

## **Title sponsorship of cause-related sport events**

### **Author**

O'Reilly, Norm, Deshpande, Sameer, Faulkner, Guy, Latimer, Amy, Leblanc, Allana, Rhodes, Ryan E, Tremblay, Mark, Werman, Melissa

### **Published**

2019

### **Journal Title**

Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal

### **Version**

Accepted Manuscript (AM)

### **DOI**

[10.1108/SBM-04-2018-0034](https://doi.org/10.1108/SBM-04-2018-0034)

### **Rights statement**

© 2019 Emerald. This is the author-manuscript version of this paper. Reproduced in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. Please refer to the journal's website for access to the definitive, published version.

### **Downloaded from**

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/397494>

### **Griffith Research Online**

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>



**Title Sponsorship of Cause-Related Sport Events**

Journal:	<i>Sport, Business, Management: an International Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	SBM-04-2018-0034.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Sponsorship, Cause-Related Marketing, Not-For-Profit, Event Management, Canada

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Title Sponsorship of Cause-Related Sport Events

Date: August 19, 2018

### ***Acknowledgements:***

We would like to thank Elio Antunes and Tala Chulak-Bozzer for their support of this research. Guy Faulkner holds a Canadian Institutes of Health Research-Public Health Agency of Canada (CIHR-PHAC) Chair in Applied Public Health. Amy Latimer-Cheung receives support from the Canada Research Chairs Program.

### ***Keywords***

Sponsorship, Cause-Related Marketing, Not-For-Profit, Event Management, Canada

Running head: Title Sponsorship

## Title Sponsorship of Cause-Related Sport Events

Corporate sponsorship of any property has increased globally year-over-year for more than two decades (IEG, 2016), with similar growth reported in Canada (CSLS, 2018). On the corporate brand side, sponsorship is a key element of their marketing mix (Walraven et al., 2016). In Canada, for example, sponsors report spending more than 20% of their marketing communication dollars on sponsorship related activities (i.e., rights fees plus activation) with more than 60% of sponsorship rights fees invested by both sport and non-sport corporations going to sport properties (Berger et al, 2008; CSLS, 2018). Not-for-profit organizations (NFPs) in sport (i.e., leagues, events, clubs) have adopted sponsorship as an important revenue generation tool (Berger et al, 2008; Meenaghan, 2013).

Corporate sponsors are increasingly interested in associating with cause-related sport events organized or founded by NFPs that address causes which resonate with their customers (Babiak & Sheth, 2010). Notably, title sponsorship is one important type of sponsorship that has received limited research attention. Title sponsorship is where the partner is given top-level naming rights to a cause-related sport event. Typically, it is the most expensive sponsorship category. Examples of cause-related sporting events that boast title sponsors are Dick's Sporting Goods Open<sup>1</sup>, Wendy's Walk for Kids<sup>2</sup>, Hershey's Track and Field Games<sup>3</sup>, Nike's Clash of Champions, and the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure<sup>4</sup>. In the NFP sport event context, it is important to recognize that seeking title sponsorship is challenging. This is why, many NFP sport

---

<sup>1</sup> See Endicott (n.d.) DICK'S Sporting Goods Open. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on January 14, 2017: <http://together.pgatour.com/tournaments/s008.html>. NY: New York.

<sup>2</sup> See Wendy's Walk for Kids. (2017). Homepage. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on January 14, 2017: <http://wendyswalkforkids.com>.

<sup>3</sup> See Run Jump Throw (n.d.). Hershey's Games 101. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on January 14, 2017: <https://www.hersheystrackandfield.com/about/hersheys-games-101.aspx>.

<sup>4</sup> See Susan G. Komen (2017). Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on January 14, 2017: <http://ww5.komen.org/findarace.aspx>.

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 events occur without a title sponsor (Groza, Cobbs & Schaefers, 2012). For example, the  
4  
5 majority of Disabled Sports USA (2015) events take place without a title sponsor. A key driver  
6  
7 of the lack of title sponsors is the need for the evaluation of the ability of the sponsorship to drive  
8  
9 consumer awareness and generate return on its investment (PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2010), as  
10  
11 well as garner support to the cause (Madill & O'Reilly, 2010).  
12  
13

14  
15 Title sponsorship differs from other levels of sponsorship. First, the 'title' status typically  
16  
17 has a higher cost to the sponsor than other sponsor levels and, in turn, increased financial  
18  
19 importance for the NFP (Clark, Cornwell & Pruitt, 2008). This may lead to increased  
20  
21 commitment of the organizations and pressure to evaluate and support the achievement of return-  
22  
23 on-investment for the title sponsor (Groza, Cobbs & Schaefers, 2012; O'Reilly & Madill, 2012).  
24  
25 Second, since the cause-related objectives are sought by *both* the title sponsor and the NFP  
26  
27 organization, such objectives can be more complicated than for a partnership between two for-  
28  
29 profit-based organizations, since the NFP organisation may struggle to embrace the profit  
30  
31 motivations of the sponsor (Madill & O'Reilly, 2010). For example, RiskVentures (2014), an  
32  
33 equity/consulting firm sponsored a golf event put on by Operation Game On, an innovative rehab  
34  
35 program for returning combat-injured troops, as part of its philanthropy strategy. Conversely,  
36  
37 Bridgestone Tires' title sponsorship<sup>5</sup> of the National Hockey League's (NHL) outdoor event  
38  
39 (game) known as the Winter Classic, involves two organizations with clear business objectives.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Third, as the title sponsor of a cause-based sport event, the sponsor associates itself with  
47  
48 the event of interest, the NFP as well as the cause. For instance, if the event was a charity run for  
49  
50 diabetes research, the title sponsor would be associating with the run, the NFP, and the cause of  
51  
52 disease prevention and cure. This increases complexity, as the sponsor would want to achieve the  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>5</sup> See NHL (2015). Bridgestone returns as title sponsor of NHL Winter Classic in five-year partnership renewal with  
56  
57 NHL. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on January 14, 2017: [https://www.nhl.com/news/bridgestone-returns-  
58  
59 as-title-sponsor-of-nhl-winter-classic-in-five-year-partnership-renewal-with-nhl/c-775909](https://www.nhl.com/news/bridgestone-returns-as-title-sponsor-of-nhl-winter-classic-in-five-year-partnership-renewal-with-nhl/c-775909)  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 business objectives and, in most cases, support the pursuit of the objectives supporting the cause  
4  
5 (Madill & O'Reilly, 2010). Fourth, due to the close association between the title sponsor and the  
6  
7 event, the ability to transfer images (a known benefit of sponsorship) is facilitated more than  
8  
9 other forms of sponsorships (Gwinner, Larson & Swanson, 2009). In general, an image transfer  
10  
11 occurs via marketing when attributes of the event are expected to be transferred to the sponsor  
12  
13 via the activation of the sponsorship between the two entities, resulting in the event image  
14  
15 "rubbing off" on the sponsor (Grohs & Reisinger, 2014). A classic example of this is Gatorade's  
16  
17 longstanding sponsorship activities in the sport of triathlon which has aided in attributing images  
18  
19 of athlete endurance to the energy drink brand.  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 The current empirical study seeks to address the topic of title sponsorship in cause-related  
25  
26 sport events by answering the following research questions: (i) how does the title sponsorship of  
27  
28 a cause-related sport event influence evaluations of the corporation? (ii) how do consumer  
29  
30 evaluations of the title sponsor compare with other sponsors, the NFP, the cause, and the event?  
31  
32 and (iii) how does the title sponsorship by a corporation influence the evaluations of other  
33  
34 sponsors, the NFP, the cause, and the event? Due to the limited research on the topic, exploratory  
35  
36 approach is undertaken in the form of an in-depth empirical study based on multiple data  
37  
38 collections around a re-occurring annual event (see Neuman, 2011; Yin 2003) to answer these  
39  
40 research questions. The study reviews a cause-related sport event spread over multiple years  
41  
42 where a title sponsor was added during the period of the research. Implications on awareness  
43  
44 levels among both the general Canadian population and the target market (event organizers) were  
45  
46 measured over the multi-year period and assessed for the title sponsor, secondary sponsors, other  
47  
48 partners, the cause, and the NFP that was the rights holder for the event.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 **Research Context**

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 The program that is the context for this research is RBC Sports Day in Canada (SDIC), a  
4 series of events where communities come together nationally to celebrate sport among Canadians  
5 and to promote sport participation across Canada. SDIC was developed by ParticipACTION, a  
6 national NFP dedicated to increasing physical activity among Canadians (Latimer, Murumets, &  
7 Faulkner 2014). SDIC could be described as an ‘event of events’. It takes place at the end of a  
8 week of thousands of local sporting events and activities and includes a day-long national  
9 television broadcast. SDIC was held annually between 2010 and 2015, usually in November.  
10  
11 Leading up to the day of the main event, local organizations, communities and schools across the  
12 country celebrate sport at the local level and help build momentum for SDIC by participating in  
13 thousands of registered open houses, games, competitions, meet-and-greets, tournaments, fun  
14 runs, spectator events, and pep rallies. ParticipACTION sends promotional materials to each  
15 registered event organizing team and lists events on their website. Previous longitudinal research  
16 on SDIC found significant increases over time in awareness of SDIC for the Canadian population  
17 (White et al., 2016) and that many of the participating organizations benefited from hosting a  
18 SDIC event (Luciani et al., 2016).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 In terms of title sponsorship, ParticipACTION<sup>6</sup> acquired RBC Bank in 2013, the 4<sup>th</sup> year  
38 of SDIC, for a 3-year term. A portion of the RBC title sponsorship allowed ParticipACTION to  
39 provide grants to select NFPs to support events as part of SDIC. SDIC fits Yin’s (2003)  
40 requirements for a case study because it is significant (i.e., impacted the cause across the country  
41 per point below), complete (i.e., multi-year event with full implementation), and displayed  
42 sufficient evidence of success. To provide evidence of success, SDIC achieved awareness levels  
43 of 47% of Canadian citizens in 2013 and 44% in 2015 (Sports Day, 2016), and more than 60  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>6</sup> See ParticipACTION. Homepage. Retrieved January 14, 2017 from the World Wide Web:  
56 <https://www.participaction.com/en-ca/about> for more detailed information.  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 million media impressions in 2013 (White et al., 2016) and more than 85 million in 2015 (Sports  
4  
5 Day, 2016).  
6

## 7 8 **Literature Review and Hypotheses Development**

### 9 10 *Sponsorship*

11  
12 Sponsorship generally contains two distinct elements: 1) the mutually beneficial  
13 exchange of sponsor resources in return for promotional value and 2) the sponsor's association  
14 with the property (Meenaghan, 2013). Sponsorship continues to be an important part of  
15 marketing. IEG (2016) reports that there was an increase in global sponsorship rights spending  
16 from 2012 to 2015, with an annual industry spend nearing US\$60 billion. In Canada, the CSLS  
17 (2018) reports an estimated total industry spend on rights fees of more than CDN\$1.96 billion in  
18 2016, up from CDN\$1.1 billion in 2007. The scale of sponsorship spending around major events  
19 is also significant. For example, sponsors of the 2012 London Olympic Summer Games spent a  
20 combined US\$2 billion around the event (Meenaghan, 2013).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Discussions regarding the differences between sponsorship and other forms of marketing  
34 communications, specifically advertising, are ongoing. Meenaghan (2013) notes that the main  
35 differences are “the mutuality of benefit, the consumer interaction process, the comparative  
36 nature of the consumer interaction process, and the sponsorship's location at the leisure end of  
37 marketing” (p.388). It is commonly believed that due to its interactive nature, sponsorship is  
38 valued higher than traditional advertising. Advantages of sponsorship over more common forms  
39 of marketing include the opportunity to differentiate from competitors, to achieve consumer-  
40 oriented objectives, and to achieve competitive advantage (Madill & O'Reilly, 2010).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 While traditional sponsorship remains important, many scholars now view sponsorship in  
52 a more widespread, digital and strategic way (Meenaghan, 2013), such as building social media  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 campaigns or creating owned properties. Sponsorship as a marketing tool is complex, as its  
4  
5 influence is dependent upon several variables including “the demographics of the audience, the  
6  
7 product category of the sponsor, and the type of activations used to support the partnership and  
8  
9 the communication used to ‘framework’ the sponsorship message” (Pearsal, 2009, p. 25).  
10  
11

### 12 *Title Sponsorship*

14  
15 Title sponsorship includes the sponsor’s name in the name of the event (Groza, Cobbs &  
16  
17 Schaefer, 2012). While the empirical study specific to the case of title sponsorship is limited,  
18  
19 corporate sponsor behaviour (i.e., higher levels of financial investment in title sponsorship  
20  
21 status) suggests that they are interested in title sponsorship in the sports industry (CSLS, 2016).  
22  
23 Title sponsorship is the highest form of sponsorship garnering top media coverage and known for  
24  
25 generating both brand and product awareness (Clark, Cornwell & Pruitt, 2008), through  
26  
27 advertising and publicity (Bicaia et al., 2013). Although very similar in nature and often used  
28  
29 interchangeably, title sponsorship is commonly categorized for an event (e.g., RBC Sport Day in  
30  
31 Canada) while naming rights sponsorship is for a venue (e.g., the Fuqua School of Business,  
32  
33 Duke University) or another tangible item (e.g., the John R. Wooden Award). Like title  
34  
35 sponsorship, previous empirical research on the naming rights of venues is also limited (Delia,  
36  
37 2014).  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 *Cause-Related Marketing (CRM)*

44  
45 Polansky and Speed (2000) define CRM as “the process of formulating and implementing  
46  
47 marketing activities that are characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified  
48  
49 amount to a designated cause when consumers engage in revenue-providing exchanges that  
50  
51 satisfy organizational and individual objectives” (p. 1365). However, these transaction-based  
52  
53 CRM partnerships have over time evolved into more strategic alliances (including sponsorships  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 and title sponsorships), where financial contribution is still considered central to the conditions  
4  
5 of contract, but less tied to consumer actions of purchasing the brand (Gourville & Rangan,  
6  
7 2004). Financially significant relationships between corporations and NFP organisations have  
8  
9 increased in recent years (Simpson, Lefroy & Tsarenko, 2011) due to reduced or inconsistent  
10  
11 funding from the government, leading NFP organisations to seek corporate entities as a funding  
12  
13 source (Navarro, 2005), such as title sponsorship of a cause-related sport event, where the  
14  
15 support of the sponsor will be positively viewed. The related literature reveals a growing trend  
16  
17 towards cause-related marketing (Rozencher, 2013). When price and value are comparable,  
18  
19 consumers tend to buy brands associated with CRM (Irmak, Jayachandran & Robinson, 2012;  
20  
21 CCSIS, 2013). Up from 85% in 2010, in 2013, 93% of U.S. consumers said that when a  
22  
23 company supports a cause, they have a more positive image of the company (CCSIS, 2013). A  
24  
25 Canadian study similarly showed that consumers favor ethical products and socially responsible  
26  
27 companies (d'Astous & Legendre, 2008). This leads to the first hypothesis to be tested:  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 H1: The corporation will receive positive evaluations as a title sponsor of a cause-related sport  
34  
35 event.  
36

37  
38 Lacey, Close and Finney (2010) found that consumer perceptions of the sponsor as  
39  
40 socially responsible are positively linked to commitment and purchase intentions. Marketing  
41  
42 opportunities involving social needs (e.g., including benefits towards a societal need such as  
43  
44 poverty) can assist companies as they differentiate and reposition their brands to increase their  
45  
46 return (Lii, Wu & Ding, 2011). CRM is also expected to have a positive effect on consumers'  
47  
48 attitudes toward the brand and the perceived credibility of the campaign (Lii, Wu & Ding, 2011).  
49  
50 However, consumers also want to know what cause-related activities companies are aligning  
51  
52 their brand with. In other words, it is critical that consumers perceive a fit between the (title)  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 sponsor and the property, as they respond more positively when there is good fit (Polonsky &  
4 Speed, 2000), which would include a link to an appropriate cause.

5  
6  
7  
8 As Cone (2013) notes, corporations and brands today cannot just be responsive, they  
9  
10 must also be responsible. CRM is ubiquitous in our environment and it plays a vital role in the  
11 way a brand is perceived by consumers. The same could be said for title sponsorship of a cause-  
12 related event. Indeed, CRM serves dual purposes: to improve firm performance and to support a  
13 social cause (Irmak, Jayachandran & Robinson, 2012). To improve a sponsor's performance,  
14 there must be a relationship between the brand and the cause. Further, they should have shared  
15 objectives, sponsor-property fit, and goal proximity; each of which influences consumers'  
16 perceptions or personal roles in helping the cause (Irmak, Jayachandran & Robinson, 2012). To  
17 achieve maximum influence on consumer perceptions, firms must be more forthcoming and  
18 share with consumers why and how they are involved in socially responsible activities. Notably,  
19 consumers must have a clear sense of the sponsor's role and the ability to drive positive change  
20 (CCSIS, 2013). This leads to the second hypothesis.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 H2: The Corporation who is a title sponsor will enhance the evaluations of (a) the cause-related  
37 event and (b) the cause.

### 38 39 40 *Sponsorship Evaluation*

41  
42 Authors of previous research note the significant challenge that surrounds the evaluation  
43 of sponsorship (O'Reilly & Madill, 2012). According to Sponsorship Works (2007), many early  
44 sponsorship evaluations relied on awareness metrics, which is still the case today and may not be  
45 a good indicator of the objectives that most sponsors seek to achieve from sponsorship, including  
46 attitude changes and brand purchase (Biscaia et al, 2014; Lee, Harris & Lyberger, 2011; Nufer &  
47 Böhler, 2010).

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 Most of the literature on sponsorship evaluation related to awareness is tied directly to a  
4  
5 specific event, often a sport event. Biscaia et al. (2014) define brand awareness as the  
6  
7 consumers' familiarity with a brand and note that sponsorship creates another outlet for  
8  
9 companies to create more awareness of their brand(s). Creating a synonymous relationship  
10  
11 between a cause and a brand through sponsorship can create both positive and negative  
12  
13 awareness for the brand (Madill & O'Reilly, 2010). To improve brand awareness and awareness  
14  
15 that the sponsor is doing 'good', businesses must understand how to communicate with  
16  
17 consumers. The top three most effective communication routes to best create this awareness for  
18  
19 information about social and environmental programs and products are via the product, media,  
20  
21 and advertising (CCSIS, 2013) and industry research tells us that sponsors want a clean  
22  
23 (exclusive) platform to activate and pursue their objectives (CSLS, 2016; 2018). Title  
24  
25 sponsorship can provide for each of these programs, products and activations. As sponsor  
26  
27 involvement increases with activations (and, by extension, via title sponsorship status) so does  
28  
29 consumer awareness, as well as consumer knowledge of the event-sponsor link (Grohs &  
30  
31 Reisinger, 2014, p. 1020).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Awareness of the sponsor's participation is important because awareness must be  
38  
39 achieved first in order to set the stage for the attainment of other sponsorship objectives related  
40  
41 to affect and behavioural outcomes, such as enhancing image, influencing intent to behave,  
42  
43 achieving image transfer, enhancing sponsor associations and increasing sales (Biscaia et al,  
44  
45 2013; Crompton, 2004; Ko et al., 2008). To move to the affect/behavior level, consumers must  
46  
47 first be aware of what the sponsor is supporting before they create an opinion. Biscaia et al.'s  
48  
49 study (2014) of consumer recall of sponsor involvement at a Portuguese professional football  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 game, found that more than 82% of respondents were able to recall the correct sponsor without  
4  
5 any prompting.  
6

7  
8 Title sponsorship is typically expected to provide a higher return on investment due to its  
9  
10 higher cost (Cameron, 2008). This means title sponsorship is often considered to be more  
11  
12 challenging to sell than other sponsorships except for the largest and most attractive NFP  
13  
14 properties with charitable components or causes that are important to many, such as cancer, heart  
15  
16 disease and children's health. Thus, our third hypothesis to test is as follows:  
17

18  
19 H3: The Corporation who is a title sponsor will (a) receive higher evaluations than the NFP who  
20  
21 owns the sport event, as well as (b) suppress NFP's evaluations over time.  
22

23  
24 The evaluation of a title sponsorship should provide insights to not only the sponsor but  
25  
26 to the property as well. According to Performance Research (2012), although many sponsors are  
27  
28 creatively getting involved past the evaluation of traditional activations (e.g., signage, public  
29  
30 announcement), they are still struggling to evaluate not only the return on investment but also the  
31  
32 effects of the sponsorship on their specific objectives. The academic literature supports this  
33  
34 (O'Reilly & Madill, 2012) and industry research shows that Canadian properties are under-  
35  
36 delivering to their sponsors on many of their sought outcomes (CSLS, 2016; 2018) and servicing  
37  
38 (O'Reilly & Huybers, 2015). According to Walraven, Bijmolt and Koning (2014), sponsorship  
39  
40 managers do believe that the longer the sponsorship, the better the brand equity. One could infer  
41  
42 an advantage to title sponsorship where the exposure of the sponsorship is typically higher,  
43  
44 which is tested with the fourth hypothesis.  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 H4: The Corporation who is a title sponsor will (a) receive higher evaluations than those  
50  
51 organizations who are involved in a lower-profile sponsorship, as well as (b) suppress their  
52  
53 evaluations over time.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

## Method

To test these hypotheses, the authors of this study analysed data from evaluations undertaken from each of the six years of SDIC: 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. For the 2013, 2014 and 2015 editions, held each November, the event was known as RBC SDIC, presented by ParticipACTION, CBC and True Sport. Data from 2010-12 is compared to 2013-15 to understand the influence of RBC's title sponsorship.

The data were collected around each of the six years of SDIC and analysed to respond to the research questions. To control for extraneous factors year-over-year, data were collected in the same timeframe (October) each year, immediately following SDIC, where respondents were asked to respond about the property and their activities undertaken in SDIC that year. Each year's evaluation was undertaken by an independent research agency, IMI International [<http://www.consultimi.com/>] from three different sources. First, a representative (by age and gender) national survey of Canadians between the ages of 13 and 65 (controlling for gender, age, region and language) was undertaken in each of the 6 years from 2010 to 2015. The sample size ranged from a low of 630 in 2011 to a high of 1,220 in 2013 (See Table 1) with each year of the survey independent in terms of respondents. If an oversample bias existed on gender or region, the survey respondents were weighted back to their national representation. Where applicable, data from all six years were compared. All comparisons are based on a 95% confidence interval.

Second, a survey of both event organizers (approximately 400 respondents annually) and ParticipACTION grant recipients (approximately 80 each year) was analysed. The studies were implemented starting in 2012 and in each of the following 3 years (to 2015). The event organizer survey helped to evaluate the overall event and allowed for an additional measurement of the objectives, while the survey of grant recipients allowed for an understanding of how awareness

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 for the grant program was generated. Finally, several secondary sources (i.e., event registration  
4 from website, broadcast and digital tracking, and social media tracking) were obtained to provide  
5 additional insights to the amount of event reach and awareness through all media.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Results**

11  
12 The results of the three data collection methods are organized under four hypotheses. All  
13 perceptual differences in this study were measured using Fisher Exact Chi Square Test. H1  
14 proposes that the Corporation will receive positive evaluations as a title sponsor of a cause-  
15 related event. RBC acquired SDIC's title sponsorship in 2013, the first of a three-year  
16 partnership. Table 1 provides several key metrics around RBC's role as title sponsor of SDIC,  
17 from both the survey of Canadians and the survey of event operators. Among lay Canadians,  
18 aided awareness remained steady from 2013 to 2015 at 28%. Unaided awareness and awareness  
19 of title sponsorship (among those aware of SDIC) reported by respondents indicate an increase in  
20 2015 over 2014 (20% from 14% at  $p < .05$ ). Among those aware of RBC sponsorship, favorability  
21 and consideration for RBC products and services enhanced in 2015 as compared to 2014 (49% to  
22 56% and 37% to 41% respectively at  $p < .05$ ).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Table 1 further displays results from the sub-sample of respondents who were aware of  
39 the sponsorship. This group reported high levels of consideration in 2015 for changing banking  
40 services (58%), for banking with RBC more (73%), for investments (63%), and for RBC credit  
41 cards (65%), although these perceptions were either similar or lower to perceptions in 2014.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 The event organizers were similarly asked to rate the influence of the RBC sponsorship  
48 on a variety of variables. In 2015, a majority (61%) supported SDIC's promotion of active living  
49 and sport participation due to the RBC sponsor, the first year this question was asked. The event  
50 organizers also noted strong favorability due to the RBC sponsorship on (i) perception of SDIC  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 in 2015 (59%), (ii) intention to register a SDIC event next year (58%), and (iii) SDIC's ability to  
4 generate local and national media attention (51%). The 2015 results of these reported perceptions  
5 were statistically higher than 2014 at  $p < .05$ .  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*  
11

12 In 2014 and 2015, the survey of Canadian respondents asked additional questions related  
13 to sponsorship equity (i.e., the value of the sponsorship for RBC as title sponsor) based on six  
14 attributes (as reported in Table 2). These attributes were then compared between those  
15 respondents who were aware of the RBC sponsorship ( $n=126$  in 2014;  $n=135$  in 2015) to those  
16 who were not aware ( $n=1,076$  in 2014;  $n=945$  in 2015). Each difference was significant at the  
17  $p < .05$  level with all of the 'not aware' group being significantly lower than the 'aware' group.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*  
27

28 Thus, it is concluded that the data largely supports H1.  
29

30  
31 In H2, it was proposed that the Corporation who is a title sponsor will enhance the  
32 evaluations of the cause-related event as well as the cause. In estimating the findings of the  
33 overall Canadian population of 13-65-year olds (estimated to be about 24 million), about 10  
34 million Canadians were aware of SDIC in 2015 and about 4.3 million were engaged in the event.  
35 Of those engaged in 2015, 62% were active participants (i.e., they played a sport, volunteered at  
36 an event, or attended an event), while 38% were non-active participants (i.e., wore a jersey on  
37 jersey day or watched the broadcast on television). Note that the active participants may also  
38 have participated non-actively.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 When the 2010-12 average (absence of RBC title sponsorship) is compared with the  
50 2013-15 average (presence of RBC title sponsorship), findings reveal consistently positive  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 perceptions at  $p < .05$ . Awareness of, and engagement with SDIC enhanced by 5% and 4%  
4  
5 respectively (see Table 3).  
6

7  
8 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*  
9

10 Table 4 outlines the results from the event organizer/grant recipient surveys. These  
11 surveys were first undertaken in 2012 and replicated in 2013, 2014 and 2015 including the three  
12 years of the RBC title sponsorship. Of note are the positive results regarding satisfaction of  
13 involvement in SDIC by event organizer and grant recipient stakeholder groups.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*  
20

21 The secondary sources of data in 2015 provide a snapshot on the scope of SDIC, noting  
22 that 289 community-wide events and 2,101 total events/activities were included in SDIC in  
23 2015. The media report estimated that SDIC 2015 achieved 85.5 million media impressions. In  
24 2013 (the most recent data available), the SDIC website attracted 38,273 unique views, 1,731  
25 streaming views, and more than 115,000-page views.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Finally, in Table 5, a change in perceptions among Canadians (13 to 65 years) towards  
34 the cause among those aware of SDIC is reported. Intention to be active and healthy increased  
35 from 49% (2010-12) to 57% (2013-15). Similarly, perception that SDIC contributes to healthy  
36 living increased from 74% to 84% during the same period. Both changes were statistically  
37 significant at  $p < .05$ .  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*  
45

46 Thus, findings support H2.  
47  
48

49 H3 and H4 hypothesize influence of RBC on the perceptions towards organizers and  
50 other sponsors. SDIC had partners/sponsors since its inception in 2010. In its first 3 years (2010  
51 to 2012), in addition to ParticipACTION (the founding NFP organisation), two media partners  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

(CBC in English and Radio-Canada in French), two government partners (Government of Canada, Government of British Columbia), and one sector partner (TrueSport, a NFP organisation whose mandate is clean, fair sport) were all involved.

With reference to H3 (see Table 6), RBC sponsorship awareness levels were consistently lower than ParticipACTION across the three years (for example, 28% versus 38% in 2015) but better than True Sport (for example, 28% versus 9% in 2015). The results are somewhat different in terms of trends in perceptions for the partner organizations. Upon RBC acquiring title sponsorship, awareness of ParticipACTION decreased from 47% in 2012 to 37% as average of 2013-15 ( $p < .05$ ), although awareness of True Sport increased from 3% in 2012 to 7% as average of 2013-15 ( $p < .05$ ). H3 was thus partially supported.

\*\*\*INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*

To assess H4, perceptions of RBC were compared with other lower-level sponsors. As noted in Table 7 and Figure 1, the overall perceptions towards sponsors are positive. Although the awareness levels ranged from 25%-30% across six years with a non-significant trend, the respondent consideration for sponsor products and services and sponsor favorability improved. Consideration for products and services increased from 30% (average of 2010-2012) to 47% (2013-2015,  $p < .05$ ). During the same period, sponsor favourability increased from 34% to 58% ( $p < .05$ ).

As reported in Table 8, for survey respondents who indicated that they were aware of SDIC, awareness levels for each of the sponsors varied considerably by organization and by year. In the case of RBC, as title sponsor, aided awareness remained steady at 28%, while the lead media partner and broadcaster, CBC, had the highest results every year except 2014, when the French media partner/broadcaster, Radio-Canada, was highest. Specific to the title

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 sponsorship which began in 2013, a comparison of the 2013 data versus 2012 (as reported in  
4  
5 Table 8) supports an argument that the addition of RBC as the title sponsor detracted from the  
6  
7 awareness levels of the other partners. Based on Fisher's exact chi-square test, four of the  
8  
9 partners experienced significant declines in 2013: CBC was down to 44% in 2013 from 60% in  
10  
11 2012 ( $p < .01$ ) and remained at those levels in 2014 and 2015, BC Healthy Families went down to  
12  
13 19% from 43% ( $p < .01$ ) and remained steady at those levels in 2014 and 2015, and Radio Canada  
14  
15 went down to 34% from 46% ( $p < .01$ ) which increased to 43% in 2014 but declined to its lowest  
16  
17 level of 30% in 2015. Government of Canada did not show significant change although it went  
18  
19 down to 28% from 34% in 2013, increased to 36% in 2014 but declined to 29% in 2015.  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 When these perceptions were compared between 2012 and an average of 2013-15, all  
25  
26 sponsors except Government of Canada displayed significant decline. CBC awareness declined  
27  
28 from 60% (average of 2010-12) to 42% (average of 2013-15); Radio-Canada Sports from 46% to  
29  
30 35%; and Government of British Columbia from 43% to 20%; all at  $p < .05$ . Government of  
31  
32 Canada awareness declined too (34% to 31%) but the difference was not statistically significant.  
33  
34

35 Despite these declines, the lower-level sponsors still performed better than the title  
36  
37 sponsor. H4 was thus partially supported.  
38  
39

40 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*

41  
42 \*\*\*INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*

43  
44 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE\*\*\*  
45  
46

## 47 Discussion

48  
49 In 2010, ParticipACTION and SDIC set out to increase awareness of the benefits of sport  
50  
51 and provide Canadian communities the opportunity to celebrate sport. In 2013, RBC became the  
52  
53 title sponsor of RBC SDIC. RBC SDIC was a successful (increases over time in awareness,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 intentions and participation) cause-related sport event (White et al., 2016; Luciani et al., 2016)  
4  
5 that added a title sponsor following its third edition, providing the context for this research on  
6  
7 title sponsorship of cause-related sport events. Three separate surveys were conducted annually  
8  
9 around SDIC to provide the data to test four hypotheses.  
10  
11

12 Overall, the key contribution of this research is its finding that title sponsorship status has  
13  
14 benefits to the sponsor, to such an extent that they can detract from the benefits provided to other  
15  
16 (non-title) sponsors of the same property thus building on the limited previous work specific to  
17  
18 title sponsorship (Clark, Cornwell & Pruitt, 2008). The results further provide insights into  
19  
20 perceptions of event and the cause (physical activity and youth) as well as sponsorship outcomes  
21  
22 for RBC. Results support that consumers place value in corporations who support events and  
23  
24 causes that are important to them and that reflect Canadian heritage. Notably, results indicate that  
25  
26 the RBC title sponsorship was shown to increase the trust that Canadian consumers have in RBC  
27  
28 as a sponsor. In addition to supporting the notion that title sponsorship is a distinct context from  
29  
30 typical sponsorship (Clark, Cornwell & Pruitt, 2008), results also support that sponsorship fit is a  
31  
32 key attribute in title sponsorship (Madill & O'Reilly, 2010) and note the importance of CRM in a  
33  
34 title sponsorship (Simpson, Lefroy & Tsarenko, 2011). From a practical perspective, these results  
35  
36 infer that title sponsorship is a high value proposition for a sponsor who fits with the cause, has a  
37  
38 plan to activate the investment using CRM and has clear communicated status as title.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 The first hypothesis explored the specific benefits to the title sponsor, RBC. Results  
45  
46 provide strong evidence of the awareness value provided to a title sponsor and demonstrate that  
47  
48 some benefits (for example, unaided awareness) increased over the 3-year title sponsorship.  
49  
50 Sponsorship outcomes for RBC were positive and supported previous literature related to  
51  
52 sponsorship's ability to build a relationship between a corporation and a consumer. First, it has  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 been established in previous research that consumers put value in corporations who support  
4  
5 events and causes that are important to them (Westberg & Pope, 2014), which is extended to the  
6  
7 specific content of title sponsorship and supported by the results here (Table 5). Second, specific  
8  
9 to the Canadian context, industry research has shown that Canadians put high value in sponsors  
10  
11 who reflect the heritage of Canada and who are seen to be giving back for a better future (Ipsos,  
12  
13 2016), which is a benefit provided to RBC via this sponsorship. Finally, and possibly most  
14  
15 important from a marketing perspective, RBC sponsorship increases trust among Canadian  
16  
17 consumers, and trust will likely enhance firm-consumer marketing relationship (Danthine & Jin,  
18  
19 2007; Sirdeshmukh, Singh, & Sabol, 2002).  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 H2 was supported by the findings suggesting that having a title sponsor will improve the  
25  
26 evaluations of the event and the cause. Although there could be other influencers to consider and  
27  
28 these are the results related to a single title sponsor, the results on these outcomes (support of the  
29  
30 event and support of the cause) were significantly higher after the RBC title sponsorship came  
31  
32 into effect. The event organizers survey results further supported the finding. These results  
33  
34 support the notion that title sponsorship, with the right title sponsor (fit with the cause and the  
35  
36 property (O'Reilly & Madill, 2012)), benefits both the event and the cause. Practically, this  
37  
38 further enforces the value of a title sponsorship above a typical sponsorship for both sponsor and  
39  
40 property.  
41  
42  
43

44 H3-H4 explored title sponsorship and how it differs from other levels of sponsorship.  
45  
46 Findings revealed that, for all levels of sponsorship the asset value of SDIC (as a cause-related  
47  
48 sport event) was substantiated and supported. This fits with the previous studies on sponsorship  
49  
50 evaluation and further reinforces that it is the activation of a sponsorship asset that largely  
51  
52 determines its success (O'Reilly & Lafrance Horning, 2013). Second, in terms of unaided  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 awareness, the title sponsor, RBC had a series of better performance measures than for most of  
4  
5 the other partners in 2013, 2014 and 2015, a notable finding given that the other partners  
6  
7 associated with SDIC since 2010 and that many of these partners had strong ties to SDIC. This  
8  
9 suggests an ‘awareness advantage’ for the title sponsor over other partners. Third, throughout the  
10  
11 three years of assessment with RBC as title sponsor, most respondents were aware of RBC as a  
12  
13 sponsor and many knew that RBC was the title sponsor. Fourth, and perhaps the most important  
14  
15 finding was that awareness levels of ParticipACTION dropped from 47% to 37% ( $p < .01$ ) from  
16  
17 2012 to 2013-15 when the RBC title sponsorship launched, suggesting that perhaps some  
18  
19 confusion over naming when a title sponsor joins. This apparent disadvantage needs to be  
20  
21 weighed against the infusion of financial and in-kind support. Finally, and further evidence of the  
22  
23 importance of activation and reach (O’Reilly & Madill, 2012), are the high levels of awareness  
24  
25 for the media partners (CBC and Radio Canada). Thus, in responding to H3-H4, the data suggest  
26  
27 that title sponsor status facilitates the ability to increase awareness for the sponsor, but that  
28  
29 success requires effective activation and a strong property to achieve greater return than other  
30  
31 sponsorship levels.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 Although this research study is exploratory, in terms of benefits for practice, it highlights  
39  
40 the need for continued evaluation at multiple levels of sponsorship (and the title sponsorship  
41  
42 level specifically) and provides important consideration for NFP organisations, and potential  
43  
44 sponsors, to consider. Notably, for managers of NFP organisations seeking to launch or support  
45  
46 events related to their cause of interest, the decision to accept a title sponsorship needs to be  
47  
48 closely considered given the possible outcome of reduced awareness for the NFP organisation.  
49  
50 Consideration of the cost-benefit of title sponsorship is recommended. Similarly, the reach of the  
51  
52 event is shown here to be important (i.e., the number of local events within SDIC), which is  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 something NFP organisations should consider when creating such a property. For corporate  
4  
5 sponsors for whom an increased association with a NFP organisation or a specific cause could be  
6  
7 of benefit, the title sponsorship of a far-reaching cause-related sport event should be an  
8  
9 alternative to consider. For corporations seeking to market their brand, products and/or services  
10  
11 to target markets, the title sponsorship with a cause and a property that would be appealing to  
12  
13 those markets, should be an important alternative to consider.  
14  
15

16  
17 The study has a few limitations. First, due to limitations of data analysis is restricted to  
18  
19 descriptive statistics and lower-order analysis and does not build a model amongst key variables.  
20  
21 This is something that future research should address by collecting data that allows for the  
22  
23 confirmation of the exploratory findings and addresses more closely the four hypotheses.  
24  
25 Second, the data on participants were collected indirectly from the event organizers. Since the  
26  
27 occurrence of physical activity is an important metric of SDIC's success, collecting data based  
28  
29 on direct and systematic observation would enhance the evaluation process and provide a more  
30  
31 accurate understanding of audience participation in the event. Data need to be collected in the  
32  
33 future to understand audience demographic profile, their physical activity status, and the match  
34  
35 with RBC consumer profile. Third, the study investigated awareness, favourability, and  
36  
37 behavioural potential for title and secondary sponsors. It did not compare the increment in value  
38  
39 for these brands because of their sponsorship decision. Future research should explore the  
40  
41 improvement in brand value as a result of sponsorship activities.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Fourth, an assumption was made that changes in perceptions 2013 onwards were solely due  
48  
49 to RBC acquiring the title sponsorship of SDIC, which may not be true. Other factors such as the  
50  
51 year-over-year growth of the event, the increasing importance of the cause, or changes in the  
52  
53 external environment over time, may have influenced these changes.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 Finally, the percentage of Canadians who were unaware of SDIC were high. This reflects  
4  
5 the weakness of the RBC SDIC campaign and reduces the importance of findings and influence  
6  
7 of title sponsorship of a cause-related sport event.  
8  
9

### 10 **Conclusion**

11  
12 This research provides strong support for title sponsorship of a cause-related sport event as  
13  
14 a consideration for corporations seeking to market products to people who have an affinity to  
15  
16 that cause. If the brand is seeking an investment that also has philanthropic and CSR outcomes,  
17  
18 then these types of events and the title sponsorship status increase incrementally. For cause-  
19  
20 related sport properties seeking resources to support their event and/or cause, title sponsorship is  
21  
22 an appropriate tactic to consider, particularly if there are brands who fit with the event property  
23  
24 and the cause.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Running head: Title Sponsorship

## References

- Babiak, K. M. & Sheth, H. (2010). Beyond the game: Perceptions and practices of corporate social responsibility in the professional sport industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 91 433-450.
- Berger, I.E., Hernandez, T., O'Reilly, N., Parent, M.M., Seguin, B. (2008). Determinants of sport participation among Canadian adolescents. *Sports Management Review*. 11. 277-307.
- Biscaia, R., Correia, A., Ross, S., & Rosado, A.F. (2014). Sponsorship effectiveness in professional sport: an examination of recall and recognition among football fans. *International Journal of Sport Marketing & Sponsorship*, 16(1), 7-23.
- Biscaia, R., Correia, A., Rosado, A.F., Ross, S., & Maroco, J. (2013). Sport sponsorship: the relationship between team loyalty, sponsorship awareness, attitude toward the sponsor, and purchase intentions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 27(2), 88-302.
- Cameron, N. (2008) Understanding sponsorship and its measurement implications. *Journal of Sponsorship*. 2(2), 131-139.
- Clark, J.M., Cornwell, B.T. & Pruitt, S.W. (2008). The impact of title event sponsorship announcements on shareholder wealth. *Marketing Letters*. 20(2), 169-182.
- CCSIS (2013). *Cone Communications Social Impact Study: The next cause evolution*. Cone Communications: Public Relations & Marketing.
- CSLS (2016). Canadian Sponsorship Landscape Study, 10<sup>th</sup> annual version; downloaded February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from [www.sponsorshiplandscape.ca](http://www.sponsorshiplandscape.ca).
- CSLS (2018). Canadian Sponsorship Landscape Study, 11<sup>th</sup> annual version; downloaded July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from [www.sponsorshiplandscape.ca](http://www.sponsorshiplandscape.ca).
- Danthine, J., & Jin, X. (2007). Intangible capital, corporate valuation and asset pricing. *Economic Theory*, 32(1), 157-177.
- d'Astous, A. & Legendre, A. (2008). Understanding consumers' ethical justifications: a scale for appraising consumers' reasons for not behaving ethically, *Journal of Business Ethics*. 87, 255-268.
- Delia, E. B. (2014). Subconscious (un)attachment to a sponsor: an irrational effect of facility naming rights. *Journal of Sport Management*. 28, 551-564
- Disabled Sports USA. (2015). Events. Retrieved October 23, 2016, <http://www.disabledsportsusa.org/events/>

Running head: Title Sponsorship

- 1  
2  
3 Grohs, R. & Reisinger, H. (2014). Sponsorship effects on brand image: The role of exposure and  
4 activity involvement, *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 1018-1025.  
5  
6 Groza, M.D., Cobbs, J. & Schaefer, T. (2012). Managing a sponsored brand the importance of  
7 sponsorship portfolio congruence. *International Journal of Advertising*, 31(1), 63-84.  
8  
9  
10 Gourville, J. T. & Rangan, V. K. (2004). Valuing the cause marketing relationship. *California*  
11 *Management Review*, 47(1), 38-57.  
12  
13 Gwinner, K.P., Larson, B.V. & Swanson, S.R. (2009). Image transfer in corporate event  
14 sponsorship: assessing the impact of team identification and event-sponsor fit.  
15 *International Journal of Management & Marketing Research*, 2(1), 1-15.  
16  
17 IEG (2016). IEG Sponsorship Report, Feb 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016; downloaded from www.sponsorship.com.  
18  
19 Ipsos (2016). *Most Valuable Property Study, Syndicated Study*.  
20  
21 Irmak, C., Jayachandran, S. & Robinson, S. R. (2012). Choice of cause in cause-related  
22 marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 76, 126-139.  
23  
24 Lacey, R., Close, A.G. & Finney, R.Z. (2010). The pivotal roles of product knowledge and  
25 corporate social responsibility in event sponsorship effectiveness, *Journal of Business*  
26 *Research*, 63, 1222-1228.  
27  
28 Lee, S., Harris, J. & Lyberger, M. (2011). Recreational golfers' attitudes and awareness of  
29 sponsorship: a case study of the 2008 Ryder Cup. *Managing Leisure*, 16(3), 13-24.  
30  
31 Lii, Y., Wu, K. & Ding, M. (2011). Doing good does good? Sustainable marketing of CSR and  
32 consumer evaluations. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*.  
33 20, 15-28.  
34  
35 Luciani, A., White, L., Berry, T.R., Deshpande, S., Latimer-Cheung, A.E., O'Reilly, N., Spence,  
36 J.C., Rhodes, R.E., Tremblay, M.S., & Faulkner, G. (2016). Sports Day in Canada:  
37 examining the benefits for event organizers (2010–2013). *International Journal of Health*  
38 *Promotion and Education*, DOI: 10.1080/14635240.2016.1217164  
39  
40 Madill, J. & O'Reilly, N. (2010). Investigating social marketing sponsorships: Terminology  
41 stakeholders, and objectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 63, 133-139.  
42  
43  
44 Meenaghan, T. (2013). Measuring sponsorship performance: challenge and direction,  
45 *Psychology & Marketing*, 30(5), 385-393.  
46  
47  
48 Navarro, E. (2005). Government funding for charities: when it declines, the charities lose twice.  
49 Retrieved October 23, 2016,  
50 <http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=content.view&cpid=281#.VPNzr-GHyQc>  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

- 1  
2  
3 Neuman, W.L. (2011). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 7<sup>th</sup>  
4 Edition, Pearson Education, Boston, MA, USA.  
5  
6  
7 Nufer, G. & Bühler, A. (2010). How effective is the sponsorship of global sports events? A  
8 comparison of the FIFA World Cups in 2006 and 1998. *International Journal of Sports*  
9 *Marketing & Sponsorship*, 11(4), 303-319.  
10  
11 O'Reilly, N. & Lafrance Horning, D. L. (2013). Leveraging sponsorship: the activation ratio.  
12 *Sports Management Review*, 16(4), 424-437.  
13  
14 O'Reilly, N. & Huybers, T. (2015). "Servicing in Sponsorship: A Best-Worst Scaling Empirical  
15 Analysis", *Journal of Sport Management*, 29(2), 153-169.  
16  
17  
18 O'Reilly, N. & Madill, J. (2012). The development of a process for evaluating marketing  
19 sponsorships. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 29(1), 50-66.  
20  
21  
22 PriceWaterhouseCoopers (2010). Back on Track? The Outlook for the Global Sports Market to  
23 2013. Retrieved December 30, 2014, from [http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/entertainment-](http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/entertainment-media/pdf/Global-Sports-Outlook.pdf)  
24 [media/pdf/Global-Sports-Outlook.pdf](http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/entertainment-media/pdf/Global-Sports-Outlook.pdf)  
25  
26  
27 Polonsky, M.J. & Speed, R. (2000), Linking sponsorship and cause-related marketing:  
28 Complementarities and conflicts. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(11/12), 1361-1385.  
29  
30  
31 RiskVentures (2014). Philanthropy. Retrieved October 23, 2016,  
32 <https://www.rizkventures.com/philanthropy/>  
33  
34  
35 Rozensher, S. (2013). The growth of cause marketing: Past, current, and future trends. *Journal of*  
36 *Business & Economics Research*, 11(4), 181-186.  
37  
38  
39 Simpson, D., Lefroy, K. & Tsarenko, Y. (2011). Together and apart: Exploring structure of the  
40 corporate-NPO relationship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101, 297-311.  
41  
42  
43  
44 Sirdeshmukh, D., Singh, J., & Sabol, B. (2002). Consumer trust, value, and loyalty in relational  
45 exchanges. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(1), 15-37.  
46  
47  
48 Sports Day (2016). Sports Day in Canada 2015 Results, February 2016; internal research  
49 document provided by ParticipACTION and IMI.  
50  
51  
52 Walraven, M., Koning, R.H., Bijmolt, T.H.A., & Los, B. (2016). Benchmarking sports  
53 sponsorship performance: Efficiency assessment with data envelopment analysis. *Journal*  
54 *of Sport Management*, 30(4), 411-426.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Running head: Title Sponsorship

1  
2  
3 Westberg, K. & Pope, N. (2014). Building brand equity with cause-related marketing: A  
4 comparison with sponsorship and sales promotion. *Journal of Marketing Communications*,  
5 20(6), 419-437.  
6

7  
8 White, L., Luciani, A., Berry, T., Deshpande, S., Latimer-Cheung, A., O'Reilly, N., Rhodes, R.,  
9 Spence, J. C., Tremblay, M., & Faulkner, G. (2016). Sports day in Canada: A longitudinal  
10 evaluation. *International Journal of Health Promotion and Education*, 54(1), 12–23.  
11 10.1080/14635240.2015.1050122  
12

13  
14 Yin, R.K. (2013). *Applications of Case Study Research*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Running head: Title Sponsorship

**Table 1****Title Sponsor Key Metrics**

<b>Metric Related to Title Sponsorship</b>	<b>2013<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
Among all Canadians	N=1220	N=1202	N=1080
Aware (unaided)	16%	14%	20%*
Aware (aided)	28%	28%	28%
“Saw a promotion at RBC branch”		7%	7%
Aware of Title Sponsor (among those aware of SDIC)	16%	10%*	16%*
Among Canadians who are aware of RBC sponsorship	N/A	N=126	N=135
Favourable to RBC Brand	N/A	49%	56%*
Consider RBC products and services	N/A	37%	41%*
Among those aware of RBC sponsorship			
Consider changing banking services	68%	57%*	58%
Consider more banking with RBC	77%	73%*	73%
Consider RBC for my investments	59%	63%*	63%
Consider RBC credit cards	67%	69%*	65%*
Among Event Organizers	N=402	N=292	N=337
Promotes active living and sport participation messages in Canada due to RBC sponsorship	N/A	N/A	61%
Perception of SDIC due to RBC sponsorship	48%	44%*	59%*
Intend to register a SDIC event next year because of RBC sponsorship	48%	44%*	58%*
Will generate local/national media attention because of RBC sponsorship	48%	43%*	51%*

Source: IMI International Annual Survey, IMI Survey of Event Organizers

<sup>^</sup> RBC joins as title sponsor

\* denotes a significant change from the previous year (p&lt;.05) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test

Running head: Title Sponsorship

**Table 2****RBC Sponsorship Equity Measures**

Equity Question	2014		2015	
	Not aware of RBC Sponsorship	Aware of RBC Sponsorship	Not aware of RBC Sponsorship	Aware of RBC Sponsorship
	N=1,076	N=126	N=945	N=135
RBC is a strong believer that physical activity is important for children	40%	62%*	40%	59%*
RBC contributes to the well-being of children	35%	61%*	36%	59%*
RBC supports events and causes that are important to my community	33%	58%*	33%	58%*
RBC reflects Canadian values in the way it conducts its affairs	32%	49%*	33%	55%*
RBC helps Canadian communities build a better future	32%	57%*	32%	54%*
RBC is a company I trust	29%	48%*	29%	53%*

Source: IMI International Annual Survey

\* denotes a significant difference between the aware and not aware groups ( $p < .05$ ) of each year based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test

Running head: Title Sponsorship

**Table 3****SDIC Perceptions**

<b>Metric/Item</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Average of 2010-2012</b>	<b>Average of 2013-2015</b>
Canadians (13 to 65 years)	863	630	731	1,220	1,202	1,080		
Total SDIC awareness	28%	47%	42%	47%	38%	44%	38%	43%*
Total SDIC engagement	11%	23%	12%	24%	15%	18%	15%	19%*

Source: IMI International Annual Survey

<sup>^</sup> RBC joins as title sponsor\* denotes a significant difference between the averages of 2010-2012 and 2013-2015 ( $p < .05$ ) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test

Running head: Title Sponsorship

**Table 4**  
**Perceptions towards SDIC event**

<b>Event Organizers</b>					
<b>Metric/Item</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Average of 2013-2015</b>
Respondents	413	402	292	337	
Very/somewhat satisfied with SDIC	87%	93%	97%	96%	95%*
Very/somewhat satisfied with promotional tools/support	91%	90%	74%	69%	76%*
Agree that organization benefitted from SDIC	78%	91%	87%	98%	93%*
Believe that SDIC was a positive experience	90%	95%	90%	97%	94%
Likely to register for another event	96%	97%	97%	97%	97%
Would recommend SDIC to another organization	88%	97%	95%	95%	96%*
Believe that SDIC has a positive effect on the community	86%	83%	98%	99%	94%*

<b>Grant Recipients</b>					
<b>Metric/Item</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013<sup>^</sup></b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Average of 2013-2015</b>
Respondents	44	82	84	120	
Reported their organization benefitted from SDIC	78%	93%	89%	95%	93%*
Increased awareness/interest in organization	34%	53%	53%	68%	59%*
Increased awareness/interest in their sport programs	39%	47%	52%	64%	56%*
Increased participation/registration in sport programs	33%	33%	28%	37%	33%
Likely to apply for grant in the future	88%	100%	91%	100%	97%*
Attracted local media attention	13%	19%	21%	32%	25%*
Facilitated new or strengthened existing partnerships	22%	25%	36%	47%	37%*

Source: IMI International Surveys – Event Organizers and Grant Recipients Surveys

<sup>^</sup> RBC joins as title sponsor

\* denotes a significant difference between 2012 and the average of 2013-2015 (p&lt;.05) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test



Running head: Title Sponsorship

**Table 5****Perceptions towards Active Living (among those aware of SDIC)**

Metric/Item	2010	2011	2012	2013 <sup>^</sup>	2014	2015	Average of 2010-2012	Average of 2013-2015
Canadians (13 to 65 years)	863	630	731	1,220	1,202	1,080		
Increased intention to be active and healthy	43%	54%	51%	56%	58%	57%	49%	57%*
Agreement that SDIC contributed to healthy living	68%	82%	73%	82%	85%	84%	74%	84%*

Source: IMI International Annual Survey

<sup>^</sup> RBC joins as title sponsor\* denotes a significant difference between the averages of 2010-2012 and 2013-2015 ( $p < .05$ ) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test

Running head: Title Sponsorship

**Table 6****Title Sponsor and Organizer Awareness (among those aware of SDIC)**

Sponsor	2012	2013 <sup>^</sup>	2014	2015	Average of 2013-2015
RBC (Title)	n/a	28%	28%	28%	28%
ParticipACTION (NFP)	47%	35%*	39%	38%	37%**
TrueSport (NFP)	3%	6%	6%	9%	7%**

Source: IMI International Annual Survey

<sup>^</sup> RBC joins as title sponsor\* denotes a significant change from the previous year ( $p < .05$ ) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test\*\* denotes a significant change from 2012 to the 2013-2015 average ( $p < .05$ ) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test

Running head: Title Sponsorship

**Table 7****Sponsor Perceptions (among those aware of SDIC)**

Metric/Item	2010	2011	2012	2013 <sup>^</sup>	2014	2015	Average of 2010-2012	Average of 2013-2015
Canadians (13 to 65 years)	863	630	731	1,220	1,202	1,080		
Sponsor awareness	25%	28%	25%	29%	30%	28%	26%	29%
Sponsor behaviour (consider products and services)	24%	30%	36%	48%	46%	48%	30%	47%*
Sponsor favourability (average of all sponsors)	24%	34%	47%	59%	56%	58%	34%	58%*

Source: IMI International Annual Survey

<sup>^</sup> RBC joins as title sponsor\* denotes a significant difference between the averages of 2010-2012 and 2013-2015 ( $p < .05$ ) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test

Running head: Title Sponsorship

**Table 8****Title and Other Sponsor Awareness (among those aware of SDIC)**

Sponsor	2012	2013 <sup>^</sup>	2014	2015	Average of 2013-2015
RBC (Title)	n/a	28%	28%	28%	28%
CBC (other sponsor)	60%	44%*	42%	40%	42%**
Radio-Canada Sports (other sponsor)	46%	34%*	43%*	30%*	35%**
Government of Canada (other sponsor)	34%	28%	36%*	29%*	31%
Government of British Columbia (other sponsor)	43%	19%*	20%	21%	20%**

Source: IMI International Annual Survey

<sup>^</sup> RBC joins as title sponsor\* denotes a significant change from the previous year ( $p < .05$ ) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test\*\* denotes a significant change from 2012 to the 2013-2015 average ( $p < .05$ ) based on Fisher's Exact Chi Square Test

Running head: Title Sponsorship

Figure 1

Sponsor Perceptions in % (among those aware of SDIC)

