effectiveness and getting effectiveness measured by advertising/some other agency.

B. Importance and frequency of use of the tools/techniques for measuring sponsorship effectiveness

Literature review showed that there were numerous types of tools/techniques used for measuring the effectiveness of sport sponsorship. For better understanding, this author has tried to categorise the tools/ techniques of evaluating the sponsorship effectiveness. The main categories are as follows:

a) Measurement related to Spectators: The most obvious thing to do here is to measure the spectator figures. Many studies [1, 16, 17] have indicated the use of measurement related to spectators. As spectators watch the game, they are expected to be exposed repeatedly to the sponsors' message. Therefore, if spectator figures are high, then the sponsorship programme can be considered to be effective.

b) Measurement by Assessing Communication Results: It has been felt [18] that due to the basic communication objectives there is also a tendency to evaluate sponsorship results in terms of communication results instead of sales increase. Several authors [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], [24] have indicated/found/suggested that communication results of sport sponsorship can be measured from consumer attitude towards the company/organisation. Assessment of image/positioning/ reputation has been indicated by many studies/authors [25], [26], [27], [28], [29]. Measuring 'awareness' has also been indicated by some studies [20], [21], [27], [29].

c) Measurement based on Media Exposure: Measurement of sport sponsorship effectiveness on the basis of media exposure is another method which finds frequent mention in the literature. One of the earliest studies [18] mentioned that the level of media coverage gained as an outcome of sponsorship activities is frequently used by companies as an indicator of performance. Many other authors have also suggested/advocated/discussed the use of media related measurements. Use of media audits [30], establishing how much air time on television or radio, or how many column inches in the print media, were given to the sponsored event [31], discovering the amount of media coverage or number of times the name is mentioned [32] is a specific technique, and advertising value of the media received via the sponsorship [33] are some of the specific media related measurements tools.

d) Measurement related to product/brand and sales results: Another important category of sponsorship effectiveness measurement tools is related to product/brand and sales results. Several authors have reported/mentioned the measurement related to product/brand and sales results to establish the outcome of sport sponsorship. For instance, sales leads or sales or trials arising out of the sponsorship [6], increase in market share [34], effect on sales [35], and new sales leads created or actual increase in sales [36], [37], [38] have been indicated.

e) Measurement based on Feedback from Participating Groups: Participating groups like spectators/attendees [31], guests [18], [40] activity organizers [18] and company staff [18], [39] can also provide useful feedback about their perceptions about the sponsorship effort.

f) Measurement through Recognition and Recall: Measurement of recognition and recall of sponsor's name or brand can also be used to gauge the effectiveness of sport sponsorship efforts. Several authors mention recall and recognition/remembrance measures [21], [38], [41], [43], [44], [46], [47] and spontaneous/unaided recall and aided recall [42], [45], [48].

A summary of the main evaluation tools/techniques used to measure effectiveness of sport sponsorship effectiveness was prepared on the basis of the review of literature. A few more tools/methods considered as important on the basis of discussion with academicians and industry experts were also included in the questionnaire. However, in the questionnaire, these tools/techniques were not put into any categories to avoid any response bias.

IV. Methodology

This study is based on primary survey conducted with the help of a questionnaire. First part of the questionnaire had statements about measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship. The respondents were to mark their opinion on a five-point scale with 1 denoting 'Not important' and 5 denoting 'Very important'. The second part of the questionnaire had a list of tools/techniques for measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship. The respondents were asked to indicate the importance attached to the tools/techniques for measuring sponsorship effectiveness on a five-point scale with 1 denoting 'Not important' and 5 denoting 'Very important'. They were also asked to indicate the frequency of use of various tools/techniques on a five-point scale with 1 denoting 'Never' and 5 denoting 'Always'. The idea was to carry out a comparison between their opinion on the importance of any given method and the level of use of that method. It was quite possible that some respondents might consider a particular method to be important to them but may not be using that method for certain reasons or may be using it infrequently.

As potential respondents were spread all over the country, it was decided to use a self-administered questionnaire mailed to the respondents. Out of the 700 questionnaires mailed, 248 were received and used for data analysis. This sample size was also found to be sufficient for a confidence interval of 5 and confidence level of 95%. The respondents' opinion on the statements regarding measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship has been explained with the help of means and standard deviation. Similar method has also been used in case of the importance of the tools/techniques for measuring sponsorship effectiveness listed in the questionnaire and the frequency of their use by the respondents' organisations. The importance of the tools/techniques for measuring sponsorship effectiveness and the frequency of their use have also been compared with the help of ranking calculated for different statements.

V. Analysis and Findings

In the questionnaire, first, the respondents were asked about their opinion on certain statements regarding measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship. After that the respondents were asked to indicate the importance of the tools/techniques for measuring sponsorship effectiveness and also indicate the frequency of their use by their respective organisations. The results are discussed below.

A. Respondents' opinion regarding measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinion on the importance of the selected statements regarding measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship. The results of the relevant data analysis are presented in Table 1. From Table 1, it can be seen that just above average (mean score >3.0) importance is given to *Setting measurement details and schedules* (EFF1) and *Measuring sponsorship effectiveness* (EFF2). Using available tools/techniques of measuring effectiveness (EFF3) gets still low importance with a mean score of just 2.52 and getting effectiveness measured by advertising/some other agency (EFF4) gets still lesser importance with a low mean score of 1.83.

Table 1 Respondents' opinion regarding measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship

Statements regarding measuring the effectiveness of sports sponsorship	Code	Importance (Mean)	S.D.
Setting measurement details and schedules	EFF1	3.35	0.59
Measuring sponsorship effectiveness	EFF2	3.12	0.72
Using available tools/techniques of measuring effectiveness	EFF3	2.52	0.80
Getting effectiveness measured by advertising/some other agency	EFF4	1.83	0.89

This means that, on an average, the organisations going in for sport sponsorship do not consider it very

important to set measurement details and schedules and to measure sponsorship effectiveness. Still lower importance is given to using available tools/techniques of measuring effectiveness and getting effectiveness measured by advertising/some other agency.

B. Importance of the tools/techniques for measuring sponsorship effectiveness and the frequency of their use

Various tools/techniques of evaluating the effectiveness of sport sponsorship were identified through literature review. A final list was prepared for inclusion in the questionnaire but the statements were mixed in the questionnaire to avoid any type of bias in response by the respondents. Table 2 presents the results of ratings given by the respondents to the selected sport sponsorship measurement tools according to importance for their respective organisations (Odd variables – E1, E3, E5 etc., to E75) in comparison to the frequency of their use (Even variables – E2, E4, E6 etc., to E76).

Table 2 Sport Sponsorship Effectiveness Measurement Tools – Importance vs. Use

Sport Sponsorship Effectiveness Measurement Tools	Importance			Use		
	Code	Mean	S.D.	Code	Mean	S.D.
Spectator figures	E1	4.38	0.58	E2	4.05	0.91
Cost accounting of sponsorship elements	E67	4.38	0.60	E68	4.23	0.73
Cost per thousand of audience delivered	E13	4.10	0.76	E14	3.24	0.94
Media reach	E27	4.06	0.59	E28	3.26	0.76
Rupee value of publicity expressed in advertising rates	E23	4.02	0.80	E24	3.29	0.76
Post-event media coverage	E9	4.00	0.58	E10	3.29	0.65
TV exposure value (time x advertising rates for 30 sec)	E19	3.97	0.86	E20	3.42	1.14
Physical exposure received by company/brand	E57	3.95	0.59	E58	3.21	0.82
Pre-event media coverage	E7	3.83	1.92	E8	3.07	0.66
Comparison with previous sponsorship spend	E65	3.82	0.80	E66	3.08	0.86
Cross impact between sponsorship and advertising	E45	3.75	0.71	E46	3.27	0.88
Column centimeters in the press	E25	3.71	1.01	E26	3.33	0.91
Cross impact between sponsorship and sales	E41	3.64	0.73	E42	2.95	0.80
Continuity of publicity after the event	E11	3.63	0.65	E12	2.64	0.70
Product/service/brand awareness	E51	3.58	0.82	E52	2.83	0.78
Target market reach effectiveness	E15	3.56	0.62	E16	2.49	1.13
Sport sponsorship cost compared to other promotional activity cost	E73	3.51	0.59	E74	2.99	0.69
Sport sponsorship cost compared to other sponsorship activity cost	E75	3.50	0.58	E76	3.00	0.67
Increase in brand/company name recall	E39	3.29	0.89	E40	2.44	0.97
Calculating increase in business	E71	3.24	0.72	E72	2.65	0.87
Return on investment in rupee value	E69	3.04	0.49	E70	2.75	0.69
Post-event survey of attitude towards the organisation	E5	2.87	0.89	E6	2.18	0.86
Cross impact between sponsorship and sales promotion	E43	2.84	1.12	E44	2.18	0.94
Cross impact between sponsorship and direct marketing	E47	2.79	1.11	E48	2.21	1.09
Pre-event survey of attitude towards the organization	E3	2.60	0.91	E4	1.80	0.91
Viewership demographics (segments, profiles, figures)	E31	2.39	1.00	E32	1.75	0.91
Measuring customer reaction	E49	2.37	0.81	E50	1.73	0.83
Time-trend analysis of product/service/brand awareness	E35	2.34	1.05	E36	1.71	0.84
Increase in product trials	E53	2.33	0.98	E54	1.86	0.85
Time-trend analysis of corporate image improvement	E37	2.23	1.03	E38	1.56	0.71
Hospitality success	E59	2.20	0.70	E60	1.92	0.78
Merchandising performance	E55	2.13	0.84	E56	1.75	0.78
Survey on staff attitude towards the sponsorship	E17	1.96	0.90	E18	1.58	0.70
Readership demographics (segments, profiles, figures)	E29	1.92	1.02	E30	1.43	0.74
Radio exposure value (time x advertising rates for 30 sec)	E21	1.75	0.87	E22	1.27	0.75
Impact on community relations	E61	1.59	0.82	E62	1.34	0.74
Reaction of competitors in terms of sponsorship spend	E63	1.55	0.87	E64	1.36	0.66
Listenership demographics (segments, profiles, figures)	E33	1.28	0.71	E34	1.18	0.62

In this table the ranking is from most important to least important based on calculation of mean values of the importance given to the listed measurement tools. The corresponding frequency of use has also been shown. Standard deviation has also been indicated for each item.

A mean score of 'Importance' closer to 5 indicates that a particular tool/technique is considered to be more important and a mean score closer to 1 indicates that lesser importance is given to a particular tool/technique. In case of 'Use', a mean score closer to 5 indicates that most of the respondents frequently use that tool/technique, while a mean score closer to 1 indicates that most respondents never or rarely used a particular tool/technique.

From Table 2, it can be inferred that the top ten tools/techniques (with mean 'Importance' score of >3.75) are considered to be relatively more important. Another eleven tools/techniques with mean 'Importance' score between 3 and 3.75 can be considered as relatively lesser important. The remaining tools/techniques (with mean 'Importance' score of <3.0 can be said to be considered as still lesser important.

The six most important tools/techniques (mean score ≥ 4.0) for measuring the effectiveness of sport sponsorship are:

- Spectator figures (E1 - 4.38),
- Cost accounting of sponsorship elements (E67 - 4.38),
- Cost per thousand of audience delivered (E13 - 4.10),
- Media reach (E27 - 4.06),
- Rupee value of publicity expressed in advertising rates (E23 - 4.02) and
- Post-event media coverage (E9 - 4.00).

The use of these tools/techniques also comes out to be relatively high in comparison to other tools/techniques. However, it can be seen in Table 2 that **there is no uniform relationship between ‘Importance’ and ‘Use’ of a particular tool/technique**. For instance, *Spectator figures* (E1) and *Cost accounting of sponsorship elements* (E67) have same ‘Importance’ mean (4.38) but *Cost accounting of sponsorship elements* has a higher ‘Use’ mean (4.23) in comparison to use of *Spectator figures*. Similarly, TV exposure value (E19), Column centimetres in the press (E25) and Cross impact between sponsorship and advertising (E45) have higher ‘Use’ mean as compared to their ranking on the basis of ‘Importance’. At the same time, if a measurement tool/technique scored a high ‘Use’ mean score it does not imply that a particular tool/technique is more effective in measuring sponsorship effectiveness. It may simply mean that some particular tool/technique may be relatively easier to use or some of the sponsors may be more inclined to use it as per their comfort level or perception of suitability.

Other important observations are: Cross impact between sponsorship and advertising (E45) and Cross impact between sponsorship and sales (E41) are considered more important than Cross impact between sponsorship and sales promotion (E43) and Cross impact between sponsorship and direct marketing (E47). Calculating increase in business (E71) and Return on investment in rupee value (E69) also returned low mean values just above the average of 3.0. Time-trend analysis of product/service/brand awareness (E35) and Time-trend analysis of corporate image improvement (E37) also lie quite low in the rankings. Does this mean that companies generally do not wish to monitor the long term impact of sport sponsorship on product/service/brand awareness and corporate image improvement?

A general observation from Table 2 is that the **mean score of ‘Use’ generally declines along with the mean score of ‘Importance’**. To check the relationship between the two, correlation coefficient was calculated by using Pearson’s correlation. It is known that two variables are very highly correlated, if the correlation coefficient r lies between 0.9 and 1.0; highly correlated, if r lies between 0.7 and 0.9; moderately correlated if r lies between 0.5 and 0.7; have low correlation, if r lies between 0.3 and 0.5 and have very low correlation if r is less than 0.3. In this case with 38 pairs of inputs, the correlation coefficient was 0.96, which indicates a very strong correlation between importance and use of tool/techniques of evaluation of sport sponsorship. This means that **those tools/techniques which are considered to be more important are likely to be used more and vice versa**. To test the significance of r , the value of t was calculated, which came out to be 22.95. With 36 degrees of freedom and a significance level of $p=0.05$, the table value of t is 1.6883. The calculated value of t statistic (22.95) is far higher than the table value. This means that **there is significant association between the importance and use of the various tool/techniques of evaluating the effectiveness of sport sponsorship**.

Table 3 presents the results of ratings given by the respondents to the frequency of their use (Even variables – E2, E4, E6 etc., to E76) of the selected sport sponsorship measurement tools in comparison to the importance attached to these tool/techniques by their respective organisations (Odd variables – E1, E3, E5 etc., to E75). In this table the frequency of use has also been shown first and then ranking has been shown on the basis of mean values of the importance given to the listed measurement tools. The corresponding standard deviation has also been indicated for each item.

It can be seen that Table 3 shows a **ranking of sport sponsorship measurement tools/techniques according to frequency of use** and is different from Table 2 showing the ranking according to ‘importance’ of the measurement tools/techniques. A high ‘Use’ mean score can be considered as an important indicator that these tools/techniques are used more (for various reasons like their importance, being inexpensive to use, easy to use, etc.). A low ‘Use’ mean score can be considered as an indication that these tools/techniques are considered to be less important or they may not be used often because the sponsors being unfamiliar with them, difficulty in using, expensive to use, gave disappointing results in the past or they still need to be refined/improved.

Another interesting observation from Table 3 is that the tools/techniques with lowest ‘Use’ scores (2.0) like Hospitality success, Increase in product trials, Pre-event survey of attitude towards the organisation, Merchandising performance, Viewership demographics, Measuring customer reaction, Time-trend analysis of product/service/brand awareness, Survey on staff attitude towards the sponsorship, Time-trend analysis of corporate image improvement, Readership demographics, Reaction of competitors in terms of sponsorship spend, Impact on community relations, Radio exposure value, and Listenership demographics are the ones considered to be least important.

Table 3 Sport Sponsorship Effectiveness Measurement Tools — Use vs. Importance

Sport Sponsorship Effectiveness Measurement Tools	Use			Importance		
	Code	Mean	S.D.	Code	Mean	S.D.
Cost accounting of sponsorship elements	E68	4.23	0.73	E67	4.38	0.60
Spectator figures	E2	4.05	0.91	E1	4.38	0.58
TV exposure value (time x advertising rates for 30 sec)	E20	3.42	1.14	E19	3.97	0.86
Column centimeters in the press	E26	3.33	0.91	E25	3.71	1.01
Post-event media coverage	E10	3.29	0.65	E9	4.00	0.58
Rupee value of publicity expressed in advertising rates	E24	3.29	0.76	E23	4.02	0.80
Cross impact between sponsorship and advertising	E46	3.27	0.88	E45	3.75	0.71
Media reach	E28	3.26	0.76	E27	4.06	0.59
Cost per thousand of audience delivered	E14	3.24	0.94	E13	4.10	0.76
Physical exposure received by company/brand	E58	3.21	0.82	E57	3.95	0.59
Comparison with previous sponsorship spend	E66	3.08	0.86	E65	3.82	0.80
Pre-event media coverage	E8	3.07	0.66	E7	3.83	1.92
Sports sponsorship cost compared to other sponsorship activity cost	E76	3.00	0.67	E75	3.50	0.58
Sports sponsorship cost compared to other promotional activity cost	E74	2.99	0.69	E73	3.51	0.59
Cross impact between sponsorship and sales	E42	2.95	0.80	E41	3.64	0.73
Product/service/brand awareness	E52	2.83	0.78	E51	3.58	0.82
Return on investment in rupee value	E70	2.75	0.69	E69	3.04	0.49
Calculating increase in business	E72	2.65	0.87	E71	3.24	0.72
Continuity of publicity after the event	E12	2.64	0.70	E11	3.63	0.65
Target market reach effectiveness	E16	2.49	1.13	E15	3.56	0.62
Increase in brand/company name recall	E40	2.44	0.97	E39	3.29	0.89
Cross impact between sponsorship and direct marketing	E48	2.21	1.09	E47	2.79	1.11
Post-event survey of attitude towards the organisation	E6	2.18	0.86	E5	2.87	0.89
Cross impact between sponsorship and sales promotion	E44	2.18	0.94	E43	2.84	1.12
Hospitality success	E60	1.92	0.78	E59	2.20	0.70
Increase in product trials	E54	1.86	0.85	E53	2.33	0.98
Pre-event survey of attitude towards the organization	E4	1.80	0.91	E3	2.60	0.91
Merchandising performance	E56	1.75	0.78	E55	2.13	0.84
Viewership demographics (segments, profiles, figures)	E32	1.75	0.91	E31	2.39	1.00
Measuring customer reaction	E50	1.73	0.83	E49	2.37	0.81
Time-trend analysis of product/service/brand awareness	E36	1.71	0.84	E35	2.34	1.05
Survey on staff attitude towards the sponsorship	E18	1.58	0.70	E17	1.96	0.90
Time-trend analysis of corporate image improvement	E38	1.56	0.71	E37	2.23	1.03
Readership demographics (segments, profiles, figures)	E30	1.43	0.74	E29	1.92	1.02
Reaction of competitors in terms of sponsorship spend	E64	1.36	0.66	E63	1.55	0.87
Impact on community relations	E62	1.34	0.74	E61	1.59	0.82
Radio exposure value (time x advertising rates for 30 sec)	E22	1.27	0.75	E21	1.75	0.87
Listenership demographics (segments, profiles, figures)	E34	1.18	0.62	E33	1.28	0.71

Among the top dozen of the sponsorship effectiveness measurement tools (mean ‘Use’ score >3.0) seven are directly and one is indirectly related to media coverage. This is shown in Table 4 below. This can be interpreted to mean that the sponsors tend to use more of the media-measurement tools for measuring the effectiveness of sport sponsorship.

Further, a perusal of Table 4 shows that all these top twelve tools/techniques of sport sponsorship evaluation also have the highest mean ‘Importance’ scores (ranging from 3.71 to 4.38). This simply means that the **most commonly used tools/techniques are the ones which are considered to be more important.**

Table 4 The Top Twelve Sport Sponsorship Evaluation Tools (Mean rank >3.0) as per their use in Comparison to their Importance

Sport Sponsorship Effectiveness Measurement Tools	Use			Importance		
	Code	Mean	S.D.	Code	Mean	S.D.
Cost accounting of sponsorship elements	E68	4.23	0.73	E67	4.38	0.60
Spectator figures	E2	4.05	0.91	E1	4.38	0.58
TV exposure value (time x advertising rates for 30 sec)	E20	3.42	1.14	E19	3.97	0.86
Column centimeters in the press	E26	3.33	0.91	E25	3.71	1.01
Post-event media coverage	E10	3.29	0.65	E9	4.00	0.58
Rupee value of publicity expressed in advertising rates	E24	3.29	0.76	E23	4.02	0.80
Cross impact between sponsorship and advertising	E46	3.27	0.88	E45	3.75	0.71
Media reach	E28	3.26	0.76	E27	4.06	0.59
Cost per thousand of audience delivered	E14	3.24	0.94	E13	4.10	0.76
Physical exposure received by company/brand	E58	3.21	0.82	E57	3.95	0.59
Comparison with previous sponsorship spend	E66	3.08	0.86	E65	3.82	0.80
Pre-event media coverage	E8	3.07	0.66	E7	3.83	1.92

The variable with the highest mean score on the basis of use is E68 (Cost accounting of sponsorship elements).

This means that Indian **companies are generally conscious about the cost incurred on sport sponsorship and attempts are made to properly account for the cost of sport sponsorship**. Other cost-related tools/techniques among the top twelve are the 'Rupee value of publicity expressed in advertising rates' (E24) and 'Cost per thousand of audience delivered' (E14).

VI. Conclusion

On an average, the organizations going in for sport sponsorship do not consider it very important to set measurement details and schedules and to measure sponsorship effectiveness. Still lower importance is given to using available tools/techniques of measuring effectiveness and getting effectiveness measured by advertising/some other agency.

After The six most important tools/techniques for measuring the effectiveness of sport sponsorship are: spectator figures, cost accounting of sponsorship elements, cost per thousand of audience delivered, media reach, rupee value of publicity expressed in advertising rates, and post-event media coverage. The use of these tools/techniques also comes out to be relatively high in comparison to other tools/techniques. However, it can be concluded that there is no uniform relationship between 'Importance' and 'Use' of a particular tool/technique.

Another conclusion is that the ranking of sport sponsorship measurement tools/techniques according to frequency of use is different from the ranking according to importance of the measurement tools/techniques. However, the findings show that the top twelve tools/techniques of sport sponsorship evaluation are also considered to be among the most important. This implies that the most commonly used tools/techniques are the ones which are considered to be more important.

Cost accounting of sponsorship elements was rated as the most frequently used tool of measurement. Other cost-related tools/techniques among the top twelve are the 'Rupee value of publicity expressed in advertising rates' and 'Cost per thousand of audience delivered'. This means that Indian companies are generally conscious about the cost incurred on sport sponsorship and attempts are made to properly account for the cost of sport sponsorship. Among the top dozen of the sponsorship effectiveness measurement tools, seven are directly and one is indirectly related to media coverage. Thus, it can be concluded that the sponsors tend to use more of the media-measurement tools for measuring the effectiveness of sport sponsorship.

References

- [1] H.K. Leng, "Effectiveness of sports sponsorship in swimming competitions," International Conference on Economics, Business and Marketing Management, IPEDR vol.29, 2012, Singapore: IACSIT Press.
- [2] R.R. Dolphin, "Sponsorship: perspectives on its strategic role," Corporate Communications: An International Journal, vol. 8, issue 3, pp. 173-186, 2003.
- [3] M.J. Polonsky and R. Speed, "Linking sponsorship and cause related marketing – complementarities and conflicts," European Journal of Marketing, vol. 35, issue 11/12, pp. 1361-1389, 2001.
- [4] L. Geng, R. Burton, & C. Blakemore, "Sport sponsorship in China: transition and evolution," Sport Marketing Quarterly, vol. 11, issue 1, pp. 20-32, 2002.
- [5] L. Ferkins and R. Garland, "Sport sponsorship," In S. Leberman, C. Collins and L. Trenberth, (Eds) Sport business management in New Zealand (2nd Ed.), Sydney: Thomson Publishing & Dunmore Press, 2006.
- [6] J. Hoek, "Sponsorship," In P. Kitchen. (Ed) Integrated marketing communications: principles and practice. London: Routledge, 1998.
- [7] R. Garland, J. Charbonneau, & T. Macpherson, "Measuring sport sponsorship effectiveness: links to existing behaviour," Innovative Marketing, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 46-51, 2008.
- [8] S. Gupta, & S. Pandey, "The marketing battle: sponsorship v/s ambushing," USP AGE, vol. 3, no. 9, pp. 32-37, 2006.
- [9] R. Busby, & W.W. Digby, "Measuring Successful Sponsorship – Evaluation Strategies for Justifying Investment. (2nd Ed.). London: International Forum of Sponsorship, 2002.
- [10] F.J. Farrelly, P.G. Quester, & R. Burton, "Integrating sports sponsorship into the corporate marketing function: an international comparative study," International Marketing Review, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 170-182, 1997.
- [11] R. Abratt & P.S. Grobler, "The evaluation of sports sponsorships. International Journal of Advertising, vol. 8, pp. 351-362, 1989.
- [12] C. Armstrong, "Sports sponsorship: A case-study approach to measuring its effectiveness. European Research, vol. 16, issue 2, pp. 97-103, 1988.
- [13] H.M. Thjomoe, E.L. Olson, & P.S. Bronn, "Decision Making Processes Surrounding Sponsorship Activities," Journal of Advertising Research, vol. 42, pp. 6-15, 2002.
- [14] IEG, "Performance research survey reveals what matters to sponsors," Sponsorship Report, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 4-5, 2002.
- [15] J.L. Crompton, "Conceptualization and alternate operationalization of the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness in sport," Leisure Studies, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 267-281, 2004.
- [16] J.A.F. Nicholls, S. Roslow, & H.A. Laskey, "Sports event sponsorship for brand promotion," Journal of Applied Business Research, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 35-40, 1994.
- [17] K. Gwinner & S. Swanson, "A model of fan identification: Antecedents and sponsorship outcomes," Journal of Services Marketing, vol. 17, pp. 275-294, 2003.
- [18] T. Meenaghan, "The Role of Sponsorship in the Marketing Communication Mix," International Journal of Advertising, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 35-47, 1991.
- [19] S. Sleight, "Sponsorship: what it is and how to use it. Maidenhead: McGraw Hill, 1989.
- [20] R.G. Javalgi, M.B. Traylor, A.C. Gross, & E. Lampman, E., "Awareness of Sponsorship and Corporate Image: an Empirical Investigation," Journal of Advertising, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 47-58, 1994.
- [21] F. Hansen, & L. Scotwin, "An Experimental Enquiry into Sponsorship: What effects can be measured?" Marketing and Research Today, August 1995, pp. 173-181.
- [22] B. Harvey, S. Gray, & G. Despain, "Measuring the effectiveness of true sponsorship. Journal of Advertising Research, vol 11, December 2006, pp. 398-409.

- [23] S. Alay, "Female Consumers' Evaluations of Sponsorship and their Response to Sponsorship," South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 15-29, 2008.
- [24] K. Alexandris, & R.H. Tsotsou, "Testing a Hierarchy of Effects Model of Sponsorship Effectiveness," Journal of Sport Management, vol. 26, pp. 363-378, 2012.
- [25] J. Rajaretnam, "The long-term effects of sponsorship on corporate and product image: findings of a unique experiment," Marketing and Research Today, February 1994, pp. 62-75.
- [26] H. Stipp, & N. Schiavone, "Modelling the impact of Olympic sponsorship on corporate image," Journal of Advertising Research, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 22-28, 1996.
- [27] R. Grohs, U. Wagner, U. & S. Vsetecka, "Assessing the Effectiveness of Sport Sponsorships – An Empirical Examination," Schmalenbach Business Review, vol. 56, April 2004, pp. 119-138.
- [28] K. Weihe, G. Mau, & G. Silberer, "How do marketing-events work? Marketing-events and brand attitudes," in S. Diehl & R. Terlutter (Eds.), International Advertising and Communication. Current Insights and Empirical Findings, New York: DUV, 2006, pp. 199-216.
- [29] K. Koo, J. Quarterman, & L. Flynn, "Effect of perceived sport event and sponsor image fit on consumers' cognition, affect, and behavioral intentions," Sport Marketing Quarterly, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 80-90, 2006.
- [30] N. Pope, "Overview of current sponsorship thought," The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing. [Online]. vol. 2, no. 1, 1998. Available: <http://fulltext.ausport.gov.au/fulltext/1998/cjsm/v2n1/pope21.htm>
- [31] F. Brassington, S. Pettitt, "Principles of Marketing," Harlow, UK: Financial Times – Prentice Hall, 2000.
- [32] P.R. Smith & J. Taylor, "Marketing communications: an integrated approach," London: Kogan Page Limited, 2004.
- [33] T. Lynde, "How to Measure the Value of a Sponsorship," 2007. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sponsorships101.com/excerpts/section10.pdf>.
- [34] D. Stotlar, "Sponsorship and the Olympic Winter Games," Sport Marketing Quarterly, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 35-43, 1993.
- [35] M. Horn & K. Buken, "Measuring the impact of sponsorship," international Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, September/October, 1999.
- [36] J.L. Crompton, "Conceptualization and alternate operationalization of the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness in sport," Leisure Studies, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 267-281, 2004.
- [37] F. Carrillat, B. Lafferty, & E. Harris, "Investigating sponsorship effectiveness: Do less familiar brands have an advantage over more familiar brands in single and multiple sponsorship agreements?" Brand Management, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 50–64, 2005.
- [38] H.K. Chi, H.R. Yeh, & K.T. Liao, "The Influences of Brand Image and Sport Sponsorship on Brand Equity: A Mediating Effect of Sport Sponsorship," The Journal of International Management Studies, vol. 4, no. 66, pp. 58-66, 2009.
- [39] IEG, "Performance Research/IEG study highlights what sponsors want," IEG Sponsorship Report, vol. 20, no. 8, pp. 4-5, 2001.
- [40] M.J. Lamont, "Small and medium business sponsorship of regional sport tourism events," Ph.D. thesis, Southern Cross University, Lismore, NSW, Australia, 2005.
- [41] G.E. Belch & M.A. Belch, "Advertising and Promotion," Boston: USA, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, 2001.
- [42] F. Anne, "Measuring the effectiveness of sponsorship: An Analysis of intermediate effects on direct audience of the event," The 6th Congress of the AFM, 1992, pp.121-148.
- [43] J. Cuneen & M.J. Hannan, "Intermediate measures and recognition testing of sponsorship advertising at an LPGA tournament," Sport Marketing Quarterly, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 47-56, 1993.
- [44] N.K. Pope & K.E. Voges, "An exploration of sponsorship awareness by product category and message location in televised sporting events," The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing. [Online]. vol. 1, no. 1, 1997. Available: <http://www.cjsm.com/vol1/pope&voges11.htm>
- [45] T. Lardinoit & C. Derbaix, "Sponsorship and recall of sponsors," Psychology & Marketing, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 167-190, 2001.
- [46] T.B. Cornwell, "Sponsorship-Linked Marketing Development," Sport Marketing Quarterly, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 13-24, 1995.
- [47] G. Masterman, "Sponsorship: for a return on investment. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2007.
- [48] F. Dekhil, "The effects of the type of audience, involvement, interest and socio-demographic variables on sponsor recall: the soccer African Nations Cup," International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 158-175., 2010