

*Ecquid Novi*  
ISSN 0256-0054  
2003 24(1):20-36

C.H. van Heerden & P.J. du Plessis

## The objectives set by South African sponsors for sport

### Abstract

Sport sponsorship expenditure has grown substantially since the early 1990s, largely due to South Africa's re-admission to international sport and an increase in television coverage of major sporting events. International experts conclude that five main categories of sport sponsorship objectives exist, and the opinions of South African sport sponsors on these were analysed. An indication was found that local sport sponsors focus heavily on media coverage objectives; and that they set objectives to suit the measurement of the effectiveness of the sponsorship through media coverage and awareness measurement tools.

*Die groei in besteding aan sportborgskappe sedert die vroeë 1990s is hoofsaaklik te danke aan Suid-Afrika se hertoelating tot internasionale sport en 'n toename in televisiedekking van belangrike sportbyeenkomste. Die opinies van internasionale kundiges stel dat vyf hoofkategorieë sportborgskapdoelwitte geïdentifiseer kan word, en die opinies van Suid-Afrikaanse sportborge oor hierdie kategorieë is ontleed. Dit wil voorkom asof plaaslike sportborge sterk klem plaas op mediadekkingsdoelwitte; en dat hul doelwitte aanpas by die gebruik van mediadekking as 'n meting van borgskap-effektiwiteit.*

**Key words:** Awareness, brand image, corporate image, marketing, marketing public relations, media coverage, public relations, publicity, sport sponsorship objectives.

---

\* Dr Neels van Heerden [nheerden@hakuna.up.ac.za] is a senior lecturer in the Department of Marketing and Communication Management, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0001, South Africa. Tel.: +27 (12) 420-3145; Fax: +27 (12) 362 5085. Prof. Flip du Plessis [pdupless@hakuna.up.ac.za] is the head of marketing in the same department. This article is based on a doctorate awarded to Van Heerden.

## Introduction

Previews on sporting events, subsequent event and match results, and the actions and activities of sporting personalities are reported daily in the mass media. The scope and variety of sport media coverage is complex and multi-dimensional but three important dimensions can be noted.

The first is the interest that supporters have in the performance of their teams, which enables media owners to sell advertising space, because 'sport supporters' can be offered to advertisers as a guaranteed target audience. The second is the nature of sport itself - sport journalists preview matches and events by inter alia focusing on the uncertainty of predicting results and they also analyse the outcome of these matches or events. This creates opportunities to stimulate wider debate and in-depth discussion among commentators and experts before and after the event took place. The third dimension is of a financial nature. The substantial amount of money invested in sport sponsorship enables sponsors to directly generate media coverage that would not have been possible in the absence of the sponsorship.

The aim of this article is then to compare the opinions and practices of South African sport sponsors to the views of leading international sport sponsorship experts on sport sponsorship objective setting.

## Growth in sport sponsorship

In South Africa sport sponsorship has enjoyed a remarkable growth since the early 1990s, largely due to SA's re-admission to international sport and the substantial increase in television coverage of major sporting events. Sport sponsorship and advertising expenditure in South Africa exceeded R1,9 billion in 1999. Table 1 illustrates the historical run of SA sponsorship spending since 1985.

**Table 1. Historical trends in sport sponsorship spending in South Africa**

Year	Sponsorship (R million)	Change	Back-up (R million)	Change	Total (R million)	Change
1985	63		50		113	
1986	84	33%	70	40%	154	27%
1987	107	27%	92	31%	199	29%
1988	124	16%	109	18%	233	17%
1989	151	21%	136	24%	287	23%
1990	174	15%	156	15%	330	15%

Year	Sponsorship (R million)	Change	Back-up (R million)	Change	Total (R million)	Change
1991	207	19%	180	15%	387	17%
1992	<b>275</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>511</b>	<b>32%</b>
1993	285	4%	238	0.1%	523	2%
1994	321	13%	272	14%	593	13%
1995	<b>418</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>758</b>	<b>28%</b>
1996	522	25%	420	24%	942	24%
1997	642	23%	530	26%	1 172	24%
1998	<b>885</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>740</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>1 625</b>	<b>39%</b>
1999	1 049	19%	852	15%	1 901	17%

Based on Grobler as quoted by Koenderman (2000:87).

*Note: Back-up spending refers to additional spending linked to the sponsorship such as advertising, hospitality and sales promotions. In Ad Focus of 2001 it was reported that total sport sponsorship spending rose to R1,986 billion in 2000.*

The biggest changes occurred in 1992 (South Africa re-admitted to the international sporting arena and participated for the first time in the Cricket World Cup); 1995 (Rugby World Cup); and 1998 (close to Cricket and Rugby World Cup tournaments). It is significant to note the decline in the growth of sponsorship and back-up spending in 1993 and 1999 which illustrates how spending follows major events. It also suggests that sport bodies should anticipate sponsorship budget cuts in 'off-peak' years. Sponsorship spending has doubled every three to four years. The ratio of back-up spending to sponsorship spending has increased from a 1:1.12 ratio in 1990 to a high of 1:1.24 in 1996.

Uncertainties exist whether sponsorships follow sporting events that will most probably be covered by the electronic media. It is argued that the sponsorship itself doesn't create media coverage, perhaps for the odd mention in the media or at after-match award ceremonies. The limelight sporting events such as rugby, soccer and cricket will always attract large sponsorships and those events that attract less media interest will always struggle to get sponsorship funding. In 1996 sporting codes such as motor racing (track), soccer, rugby, golf, and cricket (more than R30 million each), horse racing, athletics, road running, and motor rallies (off-road) (sponsorships of between R10 million to R25 million each) received the major slice of the sponsorship cake, while the following codes received hardly any substantial sponsorships (less than R 1 million each): karate, baseball/softball, netball, lifesaving, professional wrestling, rugby league, tenpin bowling, aerobics,

badminton, polo, gymnastics, hiking, rowing, wave ski, darts, shooting, table tennis, fencing, sky diving, and ice skating.

The perceived unattractiveness to sponsors of these sport codes might emanate from their lack of marketing strategies, the actions of unprofessional officials, or most probably the lack of media coverage by the electronic media.

The South African electronic media such as M-Net and the SABC is world-renowned for their application of technological innovations such as the speed-stick, the stump camera and the use of third umpires to make run-out decisions in cricket. These inventions, linked to innovative television techniques, have opened numerous advantages to sponsors and advertisers. Less time is allocated for full-blown television commercials and more scope is available for signage, virtual advertising, and split or smaller screen advertisements while the game is still in play.

The growth in sport sponsorship and back-up expenditure raises the need to identify and analyse the range of sport sponsorship objectives set by South African sport sponsors. A brief debate on international views on sport sponsorship objective setting will be offered before the opinions and practices of local sponsors are analysed.

### **International views on sport sponsorship objectives**

Sponsors should decide exactly why they are entering into a specific sport sponsorship. A diverse range of sponsorship objectives exists which makes the objective-setting decision relatively difficult. Sponsorship can be applied directly to the generation of sales, and can often be designed to augment other marketing communication variables with objectives stated as to create brand awareness, enhance corporate and brand image, build relationships and develop goodwill in the community.

Clearly defined, quantifiable sponsorship objectives provide the best guidance to selecting the events or activities to sponsor, enabling the sport marketer to develop clear selection criteria. Strategies for leveraging of the sponsorship can be developed directly from sponsorship objectives. Clear and measurable sponsorship objectives allow for focussing during implementation and enable effective evaluation of whether sponsorship 'success' has been achieved (Van Heerden, 2001:169).

An orderly system of grouping objectives in broad but distinctive categories, is that of Sandler & Shani (1993:38-43) who identified the following:

- Corporate objectives - mostly image related;
- Marketing objectives - for example brand promotion and sales increase; and

- Media objectives - coverage and exposure.

The first category has been discussed by several authors (e.g. Armstrong, 1988:97-103; Yeo, 1989; Witcher, Craigen, Culligan, & Harvey, 1991:13-33; Javalgi, Traylor, Cross & Lampman, 1994:47-58; and Cornwell, 1995:13-24). Very little proof exists for the impact of sponsorship on image, with the exception of the work of Javalgi et al. (1994:47-58), which has been disputed by Pope & Voges (1994:38-45) in a replication study.

The second category corresponds to the product/brand objectives for sponsorship identified among others by Mescon & Tilson (1987:49-61) and Irwin & Asimakopoulos (1992:43-51). Stotlar (1993:35-43) reported that Visa attained market share gains after the 1988 Olympic Games while Irwin & Asimakopoulos (1992:43) state that Volvo realised six dollars in return for every dollar spent on its sport sponsorship programmes.

Pope (1998:124) has some doubt about the last of these categories (media coverage and exposure effectiveness). He argues that theoreticians and practitioners are increasingly expressing their reservations about only setting media coverage objectives. He quotes Cornwell (1995:13-24) and Kuzma, Shanklin & McCally (1993:27-32) as proof of his statement. Lee, Sandler & Shani (1997:159-169) state that there is a clear shift from emphasising media objectives to emphasising corporate objectives such as corporate image.

Pope (1998:1) scrutinised the opinions of a number of authors namely, Gardner & Shuman (1986:11-17); Abratt, Clayton & Pitt (1987:299-311); Gross, Traylor & Shuman (1987:9-13); Gilbert (1988:6-9); Abratt & Grobler (1989:351-362); and Stotlar (1992:13-17) and compiled a set of four main categories: corporate, marketing, media, and personal - similar to that of Sandler & Shani (1993:38-43). Sleight (1989:9) observes that management 'self-indulgence' is one of the worst reasons to embark on a sponsorship programme. Pope (1998:1) therefore argues for the deletion of the 'personal' objective category.

Most of the other sources researched by the authors don't identify categories of sponsorship objectives, but do list particular sport sponsorship objectives. The range of objectives identified by these sources was fitted into the three main categories identified by Pope (1998:1) and Shani & Sandler's (1993:38-43). Experiencing difficulty in 'fitting' the objectives identified by other sources, the researchers concluded that the groupings of Pope (1998:1) and Shani & Sandler (1993:38-43) should be expanded to create five main categories of sport sponsorship objectives - as depicted in Table 2. The marketing grouping was split into two new groupings (product/brand/service) and sales. Hospitality was removed from the corporate category and included as a separate category.

**Table 2. The extended range of sport sponsorship objectives**

<b>Extending the Pope (1998:1) and Sandler &amp; Shani (1993:38-43) groupings to five categories</b>	<b>Other sources consulted</b>
<p><b>Broad corporate objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expression of community involvement</li> <li>• Increase public awareness of the company</li> <li>• Change public perception of the company</li> <li>• To build goodwill amongst opinion formers</li> <li>• To reassure stockholders</li> <li>• To aid relations with current staff</li> <li>• To assist staff recruitment</li> <li>• Promoting corporate image</li> <li>• Gain competitive advantage through exclusivity</li> <li>• Target specific corporate audiences</li> <li>• Tie the company to the success of a team/event/individual</li> </ul> <p><b>Product/brand/ service-related objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore new market segments</li> <li>• Launch new product/brand/service</li> <li>• The product/brand/service can be integrated into the event</li> <li>• Sampling at/during the event</li> <li>• Build image within the target market (positioning)</li> <li>• Increase target market awareness</li> <li>• Increase market share</li> <li>• Support brand advertising</li> <li>• Strengthen brand preference</li> </ul> <p><b>Sales objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To facilitate sales-force prospecting</li> <li>• Gain new customers</li> <li>• To aid the sales promotion drive</li> <li>• Strengthen relationships with current customers</li> <li>• Increase short-run sales</li> <li>• Increase long-run sales</li> </ul> <p><b>Media coverage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-event media coverage</li> <li>• Media coverage during the event</li> </ul>	<p>Armstrong (1988); Cornwell (1995); Enson (1987); Erdogan &amp; Kitchen (1998); Gardner &amp; Shuman (1988); Irwin &amp; Asimakopoulos (1992); Irwin &amp; Sutton (1994); Javalgi, Traylor, Gross &amp; Lampman (1994); Komorofski &amp; Biemond (1996); Kuzma, Shanklin &amp; McCally Jr (1993); Mescon &amp; Tilson (1987); McCook, Turco, &amp; Riley (1999); Pope &amp; Voges (1994); Pope (1998); Sandler &amp; Shani (1993); Stotlar (1993); Stotlar &amp; Kadlecek (1993); Farrelly, Quester &amp; Burton (1997); Witcher, Gordon, Craigen, Culligan &amp; Harvey (1991); Yeo (1989); Wilson (1997).</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-event media coverage</li> <li>• To get coverage in a diverse range of media</li> <li>• Increase overall media attention</li> </ul> <p><b>Guest hospitality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entertain current customers</li> <li>• Entertain prospective customers</li> <li>• Entertain suppliers</li> <li>• Entertain staff</li> <li>• Entertain intermediaries</li> </ul>	
---	--

The wording of the individual objectives, illustrated in Table 2, has been condensed to form generic statements. Good sponsorship objectives should in fact have the following characteristics (Van Heerden, 2001:343):

- Be concrete and measurable – merely stating that awareness should increase is not specific enough (the percentage change envisaged should be stated);
- Specify target audience(s) – for example stating that LSM (Living Standard Measurement) 6 to 10 are main target audiences indicates a lack of focus and poor planning;
- Include benchmark measures – the present status of the specified target audience concerning response hierarchy variables such as awareness, knowledge, image, attitude, and intentions should be known – only then can the objective state to what degree a change is desired;
- Specify a time period – awareness can be changed sooner than achieving repositioning of a brand or corporate image – sponsors who state that repositioning will be successful over a short period of time e.g. three months should rethink their strategy, because repositioning cannot be fully implemented over a few months.

The range of generic objectives listed in Table 2 was included in a questionnaire to quantitatively test the opinions of a particular group of South African sport sponsors (Respondent Group A) on their importance. The five main categories were used to qualitatively analyse whether the current practices of a second group of South African sport sponsors (Respondent Group B) fit into those categories.

## Methodology

The aim of the research was to compare the opinions and current practices of South African sport sponsors to the views of international sport sponsorship experts on sport sponsorship objectives - as represented by the contents of Table 2. The research was conducted in two phases. The main reason for conducting the research over two phases was to ensure that most major South African sponsors would be included as respondents in the study.

### Respondent Group A

During the first phase a quantitative study obtained the opinions of members of the Association of Marketers (ASOM) on the importance of the generic sport sponsorship objectives listed in Table 2 by means of a self-administered questionnaire. The respondents had to indicate on a 5-point Likert scale how important they regard the particular sport sponsorship objective - ranging from very important (5) to not important (1). Forty-two respondents, representing some of the main sponsors, eventually participated in the survey. Respondents had the opportunity to add their own objectives to the questionnaire but no objectives were added.

For conceptualisation purposes, all South African organisations that sponsor sport should have been included in the population to be surveyed. For pragmatic reasons, though, it was decided that:

- It would be too costly, time-consuming and impractical to compile a list of all SA organisations who may possibly sponsor sport (ranging from spaza shops to conglomerates such as Anglo American);
- Canvassing them all on whether they are involved in sport sponsorship (possibly also including those who might donate a few Rand to the local tennis club) would be impractical; and
- A subsequent sample on general terms of sponsors who indicated that they were involved in sport sponsorship would be too complex, due to the exploratory nature of this study.

*All ASOM-members who returned their questionnaires were regarded to be respondents of a convenience survey.*

### Respondent Group B

In the second phase the practices and activities of sponsors as indicated by information supplied on entry forms to a national sponsorship award competition (The Raptor Awards - organised by ASOM), was qualitatively analysed by the researcher. The Raptor Awards were introduced in 1999 and



it was envisaged that these entry forms and those of the 2000-competition would also capture major sponsors who were not members of ASOM (and who did not participate in the first phase). ASOM implemented a public relations and mass media campaign to inform sponsors about the Raptor Awards and to invite all sponsors (not only ASOM-members) to enter into the competition.

It was envisaged that organisations in the cellular industry and some of the main financial institutions who are not members of ASOM and who would not have been part of *Respondent Group A*, would enter a wide range of their sponsorships. The Raptor Award entry form information would therefore enable the researchers to cover a wider spectrum of South African sponsors rather than just depending on those ASOM-members who return their questionnaires. This strategy was proven correct because most of the important non-ASOM-member sponsors entered the Raptor Award Competition. The entry forms of 41 entrants were eventually examined.

The entrants to the Raptor Awards had to state which sport sponsorship objectives they set for each of their sponsorships. The types of objectives listed by the Raptor Award entrants were categorised by the researcher to determine whether they fit into those five main categories depicted in Table 2.

## Research results

The research results for each of the two respondent groups will be discussed separately before a final combined conclusion will be offered.

### Respondent Group A

Respondents had to indicate their opinion on the importance of a range of sport sponsorship objectives. Table 3 depicts the opinions of the ASOM-respondents on the importance of the generic range of sport sponsorship objectives, listed in Table 2. An average mean score was also calculated for every one of the five main categories.

**Table 3. The importance of sport sponsorship objectives**

Categories	Importance (mean*)	Standard deviation (SD)
<b>A. Broad corporate objectives</b>	<b>Av, mean (3,88)</b>	<b>Av, SD (0,57)</b>
Promoting corporate image	4,51	1,10
To build goodwill amongst opinion formers	4,40	0,67
Gain competitive advantage through exclusivity	4,39	0,96
Increase public awareness of the company	4,34	1,03
Change public perception of the company	4,20	1,05

Tie the sponsor to the success of a team/event/individual	4,00	0,97
Target specific corporate audiences	3,95	1,29
Expression of community involvement	3,85	0,92
To aid relations with current staff	3,51	1,05
To reassure stockholders	3,30	1,25
To assist staff recruitment	2,23	1,02
<b>B. Product/brand/service-related objectives</b>	<b>Av, mean (4,22)</b>	<b>Av, SD (0,59)</b>
Strengthen brand preference	4,68	0,66
Build image within the target market (positioning)	4,65	0,63
Increase target market awareness	4,65	0,53
Increase market share	4,54	0,77
Support brand advertising	4,50	0,69
Integrating the product/brand/service into the event	4,26	0,96
Launch new product/brand/service	3,60	1,29
Explore new market segments	3,56	1,19
Sampling at/during the event	3,55	1,46
<b>C. Sales objectives</b>	<b>Av, mean (3,96)</b>	<b>Av, SD (0,80)</b>
Strengthen relationships with current customers	4,43	0,68
To aid the sales promotion drive	4,15	1,00
Increase long-run sales	4,05	1,21
Gain new customers	3,98	1,13
To facilitate sales force prospecting	3,60	1,15
Increase short-run sales	3,55	1,17
<b>D. Media coverage</b>	<b>Av, mean (4,46)</b>	<b>Av, SD (0,60)</b>
Media coverage during the event	4,65	0,58
Increase overall media attention	4,58	0,89
Pre-event media coverage	4,51	0,73
Post-event media coverage	4,33	0,84
To get coverage in a diverse range of media	4,20	1,04
<b>E. Guest hospitality</b>	<b>Av, mean (3,66)</b>	<b>Av, SD (0,87)</b>
Entertain current customers	4,21	1,08
Entertain prospective customers	4,05	1,12
Entertain suppliers	3,49	1,30
Entertain intermediaries	3,47	1,06
Entertain staff	3,10	1,27

(\* The mean is based on a five-point Likert scale where 1 = not important and 5 = very important. The average mean for each category was calculated

by averaging the individual means of all generic sponsorship objectives included in each category)

From Table 3 the following can be deduced:

- The average mean of each of the categories indicate that media coverage objectives (Category D) scored the highest (4.46), then product/brand/service-related objectives (Category B) (4.22), then sales objectives (Category C) (3.96), then broad corporate objectives (Category A) (3.88) and lastly corporate hospitality objectives (Category E) (3.66);
- The product/brand/service-related objectives of - *Strengthen brand preference, Build image within the target market (positioning), Increase target market awareness, Increase market share, and Support brand advertising* scored  $\geq 4.5$ ;
- The media objectives of - *Media coverage during the event, Increase overall media attention, and Pre-event media coverage* scored  $\geq 4.5$ ;
- The corporate objective of - *Promoting the corporate image* scored higher than 4.5;
- No sales objective scored  $\geq 4.5$ ;
- No guest hospitality objective scored  $\geq 4.5$ ; and
- Two statements on ‘staff recruitment’ and ‘entertaining staff’ scored the lowest – an indication that employees are not regarded as a priority sponsorship target audience.

The generic sport sponsorship objectives regarded to be the most important (mean score  $\geq 4.5$ ) from Table 3 are listed in Table 4.

**Table 4. Range of sport sponsorship objectives in order of importance (mean  $\geq 4.5$ )**

<b>Sport sponsorship objective</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Strengthen brand preference	4,68	0,66
Build image within the target market (positioning)	4,65	0,63
Increase target market awareness	4,65	0,53
Media coverage during the event	4,65	0,58
Increase overall media attention	4,58	0,89
Increase market share	4,54	0,77
Promoting corporate image	4,51	1,10
Pre-event media coverage	4,51	0,73
Support brand advertising	4,50	0,69

From Table 4 it can be seen that the ASOM-respondents are more inclined to regard media-related, brand-related, and corporate image-related sport sponsorship objectives as being important. It can be assumed that the respondents indicate a tendency towards setting objectives that are more easily measured (either by themselves or advertising/sponsorship or media agencies) through existing measurement techniques or tools (also used to measure effects in other areas of marketing communication – advertising and publicity).

**Respondent Group B**

The range of main sport sponsorship objectives (corporate, brand/service/product, sales, and media) set by Raptor Award entrants were summarized and fitted into the five main categories listed in Table 2. The researcher assigned key words to every sport sponsorship objective to give the objectives a generic connotation (e.g. awareness) and to make the fitment into the five categories easier. Table 5 offers a summary of the range of sport sponsorship objectives listed by Raptor Award entrants on their entry forms (the frequency of each generic objective is given in brackets).

**Table 5. Range of sport sponsorship objectives set by the entrants to the 1999 and 2000 Raptor Awards**

<p><b>Corporate objectives:</b> The following were mentioned more than once in the wording of corporate objectives: Corporate awareness* (x19), Positioning (x14), Association (x6), Relationships (x5), Image (x4), Research target market (x3), Own sporting code/title sponsorship (x3), Awareness/brand-building (x2), Development (x2), Differentiate (x2), Long list (x3), Social upliftment (x2).</p>
<p><b>Brand/service/product objectives:</b> The following were mentioned more than once in the wording of Brand/service/product objectives: Brand awareness* (x17), Brand image (x5), Goodwill/loyalty (x4), Exposure (x3), Brand promotion (x2), Communicate values (x2), Equity (x2), Experience product (x2).</p>
<p><b>Sales objectives:</b> The following were mentioned in the wording of sales objectives: Sales/at event/volume (x9), Market growth/share gain (x4), Service use (x5), Leverage (x1).</p>
<p><b>Media objectives:</b> The following were mentioned in the wording of media objectives: Media awareness/coverage/publicity (x12), Communicate (x2), Advertising (x1), Broadcast (x1), Clutter avoid (x1), Media partnership (x1).</p>
<p><b>Hospitality objectives:</b> Hospitality (x3)</p>

(\*Corporate awareness relates to for example, awareness of SA Breweries as the sponsor, while brand awareness relates to the Castle Lager brand as the sponsor.)

Quality evidence from the information supplied on the 1999 and 2000 Raptor Award entry forms indicates that sponsors set objectives that fit into the main categories (Corporate, brand/product/service, sales, media, and hospitality) of sponsorship objectives.

Table 6 lists those sport sponsorship objectives that were mentioned more than ten times by entrants to the 1999 and 2000 Raptor Awards Competition. There seems to be a bias towards corporate sponsorship awareness, corporate positioning, brand awareness, media awareness/coverage/publicity and sales volume increase.

**Table 6. Sport sponsorship objectives mentioned by Raptor Award entrants**

<i><b>Corporate objectives</b></i> - The following objectives were mentioned more than ten times: Corporate awareness (x19), and Positioning (x14)
<i><b>Brand/service/product objectives</b></i> - The following objective was mentioned more than ten times: Brand awareness (x17)
<i><b>Sales objectives</b></i> - No objectives were mentioned more than ten times, but Sales/at event/volume were mentioned nine times
<i><b>Media objectives</b></i> - The following objective was mentioned more than ten times: Media awareness/coverage/publicity (x12)

It is generally accepted that sponsorship is a marketing activity, and in particular part of the marketing communication mix (Van Heerden, 2001:130-134), but closer analysis of the sport sponsorship objectives listed in Table 6 indicate that they tend to be biased towards public relations. Table 7 indicates that Raptor Award entrants set sport sponsorship objectives that are corporate and marketing public relations-related.

**Table 7. Raptor Award entrants set marketing and PR-related sport sponsorship objectives**

<b>Marketing or PR-related</b>	<b>Sport sponsorship objectives</b>
Corporate public relations-related	Corporate awareness (x19) <i>(Positioning (x14))*</i> Media awareness/coverage/publicity (x12) Association (x6) Relationships (x5)
Marketing public relations-related	Brand/service/product awareness (x17) Image of brand (x5)
Marketing-related	Sales/at event/volume (x9) <i>(Positioning (x14))*</i>

(\* Positioning may be classified as marketing- or PR-related)

The distinction between corporate public relations and marketing public relations (a topic to be debated on its own) can be summarised as follows: When public relations programmes are used to build the corporate brand through corporate positioning (by for example utilising corporate advertising, corporate image management and corporate brand awareness), it can be referred to as corporate public relations (CPR).

When effectively integrated with other marketing communication elements, PR functions and techniques are also capable of accomplishing objectives other than corporate image enhancement. It can also increase brand awareness, build favourable attitudes toward an organisation's brands (brand image) and ultimately encourage purchase behaviour (Shimp, 1997:554). When PR techniques are used to build a product or service brand through brand positioning, brand image and brand differentiation strategies (Duncan, 2001:535), it can be referred to as marketing public relations (MPR).

### **Combining the findings**

The range of objectives, regarded to be important by the two selected groups of South African sport sponsors fit into those categories identified by international sport sponsorship experts, namely *broad corporate, product/brand/service, sales, media coverage and guest hospitality* (as depicted in Table 2). South African sponsors seem to indicate a bias towards setting media coverage, awareness and image objectives in their sponsorship planning. This may indicate that sponsors strive to generate media coverage that will enhance corporate image and build individual brand awareness and brand image. This finding suggests that sport sponsors are very reliant on the ability of mass media coverage to carry their marketing and communication messages, logos and advertising in support of their sponsorships. Smaller sponsors who sponsor (or are aiming to sponsor) those sporting codes and events that don't attract substantial media coverage would probably have to set different types of objectives.

These findings may also indicate an underlying problem in the sense that sport sponsors set objectives to suit their ability to measure the effectiveness of the sponsorship through media coverage and awareness measurement tools. It is surmised that sponsors are currently unable to really measure the effectiveness of their sponsorships in building relations with various stakeholders (general public relations) or return on investment as represented by an increase in sales volume (marketing).

The findings of this study raise the interesting issue that current South African sport sponsorship objectives focus more on particular corporate and marketing public relations objectives than on specific marketing objectives.

## Recommendations

It is recommended that the scope of sport sponsorship objective setting should be widened to aid the effective measurement of sponsorship success. A general public relations category should be added and further divided into two separate sub-categories, namely corporate public relations and marketing public relations. This entails that practitioners should familiarise themselves with the differences in the definition, scope and domain of these two sub-categories. Objectives such as generating media coverage to aid corporate awareness, enhancing the corporate image and building stakeholder relations through guest hospitality should be included in the corporate public relations sub-category and generating brand publicity and increasing brand awareness should be included in the marketing public relations sub-category. The implication is that the product/brand/service category could be shrunk or totally excluded from the set of categories because brand sales or service use expansion (e.g. cellular organisations) objectives can be included in the sales-related category.

## References

- Ad Focus 2001. It's a new ball game now: Sponsors take a fresh look at the form card. *Supplement to the Financial Mail*. May 18:106.
- Abratt, R. & Grobler, P. 1989. The evaluation of sports sponsorship. *International Journal of Advertising*, 8:351-362.
- Abratt, R. Clayton, B. & Pitt, L. 1987. Corporate objectives in sports sponsorship. *International Journal of Advertising*, 6:299-311.
- Armstrong, C. 1988. Sports sponsorship: A case study approach to measuring its effectiveness. *European Research*, May, 16(2):97-103.
- Cornwell, T.B. 1995. Sponsorship-linked marketing development. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 4(4):13-24.
- Duncan, T. 2001. *IMC – using advertising and promotion to build brands*. Boston, USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Ensor, R.J. 1987. The corporate view of sports sponsorship. *Athletic Business*, 11(9):40-43.
- Erdogan, B.Z. & Kitchen, P.J. 1998. Managerial mindsets and the symbiotic relationship between sponsorship and advertising. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 16(6):369-374.
- Farrelly, F.J. Quester, P.G. & Burton, R. 1997. Integrating sports sponsorship into the corporate marketing function: An international comparative study. *International Marketing Review*, 14(3):170-182.
- Gardner, M. & Shuman, P. 1986. Sponsorship: An important component of the promotions mix. *Journal of Advertising*, 16(1):11-17.
- Gilbert, D. 1988. Sponsorship strategy is adrift. *The Quarterly Review of Marketing*, Autumn, 6-9.
- Graham, S., Goldblatt, J.J. & Delpy, L. 1995. *The ultimate guide to sport event management and marketing*. New York: Irwin Publishing.

- Grobler, J. as quoted by Koenderman, T. 2000. Sponsorship racing ahead. *Financial Mail*, March 24, 86-87.
- Gross, A.C., Traylor, M.B. & Shuman, P.J. 1987. Corporate sponsorship of art and sports events in North America. Unpublished paper, ESOMAR Congress, 9-13.
- Irwin, R.L. & Asimakopoulos, M.K. 1992. An approach to the evaluation and selection of sport sponsorship proposals. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 1(2):43-51.
- Irwin, R.L. & Sutton, W.A. 1994. *Creating the ideal sponsorship arrangement: An exploratory analysis of relationships existing between sport sponsorship inventory criteria and sponsorship objectives*. In: Grant K & Walker I., eds. 1994. World Marketing Congress Proceedings, Academy of Marketing Science, 7(3):15.113-15.127.
- Javalgi, R., Traylor, M., Cross, A. & Lampman, E. 1994. Awareness of sponsorship and corporate image: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Advertising*, 23(4): 47-58.
- Komorofski, L & Biemond, H 1996. Sponsor accountability: Designing and utilising an evaluation system. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, June, 5(2):35-40.
- Kuzma, J.R., Shanklin, W.L. & McCally, J.F. 1993. Number one principle for sporting events seeking corporate sponsors: Meet benefactor's objectives. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 2(3):27-32.
- Lee, M-S., Sandler, D.M. & Shani, D. 1997. Attitudinal constructs towards sponsorship scale development using three global sporting events. *International Marketing Review*, 14(3):159-169.
- McCook, K., Turco, D. & Riley, R. 1997. A look at the corporate sponsorship decision-making process. *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing (online)*, April, 1(2). <http://www.cad.gu.edu.au/cjism/mcook.html>.
- Mescon, T. & Tilson, D. 1987. Corporate philanthropy: A strategic approach to the bottom line. *California Management Review*, 29(2):49-61.
- Pope, N. 1998. Overview of current sponsorship thought. *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 2(1):1
- Pope, N.K. & Voges, K. 1994. Sponsorship evaluation: Does it match the motive and the mechanism? *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, December, 3(4):38-45.
- Sandler, D.M. & Shani, D. 1993. Sponsorship and the Olympic Games: The consumer perspective. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 2(3):38-43.
- Shimp, T. 1997. *Advertising, promotion and supplemental aspects of integrated marketing communications*, Fourth Edition. Fort Worth, USA: Dryden Press.
- Sleight, S. 1989. *Sponsorship: What it is and how to use it*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.
- Stotlar, D. 1992. Sport sponsorship & tobacco: Implications & impact of Federal Trade Commission v. Pinkerton Tobacco Organisation. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 1(1):13-17.
- Stotlar, D. 1993. Sponsorship and the Olympic Winter Games. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 2(1):35-43.
- Stotlar, D.K. & Kadlecsek, J.C. 1993. What's in it for me? *Athletic Business*, April, 32-36.
- Van Heerden, C.H. 2001. Factors affecting decision-making in South African sport sponsorships. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Wilson, G.A. 1997. Does sport sponsorship have a direct effect on product sales? *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing (online)*, October, 1(4). <http://www.cad.gu.edu.au/cjism/wilson.html>.
- Witcher, B., Craigen, J.G., Culligan, D. & Harvey, A. 1991. The links between objectives and function in organisational sponsorship. *International Journal of Advertising*, 10:13-33.



Yeo, P. 1989. An advertising PR agency's point of view. *Proceedings of the International Sports Marketing and Media Conference*, January-February, Melbourne.