DETERMINANTS OF SPONSOR BRAND RECALL: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION IN CONTEXT OF SPORTS SPONSORSHIP

Anil Gupta* and **Anish Yousaf****

Abstract: *The present study aims at providing a field test of sponsorship recall by empirically assessing the impact of relatedness, prominence, and hierarchy on recall accuracy of sponsors in context of Indian Premier League. Findings of the study support Wakefield, Becker-Olsen, and Cornwell (2007) and Wakefield and Bennett (2010) arguing that prominence and relatedness impact sponsors recall in a cluttered media environment. This study contributes to existing literature gap created as a result of lack of researches taken up on sponsorship in Asian and other Emerging economies with a special focus on concurrent sponsorship. In the study, it is found that related and prominent sponsors have the highest recall when compared with other sponsors. Hero (related and prominent) is having the highest recall (93%) among all sponsors. Though both factors have a significant impact on sponsors recall, it is explored that prominence has more potential to contribute towards recall as compared to relatedness. In addition, hierarchical commitment of sponsor also significantly impacts its recall since it is observed that main sponsors or partners are recalled strongly by respondents.*

Keywords: Concurrent Sponsorships, Hierarchy, Indian Premier League, Prominence, Relatedness, Sponsors, Sport Teams.

Jel Classification: *M –Business Administration and Business Economics; Marketing; Accounting; Personal Economics {M3- Marketing and Advertising (M31- Marketing)}*

INTRODUCTION

One strategy which has gained popularity among global marketers is sponsorship i.e. sponsoring events/causes (Gupta, Naik, & Arora, 2013) which has become an integral part of firms' communication strategy to achieve corporate objectives, irrespective of size or geographical presence (Gupta, Naik, & Arora, 2013). Over a long period of time Sponsorship as a marketing strategy has gained global acceptance. The global sponsorship industry was estimated at $53.3 billion in 2013 with a growth rate of 4.2% which was higher than the growth rate of other forms of traditional marketing communication strategies (IEG Report, 2013).

*   Senior Assistant Professor, The Business School, University of Jammu
** Assistant Professor, School of Business, Lovely Professional University

Using sponsorship as a communication strategy offers many benefits like building/enhancing brand awareness (Walraven, Koning, & Bottenburg, 2012), corporate image (Walraven, Koning, & Bottenburg, 2012), influencing consumer recall (Bennett, 1999), developing competitive advantage, goodwill (Meenaghan, 1991) and enhancing brand-equity (Henseler, Wilson, & Westberg, 2011; Simmons & Becker-Olsen, 2006) in a more direct and at a least cost as compared to other traditional communication strategies (Meenaghan, 1991).

Over the years, the concept of sponsorship has evolved as a major field of interest among the researchers. One of the recent development is the emergence of the concept of concurrent sponsorship (Carrillat, Harriss, & Lafferty, 2010; Ruth & Simonin, 2003; Ruth & Simonin, 2006) wherein an event is being sponsored by two or more than two sponsors concurrently, thus, making solo event-sponsor contracts history. One can easily see many concurrent sponsorship contracts among Europe or USA signed multiple sponsors for an event. In Asia, such contracts are commonly visible and one such example is the rise of Indian Premier League (IPL hereafter) to a globally acknowledged sporting event from India (Gupta, Naik & Arora, 2013).

Take for instance the 7th Edition of IPL which had sponsors like Pepsi, Volkswagen, Kingfisher Premium, Coca-Cola, Reebok, Adidas, Amity University, India Cements and other such prominent brand holders. All these sponsors, more than 120 in number, were from different countries or industries, having a different market prominence and relatedness with the event/team which they were sponsoring. In addition, these sponsors were presented at different hierarchical levels having different names for their sponsorship contracts such as official sponsor, official partner, official ticketing/drinks partner and many more (*www.iplt20.com*). Such concurrent presentation of many sponsors creates a cluttered environment making it very difficult for marketers to evaluate the benefits for their brands.

When academic research on sponsorship is evaluated it was found that majority of the work done is in the area of solo sponsorship and the area of concurrent sponsorship is being neglected till date (Gupta, Naik & Arora, 2013). Even few researches which focus on concurrent sponsorship are conducted either in USA or Europe since these countries dominate sponsorship research till date, since a very little research has been carried out on sponsorship in emerging economies or Asian countries. The reason is quite obvious, Sponsorship has been initially used by firms in Europe and other developed countries but the scenario is changing as Asian and Emerging economies are realizing its strategic importance and are now spending heavily on sponsorship. For example in 2012, sponsorship in the Asia Pacific region grew at the rate of 6.7% higher than other regions (IEG Report, 2012).

Interestingly, the growth of sponsorship in BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, & China) is expected to continue to $10.4 billion in 2015 with a growth rate of 4.5%

(IEG Report, 2012). Thus there is a need for assessing the effectiveness of sponsorship deals in emerging economies or Asian countries as the scale of sponsorship investments are very high. This gives an opportunity for academicians in emerging economies to answer the effectiveness of sponsorship contracts and the factors influencing it, so that sponsoring organizations can leverage the benefits of their sponsorship contracts in presence of other competing brands and achieve their organizational as well as marketing communication objectives.

Sponsorship literature is flooded with many researches arguing the important role played by event-sponsor relatedness on sponsors recall (Martensen, Gronholdt, Bendtsen, & Jensen, 2007; Wakefield, Becker-Olsen, & Cornwell, 2007). A close examination of existing researches revealed that they were conducted in solo sponsorship situations where only the relatedness between the event and a single sponsor is evaluated. Concurrent sponsorship is different from solo sponsorship entirely. Take for example, a simple case involving two sponsors A and B sponsoring an event. In such concurrent sponsorship scenario relatedness will be presented at three levels: (1) relatedness between sponsor A and event, (2) relatedness between sponsor B and event, (3) relatedness between sponsor A and sponsor B.

However in case of an event involving many sponsors, the situation can get even more complex, thus, making it important for researchers to evaluate sponsorship effectiveness in concurrent sponsorship through a rational approach. Marketers as well as academic researchers from Asian or emerging economies still need to explore the answers to this million dollar question: "Do sponsorships programs are really effective in a cluttered environment in emerging economies or Asian countries?" Research question that needs to be addressed is: Does prominence, relatedness and hierarchy have an impact on sponsors recall accuracy in modern sport sponsorship. The present study, thus is an attempt towards contributing to the existing sponsorship literature gap created as a result of the lack of researches on sponsorship in Asian or emerging economies. The study will explore this opportunity by focusing towards sponsorship effectiveness among sponsorship practices in India by a field test of sponsorship recall by empirically assessing the impact of relatedness, prominence, and hierarchy on the recall accuracy of sponsors in the context of Indian Premier League.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Sponsorship Effectiveness

Cornwell and Maignan (1998) defined sponsorship as "An exchange between an event and firm(s) where the event receives fees or donated products from the firm(s) and allow them to participate in the event and promote their association with it" at the same time they argue that sponsorship effectiveness findings are ambiguous

and contradictory due to the lack of an appropriate framework which can be used for conceptualizing and measuring sponsorship effectiveness. Today due to intense competition, cluttered media environment, and economic recession of the 21st century have put more pressure on corporate managers to justify their sponsorship investments (Verhoef & Leeflang, 2009).

Walliser (2003) argued sponsorship effectiveness as an area which has been frequently researched by researchers, thus, taking the major portion of sponsorship research. Research on sponsorship effectiveness was ranked amongst the top most studied fields of sponsorship research (Chadwick and Thwaites, 2005) including sponsor awareness (Boshoff and Gerber, 2008), image effectiveness (Gwinner, 1997), consumer purchase intentions (Cornwell, Humphreys, Maguire, Weeks, & Tellegen, 2006), employee motivation (Grimes and Meenaghan, 1998), memorization of sponsors (Cornwell, Humphreys, Maguire, Weeks, & Tellegen, 2006), brand equity effectiveness (Cornwell, Donald, & Steinard, 2001), impact on sales (Verity 2002), and corporate wealth (e.g. Miyazaki & Morgan 2001).

Previous researchers had also highlighted the recall or top-of-mind awareness of sponsors using free recall, product category recall or a fully aided recall (Wakefield & Bennett, 2010; Wakefield, Becker-Olsen, & Cornwell, 2007; Lardinoit & Derbaix, 2001; Ruth & Simonin, 2003; Boshoff & Gerber, 2008). Wakefield, Becker-Olsen, and Cornwell (2007) argued that recall of sponsors is influenced by a number of factors like relatedness of the sponsor with the event, prominence of the sponsor, the level of sponsorship (hierarchy from onwards), and brand exposure at the individual level.

Sponsorship Relatedness

Relatedness was first explained as any direct or indirect relevance to the event due to the sponsor. Woisetschlager, Eiting, Haselhoff, and Michaelis (2010) argue perceived benefits, regional identification, sincerity, provision of autonomy and ubiquity as antecedents to sponsorship fit having an impact of brand attractiveness and word-of-mouth and also argued that these elements for the core of their sponsorship fit model. Zdravkovic, Magnusson, and Stanley (2010) classified fit into *marketing strategy fit* and *prominence fit* ,in cause-related marketing, each consisting of five sub-dimensions. They defined prominence fit as the way in which the relationship is presented and explained to the target customers whereas marketing strategy fit revolves around the segmentation, targeting, and positioning similarities between the brand and the social cause.

Becker-Olson and Simmons (2002) argue that low sponsor-event fit creates confusion in the minds of the consumers regarding the brand and increases the chances of brand dilution. Categorizing fit as native (natural) fit and created (articulated) fit, they argue that sponsor-event having high natural/created fit had

the advantage of high positive outcomes. For example, Reebok or Nike sponsoring Olympics or any sports event will look highly related and legitimate which will help these brands to be easily remembered and recalled in consumers' memory in comparison to a situation when they sponsor some other arts event. Relatedness theory can explain why related brands have an advantage over non-related brands in terms of their recall or identification. Relatedness theory suggests that a highly related sponsor-sponsored entity have a direct impact on storage and retrieval of information from consumers' memory and is responsible for the stronger and favorable relationship between the two (Martensen, Gronholdt, Bendtsen, & Jensen, 2007). We, thus, argue that in sports context the following relationship will hold true:

> H1: Sponsor recall is impacted by the relatedness between the sponsor and event/team i.e. higher the relatedness, higher is the sponsor recall and vice-versa.

Sponsors Prominence

Johar and Pham (1999) were the first to empirically analyze the most important heuristics impacting sponsors identification, calling one of them as 'relatedness' (discussed above) and other as 'sponsors prominence' arguing that sponsor identification doesn't solely depends on retrieval of information from memory but involves a complex psychological phenomenon ranging from pure guessing at one end and drawing inferences on the basis of relatedness and prominence as cues on the other end. Pham and Johar (2001) defined prominence as "consumers' use of variations in the market prominence of potential sponsors as a source of information when inferring the identity of sponsors" where different factors like brand awareness, market share, visibility, and share-of-voice acts as antecedents suggesting the importance of prominence theory in sponsor identification arguing that prominent brands (e.g DLF, Coke, Hero) are viewed as more reliable/authentic which can be viewed as sponsors (accurately or guessing) in comparison to brands (e.g Shrachi Real Estate or Dheeraj Real Estate, Amity University) which are less prominent.

Wakefield, Becker-Olson and Cornwell (2007) examines the role of prominence in a field setting and advices managers to acknowledge the role played by these heuristics (prominence and relatedness) in sponsor identification. In addition, previous researchers had also highlighted the direct impact of sponsors prominence on sponsors recall, thus, influencing sponsor identification (Lardinoit and Quester, 2001; Wakefield and Bennett, 2010). We, thus, argue on the basis of above mentioned studies that prominence of sponsors influences consumers' ability to identify sponsors in a cluttered media environment and argue that the following relationship will be hold true in sports setting:

H2: Sponsor recall is impacted by the prominence of sponsor i.e greater the sponsors' prominence, higher is the sponsor recall and vice-versa.

Sponsorship Level

Firms involved in sponsorship had to often choose between different levels of sponsorship and marketing executives have to make decisions about their level of commitment with the activity being sponsored, in terms of the hierarchical position they are interested in. For example in 5th edition of Indian Premier League (IPL), marketers had the privilege to choose between different levels of sponsorships like title sponsor (DLF, Videocon), sponsor (Pepsi, Flying Machine, Nokia, Sahara etc), partner (Coca Cola, Hero, Vivel, Vodafone etc), team partner (RN Club, Mountain Dew), official partner (Reebok, Disney, Adidas, USHA, Volkswagen etc) and many others. The choice primarily depends on the sponsorship objectives of the sponsoring firms and their sponsorship budget. Sponsors were more interested in occupying the highest hierarchical position in IPL for maximum interaction with IPL fans, thus hoping to enhance their brand awareness and brand image from the same.

Wakefield, Becker-Olsen and Cornwell (2007) were the first who can be credited for empirically exploring the role played by sponsorship level on recall accuracy and accurate sponsor identification. They opined that sponsorship level has a significant impact on the recall accuracy of sponsors but specifically enhances sponsor recall for both prominent and related brands but did not influence recall for less prominent and non-related sponsors. On the basis of a field study, they observe that anchor sponsors were having highest recall when compared to mid-tier or low-tier sponsors of a professional baseball team and called sponsorship level as sponsors' commitment to the event. But despite of being an important factor, literature lacks additional researches involving sponsorship level and this field of sponsorship research needs further exploration. Focusing on this, it is argued that hierarchy of sponsors has an important role to play in sponsor recall.

H3: Hierarchy of sponsors impacts their recall.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Procedure and Sample

Two weeks before the start of the tournament (from 19th March – 3rd April, 2012), official websites of all the 9 teams and including the event (IPL) were monitored on a daily basis for correctly listing down all the sponsors in IPL and the process was stopped twenty-four hours before the opening of the first match of IPL, which resulted in the identification of 119 sponsors. Also, the hierarchical position of all these individual sponsors were listed down from the information provided on the official websites of the participating teams. It is believed that youth represents major target customers for sport organizations as well as for sport related consumption (Dickson, Derevensky & Gupta, 2004). Youth (university and college students) were defined as the target population for the study who watch IPL and

were aware of event (IPL) as well as different teams playing for it. Data was collected from 360 respondents by visiting different schools in Jammu region of J&K. After omitting half, non-filled and badly responded (No/Yes in all the boxes) questionnaires, 330 were kept for further analysis with a response rate of 92%.

Two pre-tests were carried out before the main study.

First Pre-test

The aim of the first pre-test was to categorize all the sponsors on the basis of the industry they come from as it was observed that sponsors were coming from a wide range of industries ranging from highest related (sports) to the least related (mining). Having acknowledged the fact, the pre-test was conducted 10 days before the start of IPL with a motive of exploring the relatedness of different industries with the teams/event. All the sponsors in IPL were first categorized into similar groups on the basis of the industry they belong to leading to 21 different industries (refer Table 1). The industry-team/event relatedness was measured in a similar manner using Wakefield, Becker-Olsen, and Cornwell (2007) and was customized by asking respondents on a 10-point scale "Given what these industries offer to the customers, would it make sense for brands from these industries to sponsor IPL or any team of IPL (makes no sense/makes perfect sense)?" Data was collected from 40 respondents using both offline and online sources. It was observed that sports industry was the highly related industry with IPL which was followed by entertainment industry, soft drink industry, hospitality industry, services industry and so on while paper industry and mining industry were at the bottom of the industry-IPL relatedness list.

Second Pre-test

Second pre-test was conducted to measure the relatedness and prominence of each individual brand with the event/team. Having observed the presence of 119 sponsors in the 5th Edition of IPL, the second pre-test used the manner similar to that of Johar and Pham (1999) for measuring the prominence of every individual brand and the relatedness of the sponsors with the event/team. Data was collected from 50 university students of management department (average age - 22 years) who were asked to respond to the following using seven-point scale:

- *Prominence*: Compared to their competitors, how large and prominent is this brand? (small/large)
- *Relatedness*: Given what they offer and their image, would it make sense for this brand to sponsor IPL or any team of IPL (makes no sense/makes perfect sense).

Sponsors were categorized into four different categories using Median-split analysis (refer Table 2). These four categories were: (1) Related and Prominent, (2)

Table 1
Industry-Event/Sponsors Relatedness

Industry	Mean	S.D
Sports Industry	9.00	1.51
Entertainment Industry	8.10	1.64
Soft Drink Industry	7.80	1.69
Hospitality Industry	7.53	1.90
Services Industry	7.47	1.40
FMCG/Food Industry	7.37	2.10
Telecommunications Industry	7.33	1.60
Lifestyle/Apparels Industry	7.30	2.08
Automobile Industry	7.10	1.39
Electronics Industries	7.00	2.33
Consumer Durable Goods Industry	6.73	2.16
Alcohol and Tobacco Industry	6.47	2.59
Information Technology Industry	6.33	2.46
Transportation Industry	6.31	2.02
Real Estate Industry	5.23	2.19
Banking and Finance Industry	5.07	2.54
Postal/Courier Industry	4.41	2.16
Petroleum Industry	4.20	2.49
Cement Industry	3.80	2.20
Paper Industry	3.53	2.06
Mining Industry	2.53	2.14

Table 2
Categorization of Sponsors in IPL

	Related	Unrelated
Prominent	**CATEGORY 1**	**CATEGORY 2**
	32 Brands	*24 Brands*
	Related (Mean=7.33) and Prominence (Mean=7.46)	*Related (Mean=5.46) and Prominence (Mean=4.22)*
Less-Prominent	**CATEGORY 3**	**CATEGORY 4**
	13 Brands	*50 Brands*
	Related (Mean=6.94) and Prominence (Mean=4.21)	*Related (Mean=5.17) and Prominence (Mean=4.22)*

Unrelated and Prominent, (3) Related and Less-Prominent, and (4) Unrelated and Less-Prominent. Based on the median-split analysis, the following results were observed from the second pre-test:

- *Fifty (50) brands are Unrelated (Mean=5.17) and Less-Prominent (Mean=4.22)*
- *Twenty-four (24) brands are Unrelated (Mean=5.46) and Prominent (Mean=4.22)*
- *Thirteen (13) brands are Related (Mean=6.94) and Less-Prominent (Mean=4.21)*
- *Thirty-Two (32) brands are Related (Mean=7.33) and Prominent (Mean=7.46)*

Anova and Tukeys' post-hoc test were used in order to show the statistical difference between the means of these four (4) different groups with the help of SPSS software using relatedness mean and prominence mean as the dependent variables and categorization of sponsors as the factor. Results show that the mean of related and unrelated sponsors were significantly different ($F = 69.54$, $p < 0.01$) as well as the means of prominent and less-prominent sponsors ($F = 79.05$, $p < 0.01$) were statistically different. Also, Tukey post-hoc test was applied and results shows that group in order to check out which groups have similar means. Results of Tukeys' test confirms that for relatedness, group (1) and (2) shares similar means ($p > 0.05$) when compared to the means of group (3) and (4) which also have a similar means between them ($p > 0.01$). Tukey test in terms of prominence of sponsors revealed that the means of group (1) and (3) shares similar means ($p > 0.05$) when compared to the means of group (2) and (4) having similar means ($p > 0.01$).

Instrument and Measures for the Main Study

Respondents were given a brief overview about sponsors and sponsorships scenario. Sponsors were defined as those brands or firms whose names appear in media, teams' uniforms or signage's around the stadium (Wakefield, Becker-Olsen, and Cornwell, 2007). A well drafted questionnaire was given to each respondent containing the names of all the 119 sponsors to measure the sponsor recall by asking "*Read carefully the names of the Brands mentioned in the list. Please answer each of the following brands as 'Yes', if you think it has sponsored IPL/Team (s) of IPL. If you think the brand is not a sponsor of IPL/Teams, give your answer as 'No'.*

RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

75% of the respondents were between the age group of 15-20 years and only 15% were between the age group of 22-25 years. In the study, 60% of the respondents were males whereas 40% respondents were females. It was observed that 69% of the respondents play/like Cricket in comparison to 9% who were more interested in football. When asked about the frequency of watching IPL matches, 19% respondents agree that they watch the matches of their favorite teams whereas 25% of the respondents watch all the matches of the IPL. Interestingly, IPL was viewed as an interesting T-20 cricket tournament as 60% respondents watch IPL

matches because they view it as an entertaining cricket event while 20% respondents has the motive of watching the celebrity players in IPL.

Relatedness/Prominence Heuristics

Results of descriptive analysis shows that the relatedness mean of all related sponsors was 6.07 which were having an average recall of 42% while the average recall of prominent sponsors in IPL was 45% with an average prominence mean as 5.9. It was observed that related and prominent sponsors were having the highest recall when compared to other sponsors (refer Table 3) where Hero (94.75%) was at the top followed by Royal Stag (87.56%), DLF (86.71%), Nokia (86.71%), Aircel (86.32%), Reebok (84.89%), Adidas (79.68%), Coca Cola (78.51%), Pepsi (77.73%), Kingfisher Premium (75.78%), Yamaha (71.87%), MasterCard (71.87%), Puma (68%) and many others (refer Table 5). It was also observed that industry-event relatedness also increase sponsors recall as it was found that sponsors from highly related industries (sports, entertainment, soft drink etc) were having high recall. In addition, prominence of a brand individually also mediate its recall. The impact of relatedness and prominence can be gauged by having a glimpse at the bottom of table 3 where un-related and less-prominent sponsors were having a very poor recall e.g. Punjab Kesari (36%), Ram Bandhu Masale (14.84%) and others. Regression analysis was used to statistically explore the impact of sponsors relatedness and prominence on their recall in IPL taking both as independent variables and recall of sponsors as a dependent variable (refer Table 3).

Table 3
Regression Results - Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	-44.19	2.55		8.42	.00
Prominence	.11.26	.14	.14	19.09	.01
Relatedness	3.7	.16	.16	8.79	.01

a. Dependent Variable: Recall of Sponsors

Results of regression shows that both relatedness and prominence have a significant impact ($p < 0.01$ for both) on individuals recalling the sponsors. It was observed from the results of the regression analysis that prominence of a brand has greater effect on its recall as compared to its relatedness with the event/team indicating that individuals rely more on prominence of a brand (refer eq. 1) than its relatedness to decide whether or not a brand is the sponsor of an event/team. The regression equation (eq. 3) was formulated as:

Recall of Sponsors = - 44.19 + 11.26 Prominence + 3.7 Relatedness + Error — (eq. 1)

Overall, the results lends support to our hypothesis (H1 and H2) that the recall of sponsors is impacted by the degree of relatedness and prominence of a sponsor as it was found that highly related and more prominent sponsors were having the highest recall and vice-versa.

Sponsorship Level (Hierarchy)

In order to assess the effect of sponsorship hierarchy on its recall, sponsors were categorized into three different categories. Sponsors named as sponsors, official sponsor, or founding sponsor were put in the category 1, whereas sponsorship contracts named as partner, official partner, team partner and associate partner were put in the 2nd category. Similarly, sponsors not having official sponsor/partner or sponsor/partner hierarchies were placed in the 3rd category containing tags such as apparel/pouring/bike/ticketing/knowledge partners or sponsors.

Two dummy variables (3-1) were used to explain the variation in recall of sponsors (dependent variable) by converting categorical variable (hierarchy) into a form making sense to regression analysis. It is important to mention here that the dummy variables represent only the numerical representation of the categories of nominal variable (hierarchy). Regression analysis was used to assess the degree of relationship between sponsors recall and hierarchy and the results showed that hierarchy has a significant impact on recall of sponsors ($p < 0.01$ for both) capturing approx 68% variance of sponsors recall (Ad. R Square = 0.68) lending support to the acceptance of our hypothesis (H3). It was explored from the regression results (refer Table 4) that the hierarchy has a significant impact on the recall of sponsors as it was found that sponsors investing in sponsorship contracts named as official sponsor yield better recall than sponsors investing in contracts named partners. The regression equation (eq. 2) for hierarchy using dummy variables (SponsorLevel & PartnerLevel) was formulated as:

Recall of Sponsors = 30.98 + 18.82 SponsorLevel + 11.88 PartnerLevel + Error   (2)

Hence, hypothesis 3 was accepted.

Table 4
Regression Results - Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	30.98	1.65		5.36	.00
Sponsor Level	18.82	2.14	.15	3.22	.03
Partner Level	11.88	1.96	.21	2.11	.05

a. Dependent Variable: Recall of Sponsors

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Current study aims to test hypotheses related to recall of sponsors in context of Indian Premier League using field setting as outlined previously. We summarize all our results, as shown in Table 6. A number of issues of particular interest are discussed below.

Table 5
Percentage Recall of Related/Non-Related and Prominent/Non-Prominent
Sponsors in 5th Edition of Indian Premier League

Sponsors	Relatedness (Mean)	Prominence (Mean)	Percentage Recall of Sponsors
Hero	7.45	7.69	94.75%
Royal Stag	6.36	6.76	87.56%
DLF	7.45	8.52	86.71%
Nokia	7.34	8.52	86.71%
Aircel	7.25	7.76	86.32%
Reebok	8.45	7.92	84.89%
Royal Challenge	5.91	7.38	83.59%
Adidas	8.64	8.76	79.68%
Coca Cola	7.45	8.79	78.51%
Pepsi	7.58	8.24	77.73%
Kingfisher Premium	7.27	6.97	75.78%
Yamaha	7.64	7.21	71.87%
Master Card	7.00	7.38	71.87%
Mountain Dew	7.27	8.43	67.96%
Puma	7.73	7.86	67.57%
Videocon d2h	7.75	5.93	64.06%
USHA	7.08	6.24	50.39%
Punjab Kesari	4.83	5.07	36.71%
Matrix Sim Cards	4.64	4.86	33.20%
Amity University	4.54	5.48	27.34%
Sanskar School	3.82	3.83	22.65%
The Telegraph	4.82	5.15	18.75%
Finolex Industries	4.45	4.93	17.96%
Dheeraj Real Estate	4.50	3.02	17.18%
Agon	3.92	3.14	15.23%
Manyavar	3.92	3.83	10.93%
Ram Bandhu Masale	3.42	2.97	14.84%

Table 6
Summary of Research Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Result	Statistical Significance
H1 (Impact of Relatedness)	*Supported*	(t = 8.79, p < 0.01), Ad. R Square = 0.358
H2 (Impact of Prominence)	*Supported*	(t = 19.09, p < 0.01), Ad. R Square = 0.724)
H3(Impact of Hierarchy)	*Supported*	For SponsorLevel: (t = 3.22, p < 0.03) For PartnerLevel: (t = 2.1, p < 0.05) Ad. R Square = 0.68

Relatedness and Prominence

The study highlights how important these individual level constructs are for marketers who want to increase their brand awareness among the masses. Researches on similar issues have been carried out in developed continents of USA or Europe but emerging economies like the Asian subcontinent and others are still far behind in the same. Since sponsorship have a very huge potential in developing economies therefore it is very important for marketers to understand how they can really enhance their brand awareness in such economies. Marketers should know how to streamline their other marketing activities in order to leverage effective benefits properly.

It is observed in the study that related and prominent brands are making effective use of their sponsorship investment as the recall of their brands was highest when compared to other brands. However, other sponsors can learn a lot from these sponsors and leverage the benefits in the long run. It is found that majority of the sponsors (50) in IPL falls in category 4 (unrelated and less-prominent), thus, there exists an opportunity for them to take the advantage by articulating their sponsorship to target audience. This can be done by educating them the reason for their association with the event/team (Cornwell, Humphreys, Maguire, Weeks & Tellegen, 2006). Such articulation cases are very rare in IPL such as all the sponsors of Mumbai Indians have articulated their sponsorship programs with the team and the information is being made public on the website of Mumbai Indians as such articulations make target customers to view the sponsorships as legitimate and led them to have positive associations towards the sponsor (Cornwell, Humphreys, Maguire, Weeks & Tellegen, 2006).

The results of regression analysis indicates that both relatedness and prominence significantly affect sponsors recall but at the same time prominence of a sponsor has more potential to impact sponsorship effectiveness then the relatedness. Managers of prominent firms, thus, have an advantage over other sponsors, even if their brand is not related to the event/team. E.g Royal Challenge (Sponsor of Delhi Daredevil) which is viewed as more prominent and less related had a better recall than most of the sponsors who are viewed as more related with the event/team. Importantly, Industry-IPL relatedness also has an impact on the sponsors recall. Sponsors from more related industries were having a strong recall as it was found that sponsors like Reebok, Adidas, Puma (Sports Industry-high relatedness with IPL) were having a strong recall in comparison to Sanskar School, Classmate Stationary, Amity University (Education industry-low relatedness with IPL).

Hierarchy

The overall findings for hierarchy of sponsors showed that sponsor hierarchy impact individuals' ability to recall sponsors. Firms having hierarchies quoted as

"Official" or "Founding" sponsor/partner outperforms lower-level hierarchies. This finding supports Wakefield, Becker-Olsen, & Cornwell (2007) who argued the same findings. Based on the results, the highest recall was generated by Hero (founding sponsor – IPL) followed by DLF (Title Sponsor – IPL), Aircel (Principal Sponsor – Chennai Super Kings), Idea (Principal Partner – Deccan Chargers), Adidas (Associate Partner – Delhi Daredevils and Sponsor – Pune Warriors) and many more whereas sponsors at lower level of hierarchies such as TVS (Motor Bike Partner), White Mischief (Mischief Partner), Xenoh (Deodrant Partner), Oakley (Eye Wear Partner) etc reap a very low recall rates. It was also observed that prominent and related sponsors such as Hero, Adidas, Reebok, Coca-Cola, Puma, Citibank etc enjoyed a high recall rate ranging from 94% (Hero) to 58% (Citibank) whereas unrelated and non-prominent sponsors such as Lux Cozi, TV 5, Loop Mobiles, EMT, Spanco, Dheeraj Real Estate, Rose Valley, Muffin Innovations etc were having a poor recall rates ranging from 38% to 8%. It is, thus, argued that marketers of non-prominent sponsors should invest in higher hierarchies making their brand more visible to the fans.

References

Becker-Olsen, K. and Simmons C. J. (2002), When Do Social Sponsorship Enhance or Dilute Equity? Fit, Message Source and the Persistence of Effects. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *29*, 287-289.

Bennett, R. (1999), Sports Sponsorship, Spectator Recall and False Consensus. *European Journal of Marketing, 33(3/4)*, 291-313.

Boshoff, C. and Gerber C. (2008), Sponsorship recall and recognition. The case of the 2007 Cricket World Cup. *South African Journal of Business Management, 39(2),* 1-8.

Broniarczyk, S. M. and Alba J. W. (1994), The Importance of the Brand in Brand Extension. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*(2), 214-228.

Carrillat, F. A., Harris, E. A., and Lafferty, B. A. (2010), Fortuitous Brand Image Transfer: Investigating the Side Effect of Concurrent Sponsorships. *Journal of Advertising, 39*(2), 109-23.

Chadwick, S. and Thwaites D. (2005), Managing sport sponsorship programs: lessons from a critical assessment of English soccer. *Journal of Advertising, 45*(3), 328-338.

Cornwell, T. B., Pruitt S. W. and Van N. R. (2001), The value of winning in motorsports: Sponsorship-linked marketing. *Journal of Advertising Research, 41*(1), 17-31.

_____, and Maignan I. (1998), An international review of sponsorship Research. *Journal of Advertising, 27*(2), 1-21.

_____, Donald R. P., and Steinard E. A. (2001), Exploring Managers' Perceptions of the Impact of Sponsorship on Brand Equity. *Journal of Advertising, 30*(2), 41-51.

_____, Weeks C., and Roy D. (2005), Sponsorship-Linked Marketing: Opening the Black Box. *Journal of Advertising, 34*(2), 21-42.

_____, Humphreys M., Maguire A., Weeks C. and Tellegen C. (2006), Sponsorship-linked marketing: The role of articulation in memory. *Journal of Consumer Research, 33*(3), 312-321.

Daneshvary, R., and Schwer R. K. (2000), The association endorsement and consumers' intention to purchase. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *17(*3), 203 - 213.

Dickson, L., Derevensky, J. and Gupta, R. (2004), Harm-reduction for the prevention of youth gambling problems and other high-risk behaviors. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*, 88–128.

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

Grimes, E., and Meenaghan T. (1998), Focusing commercial sponsorship on the internal corporate audience. *International Journal of Advertising, 17*, 51-74.

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

_____, and Eaton J. (1999), Building Brand Image Trough Event Sponsorship: The Role of Image Transfer. *Journal of Advertising, 18(*4), 47-57.

_____, and Swanson, S. R. (2003), A Model of Fan Identification: Antecedents and Sponsorship Outcomes. *Journal of Services Marketing, 17*(3), 275-94.

Gupta, A., Naik, A. Y. and Arora, N. (2013), Mapping Sponsorship-linked Marketing in Indian Premier League. *IIM Kozhikode Society and Management Review, 2*(1), 61–72.

IEG (International Events Group) Report. (2011), *IEG Sponsorship Report*. Chicago, IL: IEG, Inc.

IEG (International Events Group) Report. (2012), *IEG Sponsorship Report*. Chicago, IL: IEG, Inc.

IEG (International Events Group) Report. (2013), *IEG Sponsorship Report*. Chicago, IL: IEG, Inc.

Johar, G. V. and Pham M.T. (1999), Relatedness, prominence, and constructive sponsor identification. *Journal of Marketing Research, 36*(3), 299–312.

Lardinoit, T., and Derbaix C. (2001), Sponsorship and recall of sponsors. *Psychology and Marketing, 18*(2), 167–190.

_____, and Quester P.G. (2001), Attitudinal effects of combined sponsorship and sponsors prominence on basketball in Europe. *Journal of Advertising Research, 41*(1), 48–58.

Malar, L., Krohmer, H., Hoyer, W. D. and Nyffenegger, B. (2011), Emotional Brand Attachment and Brand Personality: The Relative Importance of the Actual and the Ideal Self. *Journal of Marketing, 75*(July), 35 –52.

Martensen, A., Grønholdt L., Bendtsen L. and Jensen M. J. (2007), Application of a Model for the Effectiveness of Event Marketing. *Journal of Advertising Research, 47*(3), 283-301.

Meenaghan, T. (1991), The role of sponsorship in the marketing communications mix. *International Journal of Advertising, 10*(1), 35–47.

Miyazaki, A. D. and Morgan A. G. (2001), Assessing market value of event sponsoring: corporate Olympic sponsorships. *Journal of Advertising Research, 41*(1), 9–15.

Pham, M. T. and Johar G.V. (2001), Market prominence biases in sponsorship identification: processes and consequentiality. *Psychology and Marketing, 18*(2), 123–143.

Quester, P.G. and Farrelly F. (1998), Brand association and memory decay effects of sponsorship: the case of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 7*(6),539–556.

Rifon, N. J., Choi S. M., Trimble C. S. and Li H. (2004), Congruence effects in sponsorship. *Journal of Advertising*, 22(1), 29-42.

Roy, D. P. and Cornwell T. B. (2004), The Effects of Consumer Knowledge on Responses to Event Sponsorships. *Psychology and Marketing, 21*(3), 185-207.Rust and Oliver, 1994

Ruth, J. A. and Simonin B. L. (2003), Brought to you by brand A and brand B. *Journal of Advertising, 32*(3), 19–30.

Ruth, J. A. and Simonin, L. (2006), The Power of Numbers: Investigating the Impact of Event Roster Size in Consumer Response to Sponsorship. *Journal of Advertising, 35*(4), 7-20.

Simmons, C. J. and Becker-Olsen, K. L. (2006), Achieving marketing objectives through social sponsorships. *Journal of Marketing, 70*(4), 154–69.

Speed, R. and Thompson P. (2000), Determinants of sports sponsorship response. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 28*(2), 226-238.

Stahl, F., Heitmann, M., Lehmann, D. R. and Neslin, S. A. (2012), The Impact of Brand Equity on Customer Acquisition, Retention, and Profit Margin. *Journal of Marketing, 76*(4), 44-63.

Tripodi, J. A., Hirons M., Bednall D. and Sutherland M. (2003), Cognitive evaluation: Promps used to measure sponsorship awareness. *International Journal of Market Research. 45*(4), 12-25.

Turley, L. W. and Shannon J. R. (2000), The impact and effectiveness of advertisements in a sports arena. *Journal of Services Marketing, 14*(4), 323-336.

Verhoef, P. C. and Leeflang, P. S. H. (2009), Understanding the marketing department's influence within the firm. *Journal of Marketing, 73*(2), 14-37.

Verity, J. (2002), Maximising the marketing potential of sponsorship for global brands. *European Business Journal, 14*(6), 161-174.

Wakefield, K. L., Becker-Olsen K. and Cornwell T. B. (2007), I spy a sponsor. The effects of sponsorship level, prominence, relatedness, and cueing on recall accuracy. *Journal of Advertising, 36*(4), 61–74.

_____ and Bennett G. (2010), Affective intensity and sponsor identification. *Journal of Advertising, 39*(3), 99-111.

Walraven, M., Koning, R. H. and Bottenburg, M. V. (2012), The effects of sports sponsorship : a review and research agenda. *The Marketing Review, 12*(1), 17-38.

Walliser, B. (2003), An international review of sponsorship research: extension and update. *International Journal of Advertising, 22*(1), 5–40.

Weeks, C., Cornwell T. and Drennan J. (2008), Leveraging Sponsorships on the Internet: Activation, Congruence, and Articulation. *Psychology and Marketing, 25*(7), 637-654.

Woisetschläger, D. M., Eiting A., Haselhoff V. J. and Michaelis M. (2010), Determinants and consequences of sponsorship fit: A study of fan perceptions. *Journal of Sponsorship, 3*(2), 169-180.

Zdravkovic, S., Magnusson P. and Stanley S. (2010), Dimensions of fit between a brand and a social cause and their influence on attitudes. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 27*, 151–160.