

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SPORTS SPONSORSHIPS:
A STUDY OF THE NEW ORLEANS ZEPHYRS**

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
Master of Mass Communication

in

The Manship School of Mass Communication

by
Amy M. Boyle
B.A., Loyola University, 1996
December 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first and foremost like to acknowledge my parents for teaching me how to succeed through good honest hard work. I would not be writing a Master's thesis if it were not for them and the opportunities for which they provided.

To my committee, Dr. Alan Fletcher, chairperson, as well as Dr. Richard Nelson and Dr. William Anderson for working with me through my studies from concept to finished product. Thanks for not getting frustrated with my endless emails of questions and requests. Special thanks to Dr. Dennis Wu for taking time to give me direction on the statistical analysis of my data. All of you are a testament to the teaching excellence found at Louisiana State University'sanship School of Mass Communication.

To all of my friends and family who traveled with me on the endless roller coaster ride for the past year as I worked on my thesis, listening to my complaints, sharing in my triumphs after each section was completed, and for all the encouragement along the way.

I would especially like to acknowledge Viki Gatti, my roommate. I know she didn't always understand what I was talking about as I rambled about things, but she listened and that made all the difference. To Shannon Fulmer and Eddy Hall, the simple favors they did helped tremendously.

To New Orleans Zephyrs staff members who handled the logistics of my surveying fans. I hope the information provided herein is helpful in future sponsorship sales efforts.

Thanks also to my boss, King Logan, for understanding when work on my thesis took precedence over something at the office. I promise the rewards will come as I use the extensive knowledge I have on sponsorship marketing to provide a niche service to our clients as sponsorship becomes an increasingly more important element of the marketing mix.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Definition of Sponsorship	2
Legitimizing Sponsorship Marketing	3
Thesis Problem	5
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
3 MATERIALS AND METHODS	19
Sample	20
Questionnaire	20
Subjects	22
4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	24
Sponsor Recognition	24
Differences Due to Sponsor Involvement Level	25
Differences Due to Gender, Age, Income, Education and Attendance ..	27
Future Usage	28
Foil Items	29
5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	30
REFERENCES	34
APPENDIXES	
A SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE	37
B STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA REGARDING GENDER, AGE, INCOME, EDUCATION AND ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY.	40
VITA	91

ABSTRACT

Despite the pervasiveness of sports in American society and the ever-increasing role of sponsorship in the marketing mix, sponsorship marketing as a discipline currently lacks the rigorous academic study and theoretical foundations that exist in other marketing disciplines.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not sponsorship of New Orleans Zephyrs baseball is an effective way of increasing awareness of a product or brand. Using intermediate measures of recognition testing, fans at three New Orleans Zephyrs games were surveyed to test sponsor recognition. The study examined various elements of sponsorship marketing including the effects that gender, age, income, education and attendance frequency had on sponsorship recognition. Additionally, fans were asked if they consciously looked for sponsor messages at games and where they most noticed the messages. Lastly, respondents were asked if they would use a Zephyrs sponsor's product over a non-sponsor's product given the same price and quality.

Results showed that all 12 sponsors tested were recognized. Major sponsors were recognized considerably more so than mid-level sponsors and minor sponsors. A little more than half of the respondents reported that they consciously looked for sponsor messages at games, and the majority of respondents noticed sponsor signage the most on outfield fence signs. More than 80% would choose a Zephyrs' sponsor over another brand given equal price and quality.

Chi-square analysis provided significant differences concerning age, income, education and attendance frequency. Attendance frequency had the biggest impact. The more games a fan attended, the more likely they were to correctly identify most sponsors.

As the practice of sponsorship marketing becomes an increasingly more important element of the marketing mix, this study seeks to contribute to the growing body of evidence that supports sponsorship as a means to increase awareness and enhance brand image.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In the world of sports virtually everything is for sale, and companies are buying big. The idea of sponsoring a sporting activity is more popular than ever before. These days there isn't much a company can't stick its name on for the right price – events, buildings, cars, ice and grass and turf, even people. Ever hear of Tiger Woods? Nike is betting on it. And the bet is several million dollars, \$100 million over 5 years to be exact (Hickey 2000).

Just as advertisers address their audiences through commercial messages, sponsors communicate through the activities they sponsor.

The idea of sponsorship can be traced back as far as ancient Greece when wealthy citizens supported athletics and arts festivals in order to enhance social standing. The first modern use of sponsorship occurred about 100 years ago via the placement of ads in the official program of the 1896 Olympic Games. Two decades later, the soft drink giant, Coca-Cola set a precedent with its purchase of product-sampling rights at the 1928 Olympics (Pope 1998).

A significant increase in sponsorship activity and investment as we know it today occurred between the 1976 Montreal Olympics and the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics – mainly in an effort to circumvent losses the city of Montreal suffered in hosting the Games (Pope 1998).

Today, sponsorship expenditures in North America total \$8.7 billion, up from \$1 billion in 1985. Sports as an industry sees about 68% of this, or \$5.2 billion annually (IEG 2001c). The remainder is divided up among the arts, non-profits, entertainment, causes and fairs/festivals. In 1999, the top 20 sport advertisers spent a total of \$360.6

million (Stotlar and Bennett 2000). IEG predicts a 9.6% increase in spending by North American companies in 2001, bringing expenditures to \$9.5 billion overall. The sports industry will see approximately \$6.6 billion according to the projections (IEG 2000b).

Definition of Sponsorship

There are various ways to define the activity of sponsorship. Meenaghan (1983) offers a definition that describes sponsorship as “the provision of assistance either financial or in-kind to an activity by a commercial organization for the purpose of achieving commercial objectives.”

As the study and practice of sports marketing has become more sophisticated, companies have come to sponsor more than just “activities” as Meenaghan describes it. As previously stated companies these days sponsor buildings, playing surfaces within buildings, people and the like.

Pope (1998) is more specific about exactly what can be sponsored and about the various types of objectives sponsorship can achieve in his definition. He defines sponsorship as “the provision of resources (e.g., money, people, equipment) by an organization (the sponsor) directly to an individual, authority or body (the sponsee), to enable the latter to pursue some activity in return for benefits contemplated in terms of the sponsor’s promotion strategy, and which can be expressed in terms of corporate, marketing or media objectives.” In his definition, Pope alludes to the fact that *both* parties benefit from a sponsorship. The idea of creating mutually beneficial relationships has become a major theme in sports marketing thought. Authorities in the industry continuously stress the importance of creating a “win-win” situation for sponsor and sponsee. Cheng and Stotlar (1999) go so far as to compare a sponsorship relationship to

that of a marriage. The researchers contend that “both require long-term commitments to assist each other in reaching mutual fulfillment.”

The leading professional authority in sponsorship consulting and research, IEG, Inc. defines sponsorship as “a cash and/or in-kind fee paid to a property (typically sports, entertainment, non-profit event or organization) in return for access to the exploitable commercial potential associated with that property” (IEG 2001c). While this definition is limited in terms of sponsorship being linked only to a cash contribution, it does offer a different aspect than the others – the idea that affiliating with an entity has value in and of itself. In other words, companies should consider sponsorships not only for the exposure they provide, but also for the mere opportunity to be affiliated with the event or organization putting on the event. Gwinner and Eaton (1999) conducted a study to test this very principle. In an experiment, they tested the degree to which a sporting event’s image was transferred to a brand through an event sponsorship. Results indicated that those exposed to the sporting event were more likely to report similarity on brand-event personality components than those in the control group who were not exposed to the event, thus supporting the idea that sponsoring an event has value in and of itself through the function of image transfer.

Legitimizing Sponsorship Marketing

Sports as an industry is huge and it continues to grow each year. Approximately \$320 billion was spent last year on sports activities in the United States alone. More than 40% of Americans participate in a sporting activity at least once a week (Douvis and Douvis 2000). Many advertisers recognize the ever-increasing role of sports in

Americans' daily lives, and they are taking advantage of its popularity, sponsoring everything from community run/walks and golf tournaments to the Super Bowl.

More and more companies are adding sponsorship to the marketing mix alongside traditional advertising, public relations, sales promotion and personal selling (Meenaghan 1994). Companies like Wrangler Jeans, Kentucky Fried Chicken and Marriott Corporation have created full-time positions for sports marketing specialists to select, plan and administer sponsored activities (Sandler and Shani 1989). No longer is sponsorship treated as a form of corporate social behavior says Sandler and Shani (1989). The researchers point to the increase in expenditure and the exposure that sporting events garner these days as factors for treating sponsorship as an equal competitor in the budgeting of promotional dollars.

Indeed, there has been much speculation on why sponsorship has gained popularity over the past few decades. Meenaghan (1994) points to the early 1990s when companies faced diminishing advertising effectiveness "due to factors such as clutter, zapping, audience fragmentation and spiraling media costs". He says advertisers looked around and found sponsorship was a more cost-effective "access route to target markets" than the more traditional means of advertising (Meenaghan 1994).

Despite the pervasiveness of sports in American society and the ever-increasing role of sponsorship in the marketing mix, sports marketing as a discipline currently lacks the rigorous academic study and theoretical foundations that exist in other marketing disciplines. It is the hope that this research project will contribute to the legitimization of the study of sports marketing by demonstrating that sports sponsorship can have a direct impact on marketing objectives.

Thesis Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not sponsorship of New Orleans Zephyrs baseball games is an effective way of increasing awareness of a product or brand. A secondary purpose is to examine how factors such as attendance level and sponsorship involvement level, as well as demographic factors like age, income and education affect sponsor recognition levels. Various other factors surrounding sponsorship will also be examined as outlined in the research questions that follow.

The general research problem is to assess fans' recognition of signage and other sponsored activities at games. Research questions addressed include: (a) which Zephyr sponsors were recognized most frequently (b) did level of sponsorship involvement impact recognition levels (c) were there differences in recognition due to age, income, education level and frequency of attendance (d) does "recognizability" engender usage (e) do fans consciously look for sponsor messages and (f) what types of sponsor signage/activities do fans notice most.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Sponsorship expenditures are growing in leaps and bounds, but research that supports companies spending billions of dollars on sponsorship is minuscule in comparison – both in the academic arena and in the private sector.

A variety of resources were used to search for articles and research studies in the field of sports sponsorship. Databases, indexes and abstracting services that were searched include: American Business Institute (ABI), the Educational Resource Center (ERIC), PsycLIT, ProQuest, Infotrac and Lexis/Nexis. The Internet search engine, Google, also was used to search for on-line resources concerning sports sponsorship. Search terms used for all of the above research tools included: the effectiveness of sports sponsorships, measuring sports sponsorships, sponsorship and sports marketing. Table 1 outlines the major sources cited in this paper. Other articles, books and websites were reviewed in the course of the research, but were not cited as they did not directly pertain to the discussion herein.

The bulk of the academic research on sports sponsorship began almost 20 years ago in the mid-1980's and increased significantly as the mid-1990's approached (Cornwell and Maignan 1998). To date, scholars have not adopted any theories that could guide the study of consumer reaction to sponsorship. Instead, much of the literature that does exist has focused on debating the various measurement techniques believed to be most appropriate for evaluating the effectiveness of sponsorship marketing. These techniques include measuring the amount of media coverage garnered from a sponsorship; measuring awareness, familiarity and preferences engendered by

Table 1.
Overview of the Literature on Sponsorship

Author(s) (Year)	Publication	Title of Article	Abstract/Contribution
	<i>Business Week</i> - March 2000	Take me out to the ballgame, James	Discusses the sports industry.
Cheng and Stotlar (1999)	<i>The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing</i>	A marriage between sport and corporations for the next millennium	An attempt to compare a successful sponsorship relationships to that of a successful marriage. Supports the idea of the relationship being mutually beneficial as an underlying element of sponsorship.
Cornwell and Maignan (1998)	<i>Journal of Advertising</i>	An international review of sponsorship research	Discusses and summarizes all research concerning sponsorship through 1998. Research streams that are covered include: nature of sponsorship, managerial aspects of sponsorship, measurement of sponsorship effects, strategic use of sponsorship and legal and ethical considerations in sponsorship. Demonstrates that very little research has been done in the field of sponsorship relative to other advertising vehicles.
Cuneen and Hannan (1993)	<i>Sports Marketing Quarterly</i>	Intermediate measures and recognition testing of sponsorship advertising at an LPGA tournament	Study of 451 spectators at an LPGA event using Stotlar and Johnson's (1989a; 1989b) model of intermediate measures/recognition testing. Findings were consistent with Stotlar and Johnson (1989a;1989b). Study supports the hypothesis that sponsorships are effective.
Douvis and Douvis (2000)	<i>The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing</i>	A review of the research areas in the field of sports marketing: foundations, current trends, future directions	Covers research done in sports marketing to 2000. Does not concentrate solely on sponsorship effects. Offers statistics that support the idea that sports represents a huge and still growing industry.
Gardner and Shuman (1986)	<i>Journal of Advertising</i>	Sponsorship: an important component of the promotions mix	Examines sponsorship from the perspectives of all participants in the sponsorship system: corporations, channel members, the public and sponsored organizations.
Gwinner and Eaton (1999)	<i>Journal of Advertising</i>	Building brand image through event sponsorship: the role of image	Uses experimental method to test the degree to which a sporting event's image was transferred to a brand through event sponsorship activity. Findings indicate that sponsorship does result in an image transfer.
Hansen and Scotwin (1995)	<i>Marketing and Research Today</i>	An experimental enquiry into sponsoring: what effects can be measured?	Study on sponsorship effects using recall and recognition testing in accord with an experiment. Researchers expect that sponsoring , like advertising, generates effects at all levels of the effect hierarchy. Results indicated that sponsoring messages generate attention at all levels. Researchers suggest that sponsoring can be applied effectively as marketing communication.
	<i>IEG Sponsorship Report – Aug. 2000</i>	Top sponsors use ties to bolster corporate reputation	Reports findings of a study done by Reputation Institute and Harris Interactive Inc. that found that sponsorship impacts corporate reputation.

(table continued)

Author(s) (Year)	Publication	Title of Article	Abstract/Contribution
	<i>IEG Sponsorship Report – Dec. 2000</i>	IEG forecast: sponsorship spending growth will slow in 2001	Projects that sponsorship will see a 9.6% increase in spending by North American companies in 2001.
	<i>IEG Sponsorship Report – April 2001</i>	Performance Research/IEG study highlights what sponsors want	Reports findings of a survey done with 200 leading sponsorship decision-makers. Overall findings indicate that decision-makers dedicate very little money and energy to measuring results of sponsorships.
	<i>IEG Sponsorship Report – May 2001</i>	Dominion Homes' hockey promotion increases traffic, sales	An example of a sponsorship having a direct effect in increasing traffic and sales for the sponsor. Provides evidence of sponsorship's effect.
	IEG Website		Defines sponsorship; gives information on size of the sponsorship industry.
Hoek, et. al. (1993)	<i>Journal of Promotions Management</i>	Sponsorship management and evaluation: are managers assumptions justified?	Discusses the absence of a coherent body of research as a feature of sponsorship. Their conclusion is that managers are assuming sponsorship works, but there is not significant empirical findings to support the assumption.
Javalgi et. al. (1994)	<i>Journal of Advertising</i>	Awareness of sponsorship and corporate image: an empirical investigation	An exploratory study to examine the relationship between sponsorship and corporate image. Results indicate that sponsorship can improve image, but results vary from situation to situation.
Johar and Pham (1999)	<i>Journal of Market Research</i>	Relatedness, prominence and constructive sponsor identification	Reports results from three different experiments that indicate that sponsor identification is biased toward brands that are prominent in the marketplace and/or related to the event being sponsored.
McCook et. al. (1997)	<i>The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing</i>	A look at the corporate sponsorship decision-making process	A case study on the process of sponsorship selection. Overall, the four companies studied agree that image enhancement and brand awareness are top reasons to sponsor sports.
Meenaghan (1983)	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>	Commercial sponsorship	Provides the groundwork for defining the activity of sponsorship and why it is a legitimate medium for marketing a brand/company.
Meenaghan (1994)	<i>Journal of Advertising Research</i>	Point of view: ambush marketing: immoral or imaginative practice?	Exploring the practice of ambush marketing, Meenaghan suggests that the growth of sponsorship over the last 25 years is symptomatic of the desire of marketing communicators to open up new and cost-efficient lines of access to customer groups.
Pope (1998)	<i>The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing</i>	Overview of current sponsorship thought	Pope provides a valuable overview of research done in the field of sponsorship marketing up to 1998.

(table continued)

Author(s) (Year)	Publication	Title of Article	Abstract/Contribution
Pope and Voges (1997)	<i>The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing</i>	An exploration of sponsorship awareness by product category and message location in televised sporting events	Uses recall and recognition testing to assess the impact of sponsor messages during a televised football game. Results show that location and number of messages positively effect recall and recognition levels.
Sandler and Shani (1989)	<i>Journal of Advertising Research</i>	Olympic sponsorship vs ambush marketing: who gets the gold?	Official sponsorship versus ambush marketing. Offers valuable information on the legitimization of sponsorship – whether official or ambush in nature.
Shilbury and Berriman (1996)	<i>Sports Marketing Quarterly</i>	Sponsorship awareness: a study of St. Kilda football club sponsors	Examines change in sponsor awareness over a football season. Through a pre-test and post-test survey using recall and recognition testing, researchers found minimal changes in sponsor awareness.
Stipp and Schiavone (1996)	<i>Journal of Advertising Research</i>	Modeling the impact of Olympic sponsorship on corporate image	Discusses the benefits of being an Olympic Games sponsor. Study shows significant benefits for Olympic sponsors.
Stotlar (1993a)	<i>Successful Sports Marketing</i>	Publisher: Wm. C. Brown Dubuque, IA	Textbook that offers general insight into the field of sports marketing.
Stotlar and Bennett (2000)	<i>The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing</i>	An analysis of in-game advertising for NCAA basketball	Study done using Stotlar and Johnson's (1989a) model of recall and recognition testing. Supports Stotlar and Johnson's results.
Stotlar and Johnson (1989a)	<i>Journal of Sports Management</i>	Assessing the impact and effectiveness of stadium advertising on sport spectators at Division I institutions.	Used intermediate measures to determine the impact of sponsor signage on spectators in selected NCAA Division I football and basketball games. This study established a model of testing that has been used by several researchers since then in assessing the effectiveness of sponsorship marketing.
Turco (1994b)	<i>Sports Marketing Quarterly</i>	Event sponsorship: effects on consumer brand loyalty and consumption	Studied effects of sponsorship at a large international event. Using recall method, results indicated that whether or not a spectator's image of a sponsor is enhanced depends on consumption level of the sponsor's products.
Turco (1996)	<i>Sports Marketing Quarterly</i>	The effects of courtside advertising on product recognition and attitude change	Measures spectator's recognition of and attitudes toward courtside advertisers. Examines whether or not frequency of arena visitation is a factor that effects recognition levels. Results indicate recognitions levels improved over the season.
Wilson (1997)	<i>The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing</i>	Does sport sponsorship have a direct effect on product sales?	The objective of this paper was to reflect the difficulty sponsors have in determining if increases in image and awareness translate into product sales. Sites several studies and cases where sponsors attempted to measure impact.

sponsorship through survey research; and using experiments to test the impact of sponsorships in contrived settings (Cornwell and Maignan 1998).

In the private sector a standard method of measuring sponsorship effectiveness is just as scarce. And further, there seems to be varying interest by professionals in finding a standard measure. A recent study of 200 leading sponsorship decision-makers conducted by IEG found that sponsorship accounts for as much as 12% of respondents' marketing budgets. However, the same respondents said they devote very little of this sponsorship budget to measuring return on investment. As much as 78% said their companies do not have an ongoing budget dedicated to sponsorship research. Specifically, 72% reported they allocate either nothing or no more than 1% of their sponsorship budget to concurrent or post-event research. Although brand loyalty is the top objective cited by these companies for their sponsorships, less than half (47%) employ primary consumer research as a component of their analysis when deciding to change or renew deals. Most decision-makers say they depend primarily on internal feedback to gauge the effectiveness of sponsorship investments (IEG 2001a). *IEG Sponsorship Report* says, "although their key targets are outside corporate offices, nearly all executives seem to rely on gathering opinions [about sponsorships] from their own colleagues."

Kerry Sewell is vice president of marketing for the Memphis Redbirds baseball team, one of the few sports entities that conducts primary research in cooperation with Dr. Kirk Wakefield, an academician at University of Mississippi not far from Memphis. Sewell speculates that the more involved a sponsor is, the more the sponsor expects to see measurable results (Personal Interview, July 2, 2001). In a recent survey conducted

by Wakefield to test recognition of Redbirds sponsors, 63% of fans who attended 1 to 9 games correctly identified major Redbirds sponsors. Recognition levels increased as frequency of attendance increased. Fans attending 20 games or more over the 2000 season identified 77% of major Redbirds sponsors.

The Redbirds have tested sponsor recognition for the past two years in an effort to provide feedback to its sponsors. Sewell agrees with the IEG study that some sponsors are not as interested in feedback as one might think they would be. However, he says for those who are, providing feedback is a valuable tool for maintaining the relationship between the Redbirds and the sponsor.

Coca-Cola, a leader in utilizing sports sponsorships as part of its marketing mix, is one of the few companies that invests heavily in measuring the effectiveness of its sponsorship efforts. The soft drink giant commissioned a study in 1999 in which it found that “people’s perceptions of [the company’s] educational investments and involvement in issues, causes and activities that [consumers] care about drive the overall perception of the company” (IEG 2000a).

Overall, the bulk of literature on the subject of sponsorship marketing shows that it is widely accepted that sponsorship marketing is beneficial, but as previously stated, researchers are still searching for ways to provide a theoretical framework and significant evidence that proves the effectiveness of sponsorships.

Hoek, Gendall and West (1990) describe an “absence of a coherent body of research” as a “feature of sponsorship.” Other sources indicate a consensus among researchers that there exists little empirical evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of sports sponsorships (Gardner and Shuman 1987; Sandler and Shani 1989; Javalgi et al.

1994; Meenaghan 1994; Turco 1994, 1996; McCook, Turco, and Riley 1997; Wilson 1997; Cornwell and Maignan 1998; Pope 1998).

The preliminary academic research that has been done to date shows that there are four common objectives that companies seek to accomplish through corporate sponsorship. These objectives are: (1) to increase awareness, (2) to enhance product or brand image, (3) to increase media exposure and (4) to increase sales (Javalgi et al 1994; Turco 1994; Hansen and Scotwin 1995; Stipp and Schiavone 1996; McCook, Turco, and Riley 1997; Wilson 1997; Cornwell and Maignan 1998; Pope 1998; Gwinner and Eaton 1999).

Pope (1998) also points out that personal interests of management can influence decision-making with regard to sponsorship investments. However, most researchers agree that whereas the practice of sponsorship started out this way, it has largely gotten away from this type of mindset as sports marketing as an industry has become more sophisticated.

The two benefits most often cited among academic researchers and corporate professionals are increased brand awareness and enhanced image (Pope 1998). Studies, although limited, do exist that support this viewpoint.

One study tested 451 spectators at an Ladies Professional Golf Association (LPGA) golf tournament to assess recognition of sponsor signage (Cuneen and Hannan 1993). Research questions addressed signage location, which sponsors' ads were recognized most frequently, relationships between "recognizability" and product usage, if "recognizability" affected future usage, if opinions of advertised products/services changed as a result of seeing signage, whether spectators consciously looked for ads on

the grounds, and if there were differences in recognition due to age, income and spectating style. The researchers used intermediate measures of recognition testing, a model of testing established by Stotlar and Johnson (1989), leading academic researchers in the field of sponsorship marketing.

Results, which were consistent with the Stotlar and Johnson (1989) study, indicated that 98% of those surveyed noticed signage located at various spots on the grounds. Signage at concession stands was recognized the most. Subjects noticed and recognized signage of each of the 27 sponsors. Of those who noticed signage on the course during the tournament, 91% said they did not consciously look for the signage.

The regional grocery chain had the most ads displayed and received the greatest amount of recognition. Sponsors who had products/services available on site were recognized in greater frequencies than those that did not.

Less than 5% of respondents reported that they would use advertisers' products in the future as a result of seeing tournament signage.

Logistic regression analysis showed some significant differences between subject groups related to age, income, spectating style and current usage of products/services. Specifically, respondents age 40-49 recognized the FM radio station less than any other age group. And according to Cuneen and Hannan (1993) differences in income were apparent with two sponsors. Respondents earning \$40,000 or more recognized the state lottery and a national communications service less frequently than did those in other income categories.

A more recent study done by Stotlar and Bennett (2000) using the same model of recognition testing garnered results that were consistent with prior studies. Whereas

other researchers used actual events in their studies to test sponsor recognition, Stotlar and Bennett (2000) used an experimental design in which they invited participants to watch 20 minutes of a televised basketball game specifically manufactured for the study. A convenience sample of 239 respondents was asked to complete a questionnaire after viewing the game to test recognition of sponsor signage and sportscaster mentions imbedded in the game.

Research indicated that 49.1% of respondents recognized at least one courtside sign, while 88.9% of sportscaster mentions were recognized overall. Chi-square analysis was employed to further analyze data to determine the effects that age, annual income and level of education had on recognition accuracy.

Results showed that there was no significant difference in recognition levels of adults versus that of adolescents. And further there was no significant difference in age within the adult category. Annual income and level of education had no effect on sponsor recognition either.

The sponsor with the most exposure time, also was the most recognized, as was the case in the study done by Cuneen and Hannan (1983).

Turco (1994 and 1996) found similar results in two different studies – one using recall (unaided testing) and one using recognition testing (aided testing). In the first study using recall testing, he analyzed the effects of sponsoring a large-scale international event, the 23rd Annual Kodak Albuquerque International Balloon Festival. His goal was to determine whether or not spectators' perceived image of a company was enhanced due to sponsoring the event (Turco 1994).

An estimated 591 spectators were surveyed over 7 of the 9 days that the event took place. Kodak, the title sponsor of the event, was listed by most (78.1%) of the spectators as one of the three sponsors they recalled. Beside Kodak, no other sponsor scored high recall levels. Pepsi came in second with only a 17.4% recall rate.

About 22% of those that identified Kodak as a sponsor stated that their image of the company was positively influenced by the sponsorship. Although only a marginal amount of the spectators identified Pepsi as a sponsor, 23.9% of those folks said that Pepsi's sponsorship enhanced the image of the company.

Turco concluded from this study that sponsorship at a large-scale international event can help improve corporate image.

In another study, Turco (1996) attempted to measure spectators' recognition of and attitudes toward courtside advertisers over a season of NCAA men's basketball games using recognition testing. While similar to studies done by Stotlar and Johnson (1989) and Stotlar and Bennett (2000), this study differed in that it measured recognition over a season of live basketball as opposed to a one-time exposure to a televised game as the others did.

Prior to the season, a mail-back survey was sent to a random sample of season ticket holders. The survey consisted of eight real advertisers and four "dummy" advertisers. Participants were instructed to circle the names of the sponsors they recognized and to rank their attitude towards each using a Likert Scale (1 = very positive, 2 = positive, 3 = neutral, 4 = negative, 5 = very negative).

One week after the completion of the season, the exact same questionnaire was sent to the respondents of the initial survey (n=196). From this mailing, 100 responses were garnered.

Results showed that recognition levels increased after the season for 7 of the 8 sponsors being tested. Spectators also more accurately recognized “dummy” advertisers. Attitude change levels were not significant.

These are just a few specific cases where a researcher has attempted to determine the effectiveness of sponsorship marketing. As previously stated, no study to date has found groundbreaking evidence or established any theories on the ways in which sports sponsorship directly affects common marketing objectives.

Although Stotlar and Johnson (1989) set up the model of testing that is most commonly used by academic researchers, *IEG Sponsorship Report* points out that sponsorship can be measured using “three broad schools of evaluation” – comparing the value of sponsorship-generated media coverage to the cost of the equivalent advertising space, measuring awareness or attitude changes as Stotlar and Johnson’s (1989) model does and/or quantifying effects in terms of sales results (IEG 2001c).

Initial research, both professional and academic, consisted mainly of the first of the three methods cited above – what Cornwell and Maignan (2000) refer to as “exposure-based methods”. These are measures that provide an estimation of the exposure generated by a sponsorship both on-site and through media covering the event. This value can stand alone, or as IEG (2001c) recommends, it can be compared to what the “space” would have cost if it had been sold by a media outlet.

Cornwell and Maignan (1998) point out that this type of evaluation is not the best method of evaluation because it is “unable to provide information about the commercial effects of sponsorship.” In other words, the measure of exposure does not translate into the effects the sponsorship may have had on marketing objectives like brand awareness, image or sales.

By far the most widely used method to date is what Cornwell and Maignan (1998) refer to as “tracking measures” – using consumer surveys to evaluate awareness, familiarity and preferences engendered by sponsorship. Many researchers in the field of sponsorship marketing have adopted this method (Cuneen and Hannan 1993; Stotlar 1993; Sandler and Shani 1993; Pope and Voges 1994; Turco 1994, 1996).

Quantifying results in terms of sales, the third method of measurement suggested by IEG (2001c), is rarely used because it is difficult to differentiate sponsorship effects from that of advertising and other promotional techniques. Only in isolated incidents has this type of measurement been successful. Wilson (1997) says, “true cause/effect relationships between corporate sponsorship promotional exposure and spectator consumption [i.e., sales] rarely exists, with the exception of on-site merchandising, couponing, and in-store promotions directly surrounding the event.”

One example of the latter case that Wilson (1997) speaks of is given in *IEG Sponsorship Report* (2001b). Home builder, Dominion Homes credits the most successful quarter in its 50-year history to a sponsorship it did with the National Hockey League’s Columbus Blue Jackets during the 2000-2001 season. The sponsorship – a promotion involving a \$175,000 home as a grand prize – included signage at the team’s

Nationwide Arena, local newspaper ads, and tagged TV and radio spots. Dominion Homes also touted the promotion on its website.

The goal was to drive traffic to Dominion's 35 model centers in central Ohio where Blue Jackets fans could register for the contest. It worked; visits were up 20%. Plus, Dominion's year-on-year sales increased 16% in the first three months of 2001. Nationally, new home sales were up as well, but only half as much (7.4%).

With this example, it is evident that this small regional company that put the bulk of their marketing budget into one big promotion with a highly visible professional sports team could attribute increased traffic and sales directly to the sponsorship. However, most marketing programs are much more all encompassing than this example. Therefore, measuring sponsorship effects based on sales is not feasible in most situations.

CHAPTER 3: MATERIALS AND METHODS

This particular study is modeled after the commonly cited Stotlar and Johnson (1989) study, which has been used by a number of other researchers in some form or fashion to study sponsorship effectiveness (Cuneen and Hannan 1993; Turco 1994, 1996; Shilbury and Berriman 1996; Stotlar and Bennett 2000). As previously outlined, Stotlar and Johnson (1989) used intermediate measures to determine the impact of sponsor signage on spectators in selected National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I football and basketball games. Intermediate measures assess consumer *response* to advertising as opposed to direct measures, which assess consumer *action*. Intermediate assessment is characterized by two testing methods - recall and recognition.

There has been some debate among researchers in the field of sports marketing over the use of recall versus recognition as the method of choice for testing advertising effectiveness. A few studies have used recall, which involves unaided testing (Stotlar 1993; Turco 1994). In other words, participants are asked to recall sponsors strictly from memory without a list of choices. The majority of researchers lean towards the use of recognition testing where participants are given a list of choices from which to choose sponsors they recognize.

In their research, Cuneen and Hannan (1993) refer to recognition testing as the “traditional method”. Because it does seem to be the preferred choice of most researchers in the field, recognition testing will be employed for this study.

Using recognition testing also will help the research more readily evaluate the impact of sponsorship involvement level. One of the research questions how

sponsorship involvement level affects recognition. If recall testing is used, past studies show that it is likely that only the top sponsors would be recalled (i.e., sponsors with multiple sponsorship elements). Thus, this study would be unable to effectively test this research question. So, it follows that giving participants a list of sponsors in all categories from which they can choose those they recognize will allow the research to examine the effect of sponsorship involvement level that otherwise would not be evident with the use of recall.

Sample

Approximately 600 questionnaires were distributed over a series of three baseball games at the end of the 2001 Zephyrs season. The number of questionnaires was chosen to provide for a sample size that is in line with other samples in similar studies. In other studies, sample sizes ranged from 85 to 591 (Gardner and Shuman 1987, Cuneen and Hannan 1993; Turco 1994,1996; Shilbury and Berriman 1996; Pope and Voges 1997; Stotlar and Bennett 2000). Fans were given an incentive to fill out the survey in order to maximize response rate. The incentive was that each survey also served as an entry to win a Zephyrs Prize Pack.

Questionnaire

A 9-item questionnaire was developed for the study (see Appendix A). The first item provided a list of 18 companies (12 Zephyrs sponsors and 6 foil items) from which participants were asked to pick those they recognized as Zephyrs sponsors. Actual sponsors and foil items were positioned randomly.

The questionnaire asked respondents to provide their gender, age, income, education level and frequency of attendance. Other questions queried respondents on

whether or not they would be more inclined to purchase a product they recognized as a Zephyr sponsor over a non-sponsor product given the same quality and price, whether or not respondents consciously look for sponsor messages at games, and where they noticed sponsor messages the most.

Questionnaires were handed out at different entrances to the ballpark at each game in an effort to minimize duplicate responses. According to Zephyrs management, a fan normally uses the same entrance each time he comes to a game. There are six entrances in all, so two different entrances were chosen for each game.

Participants were asked to complete the survey and turn it in at the Customer Service Desk *before* they found their seats for the game. This was done to prevent fans from filling out the survey with the help of looking around the ballpark for sponsor messages. The Customer Service Desk is located in the concourse area just before the seating area, so this limited how far fans could travel before turning in their survey. Only surveys turned in before the game began were utilized. Again, this was done in an attempt to prevent people from coming back from the seating area and turning in questionnaires that may have been filled out with the help of looking around the ballpark.

To provide for a random sample, every third fan over age 18 received a survey. Zephyrs management reported that fans traditionally come in groups of 2, 3 or 4, so hitting every third person provided for a high probability of reaching each group in attendance.

Subjects

Of the 600 surveys distributed, 231 were returned for a response rate of 38.5%. Fifty-two surveys were not usable because they reported being at a Zephyrs game for the first time and, therefore, could not recognize Zephyrs sponsors. This left 179 usable responses for analysis.

Just over half of the respondents were female (n=95; 53.1%), and 46.9% were male (n=84). Most were 36-50 years of age (n=105; 58.7%). The rest of the participants were scattered among age groups – 5.6% were 18-25 years old (n=10); 12.3% were 26-35 years old (n=22); 16.2% were 51-65 years old (n=29); and 6.7% were older than 65 years of age (n=12).

Respondents were scattered relatively evenly over the different annual income categories. About one-fifth (18.4%; n=33) reported annual incomes between \$35,000 - \$49,000. Just slightly less than that earned \$70,000-\$100,000 (17.3%, n=31). Thirty respondents (16.8%) reported earning less than \$25,000, and the same amount earned \$25,000-\$35,000. About 8.9% of respondents earned \$70,000 - \$100,000 (n=16); and 11.7% earned more than \$100,000 annually (n=21). Approximately 10% of respondents declined to report their annual income (n=18).

About half of the respondents (n=119) went to college. Of those, 41 (22.9%) did not finish college, 44 (24.6%) received a college degree, 13 went to graduate school for some amount of time and 22 earned graduate degrees. Fifty-six participants (31.5%) earned a high school diploma while only 2 participants did not finish high school, and one participant did not report his education level.

The majority of the respondents had been to at least 4 games (88.8%; n=142). Forty-six of them (25.7%) had been to between 4 and 6 games. Nineteen (10.6%) had been to between 7 and 10 games. Twenty-six (14.5%) had been to more than 10 games. And 51 (27.5%) had been to more than 20 games. Thirty-seven of the 179 respondents (20.7%) had only been to 2 or 3 games.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sponsor Recognition

Data were assessed for frequencies and percentages of recognition of each sponsor. Table 2 shows recognition levels of each of the Zephyrs sponsors tested, as well as the foil items. Respondents recognized signage of each of the 12 sponsors included in the study.

Table 2.
Summary of Frequencies & Percentages for Sponsorship Recognition

Sponsor	<i>Recognized</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Miller Lite	146	81.6%
Coca-Cola	144	80.4%
Pizza Hut	143	79.9%
Cingular Wireless	123	68.7%
Safari Car Wash	119	66.5%
Ochsner	106	59.2%
Baby Ruth	105	58.7%
Coors Light	93	51.9%
Academy Sports & Outdoors	71	40.0%
Chevron	66	36.9%
Louisiana Office Products	56	31.3%
5 Minute Oil Change	55	30.7%
Ace Hardware (Foil Item)	38	21.2%
Shell (Foil Item)	24	13.4%
Office Depot (Foil Item)	22	12.3%
St. Charles General Hospital (Foil Item)	19	10.6%
Digital Consulting	17	9.5%
Tropicana (Foil Item)	13	7.3%

Just more than half of the respondents said they consciously looked for sponsor advertising at Zephyrs games (n=103; 57.4%). This is a high percentage compared to

Cuneen and Hannan's (1993) study where only 9% reported that they consciously looked for advertising.

Most respondents (n=130; 72.6%) said they noticed sponsors on outfield fence signs over any other area at the park. No other published study to date has tested recognition of sponsors at a baseball game, so this percentage is not comparable to anything else. Cuneen and Hannan (1993) did test this factor, but it was on a golf course during a tournament. Their findings indicated that the signage was noticed most in concession areas. However, because the nature of viewing a golf tournament and viewing a baseball game are totally different, these two studies can not be compared.

Differences Due to Sponsor Involvement Level

To ascertain whether there was a difference in recognition levels due to sponsor involvement (i.e., whether major sponsors were recognized more frequently than mid-level sponsors and whether mid-level sponsors were recognized more than minor sponsors), the mean recognition scores of the three different groups of sponsors were compared. Miller Lite and Coca-Cola are classified as major Zephyr sponsors with investment levels of more than \$100,000 per season. Ochsner and Louisiana Office Supply are categorized as mid-level sponsors with investments that average \$15,000 per season and Safari Car Wash and 5 Minute Oil Change are considered minor sponsors with investments of less than \$5,000 per season.

Table 3 shows that the mean frequency of recognition of major sponsors was 144.3, meaning that those sponsors were recognized an average of 144.3 times. Mid-level sponsors were recognized an average of 81 times. Finally, minor level sponsors were recognized 87 times. When comparing the mean recognition scores, it is clear that

being involved as a major sponsor garnered considerably more recognition than the less involved sponsors did.

Table 3.
Frequency of Recognition Scores for Different Sponsor Involvement Levels

	<i>Recognized</i>
Major Sponsors	<i>f</i>
Miller Lite	146
Coca-Cola	144
Mean Score	144.3
Mid-level Sponsors	
Ochsner	106
Louisiana Office Products	56
Mean Score	81
Minor Sponsors	
Safari Car Wash	119
5 Minute Oil Change	55
Mean Score	87

No difference existed between the mid-level sponsors and the minor level sponsors. In fact, the data shows that the mean score of the minor level sponsors is actually slightly higher than that of the mid-level sponsors. This could be attributed to the fact that Safari Car Wash ($f = 119$), despite being considered a minor level sponsor, scored particularly high recognition scores for its category – probably because Safari sponsors a popular promotion where the “Dirtiest Car in the Lot” wins a free car wash. Additionally, Louisiana Office Products ($f = 56$) scored considerably lower than Ochsner ($f = 106$). This could be attributed to the fact that Ochsner is a well-established brand in the New Orleans metro area and thus among Zephyrs fans, while Louisiana Office Products is not. One of Shilbury and Berriman’s (1996) conclusions in their study was

that “brands or products already established in the market benefit more from sponsorship than do those products that are only in the early stages of the product life cycle.” Pham (1999) calls this “prominence bias”, the idea that identification accuracy is higher for events sponsored by a prominent brand than for those sponsored by a less prominent brand. His study also supports this phenomenon.

Differences Due to Gender, Age, Income, Education and Attendance

To determine the effects of the independent variables of gender, age, income, education and attendance frequency, SPSS software was utilized to analyze data using Pearson’s Chi-square test. This is in keeping with similar studies using intermediate measures of recognition testing. See Appendix 2 for details of the statistical analysis of gender, age, income, education and attendance frequency.

There were only a few significant differences between subject groups related to the demographic factors of age, income and education. No differences occurred related to gender. See Tables B-1 through B-19 for detailed results.

Age was a factor in only one instance. Respondents under 50 recognized Academy Sports & Outdoors more so than respondents over 50. The highest recognition occurred in those ages 35-50 (see Table B-31).

Income also only impacted one sponsor. Respondents in the annual income category of \$50,000-\$70,000 recognized Ochsner Hospital and Clinics as a sponsor less than respondents in any of the other income categories (see Table B-44).

Differences as a function of education were evident in two cases, one with a sponsor and one with a foil item. In the case of Louisiana Office Supply, those with high school diplomas and those with graduate degrees recognized this sponsor more so than

those in other categories (see Table B-62). This does not necessarily indicate that the more educated one is, the more he recognizes Louisiana Office Supply because those with some college, with college degrees and with some graduate school recognized the sponsor less than those with high school diplomas. Education also impacted recognition of Ace Hardware as a non-sponsor in the exact same categories. Accuracy of recognition was highest among those with high school diplomas and those with graduate degrees more so than in any other category (see Table B-59).

The most apparent differences in recognition level were due to attendance level. The more games that respondents attended, the more they recognized sponsors and also recognized foil items as non-sponsors. Statistical significant differences in recognition occurred with Louisiana Office Supply, Ochsner, Chevron, 5 Minute Oil Change, Safari Car Wash, Tropicana (foil item), Academy Sports & Outdoors, Baby Ruth, Pizza Hut and Shell (foil item). Tables B-77 through B-95 outline the statistical analysis of each sponsor tested. Turco tested this same factor in his 1996 study and found no statistically significant difference between “arena visitation” and recognition of sponsors. However, he concluded, “although not statistically significant, more frequent spectators more accurately recognized advertisers than did those who attended infrequently.” The aforementioned Memphis Redbirds study also yielded results that support the notion that attendance frequency impacts sponsor recognition.

Future Usage

Approximately 81% (n=145) of respondents said they would choose a Zephyrs sponsor over another brand given that both products were priced the same and of like quality. The other 19% said that it did not matter, while no one said that they would

choose the non-sponsor product. This is consistent with Johnson (1992) who did a study at the Chicago Blues Festival and found that 73% attested that they would be more likely to purchase a product made by a company that sponsored the event. Gardner and Shuman (1987) found that 53% of the respondents in their study indicated that a sponsorship had made them more likely to buy a product. And Cuneen and Hannan (1993) found that an average of less than 20% of respondents indicated that sponsorship would influence future usage of the products tested in their study.

Foil Items

Originally intended as a foil item, Coors Light garnered a particularly high recognition level, which caused further investigation of its status at the ballpark. It turned out that Coors Light was, in fact, a sponsor and the beer brand is actually sold at the park. Zephyrs management had listed Coors Light under its distributor's name on the sponsor list submitted for the study because that is the name under which the contract for sponsorship was written. So, it follows that recognition levels would be high, since the beer brand is actually a sponsor.

All other foil items performed as expected. Most people recognized them as non-sponsors. See Table 1 for scores.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this research was to gauge the effectiveness of sponsorship of New Orleans Zephyr baseball games over the 2001 season. The study was done in hopes of adding to the growing body of knowledge of and evidence supporting the use of sponsorship marketing, specifically at sporting events.

The study examined various elements of sponsorship including the effects that gender, age, income, education and attendance frequency had on sponsor recognition. Other questions raised included: whether or not sponsor involvement level had an impact on recognition, whether or not recognition of sponsors engendered future usage, whether or not fans consciously looked for sponsor messages and what types of sponsor signage or activities did fans notice most.

This research did not test attitudes toward sponsors as some other studies have done. It also did not consider how product usage affected recognition. Finally, graphical elements of signage and particulars about specific promotional activities were not considered. Although inferences were made about Safari Car Wash's promotional activities because it earned particularly high recognition scores for its category.

Intermediate measures of recognition testing were used in keeping with similar studies (Stotlar and Johnson 1989, Cuneen and Hannan 1993, Turco 1994 and 1996, Stotlar and Bennett 2000). A 9-item questionnaire was distributed to 600 fans over three baseball games. This garnered 179 usable responses for analysis.

Results showed that all 12 sponsors were recognized. The Zephyr's biggest sponsor, Miller Lite, garnered the most recognition. Other major sponsors such as Coca-Cola and Pizza Hut were recognized only slightly less. It is important to note here that

all three of the top-scoring sponsors have products available for sale at the concession stands at Zephyrs games. Cuneen and Hannan (1993) actually tested this phenomenon and their findings indicated that sponsors that had products available on the grounds of the event were recognized more than those that did not. So, one could infer that this fact helped with recognition of Miller Lite, Coca-Cola and Pizza Hut. Other sponsors that had products available at the game included Coors Light and Baby Ruth, both of which also scored high recognition rates among fans.

A little more than half of the respondents reported that they consciously looked for sponsor messages at games, and the majority of respondents said they noticed sponsor signage the most on outfield fence signs.

Major sponsors were recognized considerably more so than mid-level sponsors and minor sponsors. However, there was no difference in recognition between mid-level and minor sponsors.

Chi-square analysis provided for significant differences concerning age, income, education and attendance frequency. Attendance frequency had the biggest impact on sponsor recognition. Data showed that the more games a fan attends, the more likely he is to correctly identify most of the sponsors tested.

Finally, just over 80% of those surveyed reported that they would choose a Zephyrs sponsor over another brand given equal price and quality.

According to a recent article in *Business Week* (2000), sports today is characterized by multi-billion dollar TV contracts, millionaire players, gleaming new stadia and white-collar crowds in the stands. Bottom line – sports is big business. And sports sponsorship as a communication tool and promotional activity is here to stay

(Cornwell and Maignan 1998). The importance of sponsorship in the promotions mix is evident when one considers the growing number of companies sponsoring events, the exorbitant amount of money being spent on sponsorships and the growing number of corporations hiring experts to supervise special events tied to sponsorships (Gardner and Shuman 1987).

There are a couple of factors that suggest that sponsorship will continue to take up increasingly more of overall marketing budgets. They provide a different way to communicate and cut through the clutter and zapping associated with more traditional advertising (Gardner and Shuman 1987, Meenaghan 1994). They reach such a vast amount of people. Almost half of all Americans participate in a sporting activity once a week (Douvis and Douvis 2000).

The limited amount of research on sport sponsorship has not provided groundbreaking evidence that clearly demonstrates that sponsorship marketing is effective (Gardner and Shuman 1987; Sandler and Shani 1989; Javalgi et al. 1994; Meenaghan 1994; Turco 1994, 1996; McCook, Turco, and Riley 1997; Wilson 1997; Cornwell and Maignan 1998; Pope 1998). However, as evidenced throughout this paper, most concur that it is.

Sports marketers and academicians should continue in the quest to determine exactly what effect sports sponsorship can have on consumers. Specifically with regards to this study, future research could compare recognition of sponsors before and after a season of baseball to see if there is a significant change. Shilbury and Berriman (1996) did a study like this comparing sponsor awareness at the beginning and end of a season of football. They found that recognition increased only slightly. Turco (1996) also

compared recognition rates of sponsors before and after a season of sports – this time NCAA basketball. In this study, sponsor recognition improved for 7 of the 8 sponsors tested. Respondents not only recognized sponsors more, they also were better able to identify non-sponsors (foil items).

In general, future research could test exactly what kind of company benefits most from sponsorship marketing. This study and others seem to indicate that established brands are recognized more so than unestablished brands. For example, top national brands like Miller Lite, Coca-Cola, Pizza Hut and Cingular Wireless were recognized 70% to 80% of the time at Zephyrs games. On the other hand, non-established brands like Louisiana Office Products and 5 Minute Oil Changes were recognized only about 30% of the time. The conclusions above attribute recognition levels to the fact that the top four sponsors were more involved than those that were recognized less often. In other words, they spent more and had more signage and activities than the unestablished brands. However, it is worth considering whether or not the fact that the top brands were recognized more often because they are already established brands in the market.

Finally, future research also could examine different types of sponsorship from naming rights of stadia/events, to stadium/event signage, to promotional-based sponsorships. It would be interesting and quite useful for marketers to see exactly what effects different types of sponsorship have on consumers. Other researchers have recommended that future projects compare commercial advertisements during televised sporting events to the advertising signage and sponsor mentions contained in the event itself. In this type of study, marketers could see exactly where their marketing dollars would be more effectively spent for a televised sporting event.

REFERENCES

Take me out to the ball game, James. *Business Week*. March:142.

Cheng, P. and Stotlar, D. 1999. Successful sponsorship: A marriage between sport and corporations for the next millennium. *The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing*. 3, no. 3 <http://www.cjism.com/vol3/cheng&stotlar33.htm>.

Cornwell, T. and Maignan, I. 1998. An international review of sponsorship research. *Journal of Advertising*, 28, no. 1:1-21.

Cuneen, J., and Hannan, M. 1993. Intermediate measures and recognition testing of sponsorship advertising at an LPGA tournament. *Sports Marketing Quarterly*, 2, no. 1:47-56.

Douvis, J. and Douvis, S. 2000. A review of the research areas in the field of sports marketing: Foundations, current trends, future directions. *The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing*. 4, no. 3, <http://www.cjism.com/vol4/douvis43.htm>

Gardner, M. and Shuman, P. 1986. Sponsorship: an important component of the promotions mix. *Journal of Advertising*, 16, no. 1:11-17.

Gwinner, K. and Eaton, J. 1999. Building brand image through event sponsorship: the role of image transfer. *Journal of Advertising*, 28, no. 4:47-56.

Hansen, F. and Scotwin, L. 1995. An experimental enquiry into sponsoring: what effects can be measured? *Marketing and Research Today*, August:173-181.

Hickey, J. 2000. Corporations love sports. *Insight on the News*. 16, no. 142:22.

Hoek, J., Gendall, P. and Sanders, J. 1993. Sponsorship management and evaluation: are managers assumptions justified? *Journal of Promotion Management*, 1, no. 4:53-66.

International Events Group (IEG). 2000a. Top sponsors use ties to bolster corporate reputation. *IEG Sponsorship Report*, 19, no. 16:1, 4-5.

———. 2000b. IEG forecast: sponsorship spending growth will slow in 2000. *IEG Sponsorship Report*, 19, no. 24:1, 4-5.

———. 2001a. Performance Research/IEG study highlights what sponsors want. *IEG Sponsorship Report*, 20, no. 8:1, 4-5.

———. 2001b. Dominion Homes' hockey promotion increases traffic, sales. *IEG Sponsorship Report*, 20, no. 9:1-2.

- . 2001c. Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved March 7, 2001, from <http://www.sponsorship.com/forum/FAQ.html>.
- Javalgi, R., Traylor, M., Gross, A. and Lampman, E. 1994. Awareness of sponsorship and corporate image: an empirical investigation. *Journal of Advertising*, 23, no. 4:47-58.
- Johar, G. and Pham, M. 1999. Relatedness, prominence and constructive sponsor identification. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 36, no. 3:299.
- Johnson, R. 1992. How the Chicago Mayor's Office of Special Events uses surveys in its sponsorship program. *IEG Sponsorship Report*, 11, no. 1:4-5.
- McCook, K., Turco, D. and Riley, R. 1997. A look at the corporate sponsorship decision-making process. *The Cyber-Journal of Sports Marketing*, 1, no. 2 <http://www.cjism.com/vol1/mccook.htm>
- Meenaghan, J. 1983. Commercial Sponsorship. *European Journal of Marketing*, 7, no. 7:5-71.
- . 1994. Point of view: ambush marketing: immoral or imaginative practice? *Journal of Advertising Research*, September/October, pp. 77 – 88.
- Pope, N. 1998. Overview of current sponsorship thought. *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 2, no. 1 <http://www.cjism.com/vol2/pope21.htm>
- Pope, N. and Voges, K. 1997. An exploration of sponsorship awareness by product category and message location in televised sporting events. *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 1, no. 1 <http://www.cjism.com/vol1/pope&voges11.htm>
- Sandler, D. and Shani, D. 1989. Olympic sponsorship vs ambush marketing: who gets the gold? *Journal of Advertising Research*, (August/Sept.), pp. 9-14.
- Shilbury, D. and Berriman, M. 1996. Sponsorship awareness: a study of St. Kilda football club sponsors. *Sports Marketing Quarterly*, 5, no. 1:27-33.
- Stipp, H. and Schiavone, N. 1996. Modeling the impact of Olympic sponsorship on corporate image. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36, no. 4:22-28.
- Stotlar, D. 1993. *Successful Sports Marketing*. W.C. Brown Communications, Inc. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Stotlar, D. and Bennett, C. 2000. An analysis of in-game advertising for NCAA basketball. *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 4, no. 1 <http://www.cjism.com/vol4/stotlar41.htm>

Stotlar, D. and Johnson, D. 1989. Assessing the impact and effectiveness of stadium advertising on sport spectators at division I institutions. *Journal of Sports Management*, 3:90-102.

Turco, D. 1994. Event sponsorship: effects on consumer brand loyalty and consumption. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 3, no. 3:42 – 45.

———. 1996. The effects of courtside advertising on product recognition and attitude change. *Sports Marketing Quarterly*, 5, no. 4:11-15.

Wilson, G. 1997. Does sport sponsorship have a direct effect on product sales? *The Cyber-Journal of Sport Marketing*, 1, no. 4 <http://www.cjism.com/vol1/wilson.htm>

**APPENDIX A:
SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Please fill out the following survey and turn it in
at the Customer Service Booth behind home plate.**

Each person who fills out a survey has a chance to win a **Zephyrs Prize Pack!** The winner will be drawn during the first inning, so please turn in your completed survey **BEFORE** you find your seat for tonight's game.

1. Below is a list of companies. Please circle the ones that you recognize as Zephyrs sponsors?

Ace Hardware

St. Charles General Hospital

Coca-Cola

Academy Sports & Outdoors

Cingular Wireless

Baby Ruth

Louisiana Office Products

Digital Consulting and Software Services

Ochsner Clinic & Hospitals

Coors Light

Chevron

Pizza Hut

5 Minute Oil Change

Miller Lite

Safari Car Wash

Shell

Tropicana

Office Depot

2. Suppose that you were choosing between two brands that are alike in terms of price and quality. One of them you recall is a sponsor of the Zephyrs and one is not. Which brand would you choose?
- The Zephyrs sponsor
 - The other brand
 - Either one, it doesn't matter
3. Do you consciously look for sponsors/advertising at Zephyr games?
- yes
 - no
4. Where do you notice the most sponsors at Zephyr games?
- Outfield fence signs
 - Scoreboard signs
 - Scoreboard messages
 - PA Announcements
 - On-field promotions
 - Concession areas

5. Which are you?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female

6. What is your age?
 - a. 18-25 years old
 - b. 26-35 years old
 - c. 36-50 years old
 - d. 51-65 years old
 - e. 65+ years old

7. Which of the following categories contains your annual PERSONAL INCOME LEVEL before taxes?
 - a. Under \$25,000
 - b. \$25,000 to \$35,000
 - c. \$35,000 to \$49,000
 - d. \$50,000 to \$70,000
 - e. \$70,000 to \$99,000
 - f. \$100,000 or more

8. What is your highest grade of school completed?
 - a. less than high school
 - b. high school diploma
 - c. some college
 - d. college degree
 - e. some graduate school
 - f. graduate degree

9. How many games have you attended this season?
 - a. just one game
 - b. 2-3 games
 - c. 4-6 games
 - d. 7-10 games
 - e. more than 10 games
 - f. more than 20 games

Seat location for tonight's game: Sec. _____ Row _____ Seat _____

**APPENDIX B:
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA
REGARDING GENDER, AGE, INCOME,
EDUCATION AND ATTENDANCE FREQUENCY**

Table B-1. Crosstabs – Gender

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Ace Hardware * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Coca-Cola * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Cingular Wireless * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
La Office Supply * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Ochsner * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Chevron * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
5 Minute Oil Change * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Safari Car Wash * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Tropicana * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
St. Charles General * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Academy Sports * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Baby Ruth * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Digital Software Consulting * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Coors Light * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Pizza Hut * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Miller Lite * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Shell * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Office Depot * Gender	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%

Table B-2. Ace Hardware * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Ace Hardware	Not Recognized	68	73	141
	Recognized	16	22	38
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.450 ^b	1	.502		
Continuity Correction ^a	.238	1	.626		
Likelihood Ratio	.452	1	.501		
Fisher's Exact Test				.584	.314
Linear-by-Linear Association	.448	1	.503		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.83.

Table B-3. Coca-Cola * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Coca-Cola	Not Recognized	19	16	35
	Recognized	65	79	144
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.946 ^b	1	.331		
Continuity Correction ^a	.614	1	.433		
Likelihood Ratio	.944	1	.331		
Fisher's Exact Test				.351	.216
Linear-by-Linear Association	.941	1	.332		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.42.

Table B-4. Cingular Wireless * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Cingular Wireless	Not Recognized	30	26	56
	Recognized	54	69	123
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.444 ^b	1	.229	.260	.149
Continuity Correction ^a	1.082	1	.298		
Likelihood Ratio	1.443	1	.230		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.436	1	.231		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.28.

Table B-5. La Office Supply * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
La Office Supply	Not Recognized	58	65	123
	Recognized	26	30	56
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.008 ^b	1	.928	1.000	.529
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.008	1	.928		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	.008	1	.928		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.28.

Table B-6. Ochsner * Gender**Crosstab**

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Ochsner	Not Recognized	38	35	73
	Recognized	46	60	106
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.301 ^b	1	.254		
Continuity Correction ^a	.977	1	.323		
Likelihood Ratio	1.301	1	.254		
Fisher's Exact Test				.288	.161
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.294	1	.255		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.26.

Table B-7. Chevron * Gender**Crosstab**

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Chevron	Not Recognized	52	61	113
	Recognized	32	34	66
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.102 ^b	1	.750		
Continuity Correction ^a	.027	1	.870		
Likelihood Ratio	.102	1	.750		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.683
Linear-by-Linear Association	.101	1	.750		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.97.

Table B-8. 5 Minute Oil Change * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
5 Minute Oil Change	Not Recognized	55	69	124
	Recognized	29	26	55
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.072 ^b	1	.300		
Continuity Correction ^a	.763	1	.383		
Likelihood Ratio	1.071	1	.301		
Fisher's Exact Test				.332	.191
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.066	1	.302		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.81.

Table B-9. Safari Car Wash * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Safari Car Wash	Not Recognized	27	33	60
	Recognized	57	62	119
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.135 ^b	1	.714		
Continuity Correction ^a	.043	1	.835		
Likelihood Ratio	.135	1	.714		
Fisher's Exact Test				.753	.418
Linear-by-Linear Association	.134	1	.714		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.16.

Table B-10. Tropicana * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Tropicana	Not Recognized	77	89	166
	Recognized	7	6	13
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.269 ^b	1	.604		
Continuity Correction ^a	.053	1	.818		
Likelihood Ratio	.269	1	.604		
Fisher's Exact Test				.774	.407
Linear-by-Linear Association	.268	1	.605		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b.

0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.10.

Table B-11. St. Charles General * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
St. Charles	Not Recognized	73	87	160
General	Recognized	11	8	19
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.027 ^b	1	.311		
Continuity Correction ^a	.593	1	.441		
Likelihood Ratio	1.026	1	.311		
Fisher's Exact Test				.340	.221
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.021	1	.312		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b.

0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.92.

Table B-12. Academy Sports * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Academy Sports	Not Recognized	45	63	108
	Recognized	39	32	71
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.026 ^b	1	.082		
Continuity Correction ^a	2.516	1	.113		
Likelihood Ratio	3.029	1	.082		
Fisher's Exact Test				.093	.056
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.009	1	.083		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.32.

Table B-13. Baby Ruth * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Baby Ruth	Not Recognized	40	34	74
	Recognized	44	61	105
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.573 ^b	1	.109		
Continuity Correction ^a	2.108	1	.147		
Likelihood Ratio	2.575	1	.109		
Fisher's Exact Test				.129	.073
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.558	1	.110		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.73.

Table B-14. Digital Software Consulting * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Digital Software Consulting	Not Recognized	78	84	162
	Recognized	6	11	17
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.021 ^b	1	.312		
Continuity Correction ^a	.570	1	.450		
Likelihood Ratio	1.038	1	.308		
Fisher's Exact Test				.445	.226
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.015	1	.314		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b.

0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.98.

Table B-15. Coors Light * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Coors Light	Not Recognized	44	42	86
	Recognized	40	53	93
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.192 ^b	1	.275		
Continuity Correction ^a	.887	1	.346		
Likelihood Ratio	1.193	1	.275		
Fisher's Exact Test				.297	.173
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.186	1	.276		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.36.

Table B-16. Pizza Hut * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Pizza Hut	Not Recognized	17	19	36
	Recognized	67	76	143
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.002 ^b	1	.968	1.000	.590
Continuity Correction ^a	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.002	1	.968		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	.002	1	.968		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.89.

Table B-17. Miller Lite * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Miller Lite	Not Recognized	19	14	33
	Recognized	65	81	146
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.842 ^b	1	.175	.183	.122
Continuity Correction ^a	1.355	1	.244		
Likelihood Ratio	1.841	1	.175		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.832	1	.176		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.49.

Table B-18. Shell * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Shell	Not Recognized	75	80	155
	Recognized	9	15	24
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.989 ^b	1	.320	.383	.220
Continuity Correction ^a	.600	1	.438		
Likelihood Ratio	1.001	1	.317		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	.984	1	.321		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.26.

Table B-19. Office Depot * Gender

Crosstab

Count		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Office Depot	Not Recognized	73	84	157
	Recognized	11	11	22
Total		84	95	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.095 ^b	1	.758	1.000	.705
Continuity Correction ^a	.006	1	.936		
Likelihood Ratio	.095	1	.758		
Fisher's Exact Test					
Linear-by-Linear Association	.095	1	.758		
N of Valid Cases	179				

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.32.

Table B-20. Crosstabs – Age

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Ace Hardware * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Coca-Cola * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Cingular Wireless * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
La Office Supply * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Ochsner * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Chevron * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
5 Minute Oil Change * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Safari Car Wash * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Tropicana * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
St. Charles General * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Academy Sports * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Baby Ruth * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Digital Software Consulting * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Coors Light * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Pizza Hut * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Miller Lite * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Shell * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Office Depot * Age	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%

Table B-21. Ace Hardware * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Ace Hardware	Not Recognized	7	20	82	25	7	141
	Recognized	3	2	23	5	5	38
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.798 ^a	4	.215
Likelihood Ratio	5.725	4	.221
Linear-by-Linear Association	.847	1	.357
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.12.

Table B-22. Coca-Cola * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Coca-Cola	Not Recognized	3	5	17	8	2	35
	Recognized	7	17	88	22	10	144
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.618 ^a	4	.624
Likelihood Ratio	2.504	4	.644
Linear-by-Linear Association	.082	1	.774
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.96.

Table B-23. Cingular Wireless * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Cingular Wireless	Not Recognized	7	5	35	6	3	56
	Recognized	3	17	70	24	9	123
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.924 ^a	4	.042
Likelihood Ratio	9.460	4	.051
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.843	1	.050
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.13.

Table B-24. La Office Supply * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
La Office Supply	Not Recognized	9	16	72	20	6	123
	Recognized	1	6	33	10	6	56
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.287 ^a	4	.369
Likelihood Ratio	4.615	4	.329
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.489	1	.062
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.13.

Table B-25. Ochsner * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Ochsner	Not Recognized	6	7	47	9	4	73
	Recognized	4	15	58	21	8	106
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.670 ^a	4	.323
Likelihood Ratio	4.711	4	.318
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.406	1	.236
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.08.

Table B-26. Chevron * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Chevron	Not Recognized	6	17	62	21	7	113
	Recognized	4	5	43	9	5	66
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.411 ^a	4	.491
Likelihood Ratio	3.561	4	.469
Linear-by-Linear Association	.076	1	.783
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.69.

Table B-27. 5 Minute Oil Change * Age

Crosstab

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
5 Minute Oil Change	Not Recognized	8	15	79	16	6	124
	Recognized	2	7	26	14	6	55
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.983 ^a	4	.092
Likelihood Ratio	7.689	4	.104
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.295	1	.038
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.07.

Table B-28. Safari Car Wash * Age

Crosstab

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Safari Car Wash	Not Recognized	3	8	39	6	4	60
	Recognized	7	14	66	24	8	119
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.215 ^a	4	.523
Likelihood Ratio	3.433	4	.488
Linear-by-Linear Association	.519	1	.471
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.35.

Table B-29. Tropicana * Age

Crosstab

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Tropicana	Not Recognized	10	21	96	27	12	166
	Recognized		1	9	3		13
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.565 ^a	4	.633
Likelihood Ratio	4.148	4	.386
Linear-by-Linear Association	.135	1	.713
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .73.

Table B-30. St. Charles General * Age

Crosstab

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
St. Charles General	Not Recognized	10	21	91	27	11	160
	Recognized		1	14	3	1	19
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.937 ^a	4	.568
Likelihood Ratio	4.153	4	.386
Linear-by-Linear Association	.560	1	.454
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.06.

Table B-31. Academy Sports * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Academy Sports	Not Recognized	7	12	72	14	3	108
	Recognized	3	10	33	16	9	71
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.277 ^a	4	.015
Likelihood Ratio	12.236	4	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.233	1	.022
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.97.

Table B-32. Baby Ruth * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Baby Ruth	Not Recognized	6	5	47	9	7	74
	Recognized	4	17	58	21	5	105
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.106 ^a	4	.088
Likelihood Ratio	8.349	4	.080
Linear-by-Linear Association	.032	1	.858
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.13.

Table B-33. Digital Software Consulting * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Digital Software Consulting	Not Recognized	9	19	95	28	11	162
	Recognized	1	3	10	2	1	17
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.740 ^a	4	.946
Likelihood Ratio	.723	4	.948
Linear-by-Linear Association	.381	1	.537
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .95.

Table B-34. Coors Light * Age**Crosstab**

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Coors Light	Not Recognized	8	11	48	17	2	86
	Recognized	2	11	57	13	10	93
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.980 ^a	4	.041
Likelihood Ratio	10.710	4	.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.962	1	.047
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.80.

Table B-35. Pizza Hut * Age

Crosstab

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Pizza Hut	Not Recognized	3	5	20	7	1	36
	Recognized	7	17	85	23	11	143
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.006 ^a	4	.735
Likelihood Ratio	2.166	4	.705
Linear-by-Linear Association	.866	1	.352
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.01.

Table B-36. Miller Lite * Age

Crosstab

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Miller Lite	Not Recognized	3	3	21	3	3	33
	Recognized	7	19	84	27	9	146
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.161 ^a	4	.531
Likelihood Ratio	3.273	4	.513
Linear-by-Linear Association	.233	1	.630
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.84.

Table B-37. Shell * Age

Crosstab

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Shell	Not Recognized	8	21	90	26	10	155
	Recognized	2	1	15	4	2	24
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.042 ^a	4	.728
Likelihood Ratio	2.433	4	.657
Linear-by-Linear Association	.119	1	.730
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.34.

Table B-38. Office Depot * Age

Crosstab

Count		Age					Total
		18-25	26-35	36-50	51-65	65+	
Office Depot	Not Recognized	9	20	93	24	11	157
	Recognized	1	2	12	6	1	22
Total		10	22	105	30	12	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.158 ^a	4	.707
Likelihood Ratio	1.973	4	.741
Linear-by-Linear Association	.423	1	.516
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.23.

Table B-39. Crosstabs – Income

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Ace Hardware * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Coca-Cola * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Cingular Wireless * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
La Office Supply * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Ochsner * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Chevron * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
5 Minute Oil Change * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Safari Car Wash * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Tropicana * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
St. Charles General * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Academy Sports * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Baby Ruth * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Digital Software Consulting * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Coors Light * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Pizza Hut * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Miller Lite * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Shell * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%
Office Depot * Income	161	89.9%	18	10.1%	179	100.0%

Table B-40. Ace Hardware * Income**Crosstab**

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Ace Hardware	Not Recognized	25	25	29	24	12	14	129
	Recognized	5	5	4	7	4	7	32
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.428 ^a	5	.490
Likelihood Ratio	4.284	5	.509
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.808	1	.094
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.18.

Table B-41. Coca-Cola * Income**Crosstab**

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Coca-Cola	Not Recognized	5	6	5	5	2	7	30
	Recognized	25	24	28	26	14	14	131
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.896 ^a	5	.565
Likelihood Ratio	3.527	5	.619
Linear-by-Linear Association	.818	1	.366
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.98.

Table B-42. Cingular Wireless * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Cingular Wireless	Not Recognized	9	4	14	8	4	9	48
	Recognized	21	26	19	23	12	12	113
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.525 ^a	5	.130
Likelihood Ratio	8.907	5	.113
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.175	1	.278
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 1 cells (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.77.

Table B-43. La Office Supply * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
La Office	Not Recognized	26	19	21	22	10	11	109
Supply	Recognized	4	11	12	9	6	10	52
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.049 ^a	5	.154
Likelihood Ratio	8.731	5	.120
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.428	1	.035
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.17.

Table B-44. Ochsner * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Ochsner	Not Recognized	17	14	11	17	2	3	64
	Recognized	13	16	22	14	14	18	97
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.345 ^a	5	.003
Likelihood Ratio	19.896	5	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.170	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.36.

Table B-45. Chevron * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Chevron	Not Recognized	16	20	19	22	10	10	97
	Recognized	14	10	14	9	6	11	64
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.133 ^a	5	.530
Likelihood Ratio	4.162	5	.526
Linear-by-Linear Association	.028	1	.868
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.36.

Table B-46. 5 Minute Oil Change * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
5 Minute Oil Change	Not Recognized	20	22	22	21	10	15	110
	Recognized	10	8	11	10	6	6	51
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.777 ^a	5	.978
Likelihood Ratio	.782	5	.978
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.951
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.07.

Table B-47. Safari Car Wash * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Safari Car Wash	Not Recognized	10	10	8	15	4	5	52
	Recognized	20	20	25	16	12	16	109
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.760 ^a	5	.330
Likelihood Ratio	5.642	5	.343
Linear-by-Linear Association	.140	1	.708
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.17.

Table B-48. Tropicana * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Tropicana	Not Recognized	29	28	29	29	16	18	149
	Recognized	1	2	4	2		3	12
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.562 ^a	5	.472
Likelihood Ratio	5.502	5	.358
Linear-by-Linear Association	.630	1	.427
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.19.

Table B-49. St. Charles General * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
St. Charles	Not Recognized	29	28	26	28	14	17	142
General	Recognized	1	2	7	3	2	4	19
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.836 ^a	5	.233
Likelihood Ratio	7.079	5	.215
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.591	1	.107
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.89.

Table B-50. Academy Sports * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Academy Sports	Not Recognized	19	18	20	21	8	12	98
	Recognized	11	12	13	10	8	9	63
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.618 ^a	5	.899
Likelihood Ratio	1.614	5	.900
Linear-by-Linear Association	.236	1	.627
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.26.

Table B-51. Baby Ruth * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Baby Ruth	Not Recognized	10	12	14	17	3	8	64
	Recognized	20	18	19	14	13	13	97
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.532 ^a	5	.258
Likelihood Ratio	6.785	5	.237
Linear-by-Linear Association	.005	1	.946
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.36.

Table B-52. Digital Software Consulting * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Digital Software	Not Recognized	27	26	29	26	16	20	144
Consulting	Recognized	3	4	4	5		1	17
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.994 ^a	5	.550
Likelihood Ratio	5.703	5	.336
Linear-by-Linear Association	.831	1	.362
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.69.

Table B-53. Coors Light * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Coors	Not Recognized	18	11	17	14	9	10	79
Light	Recognized	12	19	16	17	7	11	82
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.897 ^a	5	.564
Likelihood Ratio	3.931	5	.559
Linear-by-Linear Association	.066	1	.797
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.85.

Table B-54. Pizza Hut * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Pizza Hut	Not Recognized	6	6	6	8	1	5	32
	Recognized	24	24	27	23	15	16	129
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.814 ^a	5	.729
Likelihood Ratio	3.295	5	.655
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.985
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.18.

Table B-55. Miller Lite * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Miller Lite	Not Recognized	7	4	6	6	1	4	28
	Recognized	23	26	27	25	15	17	133
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.601 ^a	5	.761
Likelihood Ratio	2.932	5	.710
Linear-by-Linear Association	.295	1	.587
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.78.

Table B-56. Shell * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Shell	Not Recognized	27	26	29	26	15	17	140
	Recognized	3	4	4	5	1	4	21
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.851 ^a	5	.869
Likelihood Ratio	1.917	5	.860
Linear-by-Linear Association	.381	1	.537
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.09.

Table B-57. Office Depot * Income

Crosstab

Count		Income						Total
		under \$25,000	\$25,000-\$35,000	\$35,000-\$49,000	\$50,000-\$75,000	\$70,000-\$99,000	\$100,000 or more	
Office Depot	Not Recognized	26	26	28	28	14	17	139
	Recognized	4	4	5	3	2	4	22
Total		30	30	33	31	16	21	161

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.019 ^a	5	.961
Likelihood Ratio	1.011	5	.962
Linear-by-Linear Association	.086	1	.770
N of Valid Cases	161		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.19.

Table B-58. Crosstabs – Education

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Ace Hardware * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Coca-Cola * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Cingular Wireless * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
La Office Supply * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Ochsner * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Chevron * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
5 Minute Oil Change * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Safari Car Wash * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Tropicana * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
St. Charles General * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Academy Sports * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Baby Ruth * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Digital Software Consulting * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Coors Light * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Pizza Hut * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Miller Lite * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Shell * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%
Office Depot * Education	178	99.4%	1	.6%	179	100.0%

Table B-59. Ace Hardware * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Ace Hardware	Not Recognized	2	50	24	34	11	19	140
	Recognized		6	17	10	2	3	38
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.299 ^a	5	.009
Likelihood Ratio	14.973	5	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	.011	1	.917
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table B-60. Coca-Cola * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Coca-Cola	Not Recognized	1	10	8	7	2	6	34
	Recognized	1	46	33	37	11	16	144
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.653 ^a	5	.753
Likelihood Ratio	2.316	5	.804
Linear-by-Linear Association	.122	1	.727
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

Table B-61. Cingular Wireless * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education					Total	
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school		Graduate degree
Cingular Wireless	Not Recognized		18	13	13	3	8	55
	Recognized	2	38	28	31	10	14	123
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.665 ^a	5	.893
Likelihood Ratio	2.261	5	.812
Linear-by-Linear Association	.033	1	.856
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .62.

Table B-62. La Office Supply * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education					Total	
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school		Graduate degree
La Office	Not Recognized	1	42	27	23	9	20	122
Supply	Recognized	1	14	14	21	4	2	56
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.048 ^a	5	.034
Likelihood Ratio	12.938	5	.024
Linear-by-Linear Association	.342	1	.559
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .63.

Table B-63. Ochsner * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Ochsner	Not Recognized		28	17	20	4	4	73
	Recognized	2	28	24	24	9	18	105
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.927 ^a	5	.112
Likelihood Ratio	10.163	5	.071
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.639	1	.031
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .82.

Table B-64. Chevron * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Chevron	Not Recognized	1	28	24	33	9	18	113
	Recognized	1	28	17	11	4	4	65
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.874 ^a	5	.054
Likelihood Ratio	11.217	5	.047
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.430	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .73.

Table B-65. 5 Minute Oil Change * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
5 Minute Oil Change	Not Recognized	2	42	23	29	9	18	123
	Recognized		14	18	15	4	4	55
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.930 ^a	5	.226
Likelihood Ratio	7.528	5	.184
Linear-by-Linear Association	.088	1	.766
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .62.

Table B-66. Safari Car Wash * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Safari Car Wash	Not Recognized		17	14	18	5	6	60
	Recognized	2	39	27	26	8	16	118
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.862 ^a	5	.721
Likelihood Ratio	3.476	5	.627
Linear-by-Linear Association	.156	1	.693
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .67.

Table B-67. Tropicana * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Tropicana	Not Recognized	2	53	38	37	13	22	165
	Recognized		3	3	7			13
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.042 ^a	5	.154
Likelihood Ratio	9.645	5	.086
Linear-by-Linear Association	.108	1	.742
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 7 cells (58.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

Table B-68. St. Charles General * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
St. Charles General	Not Recognized	2	52	36	36	12	21	159
	Recognized		4	5	8	1	1	19
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.660 ^a	5	.459
Likelihood Ratio	4.779	5	.443
Linear-by-Linear Association	.025	1	.874
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .21.

Table B-69. Academy Sports * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Academy Sports	Not Recognized	2	34	20	29	7	15	107
	Recognized		22	21	15	6	7	71
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.958 ^a	5	.421
Likelihood Ratio	5.644	5	.342
Linear-by-Linear Association	.237	1	.626
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

Table B-70. Baby Ruth * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Baby Ruth	Not Recognized		20	18	21	4	11	74
	Recognized	2	36	23	23	9	11	104
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.260 ^a	5	.513
Likelihood Ratio	5.004	5	.415
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.361	1	.243
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .83.

Table B-71. Digital Software Consulting * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Digital Software Consulting	Not Recognized	2	49	38	37	13	22	161
	Recognized		7	3	7			17
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.767 ^a	5	.239
Likelihood Ratio	9.953	5	.077
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.863	1	.172
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .19.

Table B-72. Coors Light * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Coors Light	Not Recognized		30	18	19	9	9	85
	Recognized	2	26	23	25	4	13	93
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.017 ^a	5	.305
Likelihood Ratio	6.836	5	.233
Linear-by-Linear Association	.064	1	.800
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .96.

Table B-73. Pizza Hut * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Pizza Hut	Not Recognized		12	7	13	1	3	36
	Recognized	2	44	34	31	12	19	142
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.036 ^a	5	.411
Likelihood Ratio	5.587	5	.349
Linear-by-Linear Association	.215	1	.643
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

Table B-74. Miller Lite * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Miller Lite	Not Recognized	1	6	10	8	2	6	33
	Recognized	1	50	31	36	11	16	145
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.711 ^a	5	.335
Likelihood Ratio	5.562	5	.351
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.265	1	.261
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .37.

Table B-75. Shell * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Shell	Not Recognized	2	49	33	37	12	21	154
	Recognized		7	8	7	1	1	24
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.738 ^a	5	.588
Likelihood Ratio	4.371	5	.497
Linear-by-Linear Association	.721	1	.396
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.

Table B-76. Office Depot * Education

Crosstab

Count		Education						Total
		Less than high school	High school diploma	Some college	College degree	Some graduate school	Graduate degree	
Office Depot	Not Recognized	2	51	34	37	11	21	156
	Recognized		5	7	7	2	1	22
Total		2	56	41	44	13	22	178

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.593 ^a	5	.609
Likelihood Ratio	4.121	5	.532
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.947
N of Valid Cases	178		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .25.

Table B-77. Crosstabs – Attendance Frequency

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Ace Hardware * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Coca-Cola * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Cingular Wireless * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
La Office Supply * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Ochsner * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Chevron * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
5 Minute Oil Change * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Safari Car Wash * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Tropicana * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
St. Charles General * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Academy Sports * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Baby Ruth * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Digital Software Consulting * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Coors Light * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Pizza Hut * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Miller Lite * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Shell * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%
Office Depot * Attendance	179	100.0%	0	.0%	179	100.0%

Table B-78. Ace Hardware * Attendance**Crosstab**

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Ace Hardware	Not Recognized	33	36	14	22	36	141
	Recognized	4	10	5	4	15	38
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.276 ^a	4	.260
Likelihood Ratio	5.542	4	.236
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.871	1	.090
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.03.

Table B-79. Coca-Cola * Attendance**Crosstab**

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Coca-Cola	Not Recognized	9	10	3	7	6	35
	Recognized	28	36	16	19	45	144
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.711 ^a	4	.447
Likelihood Ratio	3.870	4	.424
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.665	1	.197
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.72.

Table B-80. Cingular Wireless * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Cingular Wireless	Not Recognized	16	17	7	6	10	56
	Recognized	21	29	12	20	41	123
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.472 ^a	4	.113
Likelihood Ratio	7.649	4	.105
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.102	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.94.

Table B-81. La Office Supply * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
La Office Supply	Not Recognized	30	36	11	20	26	123
	Recognized	7	10	8	6	25	56
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.893 ^a	4	.008
Likelihood Ratio	13.748	4	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.500	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.94.

Table B-82. Ochsner * Attendance**Crosstab**

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Ochsner	Not Recognized	20	25	7	8	13	73
	Recognized	17	21	12	18	38	106
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.344 ^a	4	.015
Likelihood Ratio	12.552	4	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.410	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.75.

Table B-83 Chevron * Attendance**Crosstab**

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Chevron	Not Recognized	31	36	11	13	22	113
	Recognized	6	10	8	13	29	66
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.213 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	23.046	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.385	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.01.

Table B-84. 5 Minute Oil Change * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
5 Minute Oil Change	Not Recognized	29	39	13	19	24	124
	Recognized	8	7	6	7	27	55
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.647 ^a	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	18.467	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.931	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.84.

Table B-85. Safari Car Wash * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Safari Car Wash	Not Recognized	27	18	5	6	4	60
	Recognized	10	28	14	20	47	119
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43.298 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	45.539	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.787	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.37.

Table B-86. Tropicana * Attendance**Crosstab**

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Tropicana	Not Recognized	37	45	15	24	45	166
	Recognized		1	4	2	6	13
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.573 ^a	4	.021
Likelihood Ratio	12.976	4	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.375	1	.020
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.38.

Table B-87. St. Charles General * Attendance**Crosstab**

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
St. Charles	Not Recognized	36	42	15	22	45	160
General	Recognized	1	4	4	4	6	19
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.496 ^a	4	.240
Likelihood Ratio	5.938	4	.204
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.072	1	.150
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.02.

Table B-88. Academy Sports * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Academy Sports	Not Recognized	28	34	9	20	17	108
	Recognized	9	12	10	6	34	71
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.044 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	27.282	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.349	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.54.

Table B-89. Baby Ruth * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Baby Ruth	Not Recognized	23	23	8	13	7	74
	Recognized	14	23	11	13	44	105
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.884 ^a	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	27.197	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.870	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.85.

Table B-90. Digital Software Consulting * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Digital Software Consulting	Not Recognized	34	45	16	21	46	162
	Recognized	3	1	3	5	5	17
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.700 ^a	4	.153
Likelihood Ratio	7.167	4	.127
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.432	1	.232
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 5 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.80.

Table B-91. Coors Light * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Coors Light	Not Recognized	18	26	7	14	21	86
	Recognized	19	20	12	12	30	93
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.599 ^a	4	.463
Likelihood Ratio	3.620	4	.460
Linear-by-Linear Association	.911	1	.340
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.13.

Table B-92. Pizza Hut * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Pizza Hut	Not Recognized	14	8	3	5	6	36
	Recognized	23	38	16	21	45	143
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.893 ^a	4	.042
Likelihood Ratio	9.132	4	.058
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.205	1	.013
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.82.

Table B-93. Miller Lite * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Miller Lite	Not Recognized	8	11	3	5	6	33
	Recognized	29	35	16	21	45	146
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.776 ^a	4	.596
Likelihood Ratio	2.884	4	.577
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.055	1	.152
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.50.

Table B-94. Shell * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Shell	Not Recognized	35	44	15	19	42	155
	Recognized	2	2	4	7	9	24
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.129 ^a	4	.025
Likelihood Ratio	11.683	4	.020
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.498	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.55.

Table B-95. Office Depot * Attendance

Crosstab

Count		Attendance					Total
		2-3 games	4-6 games	7-10 games	More than 10 games	More than 20 games	
Office Depot	Not Recognized	35	43	15	22	42	157
	Recognized	2	3	4	4	9	22
Total		37	46	19	26	51	179

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.989 ^a	4	.200
Likelihood Ratio	6.262	4	.180
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.278	1	.039
N of Valid Cases	179		

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.34.

VITA

With more than five years experience in marketing and public relations, Amy Marie Boyle is an account executive with Logan Marketing and Communications, managing marketing efforts for a host of clients in various industries including healthcare, banking, retail, hospitality and non-profit. Previously, Amy served as promotions manager, then marketing director for the New Orleans Brass Hockey Team.

Boyle also has worked at Louisiana State University's Department of Athletics and University of New Orleans Athletics in marketing and promotions. A native of New Orleans, Louisiana, Boyle served as public relations coordinator for the Super Bowl XXXI Host Committee in New Orleans in 1996. In addition to Super Bowl XXXI, Boyle helped lead public relations efforts for the 1996 AAU Junior Olympic Games and a 1996 Houston Rockets/San Antonio Spurs exhibition game held in New Orleans as part of the Greater New Orleans Sports Foundation staff.

Boyle received a Bachelor of Arts in Communication from Loyola University New Orleans. She will receive a Master of Mass Communication from Louisiana State University in December, 2001.