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ABSTRACT

This dissertation proposes that in the case of multiple sponsorships (i.e., brands sponsoring concomitantly the same event), the group constituted by the sponsoring brands and the sponsored event will be perceived as an entity; a phenomenon that Campbell (1958) called entitativity. The extent to which a group of brands and a sponsored event is seen as being entitative will result in stereotypic processing of the group members (Brewer and Harasty 1996). Information about an entitative group is abstracted and used to form judgments about every group member (McConnell, Sherman, and Hamilton 1997). Characteristics tied to one brand or to the event will become associated to the other brands due to category-based information processing (Fiske and Neuberg 1990). As a result, images associated with a brand or an event that belongs to an entitative group will be transferred to other brands of that group due to stereotyping.

Image transfer effects were investigated through an experiment. Image transfer in sponsorship occurs primarily at an implicit level because sponsorship messages are subtle (Pham and Vanhuele 1997). As a consequence, the savings in relearning paradigm (Ebbinghaus 1885/1964) was the methodology used. It allows investigating implicit memory by comparing the recall of paired-associations between brands and image-traits across a multiple sponsorship and a no sponsorship condition. The findings confirmed
that the event and the concomitant sponsoring brands were perceived as an entitative group, which resulted in an implicit transfer of image among the brands (Brand Image Transfer, BIT) as well as from the event to the brands (Event Image Transfer, EIT). These transfer effects were moderated by the brand-concept associated with the sponsors considered. BIT was only found for sponsors with a similar brand-concept (i.e., “sport”) whereas EIT was only found for sponsors with a dissimilar brand-concept (i.e., “no sport”). Further analyses confirmed that these phenomena of implicit transfer of image were due to a category-based as opposed to an individuating processing of information. Due to high entitativity, perceivers relied on a group impression to process information. As a result, the group of brands and the event were seen as interchangeable.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Sponsorships have become a major tool of marketing communication. In 2004, corporations spent $28 billion worldwide in sponsorship activities, a growth of 8.1% compared to 2003. In North America alone, 2004 sponsorship spending reached $11.14 billion, up 8.7% from 2003 (IEG 2003). The first demonstrations of commercial sponsorship activities can be traced back to the 18th century when, in England, local sponsors supported horse races. Later, in 1891, Michelin sponsored the French cyclist Charles Terront on the race Paris-Brest (Dambron 1993). Today, sponsorship activities have evolved dramatically. They range from corporate sponsorship of sporting events such as the Olympic Games by Coca-Cola, to the sponsorship of artistic events like the Tribeca Film Festival in New York by American Express.

As a consequence of the growing importance of sponsorship, academics began studying it in the early 1980s and the literature has been expanding at a steadfast rate ever since. From the numerous definitions of sponsorship that can be found, two components are common among most sponsorship researchers (e.g., Cornwell and Maignan 1998; Meenaghan 1991; Roy and Cornwell 2003): 1) the possibility for the sponsor to associate itself with the sponsee (i.e., the sponsored entity) at the corporate, product, or brand level, in exchange for financial or in-kind support, and 2) a set of marketing activities centered on that association. The same definitional elements are provided by the International
Events Group (IEG Glossary and Lexicon 2003), a leading source of sponsorship information.

The sponsee can be an individual (e.g., an athlete, an artist), a group of individuals (e.g., a sports team, an association) or an event (e.g., a sporting event, a concert, or an art exhibit). The literature focuses principally on sporting events. Sporting events are the most popular for sponsorship arrangements, largely because they convey positive values and consumers associate them with notions of excitement and entertainment (Nichols, Roslow, and Dublish 1999; Roy and Cornwell 2002). In 2004 they represented 69% of sponsorship spending in North America (IEG 2003). In addition, sporting events have an image capital similar to corporations or brands (Ferrand and Pages 1999). They are often the preferred choices of sponsors due to the opportunity of being associated with them.

Sponsorship is distinct from philanthropy and advertising (Hoek, Phillip, Jeffcoat, and Orsman 1997). Compared with sponsorship, corporate philanthropy consists in making an anonymous donation or providing material support to charities (Berger, Cunningham, and Kozinets 1999; Ulibarri 2000) with no reciprocation expected by the firm (Gillies 1991). Contrary to sponsorship, an advertising message is totally controlled by the firm. In sponsorships, the content of the messages is contingent on the sponsee (Meenaghan 1991; Meenaghan and Shipley 1999). Advertising is seen as a less subtle activity than sponsorships that concentrates on short, rather than long term, objectives. As a result, consumers generally perceive advertising as being a more commercially oriented and obtrusive medium than sponsorship. In fact, studies have shown that
consumers have a more favorable attitude toward sponsorship than toward advertising (MacDonald 1991; Meenaghan 2001; Meenaghan and Shipley 1999).

*Sponsorship and the Brand Leverage Model*

Sponsorship’s most attractive characteristic is that it allows associating a brand to very popular and well-liked events. At a time of massive product offerings, media clutter, and savvy consumers, it has become increasingly difficult for marketing managers to build stronger brand equity than the competition. Brand equity is defined as the value that marketing effort and activities add to a product or service (e.g., Aaker 1991; Broniarczyk and Alba 1994; Farqhar 1989; Moore, Wilkie, and Lutz 2002). Brand equity is composed of both brand awareness and brand meaning (e.g., Berry 2000).

*Brand Knowledge*

According to Keller (1993, 2003), the brand leverage process (see Figure 1) consists of associating brands with other entities (e.g., event, person, place, brand, and things) that carry desirable meanings for consumers in order to develop brand knowledge (e.g., attitude, thought, image, feelings, awareness, and experience). Leveraging a brand through associations allows building brand equity more efficiently than traditional means of marketing communication (e.g., advertising). The leveraging process enables brands to borrow equity from other entities through a process of knowledge transfer (Keller 2003). Associating a brand with an event (e.g., sporting, artistic, or charitable) through sponsorship activities has become a major brand leveraging tool in recent years.
Image Transfer

Knowledge is said to be transferred between an entity and a brand when associations (e.g., attitude, feeling, image, etc.) linked to the entity become linked to the brand as well (e.g., through a sponsorship agreement). According to Keller (2003), brand image is a very important component of brand knowledge. The image of a brand encompasses all the meanings and symbols consumers associate to it (Durgee and Stuart 1987; Levy 1958). Based on this, image transfer occurring in sponsorship can be thought of as the meanings or symbols that become associated with the brand as a result of a sponsorship activity. For example, UPS might be perceived as being “international” due to its sponsorship of the Olympic Games which image has an “international” meaning.

Figure 1. The Brand Leverage Model (Keller 2003)

Multiple Sponsorships

Although researchers have conceptually and empirically investigated the brand leverage phenomenon in situations of single sponsorship (i.e., one sponsoring brand tied to one event) (e.g., Keller 2003; Gwinner 1997; Gwinner and Eaton 1999), multiple
sponsorships (i.e., two or more firms sponsoring the same event concomitantly) have
been overlooked. As a consequence, key factors concerning the impact of multiple
sponsorships on knowledge transfer are still unknown for marketing managers and
researchers due to a lack of theoretical development and empirical research. This is a
serious gap in the existing literature since the association of a single sponsor with an
event seldom characterizes event sponsorship. In fact, most of the largest sporting events
are tied to multiple sponsors. For example, ten brands, including Coca Cola,
McDonald’s, and Visa, were the multiple major sponsors (i.e., concomitant sponsors) of
the 2004 Athens Olympic Games. In view of this, the need to investigate image transfer
mechanisms in multiple sponsorships appears fundamental for achieving a better
understanding of sponsorship effects.

Statement of Research Problem

This dissertation proposes a conceptual framework for multiple event
sponsorships (i.e., when more than one brand sponsors the same event simultaneously).
Based on the notion of *entitativity*, this framework posits that multiple sponsorships
influence the sponsoring brands’ images. Entitativity is the extent to which a group of
elements is perceived as being an entity by itself (Campbell 1958). It is proposed that
when several brands sponsor the same event concomitantly (i.e., multiple sponsorships),
these brands and the event are likely to be perceived as an entitative group. Psychologists
have shown that social perceivers abstract a stereotype (i.e., a core identity) from
entitative groups and perceive each group member in light of that stereotype (Crawford,
Sherman, and Hamilton 2002). Similarly, it is argued that attributes of concomitant
sponsoring brands, such as images, are likely to be influenced by a group stereotype of the sponsors and the event.

Entitative groups are perceived through a group impression that is based on specific information associated to each individual member of the group (Yzerbyt, Rocher, and Schandron 1997). This group impression is applied to each member of the group and, as a result, knowledge (i.e., image) associated to one particular member becomes associated with other members. This results in a transfer of knowledge among group members (Crawford et al. 2002).

The Savings in Relearning Paradigm

Image transfer in sponsorship is likely to be very subtle (Pham and Vanhuele 1997) and could constitute implicit knowledge (i.e., knowledge not consciously accessible by the individual) (Reber 1989). Implicit knowledge is much more stable over time than explicit knowledge (i.e., knowledge readily accessible by the individual) (e.g., Matthews, Russ, Stanley, Blanchard-Fields, Cho, and Druhan 1997). Implicit image transfer can be captured by the savings in relearning paradigm (Ebbinghaus 1885/1964). This paradigm has been used to measure implicit learning in experimental psychology (e.g., MacLeod 1988). It has also been used in social psychology to test for implicit trait-transference among social group members (e.g., Crawford et al. 2002) or implicit trait-inference about social actors (e.g., Skowronski, Carlston, and Crawford 1998). It has not been used to measure brand or event image transfer to date. This research introduces the “savings” technique to measure image transfer in multiple sponsorships. According to this paradigm, differences in “savings” across treatment and control conditions are a
measure of implicit memory. In this research, “savings” are operationalized as the performance of individuals on cued-recall of associations between an image-trait and a brand in the case of multiple sponsorships and no sponsorship.

*Intended Contribution*

Firms are often interested in consumers’ perceptions of events and make their sponsorship decisions on the hope that consumers will associate their perceptions of an event with their perceptions of its sponsoring brands. However, entitativity in multiple sponsorships is an important phenomenon for brand managers because it implies that not only the event has to be considered when making sponsorship decisions, but also the concomitant sponsoring brands of that event. It is proposed that, in the case of multiple sponsorships, the image of a sponsoring brand can be impacted in two ways. First, the images of the other brands can be transferred to the sponsoring brand. Second, the event’s image can be transferred to the sponsoring brand.

In addition, evidence of the implicit nature of the image transferred would be very important because of the long-term effects that implicit knowledge could have on brand image and equity. The above discussion suggests that brand managers would have to consider the core identity conveyed by the group of concomitant sponsors when designing brand image and brand equity building strategies through a multiple sponsorships agreement.

This dissertation makes three major theoretical contributions to the existing literature on sponsorship and branding by:
1. Conceptualizing the role of perceived entitativity in the formation and generalization of a group stereotype in multiple sponsorships,

2. Empirically investigating implicit image transfer among the sponsoring brands as well as from the event to the sponsoring brands,

3. Adapting the savings in relearning paradigm to investigate these phenomena.

An Entitativity-Based Alternative to the Brand Leverage Model

The brand leverage model (Keller 2003) is not well adapted for situations of multiple sponsorships. According to the brand leverage model, knowledge is transferred directly from the entity to the brands. Such transfer effects have been identified from an event to its sponsoring brand (i.e., Gwinner and Eaton 1999), as well as between two concomitant sponsoring brands of the same event (Carrillat, Harris, and Lafferty 2004b). The brand leverage model, however, does not conceptually account for the multiple transfer effects that could occur when the concomitant sponsors are numerous. As illustrated in Figure 1, the brand leverage model posits that knowledge is transferred between pairs of entities. Therefore, according to this model, in the case of numerous and simultaneous brand associations such as multiple sponsorships, knowledge would be transferred from one brand to another and from the event to each brand in a pair-wise manner.
Alternatively, it is proposed that when multiple brands sponsor the same event, perceivers abstract a group impression from the brands and the event due to high entitativity. That is, in the researcher’s view, image transfer is not due to the direct association between pairs of brands as well as between the event and each brand but, rather, is due to the association of the brands with a group impression. In the case of multiple sponsorships, the association of an event with numerous sponsoring brands will be subjected to the phenomenon of entitativity. *Entitativity* is the extent to which a group of elements is perceived as having the nature of an entity, a real existence (Campbell 1958). More specifically, because concomitant sponsoring brands and the event are likely to form an entitative group, they will be perceived as being a single entity rather than distinguishable elements.

The social psychology literature has investigated the notion of entitativity and its impacts on the perception of persons and social groups. The degree of entitativity affects how knowledge about one group member characterizes the entire group and is then transferred to each group member (Crawford et al. 2002). Highly entitative groups are subjected to stereotypic processing (i.e., group impression formation) (Crawford et al. 2002). In the case of high entitativity, individual traits are abstracted from the group members simultaneously with the processing of information (i.e., in an on-line manner) (McConnell, Sherman, and Hamilton 1997), and are associated with the group and all its members due to category-based as opposed to individuating processing (in the case of low entitativity) (Fiske and Neuberg 1990). Figure 2 illustrates these principles in a multiple sponsorships context. Due to the high entitativity of the concomitant sponsoring brands and the sponsored event, a group stereotype will be formed and each member will
be perceived in light of that stereotype. Knowledge (i.e., image) will be transferred from the group stereotype to each member of the group. As a consequence, to the extent that the stereotype is composed of the image of the sponsoring brands, knowledge associated with one brand will be generalized to every other brand. In addition, since the event contributes to the group stereotype, its image will also be transferred to the sponsoring brands.

Figure 2. An Entitativity Model of Implicit Image Transfer in Multiple Sponsorships

*Implicit Knowledge Transfer*

The marketing field recognized that implicit learning could take place when consumers are exposed to fragments of advertising or subtle communication messages such as sponsorship-like communications (Johar and Pham, 1999; Pham and Vanhuele
Although the use of implicit measures of social cognition has been advocated in consumer research (Brunel, Tietje, and Greenwald 2004), to date no paradigm has been brought forward that can directly investigate implicit consumer knowledge. As will be shown subsequently, the savings in relearning paradigm (Ebbinghaus 1885/1964) allows for assessing implicit image transfer phenomena in multiple sponsorships.

The main objective of this dissertation will be to investigate the effects of multiple sponsorships on consumer knowledge about concomitant sponsoring brands’ images through the theoretical perspective of group impression formation and trait transference developed in the person and group perception literature (e.g., Crawford et al. 2002). Specifically, this dissertation will address the following research questions:

1. Do multiple sponsorships result in implicit image transfer among concomitant sponsoring brands?

2. Is there evidence of implicit image transfer from the event to the sponsoring brands?

3. Are the image transfer phenomena due to the group entitativity of the sponsoring brands and the event?

**Research Method Employed**

An experiment that relied on the savings in relearning paradigm was conducted for investigating these questions. Respondents were introduced to a set of fictitious
sponsoring brands and a fictitious event (created for use in this study). Entitativity was
manipulated through a multiple sponsorships (high entitativity) and a no sponsorship
(low entitativity) conditions and the image transfer phenomena were measured through a
memorization task (the “savings” measure).

This first chapter presented a brief introduction of sponsorship, the objective of
this study, and an overview of the method that will be used. The next chapter will
expand the different streams of literature this research draws upon. This will lead to the
formulation of empirical predictions in a hypothesis format.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The review of the literature covers the four areas of inquiry that are relevant for this dissertation. First, academic literature on sponsorship is reviewed. A description of sponsorship as a medium of marketing communication, as well as the main theoretical perspectives and empirical findings from sponsorship studies, are provided. Second, the branding literature is reviewed in order to put multiple sponsorships in the general perspective of brand associations. For that purpose, brand association techniques such as brand extensions or celebrity endorsement are presented. The particularities of multiple sponsorships as a method of brand association are also emphasized. Third, the social psychology literature is reviewed in order to provide an understanding of the concept of entitativity. Its antecedents are described, as well as its impact on information processing. In addition, conceptual arguments are presented as to how entitativity could stem from multiple sponsorship situations. Fourth, the experimental psychology literature is reviewed. A presentation of implicit memory is first undertaken followed by a description of the savings in relearning paradigm and how it captures implicit knowledge. In the last part of this chapter, a summary of the conceptual background leading to the hypotheses that will be empirically tested is provided.
Sponsorship Research

The Sponsorship Medium

Compared to advertising, sponsorship has two distinctive characteristics: 1) the medium of sponsorship is inseparable from the content of the information it conveys since the message is the sponsorship itself, and 2) consumers assign a notion of goodwill to it. Sponsorship is the medium by which a sponsor (e.g., a brand) is associated with a sponsee (e.g., a sporting event). Meenaghan and Shipley (1999) noted that this association is of a very peculiar type “…both medium and media elements are not separate, but are inextricably linked (p. 6).” As a result, the message of the sponsor of a sporting event is not independent from the environment of the sponsorship operation since the same means are used to produce and deliver the message (Meenaghan and Shipley 1999). The context of the communication is shaped by the event situation, which plays a key role in the resulting message perceived by consumers.

This is the conceptual basis of Meenaghan and Shipley (1999) who identified the possibility of the transfer of inherent values of the event to the sponsor. They considered the sponsor and the event as parts of a “symbiotic relationship.” A sponsor inherits attributes from the event to which it is linked. However, the literature points out that attribute transfer is not well understood because it lacks an underlying theoretical explanation as well as empirical investigations (i.e., Javalgi, Traylor, Gross, and Lampman 1994; Lee, Sandler, and Shani 1997).

Sponsorship has a connotation of goodwill (Meenaghan 2001). In effect, consumers often consider the association between a sponsor and a sponsee as a legitimate connection. They believe the sponsor takes risks by associating its name to an event
because they consider the sponsor has little control on its outcomes (MacDonald 1991). Consumers consider a sponsoring company as being less commercially oriented than a “traditional” advertiser because the sponsor directly assists in the development of the event, team, or individual. As a result, consumers’ defense mechanisms against sponsorships are weaker than against advertising (Meenaghan 1998, 2001).

*The Effects of Sponsorships Communication*

Early academic works on sponsorships focused on the role of sponsorship in marketing communication. Studies aimed at introducing sponsorship as a legitimate component of the marketing mix (e.g., Meenaghan 1983) that does not result from the altruistic inclination of the firm’s CEO (e.g., Crimmins and Horn 1996). Research was mostly descriptive and investigated the objectives of sponsorships as well as how organizations managed event sponsorships (e.g., Abratt, Clayton, and Pitt 1987; Crowley 1991; Marshall and Cook 1992).

*Theories associated with sponsorship effects.* More recently, research on sponsorship has attempted to integrate various theories to understand the effects of sponsorship on consumers (see Appendix 1). Schema theory, which asserts that past experiences or activities are organized as an active network in memory (Bartlett 1932), has been used by researchers on the basis that the information about the sponsor and the event is accessed from memory. Information about the sponsorship agreement is then compared with the schema of the event and the sponsor (i.e., Gwinner and Eaton 1999; McDaniel 1999; Roy and Cornwell 2003; 2004; Speed and Thompson 2000). Key
findings based on schema theory include the positive relationship between the event-sponsor congruency (in terms of brand equity) and attitude toward the sponsoring brand (Roy and Cornwell 2003). Also, Gwinner and Eaton (1999) found that image could be transferred from a sporting event to a sponsoring brand. They provided evidence that image congruency between the sponsor and the sponsoring brand was greater under a “yes sponsorship” than under a “no sponsorship” condition.

Human Associative Memory (HAM), which considers declarative knowledge as a network of concept nodes (cues and outcomes) associated by links of different strength (Anderson and Bower 1973), has also been used for investigating sponsorship effects. According to the HAM framework, the associations linked to the event modify the associations linked to a brand in consumers’ memory in the case of a sponsorship agreement. Based on this framework, studies have found that the impact of sponsorship on attitude and purchase intention was positive (Chapman and Aylesworth 1999; Simonin and Ruth 1998), but stronger for unfamiliar than for familiar brands (Carrillat, Harris, and Lafferty 2004a).

Other theoretical perspectives of sponsorship effects include balance theory, congruity theory, attribution theory, heuristics, halo effect, and social identity theory. Based on balance theory, Dean (1999) found that sponsorship positively impacts perceived corporate citizenship of the sponsoring companies. Based on congruity and attribution theory, Dean (2002) also found that corporate sponsorship of a well-liked event resulted in an improved perceived corporate community relations for the sponsor. Madrigal (2000, 2001) found that purchase intention of the sponsor’s product, as well as the link between attitude and purchase intention, were stronger for consumers with a high
versus a low level of identification with the sponsee. Johar and Pham (1999) supported the assertion that consumers rely on heuristics for identifying sponsors of events when they cannot retrieve the sponsors directly from memory. Brands that are prominent in the market or that are related to the event are more likely to be identified as sponsors of that event. Other empirical studies indicated a positive impact of sporting event sponsorships on brand image (e.g., Crimmins and Horn 1996), corporate image (e.g., Javalgi et al 1994; Stipp 1998; Stipp and Schiavone 1996) or brand recall (e.g., Lardinoit and Derbaix 2001).

The above empirical findings on sponsorship research show that studies of the knowledge transfer phenomenon are sparse (see Appendix 1). Sponsorship is described as a prominent brand leveraging tool (Keller 2003, Roy and Cornwell 2003; Ruth and Simonin 2003), however, only a few studies investigate the role of sponsorships as such a tool (i.e., transferring knowledge from other entities to a sponsoring brand). The large majority of studies assessed the impact of sponsorships on recall, image, or attitudinal variables. Nonetheless, Gwinner and Eaton’s (1999) work supports the notion that the image of the sponsored event can be transferred to the sponsoring brands in the case of single sponsorship. Two studies empirically investigated multiple sponsorships. In one study, Ruth and Simonin (2003) found that prior attitude toward the sponsors had a positive impact on attitude toward the sponsored event. This study did not, however, investigate knowledge transfer, but rather assumed the existence of this phenomenon for predicting directional changes of attitude. Besides, it examined the impact of the sponsors on the event, but it did not investigate the possibility of knowledge transfer between the sponsoring brands.
Another study showed that knowledge (i.e., image) could be transferred not only from the event to the sponsoring brands, but also between the concomitant sponsoring brands of the same event (Carrillat et al. 2004b). However, it is important to notice that these two studies included a multiple sponsorships situation with two sponsoring brands only and neither considered the possibility of the formation of a group impression that could impact consumers’ implicit knowledge about each sponsor.

**Multiple Sponsorships as a Type of Brand Association**

As mentioned before, a sponsorship can be categorized as a brand leveraging method that leads to a transfer of knowledge between entities. Other marketing techniques such as brand extensions and celebrity endorsements can be used as brand leveraging tools as well. Both these techniques allow transferring knowledge to a brand through association with another entity (Keller 2003). Therefore, examining the literature in these areas would provide a better understanding of how researchers approached knowledge transfer in related but quite different domains.

*Brand extensions.* Marketers extend brands beyond their original categories to reduce risks and cost inherent to entering a new product category (Aaker 1991). Different strategies are then available that all imply some type of knowledge transfer: brand alliance, brand extension, composite brand extension, or ingredient branding. Simonin and Ruth (1998) investigated the spillover effect that occurs in the case of brand alliance. They found that consumers’ prior attitude toward the alliance itself can influence attitude toward each brand composing the alliance. Based on the signaling theory of information economics (i.e., people infer that claims about unobservable quality
are true otherwise it would be too monetarily detrimental to the claimer), Rao and Ruekert (1999) investigated the role of an ally in a brand alliance. They found that consumers’ evaluation of the unobservable quality of brands is enhanced when it is allied with a brand that could be harmed by consumer sanctions in the case of a false claim.

Boush and Loken (1991) investigated brand extension from a categorization perspective. By assuming that a brand and its products compose a category on their own, they found a positive relationship between the typicality of the extension (i.e., its degree of representativeness of the category of the brand and its products) and the evaluation of this extension. Using a similar categorization approach, Loken and John (1993) found that when brand extension attributes are inconsistent with the family brand, beliefs held toward the attributes associated with the brand name are diluted.

Park, Jung, and Schocker (1996) examined composite brand extensions. Their results showed that combining two brands with complementary attributes into a new product (a Slim-Fast cake mix flavored with Godiva chocolate) could generate superior consumer attitudes. Desai and Keller (2002) showed that a self-branded ingredient strategy leads to more favorable evaluation of slot-filler expansion (i.e., change in the level of one product attribute), whereas a co-branded ingredient strategy leads to more favorable evaluation of new attribute expansions (i.e., an entirely new attribute or characteristic is added to the product).

These studies give insights for understanding the different forms of brand alliances; however, they do not solve the main problems raised by multiple sponsorships. First, the transfer of knowledge is not investigated per se but is posited to take place in order to explain phenomena such as improved brand attitudes or better brand evaluations.
Second, ingredient branding, brand extensions, brand alliance, or composite brand extensions involve only one source of knowledge transfer (the other brand) whereas concomitant sponsorship involves simultaneous sources of knowledge transfer (the event and all the other sponsoring brands). As pointed out by Keller (2003), multiple simultaneous sources of knowledge transfer remain an unexplored aspect of the brand leverage process.

Celebrity endorsement. Celebrity endorsement is also a way to leverage a brand. However, in this case, knowledge transfer does not take place between an event and a sponsoring brand, but between a celebrity and an endorsed brand. Celebrity endorsement is different from sponsorship due to the fact that the association between the product/brand and the entity (i.e., celebrity) is made explicit through an advertisement (McCracken 1989). Similar to brand extension studies, knowledge transfer has been posited rather than being the focus of the studies on celebrity endorsement and most findings concern traditional outcome variables. Celebrity endorsement has been shown to increase brand recognition (Petty, Cacioppo, and Schumann 1983), message recall (Friedman and Friedman 1979), attitude toward the brand (Kamins, Brand, and Hoeke 1989), and brand choice (Heath, McCarthy, and Motherbaugh 1994; Kamins et al. 1989; Khale and Homer 1985; Ohnian 1991).

Several characteristics of the source of the message (i.e., celebrity) can impact the endorsed product. Source credibility (expertise and trustworthiness of the celebrity) (Tripp, Jensen, and Carlson 1994) is positively related to attitude toward the ad and product’s image evaluation (Atkins and Block 1983). In addition, the “match-up” hypothesis suggests that celebrity endorsement is more effective when there is a fit
between the endorsed product and the endorser (Kamins 1990; Khale and Homer 1985; Lynch and Schuler 1994). Most of the evidence focuses on physical attractiveness and shows that endorsements are more effective when an attractive celebrity endorses attractiveness enhancing products (Kamins 1990; Khale and Homer 1985). Other findings suggest, however, that the “match-up” hypothesis is more valid when it is based on expertise rather than physical attractiveness. Till and Busler (1998, 2000) found that endorsements were more effective in improving brand attitude when endorsers were perceived as being experts in the product domain than when attractive celebrities endorsed products that enhance one’s attractiveness.

Source meaningfulness also plays an important role in the effectiveness of celebrity endorsers. McCracken (1989) referred to celebrity endorsement as a way to transfer social meaning from the celebrities to the products endorsed, which was supported by findings from Langmeyer and Walker (1991).

The effectiveness of multiple endorsements (i.e., one celebrity endorsing more than one product or brand) has been investigated. There is not, however, a strong conceptual foundation in this research and the evidence is sparse and contains mixed findings. A study by Mowen and Brown (1981) revealed that consumers’ attitudes toward the endorsed brands were negatively affected when the celebrity endorsed multiple brands. Alternatively, Tripp et al. (1994) did not find a negative impact of multiple endorsements on attitude toward the endorsed brands. Therefore, guidance from previous works on multiple celebrity endorsement is limited when investigating multiple sponsorships.
The Ambiguous Role of Similarity

The traditional view. Categorization research suggested that similarity is the most important antecedent of categorization because people tend to classify similar objects in the same category (e.g., Fiske and Taylor 1991; Rosch and Mervis 1975; Srull and Wyer 1989; Sujan 1985; Tversky 1977). According to this view, items associated with similar objects are judged as falling under the same cognitive category and are, therefore, associated to both objects (Boush, Shipp, Loken, Gencturk, Crockett, Kennedy, Minshall, Misurell, Rochford, and Strobel 1987; Smith and Medin 1981). As a consequence, to the extent that two entities are perceived as being similar, they will be categorized together and knowledge transfer will take place between them.

Based on this view of similarity, the branding literature has widely investigated the role of categorization in the evaluation of brand extensions (e.g., Aaker and Keller 1990; Boush and Loken 1991; Keller and Aaker 1992). Researchers posited that consumers use similarity judgment when evaluating the fit between the brand and the extension. The greater the fit, the more likely the extension is to be perceived as belonging to the category of the parent brand and the greater is the knowledge transferred from the brand to the extension (Levy and Tybout 1989; Martin and Stewart 2001; Sujan 1985).

Sponsorship research has also assumed that fit or similarity between the event sponsored and the sponsoring brand is beneficial for the sponsorship (e.g., MacDonald 1991; Meenaghan and Shipley 1999). Johar and Pham (1999) found that similarity between the event and a brand influenced sponsorship recognition in favor of that brand even when it was not a sponsor of that event. Their results indicated that when a brand is
perceived to be related to a sponsored event (i.e., semantic overlap between features of the event and those of the sponsors), consumers are more likely to attribute the sponsorship of the event to that brand rather than any other brand when they fail to directly recall the correct sponsoring brand. Gwinner and Eaton (1999) found that image transfer between the event and the sponsor of the event is positively related to their functional- and image-based similarity.

_A new stance on similarity._ More recently, researchers pointed out that the traditional notion of similarity stands on a fragile conceptual ground and that the relevance of its role in categorization and knowledge transfer should be reconsidered. Indeed, some findings in the brand extension area indicate that the notion of similarity is secondary to the notion of specific brand associations in knowledge transfer (Broniarczyk and Alba 1994). Other findings indicate that the degree of fit between the brand and the extension depends more on the extent to which the extension product accommodates the brand-concept (brand-concept consistency) (Park, Milberg, and Lawson 1991). More recently, Meyvis and Janiszewski (2004) showed that not only similarity but also brand benefit accessibility play an important role in the evaluation of brand extension. They found that the extension of a broad brand (i.e., one brand subsuming products from different categories) is preferred to the extension of a narrow brand (i.e., one brand subsuming products from the same category) when the brands are both extended to a product category similar to them. This is due to the greater accessibility of brand benefit associations of the broad brand (i.e., broad brands do not have strong category associations that interfere with their benefit associations). The above mentioned studies indicate that similarity may not be the key variable for investigating knowledge transfer.
It is possible that similarity may be as much a consequence of knowledge transfer as a cause (Murphy and Medin 1985). Given this ambiguous role of similarity in categorization, there exists a need to investigate other possible drivers of knowledge transfer.

It is suggested that the extent to which knowledge can be transferred among objects depends on their perceived entitativity as a group of objects (Campbell 1958). The next section is devoted to the notion of entitativity in multiple sponsorships and how it contributes to the understanding of image transfer mechanisms among concomitant sponsoring brands as well as between the event and the sponsoring brands.

**The Role of Entitativity in Multiple Sponsorships**

Goodman (1972) stated that similarity is “invidious, insidious, a pretender, an imposter, a quack” (p. 437). Although this position might appear extreme, it adequately conveys the notion that similarity is not all that useful for explaining the categorization process. First, similarity is too flexible (Medin 1989; Medin, Goldstone, and Gentner 1993). In effect, according to Tversky’s (1977) contrast model, similarity between objects is a function of their common and distinctive features weighted by their salience, with common features increasing similarity and distinctive ones decreasing similarity. However, these weights are relative to the context of judgment. In the context of a similarity judgment where a subject is compared to a referent, the focus is on the subject and its features are then weighted more heavily than the referent’s. For example, subjects’ ratings of the similarity between North Korea (i.e., subject) and Red China (i.e., referent) are greater than their ratings of the similarity between Red China (i.e., subject)
and North Korea (i.e., referent). This is explained by the fact that Red China has more distinctive features than North Korea and, according to the contrast model, detracts more from similarity than when North Korea is the subject (Tversky 1977).

Second, Murphy and Medin (1985) have argued that any two things may be arbitrarily similar or dissimilar. In effect, there could a countless number of features that two objects have in common. As an extreme example, a plum and a lawn mower share an infinite number of commonalities: “both weight less than 1,000 kg, are found on earth, both are found in our solar system, both cannot hear well, both have an odor, both are not worn by elephants…” (see Medin 1989, p. 1473).

Although similarity raises some problems, it is still an important element of categorization. Medin (1989) developed a model of categorization that takes into account both similarity and conceptual coherence. According to him, superficial similar features lead perceivers to infer that these features are caused by deeper underlying factors, a phenomenon called essentialization (Medin 1989). Objects will be categorized together if they share the same underlying core essence inferred from surface similarities. The concept of entitativity refers to the extent to which a group of objects is perceived to share a common core, i.e., an essence (Campbell 1958). As a consequence, members of an entitative group will be categorized together and a transfer of knowledge will take place between the group and its members (i.e., information linked to the group becomes linked to the members of the group as well). Therefore, entitativity is a more relevant variable than similarity when trying to investigate knowledge transfer. In fact, empirical evidence supports the notion that entitativity is a key driver of group stereotype formation (Crawford et al. 2002). Similarity has an ambiguous role and is, in fact, one of the
antecedents of entitativity (Campbell 1958). Welbourne (1999), however, showed that it is not as an important variable as unity or perceived cohesiveness in explaining the categorization of group members. The concept of entitativity, as well as its causes and consequences, are explained in the following section. In addition, Figure 3 graphically displays the antecedents of entitativity and its impact on information processing.

Figure 3. Antecedents and Consequences of Group Entitativity

*: Factors leading to a high entitativity of the group of brands and the event in multiple sponsorship situations.
The Antecedents of Entitativity

Drawing on the Gestalt principles of perceptual organization, Campbell (1958) stated that a group of individual elements is perceived as an organized whole to the extent that this group is entitative. According to Campbell (1958), entitativity refers to the degree with which a social aggregate is perceived as having “the nature of an entity, of having real existence” (1958, p. 17). Campbell (1958) also claimed that different groups have different degrees of entitativity. Results from Lickel, Hamilton, Lewis, Sherman, Wieczorkowska, and Uhles (2000) confirmed that view. They showed that the perception of group entitativity differs greatly from one group to another. For instance, they found that members of a sport team or of a family are perceived much more like a single entity than people in the audience at a movie or people waiting at a bus stop.

Understanding what factors can lead to a higher perceived entitativity is important for multiple sponsorships because the degree of perceived entitativity will impact how information about each sponsoring brand is processed and what knowledge can be transferred from the event or the brands to each concomitant sponsoring brand. There are two types of antecedents to entitativity: 1) the cognitive characteristics of the perceiver can influence his/her tendency to perceive the group as being high in entitativity, and 2) the characteristics of the group can impact the extent to which it is perceived as being entitative.

Individual differences. Individual difference variables such as “Need for Closure” (Webster and Kruglanski 1994) may intensify people’s tendency to seek for coherence and meaningfulness in the perception of groups (Lickel et al. 2000).
“Need for Closure” refers to the desire for a clear-cut opinion on a judgment topic (Webster and Kruglanski 1994). Two types of factors impact the need for closure: 1) contextual, and 2) individual differences. First, when the costs outweigh the benefits of further information processing in a particular situation, the need for closure of an individual increases. This can occur when the predictability is important, when a decision is made under time pressure, or when the processing of further information is tedious (Kruglanski, Webster, and Klem 1993; Webster and Kruglanski 1994). Second, “Need for Closure” is also described as a stable individual dimension. Webster and Kruglanski (1994) described “Need for Closure” as a unidimensional individual difference variable composed of 5 facets. When the need for closure of an individual is high as opposed to low, this individual will have an increase in: 1) the preference for order and structure of the environment, 2) the affective discomfort occasioned by ambiguity, 3) the decisiveness of judgment and choices, 4) the tendency to afford predictability to future contexts, and 5) the unwillingness to have one’s opinion contradicted by others or by inconsistent evidence. “Need for Closure” has been shown to lead to stereotypically driven judgment in the group perception literature (Kruglanski and Freund 1983). Individuals with a high need for closure tend to rely on stereotypes in order to limit their cognitive effort and to make quicker decisions. Therefore, the extent to which an entitative group of brands and the event involved in multiple sponsorships are processed stereotypically will be greater for individuals with a high need for closure. This implies that individuals with a high need for closure are more likely to exhibit a greater transfer of implicit knowledge (i.e., knowledge that is not consciously accessible) than individuals with a low need for closure.
Group characteristics. According to Campbell (1958), four factors could lead a group to be perceived as more entitative: 1) similarity, 2) proximity, 3) common fate, and 4) pregnancy. 1) Similarity has been established as an antecedent of perceived group entitativity. The aspects according to which groups can be perceived as similar are numerous (Lickel et al. 2000). For instance, Crawford et al. (2002) and McConnell et al. (1997) manipulated group members’ similarity by informing respondents of the resemblance of these persons’ personality, opinions, beliefs, and behaviors across situations. 2) Proximity refers to the physical distance between the different elements of the group (Campbell 1958). 3) Common fate is the extent to which elements of a group move in the same direction successively in time (Campbell 1958). 4) Pregnancy refers to the extent to which a group of elements are perceived as forming a part of a spatial organization (Campbell 1958). Common fate has been argued to be the most important driver of group entitativity before proximity, similarity, or pregnancy (Campbell 1958).

Apart from these factors, researchers have focused on other antecedents of entitativity. Lickel et al. (2000) found that the degree of interdependence between group members, the extent to which the group is perceived as having an essential core, and the importance of the group for each individual member are key factors of perceived entitativity. The degree of interdependence among the members of a group impacts perceived entitativity because it influences the degree to which the group is perceived as a coherent unit (Gartner and Schopler 1998). Three properties impact the interdependence of group members: 1) the degree of perceived group interaction, 2) the extent to which members are perceived as having common goals, and 3) the extent to which members are perceived as having common outcomes. Lickel et al.’s (2000)
findings show that these variables are positively correlated with perceived group
entitativity (r ranging from .37 to .58).

The extent to which the group has an essential core leads people to perceive the
group as being inalterable (Rothbart and Taylor 1992). Two properties of the group can
lead one to perceive the group as being as such (Lickel et al. 2000): 1) the permeability of
the group boundaries (i.e., the difficulty to exit or enter the group), and 2) the duration of
the group. Lickel et al. (2000) found that permeability was negatively related to
entitativity (r = -.24) whereas duration had a small positive correlation with entitativity (r = .11). Importance of the group to the members is a crucial variable in the social identity
and group dynamics domains (Cartwright and Zander 1960; Tajfel and Turner 1985).
Importance has a fairly strong relationship with entitativity; according to Lickel et al.
(2000) the correlation between these two variables is .50.

The Entitativity of the Concomitant Sponsoring Brands and the Event

It is likely that multiple brands sponsoring an event will be perceived as being
more entitative than if the brands do not concomitantly sponsor that event. Two
important antecedents of entitativity characterize the brands and the event involved in a
multiple sponsorships agreement: 1) proximity, and 2) interdependence. In effect, the
brands and the event are often concomitantly presented to the diverse audiences (e.g.,
television viewers, on-site spectators) through side-by-side signage (Ruth and Simonin
2003) that strengthens the impression of proximity among the brands and the event.

In addition, the sponsoring brands and the event are likely to be seen as being
interdependent because consumers will perceive they have the same goals and outcomes
(Lickel et al. 2000). As pointed out by Meenaghan and Shipley (1999), consumers’
perception of the objectives of event sponsorship depends on the type of event sponsored
(e.g., sporting events sponsorship is perceived as being commercial whereas charitable
event sponsorship is perceived as being philanthropic). Therefore, if the concomitant
sponsoring brands are tied to the same event, their objectives are likely to be perceived as
fairly similar. Empirical evidence confirms that assertion. Welbourne (1999) found that
the perceived unity of the target’s intentions and goals serve as a basis to the entitativity
assumption made by respondents. Furthermore, since concomitant sponsoring brands are
tied to the same event, it is likely that consumers will consider that the outcomes of the
sponsorship are the same for all the parties involved. As a consequence, physical
proximity and interdependence suggest that concomitant sponsoring brands and the event
will be perceived as being high in entitativity.

*The Influence of Entitativity on Information Processing*

Perceived entitativity of a group has a strong influence on the way people form
impressions about target elements of that group (Welbourne 1999). If a group is
perceived as being high in entitativity, information about its members will be processed
in much the same way as about an individual target. When trying to form an impression
about an individual target as opposed to a group, a perceiver expects consistency in the
observed traits and behaviors of that target. This is because one assumes that
dispositional characteristics, such as personality for instance, underlie these observations
Groups that are perceived as high in entitativity are assumed to have a unity (Campbell 1958) similar to an individual target. As a consequence, highly entitative groups are also expected to be consistent (e.g., given one observed behavior, the target would be expected to perform similar behaviors subsequently (Asch 1946; Kelley 1973)), which implies that information about such groups is processed in the same way as information about individual targets (Hamilton and Sherman 1996; Welbourne 1999). As a consequence, members of entitative groups are perceived to be interchangeable and they lose some of their individuality; in fact, they become confounded with the group impression (Crawford et al. 2002). Information processing of highly entitative groups as compared to low entitative groups has three main characteristics: 1) on-line versus memory-based judgment, 2) category-based versus individuating, and 3) stereotypic versus exemplar.

On-line vs. memory-based judgment. On-line judgment implies that information about the target (individual or group) is processed into an integrating fashion (McConnell et al. 1997). Integrative information processing is aimed at forming an impression of the target (McConnell et al. 1994) that leads to the reconciliation of inconsistent information and to more associative linkages in memory (Hastie and Park 1986; McConnell et al. 1994). This abstraction of a target impression will then be used in order to form an on-line judgment at the same time the information is processed (McConnell et al. 1997). Therefore, when respondents are asked to make a judgment after the information was processed, they do not have to retrieve the information from memory and then form a judgment because it is already available (Hastie and Park 1986).
In the case of memory-based judgment, the perceiver does not attempt to form an impression of the target group or reconcile inconsistent information because information is not processed into an integrative fashion (McConnell et al. 1994). Therefore, there is no abstraction formed at the time the information is processed (McConnell et al. 1997). As a consequence, in the case of memory-based judgment, when respondents are asked to form a global impression, they have to form a judgment based on information stored in memory (Hastie and Park 1986). Empirical evidence shows that high entitativity groups are characterized by on-line judgment, whereas low entitativity groups are characterized by memory-based judgment (McConnell et al. 1997, 1994). Therefore, information about high entitativity groups vs. low entitativity groups will be processed in an integrative manner.

Two factors can explain why high entitativity leads to on-line as opposed to memory-based judgment: 1) the motivation to reconcile inconsistencies, and 2) the limited capacity to process diverse and complex information (McConnell et al. 1994). In the case where a target group is perceived as being high in entitativity, the behaviors or personalities of its members are expected to be coherent (McConnell et al. 1994). Therefore, because small variance in the group characteristics is anticipated, perceivers will be more motivated to form an integrated overall impression of the group. However, when greater variance in the group characteristics is anticipated (i.e., low entitativity), perceivers will be less motivated to form an integrated overall impression of the group. In addition, integrating information about a low entitativity group is more complex than about a high entitativity group due to the variance of the information. Therefore, a perceiver is more likely to have the sufficient cognitive resources available for on-line
rather than memory-based judgment when the group is high in entitativity (McConnell et al. 1994).

Category-based vs. individuating information processing. Both the dual-process model proposed by Brewer (1988) and the continuum model proposed by Fiske and Neuberg (1990) distinguish between category-based and individuating information processing. The category-based process implies that the information about individual members is subsumed under a group impression. As a consequence, the information is stored in association with all the members of the group. The individuating process implies that information about a group member is uniquely associated with that individual. Hamilton and Sherman (1996) suggested that perceivers organize information around the units they consider coherent. In line with this assertion, Crawford et al. (2002) found that in the case of a high entitativity group, the impression of each group member is formed on a category-based manner whereas in the case of a low entitativity group, the impression of each group member is formed on an individuating manner. As a consequence, information about individual members of a highly entitative group will be associated with all the other members of the group in the perceivers’ memory. For a group low in entitativity, the information about group members will be associated uniquely to each individual.

To summarize, the previous discussion has several implications for the processing of information related to concomitant sponsoring brands of an event. As previously explained, concomitant sponsoring brands are likely to be perceived as high in entitativity because of their proximity and interdependence (i.e., common goals and outcomes) (Lickel et al. 2000). Therefore, perceivers will rely on an on-line rather than memory-
based judgment when processing information related to concomitant sponsoring brands. They will try to integrate the diverse information by abstracting a group impression that will be applied to each brand. In the case of multiple sponsorships, information related to each brand is likely to be stored on a category-based rather than on an individuating manner. Therefore, information about a sponsoring brand will become associated to the other concomitant sponsoring brands in consumers’ memory.

Both on-line judgment and category-based processing of information suggest that a transfer of image is likely to take place among the brands of a multiple sponsorships agreement as well as from the event to the sponsoring brands due to an increased entitativity. These two processes lead to the creation of a group impression. Information associated with each concomitant sponsoring brand is abstracted to form a group stereotype that will, in turn, influence each of the concomitant sponsoring brands of the multiple sponsorships agreement. This group stereotype is composed of the images of the concomitant sponsoring brands, as well as the event, and is generalized to the perception of each brand. As a consequence, a given brand will become associated with the images of all the other sponsoring brands. For instance, if Coca-Cola, MacDonald’s, and New Balance are all sponsors of the Olympic Games, consumers will try to integrate the different images of these brands and the event by abstracting a group stereotype that will influence the perception of each brand. As a result of this stereotypic processing, Coca-Cola’s image will be influenced by the images of MacDonald’s, New Balance, and the Olympic Games.

**Stereotypic vs. exemplar processing.** Entitativity impacts the cognitive processes engaged when one is developing a representation, or impression of the group (Hamilton
and Sherman 1996; Sherman, Castelli, and Hamilton 2002). Group entitativity is positively related to the extent to which groups are mentally represented as prototypes and negatively related to the extent to which they are mentally represented as exemplars (Brewer and Harasty 1996; Brewer, Weber, and Carini 1995). This prototypic representation of members from groups high in entitativity is due to the fact that perceivers are motivated to form a simple representation of the group. In fact, a group impression is generalized to group members as a function of the strength of perceivers’ expectancies about the group stereotype (Stangor and McMillan 1992). Stereotypic processing is more likely for a high entitative group for two reasons. First, entitativity creates a greater cognitive load on the perceiver that stereotypes can alleviate (Macrae, Milne, and Bodenhausen 1994). Second, entitativity leads perceivers to form expectancies about the group based on the perception of its “real essence” (Yzerbyt, Rocher, and Schadron 1997).

*The cognitive busyness of entitativity.* Social psychology considers stereotypes as energy saving devices that social perceivers use to simplify information processing and their response to that information (Allport 1954; Fiske and Neuberg 1990; Macrae et al. 1994). This leads people to rely on stereotypic processing when individuation necessitates too much cognitive resources (Brewer 1988; Fiske and Neuberg 1990). A large body of research empirically supports this assertion. Studies have shown that stereotypic processing is a simplification tool (Macrae et al. 1994) by demonstrating that an increase in stereotypic processing is obtained by inducing cognitively taxing conditions (e.g., Kruglanski and Freund 1983; Macrae, Hewstone, and Griffiths 1993). In fact, Macrae et al. (1994) suggested that stereotypic processing is often used as a heuristic
by perceivers in order to free up cognitive resources that can be applied to more rewarding mental activities. Therefore, because concomitant sponsoring brands represent an extensive source of stimuli, consumers might be tempted to rely on a stereotype in order to simplify their cognitive task. Apart from a cognitive simplification tool, stereotypes are also considered as devices allowing perceivers to find coherent patterns in the world that provide explanations of the environment through a process of essentialization (Yzerbyt et al. 1997).

*Group essentialization.* Medin (1989) defined “psychological essentialism” as the tendency of people to act as if things (e.g., objects, other people, entities) have an essence or an underlying nature that make them the things they are. This essence is composed of the underlying properties that cause observable superficial properties. According to Medin (1989), the essentialist heuristic consists in assigning objects to categories and makes inferences about these objects by generalizing characteristics from their category.

In the social perception literature, Rogier and Yzerbyt (1999) relied on the essentialization process to describe the phenomenon by which perceivers make link between surface characteristics of people and underlying features they consider as causal factors of these characteristics. Such internal causal structures generate some attribution and motivate perceivers to integrate information into a coherent story. Evidence shows that this leads to stronger dispositional inferences about group members’ behaviors (Yzerbyt, et al. 1998) and greater correspondence bias (Rogier and Yzerbyt 1999). These underlying features constitute the essence of the group, which is the common core of all group members and is crucial to the group’s identity (Rogier and Yzerbyt 1999).
According to the subjective essentialism view of Yzerbyt et al. (1997), the more a social group is perceived as having an essence, the more rationale ground a perceiver has for relying on a stereotype to make judgment about members of the group. People find a justification to their stereotypic beliefs about group members of a group in the perceived essence of the group. Furthermore, the essentialist view of stereotype implies that groups with a strong essence have a high inductive potential and a highly interconnected set of characteristics (Yzerbyt et al. 1997). Therefore, perceivers will easily infer characteristics of individuals based on information pertaining to their group membership. In addition, because these characteristics are highly interconnected, all the characteristics of the group are likely to be inferred and transferred from the group stereotype to each group member. People are more likely to rely on an essentialist heuristic if the considered objects belong to a highly entitative group. This suggests that essentialization is a function of perceived entitativity (Yzerbyt et al. 1998). Therefore, perceivers are likely to rely on a stereotype when judging members of highly entitative groups. This leads group members to be perceived as homogeneous and interchangeable (Brewer et al. 1995; Crawford et al. 2002).

It is proposed that, similarly to what is argued in the person and group perception literature (i.e., Rogier and Yzerbyt 1999), the processing of concomitant sponsoring brands will be subjected to an essentialist heuristic. This view implies that the concomitant sponsorship of the same event will be seen as the manifestation of the underlying features common to the brands and the event. For instance, people could perceive that the Olympic Games and its sponsoring brands all share the Olympic values. This is in line with the conceptualization of Pracejus (1998) who suggested that
consumers make inference about the size of the sponsor (sponsoring brands belong to large companies), the legitimacy of the sponsor (sponsoring brands care about the event they sponsor), and the facilitation of the event (sponsoring brands make the event possible). Therefore, the induction of characteristics and interconnectedness of these characteristics will increase with entitativity and perceived group essence, which will improve the potential for image transfer.

The Impact of Concept Similarity on Entitativity

It was previously argued that multiple sponsorships would increase the perceived entitativity of the sponsoring brands and the event sponsored, which then would be seen as a group. The grouping of objects by perceivers, however, depends strongly on the underlying concept of the objects considered. Objects understood to share the same concept tend to be grouped together and to constitute a category (Murphy and Medin 1985). Therefore, perceived entitativity could be influenced not only by sponsorship activities, but also by the concepts that consumers associate with the sponsoring brands and the event. For instance, if the sponsors and the event are related to the concept of “sport,” perceived entitativity for the group will be stronger than if the sponsors are not related to the concept of “sport.” It is proposed that brand-concept similarity will moderate the role of multiple sponsorships in the perceived entitativity of the brands and the event. Multiple sponsorships will generate the creation of an entitative group, but only for sponsors with the same brand-concept as the event.

Categorization and conceptual coherence. Mervis and Rosch (1981) defined categorization as one of the most fundamental processes performed by living creatures.
A category exists when two or more distinguishable elements are treated equivalently; these elements can be anything including objects, persons, events, or ideas (Mervis and Rosch 1981). Psychologists have argued that the objective of categorization for the perceiver is to achieve the highest cognitive efficiency, which is obtained when the categories maximize within-category similarity relative to between-category similarity (Medin and Schaffer 1978; Rosch and Mervis 1975). In line with that stream of research, accentuation theory (Krueger and Clement 1994; Tajfel 1959) posits that categorization leads to an assimilation effect within the categories and to a contrast effect between these categories. In other words, perceivers attempt to minimize differences among stimuli that fall in the same category (assimilation) and to maximize the differences among stimuli that fall into different categories (contrast). In addition, categorization of stimuli has been shown to impede the individualization of these stimuli. Stangor and McMillan (1992) found that stimuli in the same category are likely to be confused with each other. This finding is consistent with Crawford et al.’s (2002) results that group entitativity leads group members to be perceived as interchangeable.

An important question relative to categorization concerns the basis on which it takes place; how are elements assigned to different categories by perceivers? Murphy and Medin (1985) provided an explanation of how categories are created based on conceptual consistency. This is an alternative to the classical view (i.e., by a set of defining attributes), the probabilistic view (i.e., by a set of typical attributes) or the exemplar view (i.e., by the exemplars).

Murphy and Medin (1985) developed the argument that elements are grouped together on the basis of how coherent the relationships between their underlying concept
are. These inter-concept relationships depend on the perceivers’ theory about the world. For example, Medin (1989) reported that people consider the terms *white hairs* and *grey hairs* to be more similar than the terms *grey hairs* and *black hairs*, whereas the terms *white clouds* and *grey clouds* were judged to be less similar than the terms *grey clouds* and *black clouds*. This shows how elements can be grouped together differently depending on their underlying concept (i.e., aging or bad weather) as well as on the theory perceivers use to articulate these concepts (i.e., darker colors indicating younger age for hairs and worse weather for clouds).

Barsalou’s (1983) research on goal-derived categories illustrates the importance of theories in establishing conceptual structure. According to him, people rely on their own theories about the world to categorize together elements they think fulfill similar goals. He found that a disparate set of elements composed of objects such as children, photo albums, paintings, manuscripts, and jewelry could be categorized together under the label “taking things out of one’s home during a fire.”

*Brand-concept consistency.* Brand concepts are abstract meanings that consumers uniquely associate to brands that result from product features (e.g., a higher price can induce a high status meaning) and the firm marketing activities (Park, Milberg and Lawson 1991). The marketing literature recognized the role of consumers’ a-priori category structure in mediating information processing. Cohen and Basu (1987) as well as Sujan (1985) argued that categories to which consumers assign products and brands impact how information is processed. Sujan (1985) found that when information about a brand was consistent with the knowledge about the category of that brand, perceivers relied on category-based information processing; whereas, when information about a
brand was not consistent with the knowledge about the category of that brand, perceivers relied on individuating information processing (Fiske and Neuberg 1990).

Murphy and Medin’s (1985) work suggests that the concepts associated to the brands are key for understanding how consumers categorize the brands. In a brand extension study, Park, Milberg and Lawson (1991) found that the better the extension product accommodates the brand-concept, the more likely the brand name and the extension product will be categorized together (i.e., seen as belonging to the same group) and the more favorably the brand extension is perceived.¹ Martin and Stewart (2001) studied how a categorization process mediates the impact of different types of similarity on attitudes and purchase intentions within the context of a brand extension. Their results showed that, under a situation of goal congruency, moderate goal incongruency, or extreme goal incongruency between the brand and the extension product, the impact of similarity on attitude and purchase intention was mediated by the abstract meaning associated to the brands and the extension products. Both these studies offer considerable support for taking into account brand-concept when investigating the basis on which consumers categorize brands.

Based on the above discussion, it is asserted that perceived entitativity is a function of both the presence of a multiple sponsorships agreement and the extent to which the event and the sponsors share the same brand-concept.

1 For brands with either a “functional” or a “prestige” brand-concept.
Savings in Relearning as a Measure of Implicit memory

Johar and Pham (1999) showed that sponsor identification is biased by heuristics that consumers rely on when they cannot retrieve information directly from their explicit memory. These heuristics pertain to the different contingent processes that consumers use when trying to identify message source (Pham and Johar 1997). Specifically, when asked to identify the correct sponsor of an event among a list of alternatives, consumers tended to attribute the sponsorship of an event to a brand prominent in a product category or to a brand semantically related to the event sponsored. These findings show that consumers have difficulties remembering what brand sponsored a given event. However, as Johar and Pham (1999) suggested, their results only concern explicit memory and consumer learning about sponsoring brands could take a more implicit form during sponsorships arrangements (Pham and Vanhuele 1997; Pracejus 1998).

Pham and Vanhuele (1997) showed that “advertising fragments” (i.e., advertising messages that only include the brand name or a few words expressing the brand’s positioning) impact the implicit knowledge of consumers about brands rather than their explicit knowledge. The Implicit Association Test measures implicit attitude based on response latency (Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz 1998) and has been shown to be useful in assessing consumer implicit cognition (Brunel, Tietje, and Greenwald 2004). However, it is not well suited for the objectives of this dissertation for two reasons: 1) it does not allow investigating the processing mechanisms that entitativity triggers (i.e., category-based versus individuating), and 2) it does not allow investigating implicit learning because it focuses on the strength of the implicit associations between concepts in the consumer social knowledge structure (Greenwald et al. 1998). As it will be
subsequently shown, the savings in relearning paradigm allows investigating implicit memory (Carlston and Skowronski 1994; Ebbinghaus 1885/1964).

*Abstraction as Implicit Knowledge Creation*

Research has shown that the abstraction of the underlying characteristics of a group due to stereotyping results in the loss of individual-level information, which leads the members of the group to be seen as interchangeable. Once a group impression has been abstracted, the specific information that was used to create that group impression is forgotten (Crawford et al. 2002). Findings in the attitude domain confirm this assertion. Once a global attitude toward an object has been formed, the original information on which the attitude is based cannot be recalled (Lingle and Ostrom 1979). In fact, the passive abstraction of the deep underlying structure of the group, its “essence” as previously seen (Yzerbyt et al. 1997), is the mechanism that characterizes the creation of implicit knowledge (Matthews et al. 1997; Reber 1989; Whittlesea and Wright 1997). Implicit knowledge is intuitive and results from an unconscious inductive abstraction of the underlying structure of complex environmental stimuli (Reber 1989).

Implicit learning is more robust over time than explicit learning (Matthews et al. 1987; Seger 1994) and is directly related to implicit memory (Seger 1994). In fact, there is evidence that implicit knowledge about a phenomenon can remain long after explicit knowledge about that phenomenon no longer exists. This implies that even though an individual’s remembrance of particular information related to a brand after exposure to a sponsorship might be limited, his/her global impression of that brand could still be implicitly remembered. Therefore, the abstraction of a group impression resulting from
multiple sponsorships is likely to take place at an implicit level in consumer memory. Stimuli conveyed by sponsorship operations are not salient (Pham and Johar 1997; Pham and Vanhuele 1997) and are likely to operate below the conscious level of consumers (Greenwald 1992). The research paradigm used in this dissertation will allow studying if higher entitativity results in the formation of implicit knowledge that is stored in implicit memory and subsequently impacts performance on cued-recall trials.

Implicit memory. The field of experimental psychology distinguishes between explicit memory, which is the conscious recollection of information from a previous learning episode, and implicit memory, which is the unconscious impact of previously learned information on the facilitation of test performance (Schacter 1987). Explicit and implicit memory are dissociated systems that work independently from each other. Amnesic patients have been shown to suffer from decreased performance on explicit memory tests such as free recall or recognition while their performance on implicit memory tests such as repetition priming (i.e., partial words completion after having been exposed to the entire word) was as good as control patients (Roediger 1990). In addition, explicit memory performance has been shown to be greater than implicit memory performance in the case of conceptual priming (i.e., presentation of cues conceptually related to the target stimulus: respondents are given the word “tool” to prompt the word “hammer” they saw earlier), whereas implicit memory performance has been shown to be greater than explicit memory performance in the case of perceptual priming (i.e., presentation of a perceptually degraded version of the target stimulus as a cue: respondents are given the word “treasure” to prompt the word “treason” they saw earlier)
(Smith and Branscombe 1988). The previously mentioned evidence indicates that explicit and implicit memory tap different forms of retention (Roediger 1990).

Neuro-psychologists have suggested that these two types of memory correspond to two different systems in the brain. Explicit memory corresponds to the declarative memory system, whereas implicit memory corresponds to the procedural system (Cohen and Squire 1980). On the other hand, cognitive psychologists have argued that these two types of memory correspond to two different types of processing. Explicit memory relates to conceptually-driven processing whereas implicit memory relates to perceptually-driven processing (Roediger, Weldon, and Challis 1989). A theoretical perspective has been proposed that integrates the neurological and cognitive approaches of memory. Tulving and Schacter (1990) argued that the different memory systems of the brain have to operate through different cognitive processes, which is in line with the position of Hayman and Tulving (1989). As such, they proposed that explicit memory is based on a declarative system that operates through conceptual processing and implicit memory is based on a procedural system that operates through perceptual processing.

Savings in Relearning

During the early 18th century, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz pointed out that although some things could not be remembered directly, they could be more easily conceived if they were formerly known (Leibniz 1916). Similarly, Ebbinghaus (1885/1964) noticed that some retentions are concealed from consciousness but have effects that are significant, which demonstrates their previous experience. Ebbinghaus’ observation corresponds to the modern definition of implicit memory (Roediger 1990).
Because in the late 19th century all the measures of memory were measures of explicit memory (i.e., free recall, recognition), Ebbinghaus (1885/1964) created a way to measure implicit memory: the savings in relearning method. In its original version, the savings in relearning method consisted of subjects learning nonsense syllables and then recording the number of trials or the amount of time to achieve a perfect recitation of the syllables. At a later time, the same process was repeated requiring the subjects learn the same material again (after a delay or a distracting task). The savings in relearning were measured as the difference in the number of trials or in the amount of time needed between the second and the first learning phase. Subjects’ attempt to learn the material the second time should take less trials or less time. When subjects cannot consciously remember the previously learned material, savings during the relearning phase are a quantitative estimation of their implicit knowledge about the material learned during the first phase.

Savings in relearning effects have been shown even after several years have past since the first learning phase (Titchener 1923). The savings in relearning method is still regularly used in the field of experimental and social psychology. Recent studies include spontaneous trait inferences of social actors (Carlston and Skowronski 1994, 1999) or trait transference among group members in a social setting (Crawford et al. 2002). Over the years, several characteristics of the savings in relearning method have been pointed out that are of particular interest for the purpose of this dissertation. First, savings effects have been reported with material presented once rather than presented until memorized perfectly (i.e., learned to criterion) (Nelson 1985). Second, such effects hold not only for word pairs, but also for different combinations of verbal and pictorial materials. Third,
the number of trials or the amount of time as a measure of savings in relearning has been
replaced with a comparison of cued recall for old (relearned) versus new (control)
material (e.g., Carlston and Skowronski 1994, 1999; Crawford et al. 2002; MacLeod

Implicit Image Transfer. Sponsorships effects on the images of sponsoring brands
are likely to be subtle (e.g., Johar and Pham 1999; Pham and Vanhuele 1997; Pham and
Johar 1997). In addition, our conceptualization posits that the images characterizing the
brands and the event are abstracted into a group stereotype as a function of their brand-
concept similarity and transferred from the group to each brand due to category-based
processing (Fiske and Neuberg 1990). Therefore, image transfer effects might be below
the consciousness level of individuals. As such, the savings in relearning paradigm will
be used because “savings” in this paradigm constitute a measure of implicit memory.

Previous studies in social psychology have relied on a modified version of the
savings in relearning paradigm in order to capture trait transference about social actors at
an implicit level. Skowronski et al. (1998) showed that a trait implied by a behavior
influenced the judgment of the person communicating that behavior when referring to
another person. If somebody describes a person as being brave, the person
communicating this statement would be judged as being brave as well. Skowronski et al.
(1998) referred to this as Spontaneous Trait Transference because the trait “brave” was
transferred from the “braveness” behavior to the communicator of that behavior.

Also relying on the savings in relearning paradigm, Crawford et al. (2002)
showed that such trait transference could occur for other group members and for the
group as a whole. In their study, they conceptualized the notion of Trait-Inference and
Trait-Transference. The subjects were first presented with a behavioral description of individual group members that clearly implied a particular trait (e.g., intelligent). Then, they had to learn the association between each individual member of the group they had seen and either a word that matched the trait implied by the behavior of that individual (e.g., intelligent) or a word that did not match the trait implied by the behavior of that individual, but that matched the trait implied by the behavior of another individual of the group (e.g., lazy). When the learning task involved a trait and a word that matched, it was labeled as a Trait-Inference trial. When the learning task involved a trait and a word that did not match it was labeled as a Trait-Transference trial. They found that subjects’ performance on Trait-Transference trials was higher when the group of individuals was high on entitativity, whereas it was greater on Trait-Inference trials when the group was low on entitativity.

In this research, the transference of social actors’ traits presented above is extended to the transfer of image among the brands as well as from an event to the brands during multiple sponsorships situations. Based on Crawford et al’s (2002) work, the notion of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR), as well as the notion of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) and Event Image Transfer (EIT), are conceptualized. Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) refers to a situation in which subjects are asked to memorize the association between a brand and a word (i.e., image-trait) that is consistent with the image of the brand. Brand Image Transfer (BIT) refers to a task for which subjects have to learn the association between a brand and a word (i.e., image-trait) that is not consistent with the image of that brand, but is consistent with the image of another brand sponsoring the event. Event Image Transfer (EIT) refers to a task for which subjects
have to learn the association between a brand and a word (i.e., image trait) that is not consistent with the image of that brand, but is consistent with the image of the sponsored event. The extent to which subjects can better remember Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials, as well as Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials, in a multiple sponsorship scenario rather than in a no sponsorship condition constitutes evidence of image transfer among multiple sponsoring brands and from the event to the brands, respectively.

Summary and Hypotheses Development

Hypotheses are formulated concerning both the outcomes of multiple sponsorships in terms of image transfer and the psychological process responsible for these outcomes. It is expected that there will be a transfer of image among the sponsoring brands, as well as from the event to the sponsoring brands, due to multiple sponsorships, but only for the sponsors with the same brand-concept as the event (i.e., outcome predictions). In addition, these transfer phenomena are expected to be due to category-based processing as opposed to individuating processing (i.e., process predictions).

Outcome Hypotheses

There are two factors that can impact the perceived entitativity of an event and some brands: 1) whether or not the brands are sponsoring the event concomitantly and, 2) whether or not the sponsors share the same brand-concepts as the event. In the case of multiple sponsorships, the perceived entitativity of the sponsoring brands and the event will increase due to their proximity and interdependence (Lickel et al. 2000). In the case
of no sponsorship, the brands and the event will not be perceived as a group and, therefore, entitativity will be not be impacted.

On the other hand, if the sponsors and the event share the same brand-concept, they will form a group and consumers will perceive them as belonging to the same category (Murphy and Medin 1985). Accentuation theory (Krueger and Clement 1994; Tajfel 1959) indicates that stimuli categorized together become more similar through an “assimilation” effect whereas stimuli assigned to different categories become more dissimilar through a “contrast” effect. Therefore, if the sponsors and the event have the same brand concept, they will be perceived as similar to each other. If the sponsors and the event do not share the same brand-concepts, they will be perceived as dissimilar to each other. According to Campbell (1958), the entitativity of a group is a positive function of how similar the elements of that group are perceived to be. Therefore, if the event and the sponsors share the same brand-concept, it will increase their entitativity; whereas, should they have divergent brand-concepts, it will decrease their entitativity.

The above discussion indicates that multiple sponsorships and brand-concept are related to entitativity differently. They both increase entitativity when the brands engage in multiple sponsorships or have the same brand-concepts as the event. As suggested previously, the absence of multiple sponsorships does not impact entitativity. When the brands do not engage in multiple sponsorships, however, the influence on entitativity is different from when they do not have the same brand-concepts. If the sponsors do not have the same brand-concepts, they will become more dissimilar (i.e., brand-concept dissimilarity) (Krueger and Clement 1994; Tajfel 1959). Based on Campbell (1958), this suggests that brand-concept dissimilarity will actually decrease the perceived entitativity.
of the group. As a consequence, given a situation of multiple sponsorships, if the brand-concepts of the sponsors are similar, the entitativity of the group will be greater than if the brand-concepts are dissimilar.

The higher entitativity of the group of sponsors and the event will result in the abstraction of a group impression in light of which each group member will be perceived. Since the group impression is composed of the images of the individual members, it is abstracted from each sponsoring brand’s image and will be associated with the images of the other sponsors, as well as of the event. In the context of the savings in relearning paradigm, higher entitativity should facilitate the memorization of a brand and an inconsistent image-trait (Brand Image Transfer trials, BIT and Event Image Transfer trials, EIT). In such a learning task, because each brand is already associated with the other brands and the event’s images, respondents will only have to relearn these associations and not learn them for the first time, which should generate more “savings” compared to low entitativity.

As a result, respondents should exhibit more “savings” in the multiple sponsorships than in the no sponsorship condition for Brand Image Transfer trials (BIT) or Event Image Transfer trials (EIT) concerning sponsors that share the same brand-concepts as the event. In that case, both the sponsorship and the brand-concept factors increase the entitativity of the group. BIT or EIT trials for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts, however, should not generate greater savings in the multiple sponsorships than in the no sponsorship condition because the two factors (i.e., sponsorship and brand-concept) will contribute in opposite directions to the entitativity of the group. Since both multiple and no sponsorship conditions will have a low entitativity,
respondents will not abstract a group impression in either condition. Inconsistent paired-associations will have to be learned for the first time in both cases and respondents should not have more savings in multiple sponsorships as compared to no sponsorship. Given the above discussion, the following is hypothesized:

H1a: The recall of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) will be greater in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition.

H1b: The recall of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brands) will not be significantly different in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition.

H2a: The recall of Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brands) will be greater in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition.

H2b: The recall of Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brands) will not be significantly different in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition.
Processes Hypotheses

It is posited that entitativity will trigger category-based processing as opposed to individuating processing (Fiske and Neuberg 1990). Category-based processing implies that information about a group member is associated with all the other members of the group while individuating processing implies that information is uniquely associated to each member. Respondents exposed to multiple sponsorships should process the sponsors with similar brand-concepts in a category-based manner. Therefore, a given image-trait characterizing a brand will be less uniquely linked to that brand if entitativity is high. As a consequence, it should be more difficult for respondents to learn the association of an image-trait and a brand that are consistent (Brand Image Reinforcement trials, BIR) in the case of multiple sponsorships because the image-trait should be less strongly associated with the brand than in the case of no sponsorship.

When the sponsors have dissimilar brand-concepts, however, they will not be categorized together and entitativity will remain low in both conditions. As a result, when memorizing a consistent paired-association for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts, respondents should have the same amount of savings (recall) in multiple sponsorships as in no sponsorship. Savings (recall) should be lower in multiple sponsorships compared with no sponsorship when the sponsors have similar brand-concepts. In addition, in multiple sponsorships, respondents should show lower savings (recall) when memorizing consistent paired-associations for sponsors with similar brand-concepts than for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts. Therefore, the following is hypothesized:
H3a: The recall of *Brand Image Reinforcement* (BIR) trials for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brands) will not be significantly different in the multiple versus the no sponsorship condition.

H3b: The recall of *Brand Image Reinforcement* (BIR) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) will be lower in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition.

H4: In the multiple sponsorships condition, the recall of *Brand Image Reinforcement* (BIR) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) than for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand).

High group entitativity should lead group members to be associated with all the image-traits characterizing the group due to category-based processing. Low entitativity should lead individual members to be associated uniquely with their own image-traits due to individuating processing. In high entitativity, the association of an image-trait and a brand that do not match should be as easy to memorize as when they match. As a result, savings (recall) on consistent paired-associations should not be greater than savings (recall) on inconsistent paired-associations when entitativity is high, but they should be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts when entitativity is low. As suggested before, high entitativity is only warranted for sponsors with similar brand-
concepts in multiple sponsorships. Dissimilar brand-concepts or the absence of sponsorship will lead to lower levels of entitativity. Thus, the following is hypothesized:

H5a: In the case of no sponsorship, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials will be greater than the recall of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand).

H5b: In the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials will not be significantly different from the recall of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand).

The pattern of effects posited above should be the same when comparing Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials to Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials; therefore, the following is hypothesized:

H5c: In the case of no sponsorship, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand).

H5d: In the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials
will not be significantly different for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand).

As seen before, for low entitativity, savings on consistent paired-associations should be higher than savings on inconsistent paired-associations. Sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts will not be categorized together and, therefore, will not form a group, which will keep entitativity low even in the case of multiple sponsorships. Therefore, the following is hypothesized:

H6a: In the case of no sponsorship, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand).

H6b: In the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand).

As before, the pattern of effects posited above should be the same for Event Image Transfer trials; thus:
H6c: In the case of no sponsorship, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand).

H6d: In the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand).

Higher entitativity leads information to be associated with each group member and the group as a whole due to category-based processing (Fiske and Neuberg 1990). This results in a loss of individuality for group members, which will be perceived as interchangeable (Crawford et al. 2002). As a consequence, the higher the perceived entitativity, the more weakly the respondents should associate the brands with their tag-line and the more difficult it should be for the respondents to recognize a sponsoring brand’s correct tag-line. As we saw earlier, sponsors with a brand-concept similar to that of the event will already be perceived as a group through a categorization phenomenon (Murphy and Medin 1985). Sponsors with similar brand-concepts will be perceived as somewhat entitative whether or not they sponsor the event. Therefore, it is expected that the brands will be more uniquely associated with their respective tag-lines in the case of no sponsorship compared to multiple sponsorships only when the sponsors’ brand-concepts are dissimilar. When the sponsors’ brand concepts are similar, they should
already form an entitative group and the tag-lines should be weakly associated with their brands for both multiple sponsorships and no sponsorship. Therefore, the following is hypothesized:

H7a: Tag-line recognition for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) will not be significantly different in the no sponsorship versus the multiple sponsorships condition.

H7b: Tag-line recognition for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) will be greater in the no sponsorship versus the multiple sponsorships condition.

In this chapter, the relevant literature on sponsorship, brand associations, experimental psychology, and social psychology was reviewed. It provided a rationale for the conceptualization of multiple sponsorships as a highly entitative situation, which leads the sponsors and the event to be grouped together when they have the same brand-concepts. Based on the previous elements, Brand Image Transfer (BIT) and Event Image Transfer (EIT) phenomena were predicted in the case of multiple sponsorships and formulated in a hypothesis format. In the next section, a design will be developed which allowed testing these hypotheses through an experiment.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

Overview

The objectives of this dissertation are threefold. First, to provide evidence of image transfer among concomitant sponsors of the same event, as well as from the event to its sponsors. Second, to show the implicit aspect of these image transfer phenomena by investigating them with the savings in relearning paradigm. And finally, to demonstrate that these effects are due to respondents’ processing of information on a category-based manner as opposed to an individuating manner.

The respondents were split between a multiple sponsorships condition and a no sponsorship condition. All the respondents were first exposed to eight sponsoring brands; four of these brands had an “exciting” image and the other four had a “sincere” image. Respondents in the multiple sponsorships condition were also exposed to a “sophisticated” sporting event. This allowed respondents to associate specific image-traits with the brands and the event and to abstract a group impression (i.e., in the multiple sponsorships condition). Respondents were then presented with four consistent paired-associations that constituted the Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials and four inconsistent paired-associations. For half of the respondents, the four inconsistent paired-associations were between one of the sponsoring brands and either the word “sincerity” or “exciting,” that constituted the Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials. For the other respondents, the inconsistent paired-associations were between one of the sponsoring
brands and the word “sophisticated” that constituted the Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials. After this paired-associations task, respondents were presented with a cued-recall task during which the sponsoring brands previously seen were shown again.

Respondents had to indicate the image-trait that was paired with each brand during the previous paired-association task. Eventually, respondents had to identify the correct tagline of each brand.

Respondents and Experimental Design

One hundred and seventy-one students from a large state university received extra-credit for participating in this experiment. They were randomly assigned to a 2 (sponsorship: multiple vs. no) x 2 (image-trait: brand related vs. event related) x 8 (counterbalancing factor) x 2 (paired-associations: consistent vs. inconsistent) x 2 (brand-concept: similar vs. dissimilar) mixed-measures design with repeated measures on the last 2 factors (see Appendix 4 for a graphical representation of the design). Sixteen respondents were dropped from the analysis due to obvious misunderstanding of the task or for missing data on the cued-recall task. This resulted in a usable sample of 155 respondents with cell sizes ranging from n = 36 to n = 41. Respondents were told they were participating in a study concerning the quality of the web sites of several new brands. In addition, they were told that they might not be aware of the brands they were exposed to because they were not available nationwide yet and were in a phase of test market in the northeast of the country.
Brand personality is an important component of brand image (Aaker 1997; Gwinner and Eaton 1999) and is defined as “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand” (Aaker 1997, p. 347). As a consequence, Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR), Brand Image Transfer (BIT), and Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials were assessed through image-traits operationalized by adjectives describing specific brand personality dimensions. In order to avoid confounding effects due to the preexisting image of real brands and of real events, the eight sponsoring brands and the event were fictitious.

Aaker’s (1997) brand personality scale was used to operationalize the specific image-traits assigned to the experimental stimuli (i.e., the event and the brands). Aaker’s (1997) brand personality scale is a 42-item instrument that captures the 5 dimensions of the brand personality construct: sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness. It was decided to rely on the dimensions of sincerity and excitement in order to create the brands used as experimental stimuli. Sincerity and excitement were chosen because they represent most of the variance in personality ratings of brands across individuals, product categories, or cultural contexts (Aaker, Benet-Martínez, and Garolera 2001; Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004; Caprara, Barbaranelli, and Guido 2001). Four of the sponsoring brands conveyed a “sincere” image and four conveyed an “exciting” image. Images of excitement and sincerity were generated through four different venues on the web pages: 1) brand name, 2) product information, 3) logo, and 4) tag-line (see Appendix 2 for the selected experimental stimuli).
Pretest

A pretest ensured that these web pages appropriately created sincerity or excitement. This pretest was conducted by providing 30 students with fictitious brands associated with sincere avenues on their web pages and others associated with exciting avenues. Respondents rated the degree to which each brand could be described by sincere traits (e.g., sincere, wholesome, sentimental, family-oriented), exciting traits (e.g., exciting, unique, young, trendy), as well as sophisticated traits (e.g., upper class, glamorous, good looking, charming) using items from Aaker’s (1997) 7-point Likert-type brand personality scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) (see Appendix 3 for items). The validity of the experimental stimuli was established by making sure that: 1) the exciting brands yielded higher ratings on the exciting traits than on the sincere traits, 2) the sincere brands yielded higher ratings on the sincere traits than on the exciting traits, 3) the sincere brands obtained higher sincerity ratings than the exciting brands, and 4) the exciting brands obtained higher excitement ratings than the sincere brands, 5) the event received higher sophistication ratings than the exciting and sincere brands, 6) the event received lower excitement ratings than the exciting brands and lower sincerity ratings than the sincere brands.

In addition, the sponsors had to satisfy the criterion of similarity/dissimilarity for their underlying brand-concept: half of the sponsors had to have the same brand-concepts as the event (i.e., sport) and the other half had to have a dissimilar brand-concept (i.e., no sport). Furthermore, it was important to verify that the manipulations of brand personality did not differ on variables that could threaten the validity of the experimental treatments. The personal relevance of the brands ("the brand image is relevant to me").
“the brand image makes sense to me”) as well as the relevance of the category (“relevant in [product/service category]”, “makes sense in [product/service category]”) were measured on a 7 points Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) (Aaker et al. 2004) (see Appendix 3 for items).

More than 30 brands and several versions of the event were pretested using different samples of undergraduate students (due to respondents’ fatigue and the iterative nature of this selection process, the same sample could not rate all the brands and versions of the event). Significance levels were used to make sure that the brands and event selected within each sample satisfied the six criteria listed above. It was decided to select the brands and the event based on the individual samples’ significance tests and to include a manipulation check of the brands and the event’s images in the main experiment.  

As a result, eight sponsoring brands and one event were selected that satisfied the six criteria established above, had the appropriate brand-concept, and had brand and category relevance ratings significantly higher than the neutral point of the scale (i.e., > 4) (Table 5-1 in Appendix 5 presents the pretest results for the eight sponsoring brands and the event chosen). The four sincere brands were: “Fitness” and “Health,” which are two fitness centers, “Massachusetts Bank”, which is a financial institution, and “Aunt Mary’s Gourmet Treat”, which is a brand of cookie. Two of these sincere sponsors had “sport” as an underlying brand-concept similar to the event’s (i.e., Fitness and Health), and the other two had a brand-concept different from each other and dissimilar to the

---

2 In the experiment, in order to limit respondents’ fatigue due to the length of the brand personality scale (i.e., 42 items for each brand or event), a factor analysis was performed on the pretest data and the two adjectives that explained the most variance for each personality dimension (i.e., “sincere”, “exciting” and “sophisticated”) were included.
event’s (i.e., Massachusetts Bank and Aunt Mary). The four exciting brands were: “Glissade,” which is a sportswear manufacturer, “Energetic,” which is an energy drink, “Urbane,” which is a consumer’s electronics brand, and “Night-Club,” which is a club.

Two of these exciting brands had “sport” has an underlying brand-concept (i.e., Glissade and Energetic), similar to the event’s, and the other two had a brand-concept different from each other and dissimilar to the event’s (i.e., Night-Club and Urbane). This allowed a balance between brand-concept and brand image (see Table 1). In addition, the version of the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament with the highest sophistication ratings was selected as the event.

Table 1. Concept Similarity and Images of the Brands Used in the Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Sport” Brand-concept</th>
<th>Sincere Image</th>
<th>Exciting Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Glissade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>Energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“No Sport” Brand-concept</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Urbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aunt Mary’s Gourmet Treat</td>
<td>Night-Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

An overview of each step of the procedure is provided in Figure 4. Each respondent received a package comprised of four booklets that corresponded to a different phase of the study (i.e., exposure to target brands, exposure to foil brands, memorization task, and cued-recall/recognition tasks). On each page, the booklets presented the respondents with a one-page excerpt of the web site of the fictitious brands. It was important that all respondents followed the same pace. Respondents were
instructed to wait when finished with a booklet and not to get started on another one. The entitativity manipulation through sponsorships was received at the beginning of the experimental session before respondents started the exposure phase.

Figure 4. Methodological Steps of the Experimental Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Variables Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Sponsorship Manipulation</td>
<td>The entitativity treatment is given to the respondents through a multiple sponsorships (high entitativity) vs. no sponsorship manipulation (low entitativity).</td>
<td>- <strong>Independent Variable 1</strong> (between-subject factor): Sponsorship (multiple vs. no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Target Brand Exposure</td>
<td>Subjects are educated about the images of 8 fictitious brands plus the event for those in the multiple sponsorships condition.</td>
<td>- <strong>Independent Variable 2</strong> (within-subject factor): Brand-concept (similar vs. dissimilar).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Foil Brand Exposure</td>
<td>Subjects are provided with an additional set of 6 fictitious brands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Paired-Associations Task</td>
<td>Subjects are asked to memorize the association between each of the previous brands and an image-trait.</td>
<td>- <strong>Independent Variable 3</strong> (within-subject factor): Pairing (consistent vs. inconsistent). - <strong>Independent Variable 4</strong> (between-subject factor): Image-trait (brand related vs. event related).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Filler Task</td>
<td>Subjects have to search in a letter matrix the names of famous Fortune 500 companies’ CEOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Cued-recall Task</td>
<td>Subjects are provided with the 8 target brands and have to write down with which image-trait each one was previously associated.</td>
<td>- <strong>Dependent Measure 1</strong>: Cued-recall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Tag-line Recognition Task</td>
<td>Subjects are provided with the 8 target brands and have to identify the correct tag-line for each brand out of a choice of 4 tag-lines.</td>
<td>- <strong>Dependent Measure 2</strong>: Tag-line Recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Manipulation Checks and Covariate</td>
<td>Subjects are administered scales to asses the success of the manipulation of entitativity, brand-concept, and the images of the experimental stimuli. Need for Closure is also measured.</td>
<td>- <strong>Manipulation checks</strong>: Brand-concept; Exciting, Sincere and Sophisticated brand image; Entitativity. - <strong>Covariate</strong>: Need for Closure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sponsorships Manipulation

Respondents were given one of the two sponsorship manipulations before the exposure task began (Independent Variable 1). Respondents in the multiple sponsorships condition were provided with a page that contained a two-paragraph statement about the eight brands they were about to see. The page mentioned that the brands would all be sponsors of the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament, support the event, and participate in activities before, during, and after the event. In addition, at the bottom of the page appeared an illustration of the different signages at the event location where logos of the event and of the sponsoring brands could be seen together (see Appendix 6 for the multiple sponsorships manipulation). In the multiple sponsorships condition, respondents were presented with a one-page excerpt of the web site of the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament. Furthermore, the web pages of each sponsoring brand mentioned the sponsorship of the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament. Respondents in the no sponsorship condition were given a written statement mentioning that the brands were arbitrarily chosen from a pool of brands conducting test markets in the Northeast area. They were not provided with a one-page excerpt of the web site of the event and the web pages of the brands did not mention any sponsorship agreement concerning the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament.

Target Brands Exposure

Every respondent was provided with a copy of a one-page excerpt of the web site of each of the four exciting and four sincere sponsoring brands. Half of these sponsors had a “sport” brand-concept while the other half had a “no sport” brand-concept
Respondents were asked to familiarize themselves with the material presented in order to make sure they developed some knowledge about these fictitious brands to test for image transfer effects; respondents read the materials at their own pace. Respondents in the multiple sponsorships condition were also provided with an excerpt of the web site of the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament, which had a “sophisticated” image. The sequence of presentation of the eight brands was alternated within each condition in order to avoid order effects.

**Foil Brands Exposure**

The first exposure phase was followed by a task aimed at promoting the forgetting of the specific information contained in the web pages so that, during the cued-recall task, the respondents had to rely on their remembrance of the general impression of the brand rather than on their remembrance of the web site (e.g., Crawford et al. 2002). Six new fictitious brands were presented to the respondents through a one-page excerpt of their web site. The six brands matched the image-traits of the brands generated in the first exposure phase. Two of the brands had a “sincere” image, two had an “exciting” image, and the other two had a “sophisticated” image (these images were determined through a pretest. See Table 5-2 in Appendix 5).

**Paired-Associations Task**

Participants were presented successively with pairs of brands and image-traits. Each pair of brand and image-traits was presented on a different page. The sequence of presentation was alternated across respondents and differed from the sequence of the
exposure phase to avoid order effect and vicarious learning of the sequencing of image-trait. Eight of these pairings were composed of one of the target brands presented during the exposure task (i.e., through its one-page web site excerpt) and one image-trait. Each target brand was paired with either the word “sincere,” “exciting,” or “sophisticated” (Aaker 1997). In addition, paired-associations between foil brands and image-traits (i.e., “competent” and “rugged”) were provided to the respondents.

Participants were given 15 seconds to memorize paired-associations. Studies in experimental and social psychology usually give respondents between six and eight seconds to memorize pairs of words or pictures (e.g., Carlston and Skowronski 1994; Crawford et al. 2002; MacLeod 1988). Since, in this study, respondents had to memorize pairings between more complex stimuli (i.e., an entire web page and a word), it was decided to double the memorization time. Therefore, the investigators indicated to the respondents to go to the next page every 15 seconds. Out of the eight brands presented, four brands were associated with an image-trait that matched their image during the exposure task (i.e., consistent paired-associations) (see Figure 4). For example, if a brand was portrayed as sincere through its web page, it was now paired with the image-trait “sincere.” If respondents perceived a brand as being “sincere” after the exposure phase, they were now relearning something they already knew. These combinations constituted the Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials.

The four other brands were paired with an image-trait that did not match their image during the exposure phase (i.e., inconsistent paired-associations, Independent Variable 3). For half of the respondents the inconsistent image-traits matched the image of other target brands (i.e., brand image related). For example, if a brand was portrayed
as sincere by its web page, it was now paired with the adjective “exciting.” These combinations constituted the Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials as the transfer of image-trait initially associated with other brands was now assessed. For the other respondents, these four brands were paired with an inconsistent image-trait that matched the image of the event (i.e., event related image, Independent Variable 4). For example, if a brand was portrayed as sincere by its web page, it was now paired with the adjective “sophisticated.” These combinations constituted the Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials as the transfer of image-trait initially associated with the event was now assessed.

In the case of high entitativity, the brands and the event should be perceived as being interchangeable. Therefore, the respondents should have already had associated the other brands and the event’s traits with the focal brand and they are not asked to learn something new. They should exhibit more “savings” than in the case of low entitativity. The BIT and EIT take place if the image-traits originally associated with the sponsoring brands and the event are abstracted into a group stereotype and become associated with all the concomitant sponsoring brands. For sponsors with similar brand concepts, it is expected that BIT and EIT will be greater. BIR will be smaller in the case of multiple sponsorships as compared to no sponsorship due to an increased perceived entitativity. The pairing of the brands with the words “sincere,” “exciting,” and “sophisticated” was alternated so that a given brand was equally used as a BIR, BIT or EIT trial. This was done to ensure that “savings” effects were not confounded by paired-associations of brands and words that could be easier to remember than others.
**Filler Task**

Following the memorization task, a five minute filler task was given to the participants during which time they had to search a letter matrix for the names of well-known Fortune 500 CEOs. This task was designed to clean up respondents’ short-term memory and served to both increase forgetting of the particularities of the web pages seen during the memorization task and as a filler before the cued-recall task (e.g., Crawford et al. 2002).

**Cued-Recall Task**

The eight target brands were presented one at a time on a separate page in an order different from during the exposure and learning phase to avoid recall from vicarious learning of the sequencing. On each page appeared a blank text box in which participants were asked to write the exact image-trait that was paired with that brand during the paired-association task. Participants’ responses were recorded as correct if they were the same or a close synonym of the image-trait paired with the brand. The percentage of correctly recalled responses constituted the main dependent measure (see Figure 5).

**Tag-Line Recognition Task**

Respondents were provided with each of the eight target brands on a separate page along with four tag-lines. In each case, one tag-line was the one presented with the web page of that brand during the exposure task (the correct tag-line), two were tag-lines from other target brands, and one tag-line was from a foil brand. Respondents had to
indicate which tag-line was actually associated with each brand during the exposure phase (Dependent Measure 2).

Figure 5: Examples of Exposure, Memorization and Cued-Recall Tasks in the “Brand Image Related” and the “Event Image Related” Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Brand Image Related</th>
<th>Event Image Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposure Phase</td>
<td>Paired Association Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt Mary’s Treat</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-Club</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glissade</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Bank</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbane</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIR: Brand Image Reinforcement (% of correctly recalled paired associations)
BIT: Brand Image Transfer (% of correctly recalled paired associations)
EIT: Event Image Transfer (% of correctly recalled paired associations)

Manipulation Checks and Covariate

Respondents rated their perception of the entitativity of the brands presented during the exposure phase by indicating to what extent they considered that these brands qualified as a group by using a Likert-type scale adapted from Lickel et al.’s (2000) manipulation check (1 = the companies do not form a group; 9 = the companies form a group). In addition, respondents rated the extent to which the eight target brands were sincere, exciting, and sophisticated using items from the Aaker’s (1997) brand
personality scale. Furthermore, respondents indicated the extent to which each brand was related to the notion of “sport” on a 7-point Likert-type scale (e.g., I associate [brand X] with the idea of sports). Finally, respondents filled out a scale purported to measure their need for closure (Webster and Kruglanski 1994). As previously explained, “Need for Closure” is the desire to obtain any answer about a topic rather than to remain in a situation of ambiguity. People high in “Need for Closure” have been shown to rely more systematically on stereotypic processing (Kruglanski and Freund 1983). Therefore, the effect of “Need for Closure” on information processing is similar to perceived entitativity and might be confounded with our sponsorship manipulation. As a result, it was decided to include “Need for Closure” as a covariate during the analysis. Respondents’ ratings were made on a 42-item 6-point Likert-type scale developed by Webster and Kruglanski (1994). They had to agree or disagree with statements such as “I’d rather know bad news than stay in a state of uncertainty” or “I dislike questions that could be answered in many different ways” (see Appendix 3).

This chapter laid out the design of the experiment undertaken which is an adaptation of the general procedure used in the spontaneous trait-inference and trait-transference paradigm. Four factors were manipulated (multiple sponsorships, brand-concept, pairing consistency, and brand or event related image) in a mixed design and two dependent measures (cued-recall and tag-line recognition) were collected. The next chapter will develop the analytic procedure used to test for the hypotheses previously developed. Some additional analyses will be performed as well.
CHAPTER 4

Results

The cued-recall data yielded four dependent variables. The percentage of correct responses was tabulated separately for consistent and inconsistent paired-associations. For both consistent and inconsistent paired-associations, this percentage of recall was then tabulated separately for sponsors with similar brand-concepts and for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts. In addition, the percentage of correctly recognized tag-lines was tabulated separately for sponsors with similar brand-concepts and for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts, which resulted in the two other dependent variables. A preliminary analysis revealed that the three counterbalancing factors (i.e., reversed order of the brands during the first exposure phase, reversed order of the paired-associations, as well as alternated consistent/inconsistent paired-associations during the memorization task) did not significantly impact any of the dependent variables. The main effects of these factors were not significant and neither were their interactions with the factors of interest (i.e., sponsorship, brand concept, and event/brand related image) and are therefore not discussed further.

Manipulation Checks (see Appendix 3 for items)

The sponsorship manipulation successfully increased the perceived entitativity of the group of brands and the event. The entitativity ratings were higher in the multiple sponsorships condition than in the no sponsorship condition ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 4.42$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} =$
3.44, $t_{153} = 3.28, p < .01$). In addition, the checks show that the manipulation of brand-concept was successful. All the brands that were expected to be perceived as “sports” brands (i.e., Energetic, Glissade, Health, and Fitness) had a mean score significantly greater than the mid-point (i.e., > 4) of the scale measuring the extent to which a brand is related to the notion of “sport.” This confirmed that their underlying brand-concept was similar to the one of the event. Also, all the brands that were expected to be perceived as “no sport” brands (i.e., Massachusetts, Urbane, Night-Club, and Aunt Mary) had a mean score significantly lower than the mid-point of the scale, which confirmed they had an underlying brand-concept different from the one of the event (see Table 7-1 in Appendix 7 for detailed results).

Finally, the brand personality ratings showed that each brand had the image intended. As shown in Table 7-2 (Appendix 7), all the sincere brands had significantly greater sincerity ratings than the exciting brands and were rated significantly lower on sophistication than sincerity. All the exciting brands had higher excitement ratings than the sincere brands and were rated significantly lower on sophistication than on excitement. Furthermore, all but two brands had lower sophistication ratings than the Boston Golf Tournament (i.e., Night-Club was significantly greater while Urbane was not significantly different from the event). Although Night-Club and Urbane were selected because they showed significantly lower sophistication ratings than the event during the pretest, these results did not replicate. Contrary to the pretest, only two out of six items from the sophistication measure (Aaker 1997) were used for the manipulation checks in the study in order to limit questionnaire length and could explain this result.
Outcome Hypotheses: Implicit Brand and Event Image Transfer

H1a: The recall of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) will be greater in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition (supported).

H1b: The recall of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) will not be significantly different in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition (failed to reject).

Figure 5a. Implicit Brand Image Transfer

H1a predicted that implicit image transfer would take place among sponsors with similar brand-concepts and H1b predicted that implicit image transfer would not occur among sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts. In Figure 5a, it can be seen that the recall of inconsistent paired-associations was greater in the multiple sponsorships
condition as compared to the no sponsorship condition only for sponsors with similar brand-concepts.

H2a: The recall of Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) will be greater in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition (not supported).

H2b: The recall of Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) will not be significantly different in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition (not supported).

Figure 5b. Implicit Event Image Transfer

H2a predicted that implicit image transfer would take place from the event to the sponsors with similar brand-concepts and H2b predicted that implicit image transfer
would not occur from the event to the sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts. Figure
5b shows that the recall of inconsistent paired associations was not greater in the multiple
sponsorships condition compared to the no sponsorship condition for sponsors with
similar brand-concepts; however, it was greater in the multiple sponsorships condition for
sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts. Although an EIT effect was found, it was
significant for the “no sport” brands, but not for the “sport” brands.

Hypotheses H1a to H2b were tested using an ANCOVA (see Table 8-1 in
Appendix 8) followed by a-priori contrasts of specific cell means (see Table 9-1 in
Appendix 9). The recall data for inconsistent paired-associations (BIT and EIT trials)
were submitted to a 2 (sponsorship: multiple sponsorships vs. no sponsorship) x 2
(image: brand related vs. event related) x 2 (brand-concept: similar vs. dissimilar) mixed
measures ANCOVA with repeated measure on the third factor. The covariate “Need for
Closure” was included. As expected, the sponsorship by brand-concept interaction was
significant ($F(1,146) = 3.03, p < .09$). However, a 3-way sponsorship by brand-concept
by image interaction was also significant ($F(1, 146) = 7.71, p < .01$). The interaction
between sponsorship and brand-concept was different depending on whether the image
traits of the inconsistent paired-associations were related to the other concomitant
sponsoring brands or to the event.

Consistent with H1a and H1b, planned contrasts showed that the recall of BIT
trials was significantly greater in the multiple sponsorships condition than in the no
sponsorship condition for sponsors with similar brand-concepts ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 60.98$ vs. $M_{\text{no}}$
$= 47.56$, $t_{80} = 1.70, p < .05$), but it was not significantly different across sponsorship
conditions for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 63.42$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 67.07$,
$t_{80} = -0.46$, ns). As suggested by the 3-way interaction, this pattern of results differed for EIT trials. The recall of EIT trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts was not significantly different across multiple and no sponsorship ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 59.72$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 51.35$, $t_{71} = 1.00$, ns), but it was significantly greater in the multiple sponsorships condition for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 83.33$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 72.97$, $t_{71} = 1.43$, $p < .08$). Therefore, H2a and H2b were not supported.

Overall, these results indicated the existence of both implicit Brand Image Transfer and implicit Event Image Transfer due to multiple sponsorships. As expected, the BIT effect held true only for the “sports” brands. However, the EIT effect held true only for the “no sport” brands (see Figure 5a and 5b). The EIT effect for the “sport” brand was in the hypothesized direction although not significant. It could be that two entitative groups were formed with image transfer occurring within the boundaries of each group: one group composed of the “sport” brands uniquely and another group composed of the event and the “no sport” brands. This point will be developed further in the discussion section.

Additional Analyses

The 3-way sponsorship by brand-concept by image interaction was qualified by a significant 4-way sponsorship by brand-concept by image by “Need for Closure” interaction ($F(1, 146) = 9.02$, $p < .01$). “Need for Closure” allowed further testing of the entitativity model of image transfer developed earlier. If transfer of image effects in multiple sponsorships are caused by stereotypic processing, individuals with a high “Need for Closure” should have intensified Brand and Event Image Transfer effects.
because they more strongly rely on stereotypic processing as compared to respondents with a low “Need for Closure.” Results indicate that these post-hoc predictions are warranted concerning both Brand Image Transfer (Figure 6a and 6b) and Event Image Transfer (Figure 7a and 7b).

*Brand Image Transfer for:*

Figure 6a. Individuals with a Low Need for Closure

![Graph showing Brand Image Transfer for individuals with a Low Need for Closure](image)

Figure 6b. Individuals with a High Need for Closure

![Graph showing Brand Image Transfer for individuals with a High Need for Closure](image)
Event Image Transfer for:

Figure 7a. Individuals with a Low Need for Closure

Figure 7b. Individuals with a High Need for Closure
Brand image transfer analysis (see Table 9-2 in Appendix 9). Respondents low in “Need for Closure” did not have a significantly better recall of BIT trials in the multiple sponsorships condition as compared to the no sponsorship condition for both the “sport” brands ($M_{multiple} = 61.11$ vs. $M_{no} = 57.14$, $t_{37} = 0.34$, ns) and the “no sport” brands ($M_{multiple} = 52.78$ vs. $M_{no} = 61.91$, $t_{37} = -0.84$, ns). For respondents high in “Need for Closure”, however, the recall of BIT trials for the “sport” brands was significantly greater in the multiple sponsorships condition than in the no sponsorship condition ($M_{multiple} = 57.14$ vs. $M_{no} = 38.89$, $t_{37} = 1.64$, $p = .05$). Whereas, for the “no sport” brands, the recall of BIT trials was not influenced by multiple sponsorships ($M_{multiple} = 69.05$ vs. $M_{no} = 75.00$, $t_{37} = -0.49$, ns).

When “Need for Closure” was low there was no BIT effect either for the “no sport” brands or for the “sport” brands. The BIT effect was observed for the “sport” brands, but was not observed for the “no sport” brands when “Need for Closure” was high similarly to what was found at an aggregate level. This supports the notion that Brand Image Transfer is contingent on stereotypic processing.

Event image transfer analysis (see Table 9-2 in Appendix 9). As shown earlier, event image transfer took place for the “no sport” brands but not for the “sport” brands. Therefore, if this is due to stereotypic processing, one would expect event image transfer for the “no sport” brands to depend on “Need for Closure.” For respondents low in “Need for Closure,” the EIT trials on the “no sport” brands were not affected by multiple sponsorships ($M_{multiple} = 80.00$ vs. $M_{no} = 77.28$, $t_{35} = 0.29$, ns); whereas, for respondents high in “Need for Closure,” recall of EIT trials on the “no sport” brands was significantly
greater in the case of multiple sponsorships ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 92.86$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 68.18$, $t_{35} = 2.19$, $p < .02$).

Similarly to BIT, stereotyping seems to be the process responsible for Event Image Transfer effects. Note that the BIT effect took place among the “sport” brands, whereas the EIT effects took place from the event to the “no sport” brands. For the “sport” brands, however, respondents low in “Need for Closure” had a better recall of EIT trials in the multiple sponsorships condition than in the no sponsorship condition ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 72.73$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 43.33$, $t_{35} = 2.67$, $p < .01$). Respondents high in “Need for Closure” had a significantly lower recall of EIT trials in the multiple sponsorships condition than in the no sponsorship condition ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 39.29$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 56.82$, $t_{35} = 1.45$, $p < .08$). Since EIT occurred for the “no sport” brands, the abstracted group impression of the “sport” brands does not include the event. Based on these premises, one could expect no significant differences across sponsorship conditions for the “sport” brands on EIT trials; however, this was not the case. Differences in the ease with which low and high “Need for Closure” respondents could learn the inconsistent paired-associations due to their processing styles could explain these results (this will be further addressed in the discussion section).

**Processes Hypotheses: Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR)**

H3a: The recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) will not be significantly different in the multiple versus the no sponsorship condition **(failed to reject).**
H3b: The recall of *Brand Image Reinforcement* (BIR) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) will be lower in the multiple sponsorships versus the no sponsorship condition (*not supported*).

H4: In the multiple sponsorships condition, the recall of *Brand Image Reinforcement* (BIR) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) than for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) (*supported*).

Figure 8. Brand Image Reinforcement

Hypothesis 3a predicted that performance on BIR trials for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts would not be significantly different across sponsorship conditions while H3b predicted that BIR would be smaller in the case of multiple sponsorships for sponsors with similar brand-concepts. Hypothesis 4 predicted that, in the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of BIR trials would be greater for sponsors
with dissimilar brand-concepts. The results show that higher entitativity tend to impede the memorization of brand-consistent information (see Figure 8).

These hypotheses were tested with an ANOVA (Table 8-2 in Appendix 8) followed by contrast tests (Table 9-3 in Appendix 9). The recall data for consistent paired-associations (BIR trials) were submitted to a 2 (sponsorship: multiple vs. no) x 2 (brand-concept: similar vs. dissimilar) mixed measures ANOVA with repeated measure on the second factor.³ Although not hypothesized, the main effect of brand-concept was significant: the recall of BIR trials was greater for sponsors with dissimilar versus similar brand-concepts ($M_{\text{dissimilar}} = 76.77$ vs. $M_{\text{similar}} = 62.91$, $F(1,153) = 17.05, p < .001$). This was consistent with our conceptual view because BIR trials should be easier to remember for brands forming a lower entitativity group.

Contrary to what was expected, the brand-concept by sponsorship interaction was not significant ($F(1,153) = 0.2, \text{ns}$). However, the recall of BIR trials, as predicted, was not significantly different across the sponsorship conditions for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts, ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 79.87$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 73.72$, $t_{153} = 1.19, \text{ns}$); therefore, H3a could not be rejected. For sponsors with similar brand-concepts, the recall of BIR trials was not significantly different across sponsorship conditions either ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 65.58$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 60.26$, $t_{153} = 0.90, \text{ns}$), which did not support H3b. In addition, as predicted by H4, the recall of BIR trials in the multiple sponsorships condition was greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts than with similar brand-concepts ($M_{\text{dissimilar}} = 79.87$ vs. $M_{\text{similar}} = 65.58$, $t_{76} = 3.04, p < .01$). This indicated that entitativity affected how strongly each brand was associated with its image. Overall, this analysis supports the notion that higher

³ The image factor (brand related vs. event related) only applies for inconsistent paired-associations. BIR trials are based on consistent paired-associations; therefore, the image factor was not used in this analysis.
entitativity weakens the link between the brands and their own image in respondents’ minds.

Process Hypotheses: BIR vs. BIT and EIT Trials for Sponsors with Similar Brand-Concepts

H5a: In the case of no sponsorship, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials will be greater than the recall of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) (supported).

H5b: In the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials will not be significantly different from the recall of Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) (failed to reject).

H5c: In the case of no sponsorship, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) (not supported).

H5d: In the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials
will not be significantly different for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) \textit{(failed to reject)}.

These hypotheses posit that the levels of image transfer (either for BIT or EIT) and image reinforcement will not be different when entitativity is high, but that the level of image transfer will be greater when entitativity is low. Figure 9a shows that multiple sponsorships facilitated the memorization of BIT trials to a greater extent than the memorization of BIR trials as compared to no sponsorship, while Figure 9b shows the same phenomena for EIT trials.

\textit{Consistent vs. Inconsistent Paired-Associations for Brands with Similar Concepts:}

Figure 9a. BIR vs. BIT
These hypotheses were tested through an ANCOVA (see Table 8-3 in Appendix 8) followed by contrast tests (see Table 9-4 in Appendix 9). The percentage of correctly recalled paired-associations for sponsors with similar brand-concepts was submitted to a 2 (sponsorship: multiple vs. no) x 2 (image: brand related vs. event related) x 2 (paired-associations: consistent vs. inconsistent) mixed measures ANCOVA with repeated measures on the last factor; “Need for Closure” was included as a covariate. As expected, the paired-association by sponsorship interaction was significant ($F(1,146) = 9.61, p < .01$), which indicated that the recall differential between consistent and inconsistent paired-associations varies with sponsorship conditions.

A-priori contrasts revealed that the recall of BIR trials versus BIT trials was greater in the case of no sponsorship ($M_{BIR} = 62.20$ vs. $M_{BIT} = 47.56$, $t_{40} = 1.82$, $p < .05$), but was not significantly different in the case of multiple sponsorships ($M_{BIR} = 69.51$ vs. $M_{BIT} = 60.98$, $t_{40} = 1.1$, ns), which was in line with H5a and H5b. The recall of BIR trials versus EIT trials, in the case of no sponsorship, was in a direction consistent with H5c,
but it did not reach statistical significance ($M_{\text{BIR}} = 58.11$ vs. $M_{\text{EIT}} = 51.35$, $t_{35} = 0.87$, ns).

In accordance with H5d, the recall of BIR versus EIT trials was not significantly different in the case of multiple sponsorships ($M_{\text{BIR}} = 61.11$ vs. $M_{\text{EIT}} = 59.72$, $t_{35} = 0.17$, ns). For sponsors with similar brand-concepts, this analysis confirms that in the case of multiple sponsorships consistent paired-associations were as easy to remember as inconsistent paired-associations. In the case of no sponsorship, they were easier to remember than inconsistent paired-associations. In addition, the 3-way paired-association by sponsorship by image interaction was significant ($F(1,146) = 2.94$, $p < .09$). This shows that the differential impact on the memorization of consistent vs. inconsistent paired-associations was greater for EIT trials than for BIT trials.

**Additional Analysis (see Table 9-5 in Appendix 9)**

The 3-way paired-associations by sponsorship by image interaction was qualified by a 4-way paired association by sponsorship by image by “Need for Closure” interaction ($F(1,146) = 2.93$, $p < .09$). Contrast tests revealed that, in the multiple sponsorships condition, respondents high in “Need for Closure” exhibited a greater recall on BIR trials than BIT or EIT trials ($M_{\text{BIR}} = 78.57$ vs. $M_{\text{BIT}} = 57.14$, $t_{20} = 2.10$, $p < .03$ and $M_{\text{BIR}} = 60.71$ vs. $M_{\text{EIT}} = 39.29$, $t_{13} = 1.39$, $p < .09$) whereas, respondents low in “Need for Closure” did not have a significant greater recall of BIR trials compared to BIT or EIT trials ($M_{\text{BIR}} = 61.11$ vs. $M_{\text{BIT}} = 61.11$, $t_{17} = 0.00$, ns and $M_{\text{BIR}} = 61.36$ vs. $M_{\text{EIT}} = 72.73$, $t_{21} = 1.31$, ns). This indicates that low “Need for Closure” respondents exhibited effects consistent with our hypotheses (see Figure 10a and 10b). Respondents high in “Need for Closure” exhibited a reversed pattern of results (see Figure 11a and 11b). Although it
was shown earlier that high “Need for Closure” respondents had a stronger stereotypic processing in multiple sponsorship conditions on BIT trials, this analysis revealed that their memorization performance on the BIR trials was higher than on the BIT trials in the case of multiple sponsorships.

**BIR vs. BIT for Sponsors with Similar Brand-Concepts:**

Figure 10a. Low Need for Closure
Figure 10b. High Need for Closure

BIR vs. EIT for Sponsors with Similar Brand-Concepts:

Figure 11a. Low Need for Closure
Process Hypotheses: BIR vs. BIT and EIT Trials for Sponsors with Dissimilar Brand-Concepts

H6a: In the case of no sponsorship, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) (supported).

H6b: In the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Brand Image Transfer (BIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) (supported).

H6c: In the case of no sponsorship, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials
will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) (not supported).

H6d: In the case of multiple sponsorships, the recall of Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) trials compared to Event Image Transfer (EIT) trials will be greater for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) (not supported).

These hypotheses posit that the level of image reinforcement (BIR) will be greater than the level of image transfer (BIT and EIT) when entitativity is low (i.e., due to either no sponsorship or dissimilar brand-concepts). Consistent with these predictions, Figure 12a shows that consistent paired-associations were easier to memorize than inconsistent ones independently from the multiple sponsorships manipulation. Figure 12b reveals that this prediction did not hold true for EIT trials.
These hypotheses were tested through an ANCOVA (see Table 8-4 in Appendix 8) followed by contrast tests (see Table 9-6 in Appendix 9). The percentage of correctly recalled paired-associations for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts was submitted to
a 2 (sponsorship: multiple vs. no) x 2 (image: brand related vs. event related) x 2 (paired-associations: consistent vs. inconsistent) mixed measures ANCOVA with repeated measures on the third factor and “Need for Closure” as a covariate. Contrary to what was expected, the paired-association by sponsorship interaction was not significant ($F(1,146) = 0.03, \text{ ns}$). However, the 3-way paired-association by sponsorship by image interaction was significant ($F(1,146) = 4.05, p < .05$). For sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts, the impact of multiple sponsorships on the differential recall between consistent and inconsistent paired-associations differed depending on whether the inconsistent paired-associations were BIT or EIT trials. A-priori contrasts revealed that the recall of BIR trials versus BIT trials was greater in the case of no sponsorship ($M_{\text{BIR}} = 87.81$ vs. $M_{\text{BIT}} = 67.07, t_{40} = 3.76, p < .001$) as well as in the case of multiple sponsorships ($M_{\text{BIR}} = 80.49$ vs. $M_{\text{BIT}} = 63.41, t_{40} = 3.33, p = .001$) in support of H6a and H6b. However, contrary to H6c and H6d, the recall of BIR trials versus EIT trials was lower in the case of no sponsorship ($M_{\text{BIR}} = 58.11$ vs. $M_{\text{EIT}} = 72.97, t_{35} = 2.06, p < .05$) and not significantly different in the case of multiple sponsorships ($M_{\text{BIR}} = 79.17$ vs. $M_{\text{EIT}} = 83.33, t_{35} = 0.72, \text{ ns}$). In line with the absence of BIT effect found for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts, it appears that respondents failed to group the “no sport” brands together. Therefore, they did not engage in stereotypic processing, which did not impair their recall of consistent paired-associations. As revealed by the 3-way interaction, however, this pattern did not hold for event image transfer. For EIT, stereotypic processing was evident in the multiple sponsorships condition. This is consistent with the results from the outcome hypotheses (i.e., event image transfer occurred from the event to the “no
sport” brands) and shows that high entitativity rendered difficult the association between
the “no sport” brands and their own images.

Additional Analysis (see Table 9-7 in Appendix 9)

The 3-way paired-associations by sponsorship by image interaction was qualified
by a 4-way paired association by sponsorship by image by “Need for Closure” interaction
\(F(1,146) = 3.67, p < .06\). In line with the theorization that sponsors with dissimilar
brand-concepts would not be subjected to stereotypic processing, high “Need for
Closure” did not increase brand image transfer for the “no sport” brands (see Figure 13a
and 13b). Respondents either low or high on that variable exhibited a greater recall for
BIR than BIT trials when exposed to the multiple sponsorships treatment \(M_{BIR} = 72.22
vs. M_{BIT} = 52.78, t_{17} = 2.72, p < .01\) and \(M_{BIR} = 85.71\) vs. \(M_{BIT} = 69.05, t_{20} = 2.09, p <
.05\), respectively). In the case of multiple sponsorships, respondents low in “Need for
Closure” did not exhibit a significant difference between BIR and EIT trials \(M_{BIR} =
86.36\) vs. \(M_{EIT} = 77.37, t_{21} = 1.31, \text{ns}\) while respondents high in “Need for Closure” had
a lower recall of BIR trials than EIT trials \(M_{BIR} = 67.86\) vs. \(M_{EIT} = 92.86, t_{13} = -2.88, p <
.01\). This EIT analysis showed that “Need for Closure” had the same moderating effect
on the “no sport” brands as on the “sport” brands previously investigated. For multiple
sponsorships, the performance of high “Need for Closure” respondents on consistent
paired-associations was the same as on inconsistent paired-associations, whereas the
performance of low “Need for Closure” respondents was greater on inconsistent paired-
associations (see Figure 14a and 14b).
**BIR vs. BIT for Sponsors with Dissimilar Brand-Concepts:**

Figure 13a. Low Need for Closure

![Graph showing % of Correctly Recalled Paired-Associations for BIR and BIT for Low Need for Closure.](image)

Figure 13b. High Need for Closure
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BIR vs. EIT for Sponsors with Dissimilar Brand-Concepts:

Figure 14a. Low Need for Closure

Figure 14b. High Need for Closure
Process Hypotheses: Tag-Line Recognition Data

H7a: Tag-line recognition for sponsors with similar brand-concepts (e.g., sport brand) will not be significantly different in the no sponsorship versus the multiple sponsorships condition (failed to reject).

H7b: Tag-line recognition for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts (e.g., no sport brand) will be greater in the no sponsorship versus the multiple sponsorships condition (supported).

These hypotheses state that the strength of the association between the tag-lines and their respective sponsors will be different across multiple sponsorships and no sponsorship conditions when entitativity is low (i.e., only for the “no sport” brands). Figure 15 shows that the percentage of recognition is systematically greater for no sponsorship than for multiple sponsorships. However, the difference proved statistically significant only for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts in line with H7a and H7b.

Figure 15. Tag-Line Recognition

![Figure 15. Tag-Line Recognition](image-url)
These hypotheses were tested through an ANOVA (see Table 8-5 in Appendix 8) followed by contrast tests (see Table 9-8 in Appendix 9). The percentage of correctly recognized tag-lines was submitted to a 2 (sponsorship: multiple vs. no) x 2 (brand-concept: similar vs. dissimilar) mixed measures ANCOVA with repeated measures on the second factor and “Need for Closure” as a covariate. The sponsorship by brand-concept interaction was not significant ($F(1,150) = 0.15, \text{ns}$), however, the cell means exhibited a pattern of results consistent with H7a and H7b. For sponsors with similar brand-concepts, tag-lines recognition was not significantly impacted by multiple sponsorships ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 33.77 \text{ vs. } M_{\text{no}} = 38.78, t_{153} = -1.20, \text{ns}$) while tag-lines recognition was greater in the no sponsorship than in the multiple sponsorships condition for sponsors with dissimilar brand-concepts ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 66.32 \text{ vs. } M_{\text{no}} = 74.10, t_{153} = -2.17, p < .05$). Tag-lines were less uniquely associated with their brands in the case of multiple sponsorships especially for the “no sport” brands. For the “sport” brands, although the difference was not significant, it also suggests that lower recognition is a function of entitativity.

Additional Analysis

The results presented were qualified by two 2-way interactions in which “Need for Closure” was involved. The interaction between sponsorship and “Need for Closure” was significant ($F(1,150) = 3.10, p = .08$) as well as the interaction between brand-concept and “Need for Closure” ($F(1,150) = 5.26, p < .03$). The impact of multiple sponsorships on tag-line recognition was greater for respondents high in “Need for Closure” than for respondents low in “Need for Closure.” Contrasts tests (see Table 9-9 in Appendix 9) showed that for low “Need for Closure,” recognition of the “sport”
brands’ tag-lines in the no sponsorship condition was not significantly different from the multiple sponsorships condition ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 37.50$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 40.28$, $t_{74} = -0.46$, ns) while recognition of the “no sport” brands’ tag-lines was greater in the no sponsorship condition than in the multiple sponsorships condition ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 65.18$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 72.92$, $t_{74} = -1.44, p < .08$). This pattern of results was the same across the “sport” brands and the “no sport” brands for high “Need for Closure” respondents ($M_{\text{multiple}} = 30.00$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 37.5$, $t_{73} = -1.23$, ns and $M_{\text{multiple}} = 65.71$ vs. $M_{\text{no}} = 75.75$, $t_{73} = -2.06, p < .05$, respectively).

The significant interaction between sponsorship and “Need for Closure” indicates that the observed decrease in tag-line recognition in the multiple sponsorships condition compared to the no sponsorship condition is greater for respondents high in “Need for Closure” (see Figure 16a and 16b). In addition, the significant interaction between brand-concept and “Need for Closure” indicates that, independently of sponsorship condition, the level of tag-lines recognition for “sport” brands is weaker for respondents with a high “Need for Closure” compared to those with a low “Need for Closure.” “Need for Closure” does not impact recognition of the “no sport” brands’ tag-lines (see Figure 16a and 16b). This is consistent with the theoretical view that a higher “Need for Closure” should lead to intensified effects. In this analysis, greater entitativity led to a lower level of tag-lines recognition. For high versus low “Need for Closure” respondents, this phenomenon was larger for the “sport” brands versus the “no sport” brands (i.e., high vs. low entitativity) as well as for multiple sponsorships versus no sponsorship (i.e., high vs. low entitativity).
Tag-Line Recognition By Level of Need for Closure:

Figure 16a. Low Need for Closure
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Figure 16b. High Need for Closure
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Mediation Analysis

Although each hypothesis tested was derived from the entitativity model of image transfer, the model’s mechanism has not been tested in and of itself. This model implies that a group impression is abstracted and then influences the perception of each brand. Accordingly, the transfer of image does not take place from one brand to another or from
the event to the sponsoring brand directly but from that group impression to each brand (see Figure 2). As a result, in a multiple sponsorships situation, an observer first abstracts an entitative group and then images are transferred from that group to each brand. This is a view different from the brand leverage model (Keller 2003), according to which entities are directly associated with each other (e.g., brands, event). The entitativity model of image transfer would be supported against the brand leverage model if the perceived entitativity of the group mediated the impact of multiple sponsorships on image transfer (recall of inconsistent paired associations; BIT or EIT). This would demonstrate that image transfer does not take place directly between entities, but through a group impression.

The type of mistakes on the cued-recall task was used to operationalize the impact of entitativity on image transfer. If a group of brands and event was formed and perceived as being entitative, mistakes committed on the cued-recall task should not be constituted of image-traits that did not characterize the sponsoring brands or the event. During the memorization task, respondents were exposed to a set of fourteen brands, including the eight target brands and the six foil brands. The latter were paired with either the word “Competent” or “Rugged,” which should not have been associated with the abstracted group in the case of multiple sponsorships and, therefore, should not have been associated with the sponsoring brands (i.e., the target brands). On the other hand, in the case of no sponsorship, since no group impression should have been abstracted, the words “Competent” or “Rugged” were more likely to constitute recall errors when respondents could not retrieve the word they memorized with the target brands when presented with the paired-associations (i.e., “sincere” and “exciting”). As a result, if a
group impression was abstracted due to perceived entitativity, wrongly recalling that a target brand was paired with the words “Competent” or “Rugged” should mediate the relationship between multiple sponsorships and image transfer.

Mistakes associated with the words “Competent” or “Rugged” constituted the variable “out-group mistake” (e.g., a target brand is recalled as being associated with the word “Competent”). Image transfer was operationalized as the percentage of correctly recalled inconsistent paired-associations at an aggregate level. The causal step procedure of mediation analysis from Baron and Kenny (1986) was followed (see Table 2) in which the independent variable was multiple sponsorships, the dependent variable was image transfer, and the mediating variable was out-group mistakes. A first regression analysis revealed a significant negative impact of multiple sponsorships on out-group mistakes ($\beta = -.41, t = 1.71, p < .1$). As expected, in the case of multiple sponsorships, high entitativity rendered out-group mistakes less likely due to stronger associations among group members and group level information (i.e., “sincere” and “exciting”). A second regression analysis showed that multiple sponsorships had a significant positive impact on image transfer (i.e., $\beta = 9.53, t = 2.17, p < .05$). When image transfer was regressed on both multiple sponsorships and out-group mistakes, the beta coefficient associated with multiple sponsorships became insignificant (i.e., $\beta = 5.01, t = 1.41, \text{ns}$). This supports the notion that a group impression fully mediated the impact of multiple sponsorships on image transfer and is consistent with the entitativity model of image transfer as opposed to the brand leverage model.
Table 2. Mediation of the Impact of Multiple Sponsorships on Image Transfer by a Group Impression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Step</th>
<th>Second Step</th>
<th>Third Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td>Out-group mistake (y)</td>
<td>Image Transfer (y)</td>
<td>Image Transfer (y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variable</strong></td>
<td>Multiple sponsorships ($x_1$)</td>
<td>Multiple sponsorships ($x_1$)</td>
<td>Multiple sponsorships ($x_1$) Out-group mistake ($x_2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td>$y = b_1x_1 + \epsilon$</td>
<td>$y = b_1x_1 + \epsilon$</td>
<td>$y = b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \epsilon$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parameters</strong></td>
<td>$\beta_1 = -0.41, SD = 0.24, t = -1.71, p = .09.$</td>
<td>$\beta_1 = 9.53, SD = 4.31, t = 2.17, p = .032.$</td>
<td>$\beta_1 = 5.01, SD = 3.55, t = 1.41, p = .16.$ $\beta_2 = -10.90, SD = 1.17, t = -9.31, p &lt; .001.$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strength of BIT vs. Strength of EIT**

An important question remains to determine which of the concomitant sponsoring brands or the event has a stronger impact on image transfer. In other words: is the information associated with the abstracted group impression more strongly influenced by the sponsoring brands or the event? In order to address this question, it is necessary to compare the effect size of BIT trials and EIT trials across sponsorship conditions. The results obtained earlier showed that a Brand Image Transfer phenomenon occurred for the “sport” brands while an Event Image Transfer phenomenon occurred for the “no sport” brands. Therefore, the effect size relative to the difference between multiple sponsorships and no sponsorship on the recall of inconsistent paired-associations of the “sport” brands for BIT will be compared with the effect size relative to the differences between multiple sponsorships and no sponsorship on the recall of inconsistent paired associations of the “no sport” brands for EIT.

According to meta-analytic thinking, two effect sizes can be deemed different if their confidence intervals do not overlap (Hunter and Schmidt 2004; Kline 2004). BIT
and EIT effect sizes result from the comparison of two groups (i.e., multiple sponsorships versus no sponsorship) on the mean of a continuous variable (cued-recall of inconsistent paired-associations). Therefore, Hedge’s g, which is an estimator of the population parameter $\delta$, is appropriate for this purpose. Kline (2004) proposed a method to compute exact confidence intervals for $\delta$ based on Hedge’s g when comparing means from two independent samples. These exact confidence intervals are based on the assumption that if the null hypothesis (i.e., the two groups are equal) tested is false, one should not rely on a central t distribution since it is only appropriate when the null hypothesis is true. Rather, a noncentral t distribution needs to be used when the null hypothesis is false. The noncentral t distribution has two parameters: the degree of freedom and a noncentrality parameter, which indicates to what extent the null hypothesis is false. Since we found significant effects in previous analyses for BIT and EIT, we can assume that the null hypotheses are false. In order to rely on a noncentral t distribution, the TNONCT function in SAS was used in order to generate exact confidence intervals for BIT and EIT. The TNONCT function computes a noncentrality parameter, which is then transformed to obtain the exact confidence interval for the population effect sizes $\delta$. The estimator Hedge’s g of the population $\delta$ for BIT was .38; EIT was slightly lower with .33. However, the computation of exact C.I for BIT showed that the observed effect size $g = .38$ was as consistent with a population effect size as low as $\delta = .0073$ as it was with one as high as $\delta = .75$ with 90% confidence. The computation of exact C.I for EIT showed that the observed effect size of .33 was as consistent with a population effect size

\[ \text{Hedge’s } g = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n1} + \frac{1}{n2}} \]

\[ \]
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as low as $\delta = -.05$ as it was with one as high as $\delta = .68$ with 90% confidence. In spite of
the observed differences between the Hedge’s $g$ for BIT versus EIT (.38 vs. .33), the
large overlap of the exact confidence intervals of their corresponding $\delta$ leads to an
inconclusive assessment of which effect size is stronger. At this point, all cases are
possible. BIT could be stronger or EIT could be stronger or they could be of even
strength. Further research and replications studies would be needed in order to reduce
sampling error (Hunter and Schmidt 2004) and narrow the exact confidence intervals
around $\delta$ in order to firmly establish how BIT and EIT compare.

This chapter brought empirical evidence of a Brand Image Transfer phenomenon
taking place among the sponsors with a similar brand-concept as well as of a
phenomenon of Event Image Transfer taking place from the event to the sponsors with
dissimilar brand-concepts. Further analyses supported the notion that category-based
processing triggered by the entitativity of multiple sponsorships situations was
responsible for these image transfer phenomena. The next section will discuss further the
theoretical implications of these findings as well as the managerial recommendations that
can be derived from them. Limitations and guidelines for further research will be
provided as well.
CHAPTER 5
Discussion and Conclusion

As a medium of marketing communication, sponsorship is going through a tremendous phase of growth encompassing firms’ marketing activities as well as scholarly research. Although the early approaches to sponsorships by practitioners and academics were mostly speculative and descriptive, today both management and research conceive sponsorships in a more sophisticated manner. Keller’s (2003) brand leverage model provides a good basis for understanding sponsorships effects. This model describes sponsorships as marketing/promotion tools and conceptualizes a direct transfer of knowledge from the event sponsored to the sponsoring brand.

This dissertation focused on a very important factor that is not addressed either by sponsorship research in general or by the brand leverage model in particular: most of the sponsorship agreements involve multiple brands with multiple possible sources of brand associations. In addition, many practitioners and scholars still question the positive effect of sponsorships and sometimes point out the mixed support that sponsorships have received in terms of the beneficial impact on the sponsoring brand. Some researchers have suggested that the best way to fully explore sponsorship is to measure its influence on consumers’ implicit memory (Johar and Pham 1999; Pham and Vanhuele 1997). To the author’s knowledge, however, all of the studies conducted so far have relied on explicit measures of attitudes, awareness, intention, preferences, or evaluations.
In view of the previous points, this dissertation contributes to the expansion of knowledge regarding sponsorship effects in three ways: (1) by conceptualizing and empirically testing an entitativity model of image transfer, (2) by unraveling the psychological processes underpinning image transfer, and (3) by measuring image transfer effects at the implicit level rather than at the explicit level. This chapter is organized as follows. First, a detailed discussion of the theoretical implications of the results is provided. Then, the practical implications of the main findings are developed. Finally, areas of further research, as well as limitations, are discussed before a concluding statement.

Discussion of Experimental Results

Outcome Hypotheses

This dissertation addresses several questions that are critical for evaluating the impact of multiple sponsorships on consumers’ perceptions of sponsoring brands: is there evidence of Brand Image Transfer in situations of multiple sponsorships? Is there is also evidence of Event Image Transfer? Are these image transfer phenomena occurring at the implicit level? Do they have boundary conditions?

Evidence of brand image and event image transfer. This dissertation demonstrates the existence of a Brand Image Transfer (BIT) effect as well as an Event Image Transfer (EIT) effect due to multiple sponsorships. In other words, meaning associated with one sponsoring brand becomes associated with the other sponsors due to multiple sponsorship agreements. In the same vein, meaning associated with the event
becomes associated with the sponsors. Due to the particularities of the paradigm used (i.e., savings in relearning), it was shown that both BIT and EIT occurred in an implicit manner. Consistent with the definition of implicit memory, the recall of inconsistent paired-associations was improved by multiple sponsorships (Roediger 1990). This demonstrated that respondents had already implicitly associated the brand with the images of the other concomitant sponsors at the time they were learning these inconsistent paired-associations, which generated the “savings.”

*The impact of brand-concept similarity.* Importantly, BIT as well as EIT effects were contingent on the sponsors’ brand-concept. As expected, brand image was transferred among the sponsors that shared the same brand-concept as the event. Although event image transfer was also expected to take place for the sponsors with a “sport” brand-concept, the image of the event was transferred to the sponsors with a brand-concept different from the one of the event. Subjects associated the images of the “sport” brands together but did not do so for the “no sport” brands. Rather, the “no sport” brands were associated with the image of the event. A better understanding of the cognitive process underlying image transfer (BIT or EIT) will serve as the basis for discussing this unexpected result concerning EIT. The individual difference variable “Need for Closure” is utilized to discuss this process.

*The role of individual differences.* An investigation of the psychological process underlying BIT and EIT confirmed that the observed effects were due to category-based processing (Fiske and Neuberg 1990). Respondents high in “Need for Closure,” a variable that assesses the propensity of an individual to process information stereotypically (i.e., to rely on category-based processing), showed image transfer effects.
Respondents low in “Need for Closure” did not show such effects. Specifically, low “Need for Closure” respondents did not exhibit a better performance on inconsistent paired-associations in the case of multiple sponsorships, which showed that they did not associate the images of the concomitant sponsors together (i.e., individuating processing). High “Need for Closure” respondents did exhibit BIT. They had a better performance on inconsistent-paired associations, revealing that they associated the images of the concomitant sponsors together due to category-based processing. This supports the notion that BIT is due to stereotypic processing because BIT effect did not occur when that processing was suppressed but it did occur when that processing was intensified.

Results concerning Event Image Transfer followed exactly the same pattern. Respondents with a low “Need for Closure” did not show EIT while respondents with a high “Need for Closure” did show EIT. It is important to note that BIT occurred for the “sport” brands and EIT occurred for the “no sport” brands. Category-based processing was evident for both effects, which implies that a group was formed in each case (Sujan 1985). It was expected that respondents would categorize the “sport” brands together with the event and that EIT, as well as BIT, would take place for these brands while the “no sport” brands would not be subjected to any transfer effects. According to the results, however, respondents abstracted two different groups that both were the basis of category-based processing and image transfer.

The “sport” brands were abstracted into a group that resulted in the observed BIT effect while the “no sport” brands and the event were abstracted into another group that resulted in the observed EIT effect. Therefore, the transfer of the event’s image to the “no sport” brands was also due to a high perceived entitativity for this group of brands.
and the event. But why were the “no sport” brands and the event categorized together despite the fact that these sponsors did not have the same brand-concept as the event? Although respondents did not categorize the “no sport” brands with the event based on a “sport” concept, they may have relied on a more abstract level of categorization in order to classify together these stimuli.

According to Rosch, Gray, Johnson, and Boyes-Barem (1976), cognitive categories for stimuli range along an abstractness continuum. Studies have shown that when objects failed to be categorized together, perceivers switch to a category with a higher level of abstractness in order to successfully classify these objects (Johnson 1984). Classification into a “basic” cognitive category, the most abstract category, is an automatic process that takes place below the conscious level (Mervis and Rosch 1981). Therefore, respondents might have relied on a basic category defined by both the notions of “sport” and “brand,” which resulted in grouping the event and the “no sport” brands together since they did not belong to that category. Although the event was a sporting event (i.e., 2005 Boston Golf Tournament), because it was not a brand (a characteristic that might be at a higher hierarchical level for categorization purposes in that context) respondents may not have grouped it with the “sport” brands but with the “no sport” brands that could not be categorized in to the basic category “sport” brands. The event and the “no sport” brands may have constituted an out-group, which was entitative due to multiple sponsorships. This is consistent with accentuation theory (Tajfel 1959) according to which the goal of categorization is to maximize within-group similarity and to maximize between group dissimilarity (Mervis and Rosch 1981). Grouping the “sport” brands together in a category, as well as grouping the event and the “no sport”
brands in another category, fulfills that objective. This would explain why there was an image transfer among the “sport” brands but not from the event to the “sport” brands; however, there was a transfer of image from the event to the “no sport” brands.

*Other unexpected results.* Given that the EIT effect was found for the “no sport” brands only there should have been no difference across sponsorship conditions on the recall of EIT trials for the “sport” brands, independently of “Need for Closure,” because these brands and the event do not form a group. Surprisingly, it was found that the EIT trials for the “sport” brands were more easily remembered in the case of multiple sponsorships for respondents with a low “Need for Closure” while they were more easily remembered in the case of no sponsorship for respondents high in “Need for Closure.”

These results could be explained by the different cognitive styles of respondents that could have altered how easily they learned the EIT trials. For high “Need for Closure,” because the “sport” brands were already a group, entitativity was even stronger in the case of multiple sponsorships, which made the association between the brands and the images “sincere” and “exciting” very strong. It could also have rendered difficult learning pairings with the image “sophisticated.” On the other hand, no sponsorship triggered less entitativity and the previous association with “sincere” and “exciting” were weaker, which could have facilitated the learning of paired-associations with the image “sophisticated.” Low “Need for Closure” respondents did not make strong associations between the “sport” brands and the images “exciting” and “sincere” due to their lack of stereotypic processing. Therefore, in the multiple sponsorships condition, respondents could make the association between “sophisticated” and the brands more easily than respondents in the no sponsorships due to a higher entitativity.
Process Hypotheses

This dissertation contributes to the body of knowledge on sponsorship not only by showing evidence of implicit brand and event image transfer in the case of multiple sponsorships, but also by unraveling the information processing mechanism causing these transfer effects. Since the manipulation check of entitativity supports the fact that brands in a multiple sponsorships arrangement form an entitative group with the event, one needs to focus on the information processing implications of a highly entitative group. Particularly, this dissertation examines if the entitativity triggered by multiple sponsorships leads to category-based processing as opposed to individuating processing, which causes the image transfer phenomena.

Brand Image Reinforcement

Brand Image Reinforcement (BIR) is a measure of how strongly a brand is associated with its own image. BIR trials represent the performance of respondents on consistent paired-associations. This dissertation addressed the following question: is brand reinforcement weaker in the case of high entitativity?

The impact of multiple sponsorships on BIR. High entitativity leads respondents to associate information about a group member with all the other members of the group (i.e., category-based processing). Because the “no sport” brands constituted a lower entitativity group than the “sport” brands, they were more uniquely associated with their respective images, which resulted in enhanced respondents’ performance on the recall of consistent paired-associations (BIR). The recall of BIR trials, however, was not significantly different across sponsorship conditions. This shows that the multiple
sponsorships manipulation did not diminish the recall of BIR trials, although the previous analysis showed that it facilitated the recall of inconsistent paired-associations (i.e., BIT and EIT). This indicates that multiple sponsorships triggered more category-based processing than no sponsorship whereas no sponsorship did not trigger more individuating processing than multiple sponsorships (Fiske and Neuberg 1990).

It could be that the “savings” differential across sponsorship conditions was larger for inconsistent than for consistent paired-associations. This is perfectly possible when one compares the posited mechanisms underlying image transfer and image reinforcement. BIT and EIT effects are based on how learning is facilitated whereas BIR effect is based on how learning is impaired. In the case of multiple sponsorships, all the image-traits are implicitly associated with the target brands. Memorization of inconsistent paired-associations is then facilitated because respondents do not have to learn these associations but to relearn them, which generate some “savings.” Memorization of consistent paired-associations is impaired in multiple sponsorships. Learning is made more difficult because the association with all the image-traits makes the brand’s own image less salient. Therefore, it could be that category-based processing due to entitativity was intense enough to trigger image transfer but not to hinder learning of consistent paired-associations. Respondents in multiple sponsorships exhibited “savings” on inconsistent paired associations, but their learning of consistent paired-associations was not impeded in spite of category-based processing. Therefore, it is possible that these two mechanisms have to reach different threshold levels before making a significant difference on implicit memory.
Comparison of BIRT Trials versus BIT and EIT Trials

If higher entitativity implies category-based processing, then all the images composing the group (from the sponsors and the event) should be associated with every brand. This dissertation addresses the following question: does high entitativity lead inconsistent paired-associations to be as easy to memorize as consistent paired-association?

Results indicated that when entitativity was the highest (for the “sport” brands in multiple sponsorships), the notion of consistent and inconsistent paired-associations became almost irrelevant due to category-based processing. For the “sport” brands BIR was greater than BIT and EIT in no sponsorship, but it was not significantly different from BIT and EIT in multiple sponsorships.

This result tends to indicate that the “sport” brands were processed in a stereotypic way in the multiple sponsorships condition, which did not lead to significant differences between consistent and inconsistent paired-associations. For the “no sport” brands, entitativity was lower and consistent paired-associations were easier to remember than inconsistent paired-associations in both the multiple and no sponsorship conditions for BIT but not for EIT. As shown earlier, the event and the “no sport” brands formed an entitative group and therefore, for EIT, entitativity was the highest in that condition and the recall performance on inconsistent and consistent paired-associations was the same in multiple sponsorships. This impact of entitativity on information processing is consistent with what has been found in social psychology where respondents performed similarly on paired-association that matched or did not match with the traits of members of an entitative social group (Crawford et al. 2002).
The impact of individual differences. As before, investigating the obtained results through the “Need for Closure” variables supported further the role of entitativity in information processing in multiple sponsorships. For the “no sport” brands, BIR recall was greater than BIT for both sponsorship conditions for both levels of “Need for Closure.” Respondents failed to categorize these brands into a group which, in turn, precluded entitativity and image transfer. Consistently, high “Need for Closure” increased the predominance of EIT trials compared to BIR trials for the “no sport” brands because that group was higher on entitativity (i.e., as shown earlier the EIT effect took place for the “no sport” brands). In the case of multiple sponsorships, the performance of low “Need for Closure” respondents on EIT trials was not different from their BIR trials performance whereas the performance of high “Need for Closure” respondents on EIT trials rose above their performance on BIR trials.

This further supported the notion that entitativity drives stereotypic processing since the greater the propensity to process information stereotypically, the greater are the consequences of entitativity. For the “sport” brands, however, performance on the consistent paired-associations was greater than performance on the inconsistent paired association in multiple sponsorships for respondents with a high “Need for Closure” although it should have been the same (for both BIT and EIT). As explained before, the mechanism of BIR trial is based on the difficulty of learning new associations due to interference with associations already held in mind; it is different from the mechanism of inconsistent trials that is based on easiness of memorization due to “savings” in relearning. Therefore, even though savings occurred in the case of multiple sponsorships, this does not necessarily mean that the category-based processing originating this effect
generated enough interference to significantly impede memorization on BIR trials compared to no sponsorship.

*Tag-Line Recognition*

The recognition of the correct tag-line for each sponsoring brand allowed the investigation of the impact of entitativity on another aspect of information processing. Members of entitative groups tend to lose their uniqueness as they become assimilated with the identity of the group. Therefore, this dissertation addresses the question whether or not entitativity lowers the ability to recognize a sponsoring brand’s correct tag-line, which would be an indication that the brand is not strongly associated with its own tag-line.

The tag-lines recognition results confirm that, in the case of high entitativity, sponsoring brands tend to be seen as interchangeable. Tag-lines recognition was diminished for the “sport” brands and for multiple sponsorships in general. Once a group of sponsoring brands has been abstracted, the brands lose their individuality and respondents are less able to identify brand specific information. “Need for Closure” offers further support for this interchangeability interpretation. Tag-lines recognition in low entitativity condition outperformed tag-lines recognition in the high entitativity condition to a greater extent for respondents with a high versus a low “Need for Closure.”

This is in line with findings from attitude research and social group perception. Lingle and Ostrom (1979) found that once a global attitude is formed, specific items that generated that attitude are often forgotten. Similarly, Craword et al. (2002) found that once a group impression is abstracted, individual-level information is lost. More
generally, this dissertation’s findings show that abstraction is accompanied by the forgetting of concrete features. It is as if people had to forget the particular in order to conceive the general. This supports the Gestalt versus the structuralist view of categorization research. Gestalt psychologists assert that categories cannot be decomposed into its elements whereas structuralist psychologists assert the opposite (Murphy and Medin 1985).

The Entitativity Model of Image Transfer in Multiple Sponsorships

This dissertation also makes a contribution by demonstrating the validity of the entitativity model of image transfer in accounting for multiple sponsorships effects as compared to the brand leverage model (Keller 2003). The brand leverage model seems to be most valid when only two entities are tied together (i.e., co-branding, single sponsorship), but not when multiple simultaneous entities are associated such as in multiple sponsorships. Not only strong support was found in favor of category-based processing as the mechanism of image transfer effects, but the formation of a group impression was also demonstrated. Respondents’ wrong recall of image-traits non-associated with the group impression mediated the impact of multiple sponsorships on image transfer. Therefore, as conceptualized, entitativity leads to the formation of a group impression in light of which information about group members was perceived. This resulted in image transfer because individual members were then perceived in light of that group impression due to category-based processing.

The entitativity model of image transfer adds nicely to the traditional models of categorization-based transfer (e.g., Gregan-Paxton and Roeder John 1997; Moreau,
Markman and Lehmann 2001). In marketing, these models are used when knowledge from a familiar domain is transferred to an unfamiliar element (e.g., when product labels are used to transfer knowledge from the label category to a new product). The model proposed in this dissertation, however, does not depict how knowledge is transferred from a category to a new member of that category, but rather depicts how the category itself is constructed. Image transfer among members of a category is a by-product of the categorization process due to entitativity and results in a loss of individuality for the members of that category.

*Comparing the Importance of BIT with the Importance of EIT*

This dissertation contributes to the literature not only within the sponsorships area of inquiry, but also within the broader domain of the brand leverage process by providing direct evidence of image transfer. As described earlier, studies revolving around the concept of associating a brand with another entity such as brand extension, brand alliances, co-branding, or sponsorship (i.e., brand leverage techniques) only assume knowledge transfer rather than measuring it (e.g., Park, Milberg and Lawson 1991; Roy and Cornwell 2002, 2003; Ruth and Simonin 2003). In other studies, the design does not allow to test for image transfer (e.g., Grhos, Wagner, and Svetecak 2004; Martin and Stewart 2001; Simonin and Ruth 1998). In fact, the only study that directly assessed knowledge transfer, whether in a sponsorships setting or in another domain of brand leverage, is the experiment conducted by Gwinner and Eaton (1999). They operationalized image transfer as the difference in image congruency between the event and the sponsoring brand across a sponsorship treatment group and a control group.
Other works such as the one by Grhos, Wagner, and Svetecka (2004) relied on a correlational study in which the correlation between the event’s image and the sponsor’s image was used to assert image transfer. It seems difficult to claim that sponsorship triggering image transfer outside of the experimental realm due to the impossibility to test for causal links. This dissertation contributed to the literature by providing direct evidence of a causal relationship between multiple sponsorships and image transfer at the implicit level not only from the event to the sponsors, but also among the sponsors themselves.

This result is consistent with the findings from Crawford et al. (2002) in social psychology and tends to show that the cognitive processes involved in the perception of social groups are applicable to the perception of brands as well. Some researchers have claimed that the anthropomorphic view of brands initiated by Aaker (1997) is unrealistic due to the higher level of complexity of human beings (i.e., Azoulay and Kapferer 2003; Caprara, Barbaranelli, and Guido 2001). This dissertation suggests, however, that the literature on group perception is adapted to the study of brands. Probably the degree of complexity of the observer is as important as the degree of complexity of the observed when determining which concepts or tools are appropriate in a research domain. In addition, this dissertation investigated the impact of entitativity within the boundary conditions of categorization. Image transfer effects were contingent on respondents’ clustering of the sponsoring brands according to the categories “sport and “no sport.”
Finally, this dissertation is the first one to use Ebbinghaus’ (1885/1964) savings in relearning paradigm in a marketing context. Although a few adjustments had to be made compared to experimental or social psychology (e.g., giving respondents more time to memorize paired-associations due to the higher complexity level of the experimental stimuli used), this paradigm proved itself effective in investigating implicit memory. Marketing researchers are becoming more interested in studying the implicit aspect of consumer knowledge (e.g., Brunel, Tieje and Greenwald 2004; Lee 2002). Johar and Pham (1999) suggested the investigation of the implicit impact of sponsorships on consumer perception. This dissertation confirms and extends Johar and Pham’s (1999) findings that sponsor identification is biased toward market prominent brands and brands semantically related to the event at the explicit memory level.

The tag-lines recognition was a measure of explicit memory because respondents were previously explicitly exposed to these tag-lines. It was found, in the case of multiple sponsorships, that tag-lines recognition was impaired, not necessarily because respondents relied on heuristics like Johar and Pham (1999) found, but because entitativity made the brands appear interchangeable. Therefore, similar to Johar and Pham’s (1999) results, it was found that sponsorships adversely impact explicit memory. Of course, their focus was on sponsor identification. This dissertation’s focus was on knowledge about the sponsors’ image, but these results extend the negative influence of sponsorships to a different aspect of explicit memory (i.e., sponsor awareness vs. sponsor’s tag-line recognition). In addition, their inquiry about the implicit impact of sponsorships was followed and the savings in relearning paradigm showed that
potentially beneficial consequences could be reaped from sponsorships due to implicit image transfer effects.

**Managerial Implication**

The most important conclusion that can be drawn from this dissertation’s findings for marketing practitioners is the necessity to adopt a different approach concerning sponsorships and especially multiple sponsorships. It is vital to consider multiple sponsorships situations from a holistic standpoint and to take into account all the possible sources of brands associations that result from such operations. First and foremost, the decision of participating in multiple sponsorships agreement should not be taken without considering the other potential sponsoring brands that will also be present. As shown, people’s implicit memory about the sponsoring brands’ images might be impacted not only by the event’s image but also by the images of the other concomitant sponsors. The likely influence of the other sponsors can potentially be beneficial or harmful for the brand depending on the other sponsors’ images. Let’s assume that a brand has the objective of improving its image as a corporate citizen. If the event sponsored has an image of high corporate citizenship and if the target brand is sponsoring that event, the extent to which other concomitant sponsors are perceived as being good corporate citizens would have to be taken into account as well.

A more in-depth look at this dissertation’s results suggests more specific recommendations. When brand managers consider event sponsorship, it is not only necessary to identify the other sponsors of the event, but also to consider how they fit together with the target brand (i.e., are the underlying brand-concepts similar?). If a
subgroup among the concomitant sponsors share the same brand-concepts, they are likely to constitute an entititative group and to have their respective images implicitly transferred to each other. They will not get, however, image transferred from the event. On the other hand, if a subgroup of brands does not fit together (i.e., their underlying brand-concepts are all different), then these brands are more likely to get some image transferred from the event, but not from each other. This implies that a brand manager could still be willing to sponsor an event whose image does not correspond to the brand as long as the brand fits well with the images of the subgroup of concomitant sponsors. In that case, because the subgroup will be entitative, image transfer will take place within that group, but not from the event to the group. Conversely, a brand manager could also decide to engage in multiple sponsorships in spite of the presence of concomitant sponsors with an image ill-adapted to his goals as long as his brand does not fit with any of these other brands and that the event does fulfill his objectives in terms of image. For example, let’s assume that Red Bull has an energetic image and wants to make its image evolve toward a more established brand, a real sport drink. A concomitant sponsor of that event is Gatorade that has an authentic image but wants to veer toward an image more related to power and energy; another concomitant sponsor is a brand of watch that wants to cultivate an image of durability. If these three brands sponsor a boat race that carries an image of endurance and durability, they could all achieve their goals. Gatorade and Red Bull because they will be forming an entititative group (i.e., drink as a brand-concept) and will transfer image to each other. The watch brand and the event will form an entititative group and some image will be transferred from the event to the brand.
Figure 17 summarizes the decision rules that marketing managers could adopt when deciding about whether or not to get involved in multiple sponsorships activity.

Figure 17. Multiple Sponsorships’ Decision Rules

Concomitant Sponsoring Brands

Is the target brand similar to the concomitant sponsoring brands?

Yes

Are the concomitant sponsors’ images adapted to the target brand’s image objectives?

Yes

Engage in multiple sponsorships

No

Do not engage in multiple sponsorships

No

Sponsored Event

Is the event’s image adapted to the target brand’s image objectives?

Yes

Engage in Multiple sponsorships

No

Do not engage in multiple sponsorships

It is evident that marketing managers need to rethink multiple sponsorships as a possibility to cooperate with other brands for win-win situations. It is quite possible that two brands might be direct competitors but have different, yet mutually interesting, images as well as similar underlying brand-concepts. In that case, cooperation as
concomitant sponsors could be considered. Managers of events could also use some of these findings for strengthening their value proposition in search of sponsors. Some sponsors might be reluctant to become associated with an event because they consider there is little fit between their brand and the image of the event. Event’s managers could object that this low fit might prevent them from being associated with other concomitant sponsors (given that these brands fit with the event). As a result, their brand might be influenced exclusively by the event’s image.

Limitations and Further Research

Although this dissertation sheds light on some of the effects of multiple sponsorships, it has several limitations that need to be considered when interpreting the results. First, the generalizability of the findings to different contexts should be made cautiously and any applications of this dissertation’s results need to be made with some perspective. The use of student subjects is acceptable at the early stage of theory development (Ferber 1977) and efforts were made to ensure that the stimuli used were relevant to the respondents. However, further research should be undertaken to replicate these findings with non-student samples. The generalizability of the findings is also limited by the particular experimental stimuli used. Clearly, the researcher decided to rely on brands that were either “sincere” or “exciting” and an event that was “sophisticated.” Other dimensions from the brand personality scale (Aaker 1997) could be used in further studies. In addition, different ways to operationalize brand image could be used. The decision to rely on brand personality was motivated by the existence of a well-established scale, but other possibilities exist like the creation of ad-hoc scales.
for the experimental stimuli (i.e., Gwinner and Eaton 1999). Furthermore, due to internal validity concerns, fictitious experimental stimuli, were used. However, now that the mechanisms of multiple sponsorship are beginning to be better understood, further replications might involve the use of real brands and real events, which would imply extensive pre-testing. Specifically, because the main dependent variables are based on memory (i.e., cued-recall and recognition), the level of saliency of the brand associations and their accessibility would have to be controlled for. Brand familiarity is an important variable that impact these two factors (Low and Lamb 2000; Simonin and Ruth 1998) that is not involved when using fictitious experimental stimuli but that would need to be taken into account otherwise.

Another important issue concerns the extent to which the manipulations can be compared to real exposure to multiple sponsorships stimuli. In the paradigm used, respondents were exposed for a few minutes to black and white copies of a web page mentioning that some brands would be sponsoring the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament. In reality, consumers are exposed to a much larger amount of stimuli through on site signage exposure and/or media coverage for an extended period of time. This might lead to much more perceived entitativity than what was obtained through the manipulation performed. As a consequence, this dissertation’s findings are possibly a conservative estimate of the real impact of multiple sponsorships on image transfer. Field experiments could alleviate this limitation in the future by replicating this study in a natural setting. Note, however, that given the likely small cause size produced by manipulations in a laboratory experiment (Kline 2004), the importance of the results should not be underestimated.
Although considerable support for the entitativity model of image transfer was found, more work is needed to definitely ascertain the validity of this conceptual framework. The data strongly supported the notion that entitativity triggers category-based processing in multiple sponsorships (Fiske and Neuberg 1990). The analysis undertaken did a good job for providing evidence that a group impression is formed due to entitativity and mediates the impact of multiple sponsorships on brand image transfer, however, some more work is needed to definitely support the entitativity model of image transfer developed (Keller 2003). The mediation analysis does not completely ensure that the group impression is formed through an abstraction process resulting from entitativity. Further research could try to replicate these findings by using a different timing for the manipulation of entitativity. In this dissertation, entitativity was manipulated by giving the respondents the multiple sponsorships information before presenting the brands. This means that if the respondents abstracted a group, they encoded the brand information in light of that group, which allowed category-based processing and image transfer. If the information about the multiple sponsorships is given after the brands are presented (i.e., retrieval stage) then respondents should not be able to process the brands in light of a group impression when they are exposed to the brands. Therefore, it should preclude category-based processing and image transfer.

Another possible alternative explanation for these results is that respondents stereotyped the sponsoring brands not because they sponsored the same event, but because they had the same images. In the study, brands were either “sincere” or “exciting.” Therefore, stereotypic processing could have been triggered by image similarity rather than entitativity. Further research could rule out that explanation by
including some sponsoring brands with a neutral image. If the entitativity model of image transfer is correct, these neutral brands should still be included in the group impression despite the fact that due to their image neutrality they do not fit the brand stereotype characteristics sincere-exciting.

Two important factors that were not included in this dissertation could impact image transfer. First, because fictitious brands and a fictitious event were used, familiarity was not manipulated although it has been acknowledged as a major factor influencing the processing of brand information as well as brand evaluation (e.g., Alba and Hutchinson 1987; Fazio 1989). Specifically, consumer knowledge structure about familiar brands is more rigid (Fazio 1989); therefore, image transfer for familiar brands could be attenuated. Conversely, if an unfamiliar brand is subsumed under a group impression with other more familiar brands, it is likely that transfer effects for this brand would be stronger. Stronger image transfer effects are also likely from the event to unfamiliar brands compared to familiar brands.

A second important factor concerns the way multiple sponsorships have been assumed to increase perceived entitativity. Remember that it was posited that multiple sponsorships would positively influence entitativity through two antecedents: proximity and interdependence (Campbell 1958). Campbell established that another very important antecedent of entitativity, in fact the most important according to him, was common fate: the extent to which different elements are found together at different places in the same situations at the same time. Although common fate is not relevant when one considers multiple sponsorships as a one time experience, it can become relevant when one starts to consider cases in which multiple sponsors are tied to the same event several times over
the years. This might potentially increase their entitativity even more and moderate image transfer process. In the future, longitudinal experimental studies could examine these issues. The impact of common fate might trigger numerous questions. If the same group of brands sponsors a different event every time, does that strengthen Brand Image Transfer as opposed to Event Image Transfer? If the brands that sponsored the same event together over the years form a very highly entitative group, can a new sponsor easily integrate that group? If a new sponsor joins the existing concomitant sponsors will it also be subsumed under the same group impression? If two brands are linked together through an operation of co-branding and one of these brands has also been involved in multiple sponsorships with other concomitant sponsors several times, is there an image transfer not only between the co-brands but also from the entitative group to the co-brand not involved in the multiple sponsorships? In other words, could co-branding be a link between a group impression resulting from multiple sponsorships and a brand not involved with these sponsors?

Also, it is important to notice that some results obtained could not be definitely explained, such as when the moderating effects of high “Need for Closure” facilitated learning for BIR trials in multiple sponsorships. Further research is needed for a more in-depth understanding of the mechanisms of implicit memorization. At this point, it is a problem difficult to handle since implicit memory is an indirectly observed phenomenon. Implicit memory is measured through its observed impact on performance (Reber 1989). More progress in experimental and cognitive psychology needs to be accomplished before the impact of multiple sponsorships on implicit knowledge can be more completely addressed.
Conclusion

This dissertation is the first study to demonstrate that sponsorships can impact a brand in two ways: (1) through the event sponsored and (2) through the other brands that sponsor that same event. Specifically, when the sponsor has a brand-concept different from the event’s brand-concept and different from the other sponsors’ brand-concepts, it is subjected to image transfer from the event. In the case the sponsor’s brand-concept fits with the other sponsors’ brand-concepts, it is subjected to image transfer from the concomitant sponsors. The entitativity model of image transfer proposed was supported. Stereotypic processing is responsible for image transfer due to the formation of a group impression. The event and the sponsoring brands tend to be perceived as one entity and each element forming that group becomes assimilated into a collective identity which leads the brands to lose their uniqueness.

These results indicate that multiple sponsorships are formidable avenues for brand management. The leverage process seems to be multidimensional and iterative rather than a two-way linear process. This dissertation shows that multiple sponsorships can provide numerous sources of brand associations and could constitute a very effective marketing promotion tool for brand managers. Finally, by proposing a framework of multiple sponsorships based on entitativity, this dissertation lays the ground for a more comprehensive study of sponsorship effects in the future.
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### Appendix 1
**Summary of Empirical Studies on Sponsorship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Conceptual Background</th>
<th>Study (Type, Subjects, Sample size)</th>
<th>Stimuli (Brand, Event)</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy and Cornwell (2004)</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Schema Theory</td>
<td>Experiment, Students, 402</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Expert consumers engage in more negative thoughts about the sponsor-event combination than novices (piecemeal processing); both experts and novices perceive a high equity sponsor and an event to be congruent whereas only experts perceive a low equity sponsor and an event to be incongruent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth and Simonin (2003)</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>Schema Theory</td>
<td>Experiment, Students, 219</td>
<td>Real, fictitious</td>
<td>In the case of multiple sponsorships (2 brands) attitude toward both sponsors is positively related to attitude toward the event. Events associated with controversial sponsors have a less favorable attitude than when associated with a non controversial sponsor when the sponsor is a domestic brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grohs, Wagner, and Vsetecka (2004)</td>
<td>Schmalenbach Business Review</td>
<td>Heuristics, Human Associative Memory</td>
<td>Experiments, General Population, 132</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Ambush marketing seems to be minimal with only 2 sponsors out of 6 being misidentified. The closer the fit between the event and the sponsors the higher the sponsor’s recall. Event involvement and event exposure are positively related with unaided recall of sponsors. Image transfer depends on post-event sponsor’s image, event image and sponsor’s awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrigal (2000)</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>Social Identity Theory</td>
<td>Survey, adults attending college football game, 678</td>
<td>Fictitious, real</td>
<td>The positive impact of team identification on purchase intention is greater when the group norm is not important for the fans than when it is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean (1999)</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>Balance Theory</td>
<td>Experiment, Students, 185</td>
<td>Fictitious, real</td>
<td>Sponsorship positively impacts perceived corporate citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet (1999)</td>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>Mere exposure Effects, False consensus effect</td>
<td>Soccer game spectators, survey, 789</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Unprompted and aided recall of event sponsor is positively related to the frequency of game attendance; it does not follow the inverted U shape usually found with mere exposure effects. In addition, respondents tended to believe that spectators attending the game were more inclined to buy products of the sponsor than the general population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholls, Roslow, and Dubish (1999)</td>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Golf and tennis tournament spectators, survey, 762</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Sponsorship leads to unaided sponsor recall and brand preference even more so for a tennis than for a golf tournament.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Study 2: students, survey, 127  
Study 3: mall intercepts surveys, shoppers, 229 | Study 1:  
Fictitious, fictitious  
Study 2: Real, real  
Study 3: Fictitious, fictitious | Study 1: Corporate ability (CA) associations and corporate social responsibility (CSR) association both affect product response but in a different manner. CA through product attribute and CSR through the overall corporate reputation. Study 2: the impact of corporate ability is stronger with real brands than the impact of corporate social responsibility. Surprisingly, product social responsibility negatively impacts product evaluation. Study 3: There is evidence of a context effect that differs according to the type of corporate association: evaluation of a good product is greater in the case the CA is negative than when it is positive. Evaluation of a good product is greater when the CSR is positive than when it is negative. |
| Becker-Olsen and Simmons (2002) | Advances in Consumer Research | Congruency | Real, real | Low fit between sponsor and a social cause generates less favorable thoughts, attitudes, affective, and behavioral responses to the firm than high fit. These result hold when the sponsor artificially creates the fit; also the effects of fit persist one year after the manipulation. When the sponsorships is announced by the sponsored social cause rather then the sponsor, the benefits for the sponsor are greater (this finding does not hold over time). |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johar and Pham (1999)</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing Research</td>
<td>Heuristics</td>
<td>Study 1: Students, experiment, 44; Study 2: Students, experiment, 65; Study 3: Students, experiment, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javalgi et al. (1994)</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Phone survey, 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrigal (2001)</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Social Identity Theory</td>
<td>Telephone survey, Households, 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Methodologies</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pham and Johar (2001)</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
<td>Students, experiment, 34</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Replication of the prominence bias found in Johar and Pham (1999): consumers relying on an hypothesis testing procedure for identifying sponsors. In addition, they showed that more prominent sponsors benefit more in terms of image relevant to the sponsored activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipp and Schiavone (1996)</td>
<td>International journal of Advertising</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Phone surveys, General population, 479</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>The corporate image of a particular sponsor of the Olympics is impacted by attitude toward the general Olympic Games corporate sponsors, the recall of advertisements of the sponsor, how much liked these ads are, and how strong is the linkage between the sponsor and the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quester and Farrelly (1998)</td>
<td>The Journal of Product &amp; Brand Management</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pre/Post longitudinal phone survey, General population, 250 every year for 4 years</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Unprompted recall is positively impacted by the involvement of the sponsor in the core activity of the event, the congruency between the sponsor domain of activity and the event, and especially by the local factor (consumer living close to where the area takes place exhibit higher unprompted recall scores).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lardinoit and Quester (2001)</td>
<td>The journal of Advertising Research</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Experiment, 240</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>On site and television sponsorships both improve attitude toward the sponsor for non-prominent brands only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Real vs. Real</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shani and Sandler (1998)</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Survey, general population, 1500</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Consumers are confused about sponsorship right, which leads to ambush marketing. A third of the consumers think that advertisers during the Olympic telecast are official sponsors. In addition, consumers do not distinguish among the different degrees of commitment of different sponsor category independently of their level of involvement with the Olympics. In addition, consumers do not exhibit negative attitudes toward ambush marketers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel (1999)</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Experiment, students, 216</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Consumers’ degree of involvement with the sponsored event and degree of relevance of the media used are positively related to the impact of a sponsorship advertisement on attitude toward the ad for males. For females there was an impact on purchase intention, also the impact on attitude toward the ad was stronger than for males.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoek et al. (1997)</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing Communications</td>
<td>Awareness-trial-Reinforcement Model from advertising</td>
<td>Survey, Students,</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Contrary to advertising, sponsorship impact on recall is stronger for non-users than users. The impact of advertising on brand beliefs is greater for users than non-users whereas this difference of impact is not consistent for sponsorships. However, neither sponsorship nor advertising increased the probability of purchase of users and non users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalleh, Giles-Corti, and Holman (2002)</td>
<td>Social Marketing Quarterly</td>
<td>Questionnaires, spectators of the event, 355</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>The impact of health sponsorship on awareness and attitude is greater than the impact of commercial sponsorship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel and Mason (1999)</td>
<td>Journal of Services marketing</td>
<td>Phone survey,</td>
<td>General population, 248</td>
<td>Consumers judge more acceptable the sponsorship of the Olympics by a beer company than by a cigarette company. In addition, the acceptance toward the use of Olympic sponsorship to promote beer is related to one’s use of beer/alcohol, attitude toward advertising and beer expectancies. Finally, acceptance toward the use of Olympic sponsorships to promote tobacco products is related to attitude toward advertising and tobacco product expectancies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel and Kinney (1998)</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Experiment,</td>
<td>Students, 215</td>
<td>Ambush sponsors can be recalled as being the official sponsor of an event (no difference across males and females). In addition, males and females do not differ in terms of their response to sponsorship and ambush sponsorship stimuli.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinner and Eaton (1999)</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>Experiment,</td>
<td>Students, 360</td>
<td>Image congruency between a brand and an event is greater when that brand sponsors the event (i.e., image transfer). This effect is stronger when the brand and the event present a functionally based or an image-based similarity. In the case image or function based similarity is very low, image congruency was found to be greater in the case of no sponsorship than in the case of sponsorship (i.e., contrast of image).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholls, Roslow, and Laskey (1994)</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Business Research</td>
<td>Golf tournament spectators, survey, 276</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Mixed results concerning the positive link between number of days attending the event and preference for the sponsoring brand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed and Thompson (2000)</td>
<td>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</td>
<td>Classical conditioning</td>
<td>Experiment, Students, 195</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Attitude toward the sponsor, perceived sincerity and sponsor-event fit positively impact interest in the sponsor, favorability toward the sponsor and intention to use the sponsor's products. The status of the sponsored event is positively related to interest and favorability. Perceived ubiquity of the sponsor was negatively related to interest and favorability. In addition, the positive impact of personal liking on interest, favorability and use was stronger when there was a fit between the event and the sponsors. Also, the impact of the event status on interest, favorability and use was weaker in the case of fit between the sponsor and the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lardinoit and Derbaix (2001)</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Experiment, Students, 240</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>Television sponsorship is more effective than field sponsorship for improving unaided and aided recall. In addition, the impact of field sponsorship on unaided recall is greater for highly involved consumers whereas the impact of television sponsorship is not moderated by involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrillat, Harris, and Lafferty (2004a)</td>
<td>Proceedings of the AMA Winter Educators’ Conference</td>
<td>Human Associative Memory</td>
<td>Experiment, Student, 158</td>
<td>Real, real</td>
<td>The impact of sponsorship on attitude and purchase intention is greater for unfamiliar than familiar brands. Multiple sponsorships do not dilute the impact of sponsorship on attitude and purchase intention for both familiar and unfamiliar brands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Experimental Stimuli Used in the Study

Energetic is an energy drink developed for those who demand maximum energy from their body. Energetic is pure concentration of power and stamina that will allow you to take all the challenges.

Thanks to its unique formula, Energetic is the only energy drink that contains all the electrolytes necessary to keep your blood concentration of potassium, sodium, and glucose stable during your effort.
Strengthen Your Body Free Your Mind

The Fitness Difference

Fitness is more than just a health club. Fitness is a family-friendly fitness club for members of all ages and abilities.

We offer a wide range of specialty programs from kids to seniors including youth fitness programs, performance programs for athletes, senior programs, weight management and special populations programs.

The mission of Fitness is to enhance the health and quality of life of the populations we serve by promoting fitness and wellness as forms of preventative care and by striving to meet the physiological, psychological and social needs of the community.

Fitness Consultations

Our fitness consultants help new members get started on the right foot. All of our fitness consultants complete a thorough training program and are pursuing degrees or have degrees in an exercise-related field. They will assess your goals and design a personalized workout program to help you meet your fitness needs.

Certified by ISSA the world leader in fitness certification
The BeoSound 2 is a fully portable music system from urbane Eletronics. Weighing only 90 grams this futurist design unit has the capability to store around 10 hours of music data stored in MP3 format on its 128 meg card.

The Beosound 3200 is Urbane Eletronics’ latest audio system. Approach the system and its glass doors glide open to allow access to the center console. Inside a high quality compact disk player, tuner and now built in hard drive capable of storing close to 400 CD's worth of music data. Store the whole CD or just your favourite tracks into any one of the four different storage groups. Each group is differentiated by a different colour code in symmetry with the colours on the optional Beo4 remote control.
About us

Massachusetts Bank & Trust serves the personal and business banking needs of customers in Massachusetts, Delaware, Maine, Pennsylvania and New York.

Our philosophy is to provide a service of proximity available globally. Massachusetts Bank & Trust understands your needs and is the financial partner that addresses your needs genuinely based on our long-held tradition.

With a proud 130-year history of responding to the communities we serve, we invite you to discover more about Massachusetts Bank & Trust and the many products and services we have to offer.
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Treat Yourself Well

Boston Health & Fitness Center
1725 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02625
627–377–4955
Open 24 Hours on Weekdays

Boston Health & Fitness Center
1757 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02625
627–377–4948
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Demonstrate Your Character

Presentation

Ever since its creation in Europe in 1985, Glissade has been a unique brand for sportswear garments and accessories that has always stood out by its expression of a peerless attitude.

Glissade has brought about a genuine revolution not only in the world of sportswear but also in its communication.

Features

The introduction of "fun" clothes - in their cut, prints and materials. Shorts and pullovers come alive. Ever since its beginnings, Glissade has always positioned itself as an avant-garde brand totally different from all its competitors.
Company Information

Aunt’s Mary Gourmet Treats believes in using only the very finest ingredients with no preservatives for a truly memorable taste. No matter what your choice, we think you will agree that they are some of the most delicious treats you have ever eaten! Order some today for yourself, your family, or as a gift for someone special.

Double Chocolate Chip Cookies - 1 lb. Box
Our famous chocolate chip cookies are unlike any you have ever tasted with deep, rich chocolate chips, creamy white chocolate, and topped off with fresh pecans. By the way, what is that fabulous, unique flavor? We’ll never tell...
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About Us

Night-Club is one of the most famous and fashionable venue in Boston.

Ever since a million dollar renovation, The Night Club has grown to be a hotspot in Boston’s nightlife scene. With an amazing light system, an even better sound system, new, sleek style and first-rate house music, The Night Club has become the place to be.

Don’t take our word for it, as you get hazy at the bar, and crazy on the dancefloor. The Night Club is the most spectacular production around, an extreme club experience. This new club is steeped in incredible theatrics, featuring indoor fireworks, sheer sheets of silk bathed in live club video, and dancers above the crowd on a 100-foot catwalk.
The 2005 Boston Golf Tournament will have one of the finest fields in golf. It is expected that 50 of the Top 100 World Class Professionals will play with their exceptional skills and sportsmanship.

Our golf course is one of the most sophisticated and difficult in the world. It allows intense competition at the game's highest level in an immensely beautiful and delicate environment.

**Accommodations**
Stay in the Golf Course Resort and enjoy luxury lodging for a luxury even

**Restaurant**
Boston's best chefs are catering in our exclusive club house....

**About the Event**
Players
News
Whether
Course Tour

World Golf Ranking has ranked the Boston Golf Tournament in the Top 5 in the country in terms of beauty of the landscape, quickness of the greens, and classiness of the event.
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Scale Items

Pre-test

Brand Personality Scale (Aaker 1997)

Consider the brands and events that were presented to you previously and how well they are described by the adjectives below. For each brand, choose a number between 1 and 7 where “1” means that the adjective does not describes at all brand[event] X and “7” means that the adjective describes very well brand [event]X.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension (Column not shown to respondents)</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>1= not at all describe</th>
<th>7 = describe very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Down-to-Earth</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family-oriented</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small-town</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentimental</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trendy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cool*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up-to-date</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glamorous*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good looking*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smooth</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Used for manipulation checks during the main experiment
Need for Closure Scale (Webster and Kruglanski 1994)

Please read the following set of statements and indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with these statements by selecting a number between 1 and 6 where 1 indicates that you “strongly disagree” and 6 indicates that you “strongly agree.” You may use any of the numbers in the middle as well to show how much you agree or disagree with these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1=strongly disagree</th>
<th>6=strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that having clear rules and order at work is essential for success.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even after I've made up my mind about something, I am always eager to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider a different opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like situations that are uncertain.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dislike questions which could be answered in many different ways.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to have friends who are unpredictable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that a well ordered life with regular hours suits my temperament.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When dining out, I like to go to places where I have been before so that I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know what to expect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable when I don't understand the reason why an event</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occurred in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel irritated when one person disagrees with what everyone else in a</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group believes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hate to change my plans at the last minute.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like to go into a situation without knowing what I can expect from</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I go shopping, I have difficulty deciding exactly what it is that I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When faced with a problem I usually see the one best solution very quickly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am confused about an important issue, I feel very upset.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to put off making important decisions until the last possible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually make important decisions quickly and confidently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would describe myself as indecisive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is fun to change my plans at the last moment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the uncertainty of going into a new situation without knowing what might happen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal space is usually messy and disorganized.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In most social conflicts, I can easily see which side is right and which is wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to struggle with most decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that orderliness and organization are among the most important characteristics of a good student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When considering most conflict situations, I can usually see how both sides could be right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like to be with people who are capable of unexpected actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to socialize with familiar friends because I know what to expect from them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that I would learn best in a class that lacks clearly stated objectives and requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When thinking about a problem, I consider as many different opinions on the issue as possible.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to know what people are thinking all the time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dislike it when a person's statement could mean many different things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's annoying to listen to someone who cannot seem to make up his or her mind.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that establishing a consistent routine enables me to enjoy life more.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy having a clear and structured mode of life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer interacting with people whose opinions are very different from my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable when someone's meaning or intention is unclear to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When trying to solve a problem I often see so many possible options that it's confusing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always see many possible solutions to problems I face.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd rather know bad news than stay in a state of uncertainty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not usually consult many different opinions before forming my own view.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dislike unpredictable situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dislike the routine aspects of my work (studies).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: reversed items

Manipulation Checks (Lickel et al. 2000)

Brand-concept

Indicate the extent you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the number that best express your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The product category of <em>Aunt Mary’s Gourmet Treat</em> is related to sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I associate <em>Aunt Mary’s Gourmet Treat</em> with the idea of sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Continued

Entitativity⁵

Consider the 8 companies that were first introduced to you earlier as being sponsors of the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament. The 8 sponsoring companies form a group. We would like you to rate this group on some characteristics.

In the space below, circle a number that represents your opinion about the extent to which the companies: Night-Club, Aunt Mary’s Gourmet Treat, Urbane, Boston Health & Fitness, Glissade, Massachusetts Bank & Trust, Fitness and Energetic share characteristics. For example if the sponsoring companies do not share characteristics you would circle a (1) if they share only a few characteristics you would circle a (4), and if they share many characteristics you would circle a (9).

1=companies do not form a group 9=companies form a group

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Personal and Category Relevance

Indicate the extent to which you agree with these statements using a number form 1 to 7 where 1 means that you “strongly disagree” with the statement and 7 mean that you “strongly agree” with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= strongly disagree</th>
<th>7 = strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The brand image of brand X is relevant to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The brand image of brand X makes sense to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand X is relevant in the Y product/service category</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand X makes sense in the Y product/service category</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵ This was the manipulation check for the multiple sponsorships condition; in the no sponsorship condition any reference to the sponsorship was omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple Sponsorships</th>
<th>No Sponsorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand related Image-Traits</strong></td>
<td>“No Sport” Brands Consistent Paired-Associations (BIR)</td>
<td>“No Sport” Brands Consistent Paired-Associations (BIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Sport” Brands Inconsistent Paired-Associations (BIT)</td>
<td>“No Sport” Brands Consistent Paired-Associations (BIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event Related Image-Traits</strong></td>
<td>“No Sport” Brands Consistent Paired-Associations (BIR)</td>
<td>“No Sport” Brands Consistent Paired-Associations (BIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Sport” Brands Inconsistent Paired-Associations (BIT)</td>
<td>“Sport” Brands Consistent Paired-Associations (BIR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The bolded variables represent between subject factors, cells separated by the bolded straight lines represent repeated measures for a given subject.
- The “No Sport” and the “Sport” brands stand for the within subject factor of brand-concept similarity.
- Inconsistent paired-associations are BIT trials in the “Brand Related Image-Traits” condition and they are EIT trials in the “Event Related Image-Traits” condition.
Appendix 5
Results of Experimental Stimuli Pretest

Table 5-1. Image and Relevance Ratings of the Target Brands and the Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying Brand-Concept</th>
<th>Sincerity (SD)</th>
<th>Excitement (SD)</th>
<th>Sophistication (SD)</th>
<th>Usage During Experiment</th>
<th>Brand Relevance (SD)</th>
<th>Category Relevance (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>5.06 (0.69)</td>
<td>4.08 (1.13)</td>
<td>3.79 (1.30)</td>
<td>Sincere Sponsor</td>
<td>5.75 (1.05)</td>
<td>6.1 (0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4.87 (0.98)</td>
<td>4.03 (1.23)</td>
<td>3.50 (1.11)</td>
<td>Sincere Sponsor</td>
<td>5.19 (1.28)</td>
<td>5.69 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Bank</td>
<td>5.05 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.30 (1.25)</td>
<td>3.48 (1.27)</td>
<td>Sincere Sponsor</td>
<td>4.81 (1.45)</td>
<td>5.59 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt Mary's Treat</td>
<td>4.81 (0.90)</td>
<td>3.66 (0.91)</td>
<td>3.69 (1.10)</td>
<td>Sincere Sponsor</td>
<td>6.06 (1.01)</td>
<td>6.35 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glissade</td>
<td>4.36 (1.01)</td>
<td>5.68 (0.83)</td>
<td>3.74 (1.31)</td>
<td>Exciting Sponsor</td>
<td>4.57 (1.21)</td>
<td>5.26 (1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>3.37 (1.05)</td>
<td>4.89 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.06 (1.09)</td>
<td>Exciting Sponsor</td>
<td>5.4 (0.93)</td>
<td>6.27 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbane</td>
<td>3.48 (1.16)</td>
<td>5.30 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.29 (1.36)</td>
<td>Exciting Sponsor</td>
<td>5.43 (1.24)</td>
<td>6.1 (0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-Club</td>
<td>3.57 (0.92)</td>
<td>5.69 (0.79)</td>
<td>4.03 (1.27)</td>
<td>Exciting Sponsor</td>
<td>5.86 (1.06)</td>
<td>6.38 (0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Golf Tournament</td>
<td>4.00 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.24 (0.87)</td>
<td><strong>4.85 (1.03)</strong></td>
<td>Sophisticated Event</td>
<td>4.88 (0.98)</td>
<td>6.04 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-2. Image and Relevance Ratings of the Foil Brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sincerity (SD)</th>
<th>Excitement (SD)</th>
<th>Sophistication (SD)</th>
<th>Usage During Experiment</th>
<th>Brand Relevance (SD)</th>
<th>Category Relevance (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chic</td>
<td>3.55 (0.92)</td>
<td>4.12 (1.04)</td>
<td><strong>5.26 (0.97)</strong></td>
<td>Sophisticated Foil</td>
<td>4.72 (1.09)</td>
<td>5.83 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>3.17 (1.11)</td>
<td>4.45 (1.39)</td>
<td><strong>5.01 (1.08)</strong></td>
<td>Sophisticated Foil</td>
<td>5.56 (1.32)</td>
<td>5.87 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuperRide</td>
<td>4.16 (1.16)</td>
<td><strong>4.97 (1.10)</strong></td>
<td>2.70 (1.43)</td>
<td>Exciting Foil</td>
<td>4.92 (1.58)</td>
<td>5.86 (1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Wave</td>
<td>3.61 (1.08)</td>
<td><strong>4.27 (1.02)</strong></td>
<td>3.14 (1.36)</td>
<td>Exciting Foil</td>
<td>5.02 (1.44)</td>
<td>5.75 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td><strong>4.99 (0.71)</strong></td>
<td>3.76 (1.15)</td>
<td>3.30 (1.39)</td>
<td>Sincere Foil</td>
<td>5.46 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.42 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing</td>
<td><strong>4.69 (1.15)</strong></td>
<td>4.00 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.34 (1.36)</td>
<td>Sincere Foil</td>
<td>5.50 (0.96)</td>
<td>6.26 (0.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6
The Multiple Sponsorships Manipulation

The companies on the next pages will be sponsors of the 2005 Boston Golf Tournament. You may not recognize the names of the companies as they are all from the Northeast part of the United States. It is difficult to become a sponsor of this locally popular event. The Boston Golf Tournament limits the number of companies as sponsors.

The Boston Golf Tournament plans to have activities, programs and advertisements prior to the tournament, during the tournament as well as public relations campaign after the tournament. The sponsoring companies will appear together as a group on all signage for the event. In addition, the names and logos of the companies will be seen together on all television, newspaper, and magazine ads such as in the example below:
### Appendix 7
Manipulation Checks Results

Table 7-1. Similarity Ratings of Target Brands with the Sport Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand-Concept</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>T-value*</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>5.44 (1.44)</td>
<td>12.63 (1,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>5.14 (1.66)</td>
<td>8.56 (1,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>5.81 (1.29)</td>
<td>17.52 (1,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glissade</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>6.21 (1.02)</td>
<td>26.88 (1,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>1.81 (1.25)</td>
<td>-21.89 (1,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>1.26 (0.73)</td>
<td>-44.68 (1,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbane</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>1.81 (1.20)</td>
<td>-22.79 (1,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt Mary</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>1.31 (0.83)</td>
<td>-40.20 (1,154)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: t-values result from a comparison of the mean of that brand and the mid-point of the scale (i.e., 4).
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Table 7-2. Image Ratings of the Target Brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Sincerity (SD)</th>
<th>Excitement (SD)</th>
<th>Sophistication (SD)</th>
<th>Sig 1*</th>
<th>Sig 2**</th>
<th>Sig 3***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>4.85 (1.51)</td>
<td>4.59 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.24 (1.40)</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 1.74, p &lt; .05$</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 3.04, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>4.68 (1.90)</td>
<td>4.32 (1.65)</td>
<td>3.79 (1.55)</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 1.98, p &lt; .05$</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 4.59, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>5.31 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.40 (1.21)</td>
<td>2.95 (1.60)</td>
<td>$t_{76} = 16.15, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$t_{76} = 11.34, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt Mary</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>5.38 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.63 (1.61)</td>
<td>3.49 (1.81)</td>
<td>$t_{76} = 8.55, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$t_{76} = 9.08, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glissade</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>3.69 (1.61)</td>
<td>5.89 (1.41)</td>
<td>4.31 (1.52)</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 11.93, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 9.64, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>3.13 (1.43)</td>
<td>4.84 (1.47)</td>
<td>3.49 (1.74)</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 8.19, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 6.66, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbane</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>4.05 (1.69)</td>
<td>5.46 (1.65)</td>
<td>4.94 (1.70)</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 8.55, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 3.59, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-Club</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>3.38 (1.69)</td>
<td>6.00 (1.45)</td>
<td>5.36 (1.61)</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 12.15, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$t_{75} = 5.54, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Results of paired sample t-tests between the ratings of the brand on its expected image and its ratings on the image characterizing brands with an expected different image (e.g., the sincerity rating of a sincere brand versus its excitement rating)

**: Results of paired sample t-tests between the ratings of the brand on its expected image and its ratings on the image characterizing the event (e.g., the sincerity rating of a sincere brand versus its sophistication rating)

***: Result of one-sample t-tests between the sophistication ratings of the brand and the sophistication rating of the event during the pretest, which is used as a test-value (i.e., 4.85).
Appendix 8  
ANOVA and ANCOVA Tables

Table 8-1. ANCOVA Table for the Outcome Hypotheses H1a to H2b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Effect Type</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Sponsorships</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6191</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Image</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2558</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2670</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Sponsorships * Image</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12157</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Sponsorships * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5617</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Sponsorships * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13479</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12992</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5288</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Image</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4448</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8 Continued

Table 8-2. ANOVA Table for Brand Image Reinforcement (H3a to H4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Effect Type</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,916</td>
<td>17.054</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept *</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.160</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,512,747</td>
<td>988.308</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8-3. ANCOVA Table for the Process Hypotheses H5a to H5d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Effect Type</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Sponsorships</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,204</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Image</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Sponsorships * Image</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>2.944</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Sponsorships * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,663</td>
<td>9.146</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Sponsorships * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,334</td>
<td>18.365</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>1.505</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Image</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>6.581</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,736</td>
<td>7.059</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 8-4. ANCOVA Table for the Process Hypotheses H6a to H6d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Effect Type</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 637</td>
<td>3.966</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Sponsorships</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Image</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>269.366</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 269</td>
<td>3.411</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Sponsorships * Image</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 692</td>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Sponsorships * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired-Association * Sponsorships * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 443</td>
<td>3.673</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 477</td>
<td>12.363</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 403</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Image</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.792</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 505</td>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Image * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1 414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8-5. ANCOVA Table for the Process Hypotheses H7a and H7b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Effect Type</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Sponsorships</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>5.256</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-concept * Sponsorships * Closure</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,502</td>
<td>13,502</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>2.205</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships * Closure</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>3.101</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 9

#### A-priori Contrast Tests Tables

**Table 9-1. Contrasts Tests for the Outcome Hypotheses H1a to H2b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Image Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Multiple vs. No sponsorships)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>60.98 vs. 47.56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>63.42 vs. 67.07</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>59.72 vs. 51.35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>83.33 vs. 72.97</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9-2. Contrast Test for the Need for Closure Analysis of the Outcome Hypotheses H1a to H2b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Closure Factor</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Image Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Multiple vs. No sponsorships)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>61.11 vs. 57.14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>52.78 vs. 61.91</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-.845</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>57.14 vs. 38.89</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>69.05 vs. 75.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-487</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>72.73 vs. 43.33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.665</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>80.00 vs. 7.28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>39.29 vs. 56.82</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-1.453</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>92.86 vs. 68.18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 9-3. Contrast Tests For Brand Image Reinforcement Analysis (H3a to H4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Multiple vs. No sponsorships)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>79.87 vs. 73.72</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>65.58 vs. 60.36</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Multiple Sponsorships*</td>
<td>79.87 vs. 65.58</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.039</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: These means were tested through an independent sample t-test. The means compared were dissimilar vs. similar brand-concept.

Table 9-4. Contrast Tests for the Processes Hypotheses H5a to H5d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Sponsorship Factor</th>
<th>Image Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Consistent vs. Inconsistent paired associations)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>62.20 vs. 47.56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.818</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>69.51 vs. 60.98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5c</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>58.11 vs. 51.35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5d</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>61.11 vs. 59.72</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9-5. Contrast Tests for the Need for Closure Analysis of the Process Hypotheses H5a to H5d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Closure</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Sponsorship Factor</th>
<th>Image Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Consistent vs. Inconsistent paired - associations)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>78.57 vs. 57.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>60.71 vs. 39.29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>61.11 vs. 61.11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>61.37 vs. 72.73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-1.312</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sport</td>
<td>No Sponsorship</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>63.89 vs. 38.89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.297</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sport</td>
<td>No Sponsorship</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>50.00 vs. 56.82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.680</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Sport</td>
<td>No Sponsorship</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>61.90 vs. 57.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Sport</td>
<td>No Sponsorship</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>70.00 vs. 43.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.477</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 9-6. Contrast Tests for Process Hypotheses H6a to H6d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Sponsorship Factor</th>
<th>Image Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Consistent vs. Inconsistent paired associations)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>87.80 vs. 67.07</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.759</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>80.49 vs. 63.41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.332</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6c</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>58.11 vs. 72.97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-2.060</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6d</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>79.17 vs. 83.33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-.723</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 9-7. Contrast Tests for the Need for Closure Analysis of the Process Hypotheses H6a to H6d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Closure</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Sponsorship Factor</th>
<th>Image Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Consistent vs. Inconsistent paired associations)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>85.71 vs. 69.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>67.86 vs. 92.86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2.876</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>72.22 vs. 52.78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.715</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>86.36 vs. 77.27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>No Sponsorship</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>83.33 vs. 75.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>No Sponsorship</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>54.55 vs. 68.18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-1.449</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>No Sponsorship</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>90.48 vs. 61.90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.382</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>No Sponsorship</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>63.33 vs. 80.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1.435</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9 Continued

Table 9-8. Contrast Tests for the Process Hypotheses H7a and H7b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Multiple vs. No sponsorship)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7a</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>33.77 vs. 38.78</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-1.196</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7b</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>66.32 vs. 74.10</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-2.170</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9-9. Contrast Tests for the Need for Closure Analysis of the Process Hypotheses H7a and H7b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Closure Factor</th>
<th>Brand-concept Factor</th>
<th>Means Compared (Multiple vs. No sponsorship)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>37.50 vs. 40.28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-.464</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>65.17 vs. 72.92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-1.439</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>30.00 vs. 37.50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-1.226</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No Sport</td>
<td>65.71 vs. 75.75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-2.055</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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