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ABSTRACT

Maximizing the Impact of Sponsorship: An Examination of Sponsorship on Attendees’ Recognition of Sponsors and Their Attitudes Toward Corporate Sponsorship

by

Eunju Suh

Dr. Curtis Love, Examination Committee Chair
Assistant Professor of Tourism & Convention Administration
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Sponsorships are a critical component of the exhibition industry. Sponsorships are not only a financial source of revenue for associations and show management but also a tool to assist a sponsor’s marketing objectives. In today’s business environment, sponsorships are customized to meet specific company needs and sponsors expect more benefits derived from their contributions. However, little empirical research has been devoted to assessing how public preferences for specific sponsorships are related to sponsorship evaluation in the convention and exposition industry.

The purpose of this study was to measure the impact of sponsorships on trade show attendees. This study sought to understand whether different types of sponsorships, number of days attending at a show, and demographic characteristics differently influenced attendees’ recognition of sponsors and their overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorship.

For this study, a questionnaire was designed to measure trade show attendees’ recognition of sponsoring companies, overall attitudes toward sponsorship, preferences for specific sponsorship types, and demo-
graphic information. Attendees were queried while exiting the Association of Progressive Rental Organizations' Convention and Trade show (APRO) in Las Vegas from July 24 and to 25, 2002.

In the recognition test, names of actual sponsors and non-sponsors (companies who were exhibitors only) were listed on the questionnaire and attendees were asked to indicate whether or not they recognized the name of sponsors at the show by checking yes or no. In addition, measurements to detect whether these different sponsorship types influenced attitudes towards corporate sponsorships in general were made. Attendees were asked whether they support corporate sponsorships and to indicate the degree of importance of each nine different sponsorship types (refreshment breaks, meals, educational sessions, tote bags, badge holders, keynote address, closing banquet, cocktail reception, e-mail station). Demographic information including age, gender, number of days in attendance at the show, and purchasing role were also gathered. Repeated annual attendance at a show, a variable relating to exposition, was also asked. A total of 221 attendees completed the survey on a voluntary basis and 206 questionnaires were usable. Data were analyzed by using T-test, ANOVA, and Multiple Regression with SPSS 11.0 for Windows.

Results show that different types of sponsorships affected attendees' recognition level of the sponsors. Sponsorship items such as massage station, complimentary ice cream, diner/entertainment, and keynote speaker/general session had higher recognition than other sponsorship types. In addition, as duration of attendance increased, attendees' recognition of sponsors also increased ($F_{3,199}=12.679$). Overall, actual sponsors ($N=14$) achieved much higher recognition level ($t=4.134$, $p=.001$) than non sponsors ($N=4$). The results of the Multiple Regression analysis on the overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorships indi-
cated that three sponsorship types (food and beverage, tote bag and badge holders, and e-mail station), one demographic characteristic (education level) and repeated annual attendance were positive predictors of overall attendee attitudes toward corporate sponsorships.

This study helps show managers and sponsors in the convention and exposition industry understand how to accomplish sponsors’ objectives by selecting appropriate sponsorship items. In addition, the results of this study will be a good guide for sponsors to promote their brand message, to become high-profile sponsors, and to maximize positive impacts of sponsorships. The results of this study are applicable to the APRO show, as well as other rental equipment shows. The results may be generalizable to other expositions that utilize similar sponsorship opportunities. For future study, all aspects of conventions and trade show phenomena need to be collectively integrated for sponsorship evaluation in order to obtain a more complete understanding of sponsorship impact, such as attendees’ attitudes, recognition, and purchase behaviors.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sponsorships As A Revenue Source and Marketing Tool

Sponsorships have become a critical component in every aspect of promotional efforts in the convention and exhibition industry. Sponsorships are not only a financial source of revenue for associations and show management companies but also a tool to assist a sponsor's marketing objectives. Higgison (2001) mentioned the spending trend on sponsorships in the exhibition industry is expected to continue because trade associations and meeting managers are looking for new revenue streams to keep membership fees down, registration fees low, and services up to maintain member and attendee loyalty.

Cooke (2002, p.51) said, "Dollars might be tight, but companies still are spending money on sponsorships." In fact, industry and trade associations acquired $270 million from sponsors, up from $250 million in 2000, according to IEG, a Chicago-based research and consulting firm (Cook, 2002). Also, the result of Tradeshow Week's 10th Annual Survey of Exposition Managers and their Operational Policies revealed that 85% of show managers offer sponsorship opportunities at their largest shows and 17% of respondents said sponsorship revenue will generate the most growth for their companies or associations in 2001 (Farber, 2001). The survey by Tradeshow Week magazine, which asked show managers "Which sources are likely to generate the most revenue growth for their organization's consumer show operations in the next two years?" revealed
that increased exhibit space revenue (79%), increase attendance revenue (69%), increased sponsor revenue (65%), new show launches (30%), acquisitions (11%), web site (10%), other (9%), joint ventures (5%), conference program development/enhancement (5%), and ancillaries such as attendee list rental (1%) would generate revenue for their shows (Trade-show Week, 2001).

For show organizers, sponsorships are an additional value-added benefit to offer exhibitors and exhibitor prospects while offsetting costs and producing additional revenues (Hough 2001). "The advantages of sponsorships for show management include: increased revenue, raised profile of the show; and, in the case of association show management, increased non-dues revenue percentage/ratio (Farber, 2001, p.6)."

"Sponsorships also build excitement that increases a show's visibility and memorability by giving prospective attendees an additional incentive to be present (Hough, 2001, p.41)."

In addition, sponsorships are recognized as a marketing opportunity to access potential customers. Higgison (2001) described the power of sponsorships as following:

Simultaneously, the market-driven economy is forcing corporations to create personal relationships and communities with their consumers through shared experiences to maintain loyalty. Sponsorship solves both challenges. Sponsorship allows the exhibitor to leverage the product demonstration and sampling with entertainment or a service and create a more personal relationship with the attendee on the show. The entertainment or service enhances the quality of the trade show experience for the attendees, who then goes home and tells his or her clients, family or friends the sponsored experience, thus reinforcing the brand for both and the trade show and its sponsors (p.12).

Using sponsorship as a promotional and marketing tool also includes many benefits. One of the objectives companies want to accomplish through the sponsorship is branding, image-building, and sales generation. Advantages for companies who choose to be sponsors include oppor-
tunities for: increased exposure, greater access to a specific audience, enhanced brand loyalty, increased sales and support of the association, profession or event (Gilbert, 1988; Farber, 2001; Ehmann, 2002).

Research Justification and Rationale

There have been several studies (Stotlar & Johnson, 1989; Meenaghan, 1991; Marshall & Cook, 1992; Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Crompton, 1994; McDaniel, 1995; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996; Thwaites and Caruthers, 1996; McCarville, Flood & Froats, 1998; Meenaghan, 1998; Olsen, 1998; Jung, 1999; Karabestsos, 1999; Ludwig & Karabestsos, 1999; Mowen, 1999; Rodgers, 2000; Busser, Benson, & Feinstein, 2001; Ehmann 2002), which investigated sponsorships.

Other studies (Stotlar & Johnson, 1989; McDaniel, 1995; Jung, 1999; Busser, Benson, & Feinstein, 2001) examining sponsorship programs found that they positively affect corporate awareness. However, few of them examined the impacts of sponsorship on attitude toward sponsors or sponsorship activities or products. This attitudinal aspect had generally been examined from only the perspective of the corporate sponsor and not from convention attendees.

However, in the review of existing literature that have addressed sponsorships impact, the majority of the studies concern the sponsorship of athletic events. In addition, most often the spectators' awareness, recognition, and recall of sponsors were measured.

Since the ultimate goal of sponsorship is to influence consumer behavior, it is important that consumer preferences and attitudes be ascertained (Mowen, 1999). Olson (1998) supported the idea that sponsorship impact on the public’s attitudes toward the corporations and also indicated overall attitudes could be the link explaining the relationship between product/company attributes and purchase-related behavior.
Researchers also indicated that corporations have assumed that sponsorship is a powerful promotional tool, but little effort has been made in evaluating the impact of sponsorship especially in the attendees' perspectives. Thwaites and Caruthers (1996) found that while more sponsors were attempting to evaluate the impact of their sponsoring activities by monitoring guest feedback and measuring gains in media coverage, these approaches were unsophisticated and used intermittently in general. The researchers believed that most companies do not fully understand the difficulty and challenge in sponsorship evaluation.

It was reported that companies typically spend at least two times the sponsorship fee on additional advertising and promotional program (Meenaghan, 1998). Considering the high level of spending on sponsorship programs, companies need to understand how sponsorship programs can benefit their organization and what type of measurable results they can expect from sponsorship program (Olsen, 1998).

This reasoning can be applied to the convention and exhibition industry. While there are diverse forms of sponsorships in this industry, there have been few attempts to examine the impact of sponsorships.

Given the limitations of the current knowledge about the impacts of corporate sponsorship, there is a clear need for research which can help understand how best to use sponsorships to achieve sponsoring companies' objectives in the conventions and exhibitions. This research was designed to examine the impact of sponsorship types, exposition related factors, and attendee demographics on the recognition of sponsors and overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorship. Since there is neither sufficient research nor evaluation of the impact of sponsorship in the convention and exhibition area, this research would be very helpful for sponsors and show managers to operate successful sponsorship activities.
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to measure the impact of sponsorships on convention and trade show attendees. For this, the present study proposed a corporate sponsorship evaluation model that examined whether different types of sponsorships, repeated annual attendance, and demographic characteristics were significantly related to the attendees’ attitudes toward corporate sponsorships. This study also measured attendee recognition by sponsorship type and duration of attendance. In addition, actual sponsors were compared each other as well as with non-sponsors (exhibitors only) to measure differences in recognition level.

Research Questions

Four research questions associated this study were developed. Research questions are as follows:

Q 1: Do different types of sponsorships affect attendees’ recognition levels of the sponsors?
Q 2: Do different numbers of days attending a show affect attendees’ recognition levels of the sponsors?
Q 3: Will sponsors receive more recognition than non-sponsors?
Q 4: Do different types of sponsorships, attendee demographics (age, gender, education, and purchasing position in the company), and repeated annual attendance at a show influence attendees’ attitudes toward corporate sponsorship?

Statement of Hypotheses

Hypotheses associated research questions are as follows:

- H1: Actual sponsors will not achieve higher recognition level than non-sponsors (exhibitors only).  
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• H2: Recognition level of sponsors is independent of the number of days attending a show.

• H3: There will be no significant relationship between attendees' attitudes toward sponsorships by corporation and their preferences for different sponsorship types, such as refreshment breaks, meals, keynote addresses, educational sessions, tote bags, badge holders, cocktail receptions, banquet, and e-mail station, and demographic characteristics, such as gender, education, and purchasing role, and repeated annual attendance at a show as a variable relating to expositions.

**Independent Variables**

Independent variables in this study are the nine types of sponsorship: (1) refreshment breaks, (2) meals such as diners and luncheon (3) keynote addresses, (4) educational sessions, (5) tote bags, (6) badge holders, (7) cocktail reception, (8) banquet, and (9) e-mail station.

In addition, demographic characteristics such as gender, number of days attending a show, purchase role, and education level, and repeated annual attendance as a factor relating to exhibitions were considered as independent variables.

**Dependent Variables**

Two dependent variables in this study were attendees' recognition level and their attitudes toward sponsorships by corporations.

**Attendees' Recognition of Sponsors**

A total of 18 sponsors participating in the APRO show were listed. Fourteen actual sponsors and 4 non-sponsors (exhibitors only) were listed on the attendees' questionnaire in a random order. Actual sponsor names were randomly selected by sponsorship type for this survey.
Attendees indicated whether they recognized sponsors at the show by answering "yes" or "no".

**Attitude Toward Sponsorships by Corporations**

To measure attendees' attitude and their sponsorship preferences, the Likert scale from 1 (very opposed) to 5 (very supportive) was employed.

**Significance of the Study**

This study attempted to evaluate the impact of sponsorships in the convention and exposition area and the data and analysis may be generalized in other industries. Participants in the survey and readers will receive an increased understanding of sponsorship.

This study will also provide current sponsors, decision makers for sponsorship, and potential sponsors effective methods to increase attendees' recognition of sponsors and positive attitude toward corporate sponsorship. The findings will help show managers to understand characteristics of sponsorship types. This will assist them in practicing successful sponsorship program fitting the objectives of sponsors, offering attractive sponsorship opportunities, pricing them right, and convincing potential sponsors to participate in sponsorship programs.

**Definitions of Terms**

Following terms were used in this study.

- **Sponsorship**: any type of sponsorship at exhibitions such as food and beverage, special attraction areas, services, products, and events.
- **Recognition of sponsors**: the ability of identifying the company name of sponsors.
• Type of sponsorship: (1) refreshment breaks, (2) meals such as dinners and luncheon (3) keynote addresses, (4) educational sessions, (5) tote bags, (6) badge holders, (7) cocktail reception, (8) banquet, and (9) e-mail station

• Sponsor: Corporations that buy opportunities to promote their companies with sponsorship activities

• Attitude: An overall evaluation, which may include a person’s knowledge and overall feelings toward some object. The present study will focus on the affective or evaluative component of attendees’ attitude (Mowen, 1999).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Today, corporations are placing an increased emphasis on the sponsor's ability to show a return on investment (Mowen 1999). If Show Managers are to make the best use of corporate sponsorships as a resource generation tool and if they are to continue to attract sponsors, they must first understand how to evaluate the impact of sponsorship and which conditions maximize the impact.

In order to understand better the topic of sponsorships and their impact, the author conducted a review of related literature. This literature review presents the research findings on measuring sponsorship impact. This review will concern definition of sponsorship, sponsorship evaluation, sponsor recognition, sponsorship types and recognition, duration of attendance and recognition, and the impact of sponsorship on attendees' attitudes toward sponsorship by corporations.

Definitions of Sponsorships

There are several definitions of sponsorships in previous literature. Meenaghan (1983) defined 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." Pope and Voges (1998) described sponsorship as the provision of resources (e.g., money, people, equipment) by an organization (the sponsor) di-
rectly to an individual, authority or body (the sponsoree) for the purpose of the sponsor's promotion strategy. Gilbert (1988, p.9) adds: "Sponsorship acts as a link-pin between public relations, advertising and sales promotion." While Gilbert described sponsorship as the intermediaries in the marketing mix, Cornwell (1995, p.15) used the word "orchestration" to define it. "Sponsorship-linked marketing is the orchestration and implementation of marketing activities for the purpose of building and communicating an association (link) to sponsorship."

Sponsorship Evaluation

Every day, companies are faced with the daunting challenge of maximizing their sponsorships to impact business quantitatively and qualitatively before, during and after the event. In an era of down sizing and profit squeeze, the need to prove the impact of special event sponsorship to the bottom line demands an unprecedented level of measurability and accountability (Heffler, 1994, p.1).

The need for sponsorship evaluation was also reflected by Crompton (1993). According to the study, corporations such as Philips Electronics were receiving an increasing amount of sponsorship requests from a variety of organizations. Considering the sheer volume of these requests, the author suggested that corporations needed to carefully evaluate and choose sponsorships, which net the highest potential returns (Crompton, 1993).

A review of the existing literature revealed that many companies have objectives involving in sponsorship and have tried to measure the impact of sponsorship by reviewing sales figures, respondents' image toward sponsors, and their awareness of sponsors. However, companies do not seem to measure their sponsorship efforts effectively. According to Heffler (1994, p.1), "A leading marketer in the arena of global special events recently estimated that fewer than 25% of major-event sponsors
know how to use sponsorships effectively." Kuzma (1990) previously reported that only 50% of companies conducted evaluations of sponsorships. McCarville, Flood & Froats (1998, p.52) concluded that "Corporations do not conduct a truly effective job of evaluating the impact of their sponsorship involvement and they contributed it to the fact that the impact of sponsorship on the consumer are often subtle and difficult to measure."

In addition, there were researchers who doubted the appropriateness of the approach necessary for measuring the impact of sponsorship. The reason was that measuring the explicit impact of sponsorship is complicated by the difficulty of isolating its impact from the other marketing and communication variables (Marshall & Cook, 1992). Therefore, the impacts from other marketing and communication programs going on at the same time make it difficult to measure the impact of the sponsorship (Sleight, 1989; Marshall & Cook, 1992). Moriarty (1994) also supported the concept of integrated marketing communications (IMC), which implies that the impacts of sponsorship can only be understood by integrating the impact of advertising and other promotions. Meenaghan (1983) also suggested that it is difficult to measure the residual impacts from previous sponsorship activity.

Beyond the discussion about the appropriateness of the way measuring the impact of sponsorship, it is crucial to the success of any sponsorship that the sponsors evaluate the overall impact of their sponsorship. "In order to determine the success and effect of a sponsorship involvement, corporations need to evaluate the outcome and results of their investments. As a result, corporations need to require sponsorships to be more accountable to the corporate bottom line (Ludwig & Karabestsos, 1999, p.14)."
The impact of sponsorship can be broadly measured by reviewing sales figures and/or communication effect depending on the objectives of corporations or measuring the attendees' recognition of sponsors (Marshall & Cook, 1992). Sponsorship impact has been measured through sponsor awareness, media equivalencies, sponsorship attitudes and images, and intentions to purchase. Meenaghan (1991) suggested five main methods of measuring sponsorship impact by (1) measuring the level of media coverage/exposure gained, (2) measuring the communications effects of sponsorship involvement, which involves measuring the awareness level, attitudes, perceptions changed regarding sponsorship/sponsors, (3) measuring the sales effectiveness, (4) monitoring guest feedback, and (5) cost-benefit analysis.

Ehmann (2002) said sponsors should take action depending on the objectives of their sponsorship in measuring the result of sponsorship. "A company wishing to boost its media profile, for instance, can track its hits in newspapers, magazines and other venues during and after the show. If you want to increase sales lead, you can track how many people pass through your booth and how many of those visitors turn into actual sales. Then compare the figures with ones from comparable shows at which you bought no sponsorship (Ehmann, 2002, p.69)."

In a study conducted by Ludwig and Karabestsos (1999) eleven companies were surveyed to determine whether the evaluation of their sponsorships was conducted in-house or outsourced. Eight criteria were selected to study the evaluation process. These eight criteria were: hospitality opportunity, sales, media coverage, image and public perception, attitude toward advertisement, distributors, market share, and sponsor awareness. Results indicated that more companies had outsourced evaluation rather than conducted it in-house. Of the 8 criteria examined, only four criteria were commonly used: media coverage, image and
public perception, attitudes toward ads, and sponsor awareness. In addition, they asked eleven companies who had set criteria by which to benchmark the evolution of their sponsorships to rank those criteria by level of importance. The results of this study suggested it is difficult to improve sponsorship performance and maximize its impact as a meaningful promotional event without a clear and meaningful evaluation of it.

Evaluation should be the final step in the sponsorship process and the most important step of all. "Whatever the method(s) utilized it is incumbent on event organizers to properly report the efficacy of the sponsorship to achieve corporate objectives (Arthur, Scott, Woods, & Booker, 1998, p.57).” It would be in the best interest of the sponsor if the evaluation were tied directly to the stated objective of the sponsorship. Both the sponsors and show managers of exhibitions and conventions must conduct the evaluation of sponsorship programs to maximize their positive impact.

If show managers and companies had a better understanding of how sponsorship can enhance the experience of attendees and how it can improve the bottom line, they may be in a better position to establish and manage sponsorships. Understanding how sponsorship activities and potential factors influence attendees’ attitudes and perception toward sponsors/sponsorship will also provide insight to the effective management of sponsorship design and performance.

The following research findings related to sponsorship evaluation will be discussed.

Recognition of Sponsors

As mentioned above, one of the areas of sponsorship evaluation in prior studies was measuring consumer recognition of sponsors. Sponsors
seek to increase consumer awareness of their products or services through sponsorships. Sponsorship has been shown to have a greater impact on consumer awareness of brand than advertising (International Events Group, 1993). Sponsorship is one of the fastest ways to access a target market especially in the convention and exhibition area due to the nature of the show, which attendees voluntarily attend. Therefore, expanding consumer awareness of a sponsoring company and its products or services is one of the founding objectives of sponsorship.

Most studies on sponsorships have used brand awareness as a measurement to evaluate sponsorship achievements. A definition of brand awareness is "the buyer's ability to identify, recognize or recall the brand within the category in sufficient details to make a purchase (Rossiter & Percy, 1987, p.132)." Keller (1993, p.3) said "Brand awareness affects consumer decision-making by influencing the formation and strength of brand associations in the brand image." By increasing consumer awareness, sponsors attempt to influence the development and depth of brand association and increase the chance that consumers will select the brand or product. As a result, brand awareness and brand image will subsequently influence consumers' attitudes toward the products and services of sponsoring companies (Gladden, Milne, & Sutton, 1998).

Several other studies have investigated the awareness created by sponsorship and these studies have shown mixed results. Studies tracking awareness of sponsors or their brand (Stotlar & Johnson, 1989; McDaniel, 1995; Jung, 1999; Busser, Benson, & Feinstein, 2001) reveal high recall and recognition rates of sponsors. Others (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Shilbury & Berriman, 1996) showed low recall and recognition rates of the sponsors in their studies.
In an early study regarding corporate sponsor awareness, Gardner and Shuman (1987) assessed sponsors awareness and perception from four groups: corporations, channel members, sponsored organization, and the general public. They assessed awareness of corporate sponsors by asking respondents to select sponsors on a list of corporations. On average, they found that respondents were able to identify 5 sponsorships out of 12 (41.7%). The authors found that respondents with professional occupations who were between 21 and 35 years with income over $50,000 (in 1986 dollars) were more likely to correctly identify corporate sponsors. These authors concluded that sponsorships affect the knowledge of consumers about sponsor brands. It is questionable, however, whether an identification rate of less than fifty percent will be enough to convince companies to invest sponsorship activities to impact consumer awareness effectively (Mowen, 1999). Another example (Sandler & Shani, 1989), which focused on consumer awareness of Olympic sponsors, showed that consumers had relatively low levels of awareness of Olympic sponsors.

Busser, Benson, and Feinstein, (2001) examined the impact of sponsorship type and exposure on spectator ability to recognize sponsors at a Professional Golfers’ Association (PGA) Tour event. They concluded sponsorship types as well as spectator exposure to the sponsor’s message enhances spectators’ recognition of corporate sponsors. In addition, the recognition can influence the development and depth of brand associations and increase the chance that a brand or product will be considered and chosen by consumers (Jung, 1999). The study also indicated brand awareness precedes other brand level communication impacts such as brand image, brand attitude, or brand preference, therefore, gaining a high awareness is a necessary condition of building brand image.
Cuneen and Hannan (1993) assessed sponsor recognition by spectators attending a Ladies' Professional Golf Association (LPGA) tournament. The authors measured the effects of signage at the event. Respondents were asked to recall the signs they saw on the grounds, the locations of these signs, which sponsors' products they currently use, and which products they may use as a result of exposure. The results indicated that only a small percentage of the audience was going to alter their consumption pattern and switch to the sponsors' brand. Logistic regression models found differences in recognition of sponsors depending on age, income spending styles, and current product usage.

Duration of Attendance and Recognition of Sponsors

Several studies researched the relationship between the number of days attending events of sponsors and spectators' recognition of sponsors. The spectator's ability to recall or recognize sponsors has been analyzed by measuring their responses to the sponsorship or sponsors and results were mixed.

Busser, Benson, and Feinstein (2001) examined the quantitative relationship between the number of days that spectators attended a golf tournament and their recognition of sponsors. Exposure was measured as the number of days a spectator attended the Las Vegas Invitational Golf Tournament. They concluded as the number of days that spectators attended an event increased, their recognition of sponsors also increased. The findings also suggested that corporations and event managers might enhance spectator awareness of a sponsor by increasing exposure of the sponsor's message.

However, Kerstetter and Gitelson (1995) indicated that sponsorship activities might not heavily contribute in increasing consumers' awareness of sponsors in their study assessing short-term sponsorship aware-
ness of participants at a regional arts festival. After a short period of one to four weeks following the festival, participants were asked to cite their awareness levels of festival sponsors. Results indicate that approximately seven out of ten respondents could not recall any of the event sponsors or chose not to answer the recall question. Twenty-four of the thirty-three official sponsors were recognized by at least one respondent. Of the 100 corporate sponsors that were identified by respondents, 40 were not official sponsors.

Regarding this conclusion, Kerstetter and Gitelson (1995) noted that, while overall sponsor awareness was limited, many of the official festival sponsors were first-time sponsors and that the festival experiences a high sponsor turnover from year-to-year. Corporations who engage in a long-term festival sponsorship agreement may, therefore, have more success in raising consumer awareness level, especially among repeat attendees.

While several sponsorship research initiatives have attempted to assess consumers sponsor awareness over a short term of time, evaluating the impact of sponsorships for an extended period awareness was also assessed. Meenaghan’s (1991) indicated a tenuous relationship between sponsorship and increased consumer brand awareness. In the study, Marlboro as a motor racing sponsor demonstrated increased awareness from 6 percent to 42 percent over the six-year sponsorship period.

Sponsorship Types and Recognition

Sponsors have the opportunity to purchase a variety of sponsorship types. Sponsorship types in the convention and exhibition area can be as mundane as tote bag and badge holder. These items reach every attendee who registers for a show. Entertainment, receptions, keynote speakers, and meals are other popular and expensive options (Koski, 2001).
Online sponsorships, PDA beaming kiosks, and e-mail stations are also gaining in popularity. In addition, there is an increasing number of attendees who use the Internet to view the show website prior to the show. At show site, kiosks where they can check e-mail and exchange messages during the show are becoming commonplace. Through online sponsorship, a company can sponsor a new-product showcase on a website or a live Internet broadcast from a show (Ehmann, 2002). These various types of sponsorship offer multiple opportunities to access a highly targeted market and communicate with current and potential customers.

According to Tradeshow Week's 10th Annual Survey of Exposition Managers and Their Operational Policies, the five most often used sponsorship types in the convention and exhibition industry are as follows:

1. Refreshment breaks
2. Dinners, parties or special events
3. Keynote addresses, speeches, educational sessions
4. Tote bags
5. Badge holders

Hough (2001) suggested that a sponsorship program in the convention and exposition industry should offer a variety of options, price points, and levels of exclusivity to sponsors. The following can be included in the sponsorship program:

- Advertising opportunities: ads in attendee promotion materials, the show directory, and show daily; on-site entranceways, banners, and signage; Web site banners.
- Attendee premiums: badge lanyards, official show tote bags, pens, and notebooks.
- Attendee services: product locators, electronic message centers, international visitors lounge, food and beverage services.
- Special event sponsorships: keynotes, awards dinners, press conferences (Hough, 2001, p. 41).

Several studies showed that the type of sponsorship could affect consumers' recognition of sponsors. Busser, Benson, and Feinstein
(2001) found that sport spectator recognition of sponsors was greatly attributable to the type of sponsorship purchased. Spectators (n=269) completed a questionnaire that listed 30 individual sponsors representing four types of event sponsorships: multi-level (sponsor more than one item), exposition (booth), skybox (restricted booth), and dummy. There was a wide range of spectator recognition for each type of sponsor. The range of spectator recognition by sponsorship category was: multi-level (32% to 69.1%), exposition (10.8% to 65.1%), skybox (13.8% to 37.5%), and dummy (8.2% to 43.1%).

They found that the sponsorship type was a significant predictor of spectator recognition. The findings suggested that corporations and event managers might benefit from the use of certain types of sponsorships. They also indicated that among four types of sponsorships, multi-level sponsors had by far the highest probability of spectator recognition followed by exposition sponsors and skybox sponsors. The differences in spectator recognition among the type of sponsors can be attributed to several factors, including size of the ad, multiple message delivery points, and expenditure and purchasing options.

Stotlar and Johnson (1989) investigated the impact of stadium advertising on sports spectators. The results indicated that a majority of spectators noticed advertising, and approximately seven out of ten correctly identified the sponsor. The authors concluded that the use of stadium advertising as a kind of sponsorship should be strongly considered by companies contemplating sponsorship. They said one of the significant factors in determining advertising recognizability was the location of advertisements. In particular, stadium advertisement was recommended for the positive impact of sponsorship.

Hansen and Scotwin (1995) concluded not only sponsorship types, but also types of sponsoring messages impact the level of sponsor recall.
They tried to measure the impact of sponsorship, concentrating on messages broadcast on television. They found that the type of sponsoring messages with different level of exposure impacts the level of sponsor recall.

As shown, many previous studies measuring the impact of sponsorship were about sport sponsorship. There were few attempts to measure sponsorship impact to attendees in the convention and exhibition area.

Attitudes Toward Corporate Sponsorship

Several key indicators (awareness, attitude, purchase intention, and purchase behavior) of sponsorship impact as sponsorship evaluation index were discussed in previous studies. Attitude was selected for this study among these primary measures of sponsorship evaluation because it allows a researcher to measure sponsorship impact closer to the purchase phase in the actual consumer decision-making process (Crompton, 1994).

Currently, less effort on the empirical research on attendees’ attitudes toward corporate sponsorship activities has been conducted while there are several prior studies on the awareness of sponsors/sponsorships. If these sponsoring companies were presented information on the sponsorship’s positive attitudinal impact, they may be willing to provide more flexible sponsorship activities. Conversely, show organizers and associations may also wish to assess how well or how poorly a specific sponsorship would be received by their attendees. Evaluating the impact of sponsorships on attitudes may facilitate a sponsorship’s desirability from attendees’ perception (Mowen, 1999).
Attitudes as a Measurement of Sponsorship Impact

Crimmins and Horn (1996) concluded their study by stating that sponsorships change the way consumers view the sponsoring brand. They indicated respondents' perceptual changes toward the major credit card companies throughout the 1992 Olympics. In particular, VISA, an official Olympic sponsor, doubled its perceived brand superiority during and after its Olympic sponsorship.

Another study evaluating sponsorship was Stipp and Schiavone's (1996) research on Olympic television network sponsorships. This research combined a variety of methods, such as a series of in-depth focus groups, correspondence analyses, and pre-test/post-test advertising research. They measured respondents' attitudes toward Olympic sponsorship and attitudes toward specific Olympic sponsors. The results indicated that a large portion of network viewers held very positive attitudes toward Olympic sponsorship in general and specific Olympic sponsors in particular.

In this study, attitudes were measured by the knowledge of sponsorship activities and beliefs regarding the sponsor's motives. This study focused on the cognitive component of attitudes and not the evaluative component. Mowen (1999) mentioned that while beliefs or cognitions are important in aspects of influencing purchase behaviors, it is often the affective or evaluative component of attitudes, which helps consumers distinguish between and choose a specific brand/product and serve as a tool for measuring sponsorship impact.

McCarville, Flood, and Froats (1998) measured respondents' attitudes toward sponsors on a semantic differential scale including elements such as sponsor efficiency, reliability, and business responsibility. In this study, the attitude assessment emphasized an evaluative component based on current corporate performance and brand images. The com-
ponent was directed toward the corporate sponsors. Findings suggested that measuring respondent's preference for sponsorship activities and arrangements could benefit corporations to evaluate the impact of sponsorships on respondents' attitudes.

Mowen (1999) studied corporate sponsorship and a park agency, which use sponsoring companies in the recreation area. For sponsorship evaluation, the study examined what sponsorship activities and organizational arrangements (contractual conditions) are more preferable and how recreation phenomena (activity type, activity involvement, place attachment, and desired experiences) impact specific sponsorship preferences and overall attitudes toward sponsorships by corporations and a park agency. The study involved a mail survey distributed to over 400 people and received 51% response rate. Overall results indicated that people felt favorably toward recreation sponsorship and the organizations conducting sponsorship activities. Respondents also had different preferences for sponsorship activities and organizational arrangements and they preferred local sponsors, sponsorship of free programs, coupons/special offers at hospitality tents, and free trials at special events rather than corporate logo banners/print and felt negatively toward sponsor exclusivity.

Other previous research supported attitudes as a measurement tool for sponsorship evaluation by suggesting that stronger attitudes are more likely to guide behavior (Fazio, Sanbonmatsu, Powell, & Kardes, 1986). Such attitudes tend to be based on beliefs about the consequences of the behavior (Olson, 1999). Studies suggested that attitudes enables a researcher to create a more confident assessment of the attitude object (sponsoring company or sponsorship activities), make the attitude more accessible when one is confronted with behavioral cues (Aaker & Keller, 1990; Alwitt & Berger, 1992; Smith & Andrews, 1995),
and thus increase the likelihood of the respondent's engagement in the desired behavior. Olson (1998) suggested that if researchers are interested in behavior such as purchase through sponsorship, they should create strong attitudes and reinforce these attitudes. One way to create strong and positive attitudes is to design a sponsorship activity highly self-relevant (Alwitt & Berger, 1992).

In addition, a previous study by Azjen and Fishbein (1977) mentioned that attitudes would be a good predictor of intention, as intention in turn would be a good predictor of behavior. The study suggested that attitude toward the object (e.g., specific products or sponsorship relationship) must be examined to predict purchase behavior.

Stipp and Schiavone (1996) also indicated attitude toward sponsorship promotion can influence overall attitudes toward sponsors. However, the study focused on attitudes toward the corporation itself instead of attitudes toward their promotional and sponsorship activities. They suggested that not only sponsorship activities, but also how these activities affect respondents' attitudes toward sponsorship/sponsors should be conducted as a future study.

However, several studies indicated that sponsorship may not always impact consumer attitudes positively. They mentioned sponsorship arrangements between inappropriate partners may lead a negative public image if the sponsorship is not perceived as genuine and/or is not conducted in the preferred manner (Crompton, 1994). In light of this risk, Mowen (1999) suggested that event organizers and corporations should not assume that corporate images would automatically be increased through the sponsorship.

Crompton (1994) provided an example of this potential risk. Results indicated that respondents' positive attitudes toward a host of corporations decreased several weeks later after a sponsored event. The
findings suggested that attitudes might be higher with on-site surveys than surveys conducted several weeks after the sponsored activity. The author suggested researchers consider the context of their evaluation before assessing the sponsorship impact on attitudes.

A growing number of sponsorship research has begun to examine the impact of sponsorship on awareness, attitudes, purchase intention, and purchase behavior (Assael, 1995; Stipp & Schiavone, 1996; McCarville, Flood, & Froats, 1998; Olson, 1998; Mowen, 1999). Typically, the ultimate goal of sponsorship is to create positive attitudes toward a company or brand in hope of positive behavioral impact (selling products). Therefore, measuring attitudes toward the sponsorships perhaps is a more beneficial measurement to evaluate the impact of sponsorship. A study on sponsorship by Mowen (1999) supports this notion. The study used overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorship and the entity being sponsored, a metropolitan park agency, as a way to measure sponsorship impact. Prior studies also supported overall attitudes as the key to creating the link between products/company attributes and purchase-related behavior due to the complexity of research design and difficulty to isolate the impact of sponsorship itself on sales.

Based on prior studies, the study did not evaluate sponsorships in terms of purchase intention and behavior because it requires confidential information on sales from sponsoring companies and is also hard to measure given that purchasing behavior can happen during the show or within several months after the show. In addition, the purchase might depend on a company’s business needs, which might not be influenced by sponsorship activities. Therefore, this present study was limited to measuring the impact of sponsorship on attendees’ attitudes toward corporate sponsorship, which possibly could lead to purchase intention or actual purchasing of sponsors’ products/services.
It should be noted that the present study did not ask attendees' attitudes toward individual corporate sponsors. This study asked attendees' attitudes toward corporate sponsorship in general, because an assumption of this study is if attendees have positive attitudes toward sponsorships, they would have positive attitudes toward sponsors.

In relation to previous studies, this study has similarities in terms of evaluating sponsorship activities by using recognition and attitudes as measurements. This study measured broader attitudes toward corporate sponsorship and attendees' preferences for specific sponsorship type in the convention and tradeshow while previous studies are more focused on attitudes toward individual sponsoring companies.

Demographics and Attitudes Toward Sponsorships

Rodgers (2000) predicted sponsorship impact in e-news papers using the sponsorship knowledge inventory. The study found significant differences in sponsorship attitudes, such as sponsor liking, skepticism, and behavioral intent depending on demographic characteristics. Specifically, males were more skeptical to the sponsor's motives than females and females have stronger behavioral intention for the sponsors than males. Age also significantly predicted sponsor liking, skepticism, and behavioral intent as an independent variable. A negative correlation between age and sponsor liking indicated that as age decreased, liking of the sponsors increased. Findings also indicated a negative relationship between education and sponsor liking, which means the more education a person had, the less he/she liked the sponsors. In addition, a negative relationship was found for education and behavioral intent for the sponsors in relation to willingness to try the sponsor's product. Finally, a negative relationship was also found between age and judgments about the e-newspaper's credibility.
As a result, the study concluded that demographics should be considered importantly when examining skepticism and sponsorship impact. The findings of the study suggested that companies using sponsorship as a marketing strategy need to be aware of demographics of consumers. In addition, it recommended sponsoring companies to educate consumers about what a sponsorship is and how it benefit the thing being sponsored via complementary advertising campaigns and/or slogan. This study suggested as a future study to measure attitudes toward sponsors and sponsorship.

As shown, the literature review indicated that while sponsorship evaluation is receiving more research emphasis, less efforts has been devoted to assessing public preferences for specific sponsorship activities and how these preferences impact their attitudes toward corporate sponsorship. The literature review concludes by suggesting an understanding of the attendees' preferences for different sponsorship types, factors relating to exposition and their demographic characteristics to enhance convention sponsorship effectiveness.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Setting

The Association of Progressive Rental Organizations' Convention and Trade show (APRO) show, a leading rental industry trade show in the United States, was chosen for this research due to the number of sponsors and attendees at the show, the different categories of sponsorship available, and convenience. An on-site survey was conducted outside the show floor entrance. During the survey, the subject was not allowed to see any signage or sponsorship items. Average attendance at the annual APRO trade show is more than 1,300 people and 114 companies exhibited their products and services. There were 17 sponsors in the APRO show. A total of 221 people responded to the survey. However, due to the ineligibility of 15 respondents, the total usable sample was 206.

Procedure

Two trained volunteers and the Principle Investigator administered the survey. Attendees leaving the show were asked to complete the questionnaire (convenience sample). The survey was conducted from Wednesday, July 24 to Thursday, July 25, 2002 at Mandalay Bay Convention Center in Las Vegas. Attendees were approached and they completed the survey on a voluntary basis. They were given a script describing the purpose of the survey, an informed consent form, with a self-administered questionnaire (Appendix). The survey was conducted on the third and
fourth day out of four show days to examine attendees' matured recognition of sponsors.

**Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was pretested twice on a sample of 10 students and 10 professionals in the convention and trade show industry to ensure its content validity. Based on the pilot tests, a final self-report survey, which consisted of two-pages (Appendix), was used for this study.

The questionnaire included multiple choice, dichotomous, and open-ended questions. The first page examined the impact of sponsorship by measuring attendees' recognition of sponsors and their sponsorship preference. In the recognition test, 18 sponsor names (14 actual sponsors and 4 non-sponsors) were listed in a random order. Attendees were asked to indicate whether or not they recognized the name of the company as a sponsor by indicating "yes" or "no." Attendees were asked whether they experienced the APRO show enough to respond the questionnaire, although they were randomly accessed by surveyors. This enabled surveyors to avoid people who were not directly relevant to the show, such as spouses.

Attendees were also asked whether they support corporate sponsorship. Related to attitude toward corporate sponsorship, they were asked to indicate the degree of importance of each nine different sponsorship types. For attendees' attitude and their sponsorship preferences, the Likert scale was employed. Among nine sponsorship types, six items were selected based on the *Tradeshow Week*'s 10th Annual Survey of Exposition Managers and Their Operational Policies. They were: (1) refreshment breaks, (2) meals such as diners and luncheon (3) keynote addresses, (4) educational sessions, (5) tote bags, (6) badge holders. Additional
items were (7) cocktail reception and (8) closing banquets. At the APRO show, gala cocktail reception was the most expensive sponsorship followed by closing banquet. However, depending on the show, the number of attendees at the show, and the quality of the sponsoring items, other types of sponsorships, such as tote bag, might be expensive. E-mail station (9) was also added given that this item is gaining popularity and is a big revenue source for show organizers.

On the second page, demographic information including age, gender, number of days in attendance at the show, and status as a final purchase decision maker and repeated annual attendance as a variable relating to exposition were also asked.

Data Analysis

Data from the survey were analyzed using SPSS for Windows 11.0. Frequencies, Independent Samples T-test, One-way Analysis of Variance (abbreviated ANOVA), and Multiple Regression were employed. First, the data was examined to check the accuracy of input and determine whether they were within range or not. Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies, means, and standard deviation were calculated by SPSS to determine the percentage of attendees' recognition of sponsors and demographic information.

In this study, percentages of attendees' recognition by sponsorship types were compared. To test the null hypothesis that recognition levels are equal regardless of number of days attending the show, ANOVA was used. In addition, multiple comparison procedure was conducted through the Post-Hoc test to determine significant differences in recognition across different number of days attending a show.

To test whether there is a difference in recognition level between actual sponsors and non-sponsors (exhibitors only), the Independent
Samples T-test was used. Since the T-test is based on the comparison of significant differences between two independent groups, the mean score of recognition in each group was calculated to test the hypothesis that people equally recognize actual sponsors and non-sponsors as sponsors at the show.

Hypothesis 3 that the different types of company sponsorship, repeated annual attendance, and demographic characteristics would significantly affect attendees overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorship were examined by using Multiple Regression. To test the relationship between these sponsorship variables, an enter regression was used as the nature of this study is exploratory and there is little theory or logic to determine which variables to include in the model.

Within the context of conventions and trade shows, it appears that sponsorship types can be categorized under similar categories. Sponsorship types were reduced to a 4-factor group.

The following are four categories of sponsorships: (1) food and beverage (meals, closing banquet, cocktail reception, and refreshment breaks) (2) keynote addresses and educational sessions (3) tote bags and badge holders, (4) e-mail station.

All independent variables regarding preference for specific sponsorship types were measured intervally.

**Assumptions in Data Consideration**

Assumptions needed for this study about the data are as follows:

(1) Convenience sample was used for data collection.
(2) The populations are normal.
(3) The population variances are all equal.

Normality assumption can be checked by making histograms or normal probability plots for each of the groups. However, in practice, ANOVA is not heavily dependent on the normality assumption. As long as the
data are not extremely non-normal and the sample sizes in the groups are not too small, the normality assumptions are acceptable (Norusis, 2000). In this study, the sample size (N=206) is large enough to assume normality.

The equality of variance assumption can be checked by examining the spread of the observations in the boxplot or by computing the Levene test. "In practice, if the number of cases in each of the group is similar, the equality of variance assumption is not too important" (Norusis, p.263). For this study, total 221 attendees participated in the survey and the number of cases in each group is similar due to the big sample size (N=206). Therefore, the equality of variance is assumed.

Delimitations

This study did not account for other factors, which can influence the impact of sponsorship on attendees. First, location and size of the sponsorship advertisement and other promotional efforts, which were conducted simultaneously with sponsorship activities (TV advertisement and public relations), were not considered for this study (Dodd, 1997). Second, this study did not account for graphic and color differences in sponsoring items. Sponsors may receive more attendees' attention simply based upon color and design of the advertisement on the sponsoring item (Dodd, 1997). Third, food and beverage quality and menus were not examined on this study. Finally, this study does not control for prior perceptions and pre-existing attitudes toward the sponsoring companies. Prior perceptions may significantly influence the evaluation of sponsorship (Olson, 1998; Javalgi et. al., 1994).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The following chapter reports the results of this study regarding research questions and hypotheses. The results of each statistical test such as Independent Samples T-test, ANOVA, and Multiple Regression analysis will report the recognition level and sponsorship preference predicting sponsorship attitudes toward corporate sponsorship. All data was analyzed using SPSS for Windows 11.0.

Description of the Sample

A total of 221 attendees completed the questionnaire and 206 questionnaires were usable due to the ineligibility of 15 respondents. The majority (76.7%) of the sample was male (n=158) and 23.3% (n=48) were female. Ages of respondents were between 21 and 69 with a mean age of 43 years. The majority of subjects attended the show for three days (40.8%), followed by two days (24.8%), four days (21.4%), and one day (13.1%) out of four show days. In addition, 46.1% of respondents indicated that they have attended the show over 3 times followed by one times (26.2%), 3 times (14.6%), and 2 times (13.1%) by this year. As far as education level, 37.3% of respondents have a college degree, followed by some college (27.5%), graduate degree (14.2%), high school (12.7%), and associate degree (8.3%). Almost half (45.6%) of the sample had final say in approving purchases and 45.1% of respondents were people who recommend and specify brand/vendor.
Table 1 Description of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean/Percentage</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>42.82</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase role</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No role</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify brand/vendor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final say/approve purchase</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated Annual Attendance</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 times</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of attendance</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes toward corporate sponsorship was examined for sponsorship evaluation. The response to the question "how favorably they felt toward sponsorships by corporations" (1=very opposed, 5=very supportive) was overall favorable. The mean was 4.21 (N=206), which is somewhat supportive of corporate sponsorships (Table 2). This sponsorship attitude measurement was used in a Multiple Regression equation. For the regression test, attitude toward sponsorship by corporations and specific preferences for sponsorship types were used to examine a sponsorship impact (Table 11).
Although overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorship were somewhat favorable, respondents showed a range of preferences to specific sponsorship types from "tote bag" having the lowest rating of importance at 3.06 to "educational sessions" having the highest rating at 4.21 (Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 Description of Attitudes Toward Corporate Sponsorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N = 206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward corporate sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither supportive of or opposed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very supportive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= Very opposed, 2= somewhat opposed, 3= neither opposed nor supportive, 4= somewhat supportive, 5= Very supportive

Attendees also indicated significantly higher importance for meals (3.73), keynote addresses (3.73), closing banquet (3.69), and cocktail reception (3.60). The mean score of refreshment (3.56) and badge holder (3.52) were also high while tote bags (3.06) and e-mail station (3.27) received lower scores close to the neutral score 3.0 in the Likert scale from 1 to 5. It appears that attendees put more importance on educational sessions and special events including food and beverage than giveaways.
Table 3 Descriptive Statistics of Sponsorship Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsorship types</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational sessions</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals such as breakfast,</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lunch, or dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote addresses</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing banquet</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocktail reception</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment breaks</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badge holders</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail station</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tote bags</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to recognition test, the percentages of recognizing sponsors were calculated. The recognition rates of 14 sponsors used on the survey are presented in Table 4 by their sponsorship types.

Table 4 shows counts of the sponsor recognition, which is the number of attendees who recognize sponsors correctly, not sponsorship type. As the percentage comparison shows, there are differences in the recognition among sponsorship types. It shows a wide range of recognition rates from 45.1% to 75.7%. The recognition results showed that Philips Consumer Electronics (Cocktail Reception sponsor) was correctly identified as the APRO convention sponsor by 75.7% of the attendees, receiving the highest percentage recognition rate of any sponsors. Trib Group sponsoring massage station was recognized by almost 75% attendees followed by Ashley, a sponsor of complimentary ice cream (73.3%), High-touch sponsoring dinner/entertainment (68.0%), GE Appliances sponsoring keynote speaker/general session (67.0%), Foresight Inc. sponsoring cocktail reception (62.6%), and Sears sponsoring badge holders (60.7%).
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Only 46.6% attendees recognized Nationwide Club Administration (tote bags/award reception) as a sponsor.

Based on the percentage comparison, it appears that different types of sponsorship do affect attendees’ recognition levels of the sponsors. Sponsorship types such as massage station, dinner/entertainment, and keynote speaker/general session had more recognition than other sponsorship types.

Table 4 Attendee Recognition Rates of Sponsors by Sponsorship Type
(N=206)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Recognition Rate</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sponsorship Type</th>
<th>Years of Sponsorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Cocktail reception</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trib</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Massage station</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Complimentary ice cream</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Touch</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Dinner &amp; Entertainment</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Appliances</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Keynote speaker &amp; general session</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresight</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Cocktail reception</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Badge holders &amp; APRO Daily</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Refreshment breaks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Complimentary ice cream</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Cocktail reception</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cocktail reception</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Tote bags &amp; Award reception</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Pre-cocktail banquet</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Exhibit hall champagne welcome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Test of Hypotheses

The results of the statistical tests regarding recognition will be displayed in the order that the research hypotheses were presented in the chapter.

**Hypothesis 1**

It was hypothesized that in the recognition test, actual sponsors will not achieve higher recognition level than those of non-sponsors. The hypothesis was tested by using T-test. The frequency and percentage comparison of correctly and incorrectly recognized sponsors were also counted based on the data from the recognition test (Table 5). It compares the percentages of recognition between sponsors and non-sponsors which attendees correctly recognized actual sponsoring corporations as sponsors and only exhibitors as non-sponsors. Non-sponsors incorrectly recognized as sponsors and sponsors incorrectly recognized as non-sponsors are also presented in Table 5 under the title of incorrect recognition.

Results indicated that actual sponsors achieved higher recognition level (60.01%) than non-sponsors (33.63%). The average number of attendees who correctly identified actual sponsors in the recognition test was 124 (60.1%) while 69 (33.63%) respondents recognized non-sponsors (only exhibitors) as sponsors. It appears that attendees more easily recognize actual sponsors than non-sponsors.

False recognition of non-sponsors as sponsors has wide variance from a high of 50.0% for Zenith to 18.0% for Home Line. Among the eighteen companies listed, Zenith, Home Line, JVC, and Compaq were non-sponsors of the show while the remaining fourteen brands were sponsors. Half of the respondents incorrectly recognized Zenith as a sponsor and about a third of respondents falsely recognized JVC (32.0%) and Compaq (34.0%) as sponsors.
### Table 5 Recognition Level: Actual Sponsors vs. Non-Sponsors (N=206)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Correct F</th>
<th>Incorrect F</th>
<th>Don’t know F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trib</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightouch</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresight</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Appliances</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sponsors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenith</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home line</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JVC</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compaq</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. F: Frequency

However, Home Line was correctly identified as a non-sponsors by 56.8% of respondents. The average scores (33.63%), which attendees answered incorrectly non-sponsors as sponsors, are fairly low when compared to the recognition level of actual sponsors (60.01%), which respondents correctly recognize the sponsoring companies as sponsors. It is also higher than the percentage (42.60%), which respondents correctly recognize exhibitors as non-sponsors. More specifically, Home Line recognized as a non-sponsor correctly by 56.8% of respondents followed by JVC (45.6%), Compaq (36.4%), and Zenith (31.6%). These sponsors had exhibit booths on the trade show floor but were not sponsors.
Independent Samples T-test was conducted to examine whether there was any significance differences in attendees' recognitions between sponsors and non-sponsors. Prior to conducting T-test, the Levene test was conducted as an assumption for the T-test that the population variances were equal. The result of Levene's tests for equality of variance showed that significance was >.05 (Table 7). Consequently, Independent Samples T-test was used and the result indicated that recognition varied significantly between sponsors and non-sponsors ($t=4.134$, $p=.001$). Overall actual sponsors ($N=14$) achieved higher recognition level ($t=4.134$, $p=.001$) than non-sponsors ($N=4$).

Table 6 Group Statistics: Actual Sponsors vs. Non-Sponsors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsors or Non-sponsors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>123.64</td>
<td>22.232</td>
<td>5.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sponsor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>27.035</td>
<td>13.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Levene's Test for Equality of Variances for T-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition level</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the evidence was sufficient to reject the null hypothesis and to verify that actual sponsors were recognized significantly more than non-sponsors.
Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis was that recognition level of sponsors is independent of the number of days attending a show.

ANOVA was used to detect whether there were any statistical differences in recognition level across different number of days attending the show. Since significance (p= 0.000) is smaller than acceptable (p<0.5), the null hypothesis that recognition level of sponsors is independent of the number of days attending at a show was rejected. The finding shows that the alternative hypothesis, which predicted that the recognition level of sponsorship would differ across different number of days attending a show, is supported (Table 9). It appears that the number of days attending a show influences their recognition of sponsors. Those who attended more days recognized sponsors more correctly than those who attended less (F_{3, 199}=12.679).

Table 9 Recognition Score and Number of Days Attending A Show

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.679</td>
<td>137.267</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p* < 0.05 (*N* = 202)
Since recognition scores for the sponsors appeared significant across the number of days attending a show, a Post Hoc test was conducted to define significant differences among different number of days attending a show. Table 10 presents the results of the Post Hoc Tests.

Results of the Post Hoc tests also provided evidence that the number of days attending a show positively correlated to the recognition level. Four-day attendees achieved higher recognition level (60.01%) than one day, two-day, and three-day attendees. Significant mean differences were observed in the recognition score between one day attendees and two day attendees, two day attendees and three day attendees, and one day attendees and three day attendees. However, there was no significant mean difference between three-day attendees and four-day attendees. Figure 1 shows as the number of days attending the show increased, their recognition of sponsors also increased.

Since the observed significance level is less than p value (0.05) as a result of the Post Hoc Test and ANOVA, this leads to reject the null hypothesis that recognition level of sponsors is independent of the number of days attending the show. It appears that as duration of attendance increased, attendees’ recognition of sponsors also increased.

Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that there will be no significant relationship between attendees’ attitudes toward sponsorships by corporation and different sponsorship types, repeated annual attendance, and demographic characteristics.

A sponsorship evaluation model was developed to investigate what specific sponsorship types, which demographic characteristics and whether an exposition related factor were significant predictors of overall attitudes toward sponsorship by corporation. Independent and dependent variables and the equation for the regression model are de-
scribed in Table 11.

Table 10 Post Hoc Tests (Multiple Comparisons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of attendance</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonferroni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>2 days*</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 days*</td>
<td>-4.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 days*</td>
<td>-4.26</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>1 day*</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 days*</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 days*</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>1 day*</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days*</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>1 day*</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days*</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p* < 0.05, Dependent Variable: recognition score

Figure 1. Recognition Score and Days of Attendance
Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that there will be no significant relationship between attendees' attitudes toward sponsorships by corporation and different sponsorship types, repeated annual attendance, and demographic characteristics.

A sponsorship evaluation model was developed to investigate what specific sponsorship types, which demographic characteristics and whether an exposition related factor were significant predictors of overall attitudes toward sponsorship by corporation. Independent and dependent variables and the equation for the regression model are described in Table 11.

Table 11 Regression Model and Description of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitudes = $\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \text{age} + \text{gender} + \text{education} + \text{position in purchasing} + \text{repeated annual attendance at the show} + \varepsilon$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y$ = Attitudes toward sponsorship by corporation, (1= very opposed, 5= very supportive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X$ = Type of sponsorship (1= food and beverage 2= keynote address and educational session 3= tote bag and badge holder, 4= e-mail station)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage: meals, refreshments, banquets, and cocktail reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics = Age, gender, education, and position in purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition-related variable = Repeated annual attendance at the show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon$ = Error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Multiple Regression was used to test the hypothesis 3. For the Multiple Regression test, sponsorship types were grouped by similar
characteristics. Cocktail reception, dinner/entertainment, refreshment breaks, and award reception were grouped under the title of "food and beverage". Keynote addresses and educational sessions were categorized as a group and tote bag was grouped with badge holders.

Before grouping variables into the 4-factor group, each independent variable were tested simultaneously for the Multiple Regression test without grouping. Since correlations among variables under the same category were high, it appeared that results between grouping model and ungrouping model were similar. Therefore, only the results of grouping model, which sponsorship types were categorized under similar categories, were suggested in this section.

All predictors were entered simultaneously by using the enter method. As a result, a significant model emerged at p. 0.5. Table 12 included data that confirm the significance of sponsorship types, demographic characteristics, and repeated annual attendance as predictors of overall attitudes toward sponsorship by corporation.

As shown in Table 12, the p-value is less than .05 ($F_{9, 183}=11.661$, $p=.000$). Therefore, the null hypothesis of no predictor impact was rejected and it was interpreted that at least one of the predictors has impact on overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorship. As far as which items best predicted overall attitudes toward sponsorship, the beta coefficients were used to interpret the relative contribution of each independent variable. Given that all independent variables were of the same scale, three sponsorships (food and beverage, tote bag and badge holders, and e-mail station), repeated annual attendance at the show, and one demographic characteristic (education level) were positive predictors of overall attendee attitudes toward corporate sponsorship. The beta coefficients of these dimensions were positive while the beta coefficient of gender was negative. In other words, the more positive respondents felt about the
food and beverage, tote bag and badge holders, e-mail station, the more positive they felt about the corporate sponsorship. Also, the more respondents attend the show annually, and the higher respondents' education level, the more positive they felt about the corporate sponsorship.

In the regression, "food & beverage" (p=.000) is the most influential factors for attendees' attitude toward sponsorships by corporations at p<.05 followed by "repeated annual attendance" (p=.010), "e-mail station" (p=.020), "education level" (p=.022), and "tote bag and badge holders" (p=.036).

Table 12 Results of Multiple Regression on Attendees' Attitudes Toward Corporate Sponsorships in Relation to Sponsorship Types, Repeated Annual Attendance, and Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; beverage*</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated annual attendance*</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.010*</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail station*</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.020*</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level*</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.022*</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tote bag and badge holders*</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.036*</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational sessions/Keynote address</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase role</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R^2 = .364, p* < 0.05, two-tailed. F_5, 182=11.661, p=.000

Food & Beverage: refreshment, meals, reception, and banquet

For the hypothesis 2, evidence was sufficient to reject null hypothesis that there are no relationship among attendees' attitudes to-
ward corporate sponsorships, different sponsorship types, repeated annual attendance, and demographics. It appears that respondents have different preferences for sponsorship types, which influence their overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorships. However, the low $R^2$ square reported in the tested model indicated that there might be other variables that could contribute to the overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorship (Table 12).

Open-ended comments were solicited to substantiate the specific sponsor needs of attendees. However, few attendees responded to this question.

The implications of these findings are now discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

A review of the sponsorship literature indicates that there is a continuing need to examine the impact of sponsorship, in particular, how different types of sponsorship impact attendees' attitudes toward sponsorship and their recognition of sponsors.

In the recognition test, results showed that different types of sponsorship affected attendees' recognition level of the sponsors. Sponsorship items such as massage station, complimentary ice cream, dinner/entertainment, and keynote speaker/general session had higher recognition than other sponsorship types. In addition, as duration of attendance increased, attendees' recognition of sponsors also increased ($F_3, 196=12.679$). Overall actual sponsors ($N=14$) achieved higher recognition level ($t=4.134$, $p=.001$) than non-sponsors ($N=4$). The results of the Multiple Regression analysis (Table 12) indicated that three sponsorship activities (food and beverage, tote bag and badge holders, and e-mail station), repeated attendance at a show, and one demographic characteristic (education level) were positive predictors of overall attendee attitudes toward corporate sponsorship.

In light of these results, this chapter will discuss the relevance and implications of this research for managerial applications of corporate sponsorship and research consideration regarding sponsorship evaluation in the convention and trade show settings. The discussion
will be organized according to the hypotheses presented in this study and will end with conclusions and future research direction.

Recognition of Sponsors

In this study, respondents were asked to indicate sponsors without having the actual sponsored item identified on the questionnaire. Respondents recognized Philips as sponsoring the cocktail reception (75.7%) slightly more than Trib's (74.8%) sponsoring the massage station. Ashley (73.3%) sponsoring complimentary ice cream recorded third in the recognition test. Differences in attendees' recognition among different types of sponsorship can be attributed to several factors. These include different sponsoring items, exclusivity in conducting sponsorship activities, number of days attending a show, and sponsorship tenure (long term vs. short-term).

Sponsorship Type

In relation to sponsorship types, results indicated that sponsorship, such as tote bag (46.6%) and badge holder (60.7%), which would be highly visible, did not receive high recognition compared to one time special event, such as closing banquet (68%) and keynote speaker/general sessions (67%), and food and beverage, such as complimentary ice cream (73.3%). Specifically, the massage station (74.8%) was well recognized because it was free and everyone loves a massage, according to Cindy Ferguson, a Trade Show Manager with the APRO show.

A previous study by Busser, Benson, and Feinstein (2001) supports this study's results that different types of sponsorship can affect consumers' recognition of sponsors. They found that spectator recognition of sponsorships was greatly attributable to the type of sponsorship purchased. The findings suggest that corporations and event managers may benefit from the use of certain types of sponsorships.
Exclusivity

Besides sponsorship types, exclusivity of sponsorship can be an attributable factor in recognition. Allowing only one company to be a sponsor in a sponsorship category (exclusivity) may increase attendees' recognition of sponsors. In this study, Trib (74.8%) who sponsored massage station received high marks and was the sole sponsor. A study by Copeland, Frisby, and McCarville, (1996) indicated that corporations tend to prefer sponsorship where exclusivity is provided or where there are few sponsors so that the corporate image does not become muddled and the brand name can stand out more easily.

In support, a similar finding occurred in this study. Respondents indicated a higher recognition with one exclusive sponsor (massage station and dinner/entertainment) rather than multiple sponsors (cocktail reception co-sponsors). Hightouch Inc., sponsoring dinner/entertainment exclusively, recorded high recognition (68.0%) compared to some companies cosponsoring cocktail reception (Rental, 55.8%; Standard, 48.5%; Imagery Marketing, 45.1%).

Based on the results of this study, muddled impact on company names might hinder corporate identification and lead to the low recognition level. It seems that the impact of sponsorship on attendees' recognition of sponsors is typically higher in the case of exclusive sponsors. In the case of Ashley, sponsoring complimentary ice cream received high recognition while Progressive Furniture sponsoring the same item on the next day was not recognized well. The reason may be prior positioning impact, which leads stronger impression on attendees' recognition by sponsoring the item first.

Corporations tend to prefer sponsorship where exclusivity is provided or where there are few sponsors so that the corporate image does not become muddled and the brand name can stand out more easily (Cope-
land, Frisby, & Mccarville, 1996). Mowen (1999) mentioned recent sponsorship activities which show managers are now dealing with sponsor numbers and exclusivity in several ways. "One of the ways is selecting sponsors from the same product category and have them sponsor different events that have distinct images (Mowen, 1999, p.147)." By allowing exclusivity in sponsoring activities, Show Managers may help a sponsor to decrease image clutter and increase corporate recognition of a single company.

Recognition Level Between Actual Sponsors vs. Non-Sponsors

Overall actual sponsors (N=14) achieved higher recognition level (t=4.134, p=. 001) than non-sponsors (N=4). In this study, three sponsors exceeded 70% recognition and four sponsors received over 60% recognition. A previous study on recognition of sponsors (Stotlar & Johnson, 1989) found that 70% of stadium advertising was correctly identified by sport spectators, a figure consistent with the standard for outdoor advertising. In addition, Dodd (1997) found that sports event sponsors exceeded 70% recognition levels.

Sponsorship Tenure (short-term vs. long-term)

As far as sponsorship tenure, the results indicated that many long-term sponsors, except Nationwide, received high recognition levels and Imagery (first year sponsorship) received the lowest recognition score. Cindy Ferguson, a Trade Show Manager with the APRO show, suggests that some companies receive a higher recognition score because they have sponsored longer or been in the industry longer. Corporations who engage in a long-term sponsorship agreement may have more success in raising consumer recognition level, especially among repeat attendees (Kerstetter & Gitelson, 1995).

Regarding low recognitions, Kerstetter and Gitelson (1995) noted that the reason of overall limited awareness of sponsors might be at-
tributed to companies who were first-time sponsors and if there is high sponsor turnover from year-to-year. Imagery, sponsoring the exhibit hall champagne welcome was a first year sponsor in the APRO show and the sponsoring event was one-time special event, which not all attendees could attend.

However, in the case of Nationwide sponsoring tote bags and award reception, the company received low recognition rate although it has been a sponsor for over 13 years. The reason might be attributed to changing of its sponsorship type from year to year. Also every attendee did not attend the award reception and the event was held on the last show day.

Number of Days Attending A Show and Recognition Level

Results of this study indicated that as the number of days attending a show increased, their recognition of sponsors also increased. Three research investigation addressing spectator exposure to the sponsor’s message provide support for this study’s findings. Busser, Benson, and Feinstein (2001) researched the quantitative relationship between the number of days that spectators attended a golf tournament and their recognition of sponsors. They concluded as the number of days that spectators attended a sponsored event increased, their recognition of the sponsor also increased.

A study of television viewing patterns of Olympic telecast (Ishikawa, et al., 1996) reported that heavier viewers were more accurate in their recall and recognition of sponsors. Similarly, Turco (1996) examined pre- and post-season sponsorship recognition rates. In this study, a random sample of 384 Illinois State University men’s basketball season ticket holders were polled to see if their recognition levels changed throughout the season. The author found that subjects improved
their recognition accuracy of the advertised companies as much as 20 percent during the season.

It appears that exposure is an important contributor to recognition. The findings suggest that corporations and event managers may benefit from the increased exposure of the message to enhance attendees' recognition of the sponsor. More specifically a three-day exposure would be required to maximize recognition of sponsors by attendees (see Table 10 and Figure 1).

**Exceptions**

Exceptions occurred in case of Philips, Foresight and Thomson. Philips and Foresight received high recognition levels although they co-sponsored a cocktail reception. Existing brand power might have influenced attendees to recognize Philips as a sponsor. Foresight has co-sponsored the cocktail reception for over 10 years and as a result it might have increased name recognition. Order bias can result from a company name's position in a table on the questionnaire, which listed 18 company names. Since Philips was mentioned first on the questionnaire, it might receive an artificially high recognition rating because respondents are prone to yea-saying by indicating awareness of the first time in the list (Zikmund, 2002).

In addition, given that some cocktail reception co-sponsors received low recognition, it appears that there might be something else, which leads to low or high recognition. Thomson failed to be recognized by less than half of the respondents (48.5%) in the recognition test although it solely sponsored a pre banquet cocktail reception on the last day of the show. Given that the company has been a major sponsor for over 13 years, 48% recognition is surprising. The fact that the cocktail reception were held on the last day, when many attendees were leaving the show and the possibility that attendees might be confused
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Thomson with High Touch, which sponsored closing banquet, might explain the low recognition level. Also, the company name was listed at the end of the company list and the survey was conducted before the pre-banquet cocktail reception actually happened.

The lower score of Sears Contract Sales (badge holders sponsor) may be influenced by their sponsorship tenure (6 years), which was relatively shorter than other sponsors (10 years).

Finally, companies sponsoring tote bags, which is a high profile item, did not receive high recognition compared to other sponsors. Before the survey, it was expected that tote bag sponsors would receive high recognition since every attendee was provided with a tote bag when they registered at the show and typically used it to carry materials during the show. It is possible that the quality of the tote bag might influence attendees' recognition of sponsors. If a sponsored tote bag is of high quality, so attendees keep it after the show, their recognition of the tote bag sponsors might be higher.

**Attitudes Toward Corporate Sponsorship**

The results of this study indicated that certain sponsorship types and demographics were related to attitudes toward corporate sponsorship. This supports previous research conducted by Madrigal (2001), Rodgers (2000), Mowen (1999), Becker (1998), Crompton (1994), and Rajaretnam (1994). In this study, attendees have different evaluations of sponsorship types and they perceived corporate sponsorship positively. Sponsorship preference varied depending on the type of sponsorship. Results of the Multiple Regression analysis indicated that three sponsorship types (food and beverage, tote bag and badge holders, and e-mail station), repeated annual attendance, and one demographic characteristic (education level) were positive predictors of overall attendee attitudes toward corporate sponsorship.
More specifically, among four different sponsorship groups, food and beverage contribute the most to the positive attitudes of attendees followed by e-mail station and tote bag/badge holder. Food and beverage includes meals, refreshments, and one-time special events, such as banquet and cocktail receptions, which usually require large investments of sponsorship dollars. These three sponsorship types influenced attendees’ positive attitudes toward corporate sponsorship more than the educational sessions and the keynote address.

It appears that many respondents felt most favorably toward sponsorship practice, which provided them with direct benefits like food and beverage. They also favored the e-mail station and free giveaways such as tote bag and badge holders in relation to positive attitudes toward corporate sponsorship over those (educational sessions and the keynote address) that could be viewed as sales pitch. In case of educational sessions/keynote address, respondents placed a higher importance on them and these items recorded higher ranking in terms of mean score when compared with other sponsorship types individually. However, they were not significant predictors of attitudes toward corporate sponsorship. This may imply that while it is acceptable to provide goods, products and free meals as sponsorship, attendees prefer not to have corporate sponsorship influencing educational programming or using such sessions as a forum for self-promotion and sales pitch.

Overall, none of the four sponsorship types and demographics except gender was negatively related to attitudes. It is worth noting that e-mail station was ranked higher than both educational sessions and keynote address, which reflects a current trend of sponsoring high-tech communication items. As far as demographic characteristics, purchase role, gender, and age were not significant relating to attitudes. Per-
haps in another setting, these factors would have significant relationship with sponsorship attitudes.

The results support previous research, which suggested that sponsorship activities and arrangements can enhance images of sponsors and attitudes toward the corporation (Olson, 1998; Mowen, 1999). Mowen (1999) has shown that preferences for specific types of activities and conditions of sponsorship were related to overall positive attitudes of respondents. The author concluded that participants are most favorable toward activities that hold direct benefit for them provided by hospitality at special events than promotional items.

An important consideration is that attendees paid additional fees to attend education programs at the APRO show, while other events, such as banquet, cocktail-receptions, refreshments, and ice cream were complimentary. Mowen (1999) found that respondents evaluated the sponsorship of free programming much more highly than sponsored programs that charged a fee. Attendees often believe the registration fee should cover the expenses concerning the convention programs such as gala and receptions. Corporate sponsorship would then be seen as additional support used to cover the costs of the event and not be used as a revenue generator for the organization.

The findings of this study also support previous study by Rodgers (2000), which indicated that respondents' demographics are highly related with attendees' positive attitudes toward corporate sponsorship. However, concerning education level, this study showed opposite results with Rogers. While findings of the study by Rogers (2000) showed a negative relationship between education and sponsor liking, this study showed positive relationship between them, which means the more education a person had, the more he/she were likely to have positive attitudes toward corporate sponsorship.
Relating to previous studies overall, this study has similarities in terms of the high positive relationship between sponsorship activities and overall sponsorship attitudes. Since sponsorship has grown significantly in the past twenty years and it will continue to grow (McDowell, 1999), it is imperative to understand what makes sponsorship effective. Therefore, corporations should attempt to attract attendees to a particular product or service by sponsoring an event that matches the demographic characteristics of attendees with a particular type of sponsorship (Howard & Crompton, 1995).

Implications

There are several implications of this study for future sponsorship evaluation research and for effective sponsorship program at conventions and trade shows. This section will discuss implications of this study regarding sponsorship impact measured by recognition and attitudes.

Based on the findings of this study, it is imperative for sponsoring companies to identify their goals in sponsorship and select the most appropriate type of sponsorship that meets their needs. An analysis of sponsorship types may assist companies in deciding which type of sponsorship is most effective for their goals.

First, if their goal is maximizing recognition, sponsoring companies can achieve optimal impact of sponsorship in recognition by using exclusive sponsorship opportunities such as massage station, banquet, and keynote speakers and general session. Long-term sponsorship will also increase recognition while co-sponsoring items may decrease recognition of individual sponsors. Show managers may attempt to support a sponsor's desire for attendee recognition by facilitating attendee exposure. Creating an exciting trade show and encouraging participation for
the full length of the show, will translate into higher recognition of sponsors.

The findings also have important implications for the sale of sponsorships and for establishing close relationships between sponsoring company and attendees. Show managers may recommend on-site hospitality sponsorship with one sponsor. On-site hospitality sponsorships are important for attendee entertainment and valuable to build positive attitudes toward corporate sponsorships. Show managers may also utilize findings of this study to adjust their pricing of sponsorship packages based on attendee preference for different sponsorship types.

Concerning other factors relating to attitudes, repeated annual attendances at the show and education level were significant predictors of positive attitudes toward corporate sponsorship in this study. Since demographic characteristics were influential factors of sponsorship impact, show organizers should consider attendees' best interests to determine their needs first. For this, it is important for managers to have attendees evaluate sponsorship based on previous experience. A focus group interview or questionnaire survey might be conducted prior to offering sponsorship opportunities. Managers can differentiate sponsorship programs based on the analysis of attendees' demographic characteristics, such as education level, and they also can encourage attendees' annual attendance at the show by offering benefits to them. Shows which have similar demographics as this study, which were more or less biased to male attendees whose mean age were 43, might reflect the results and implications of this study on their sponsorship programs.

The results of this study are applicable to the APRO show, as well as other rental equipment shows. The results may be generalizable to other expositions and conventions that utilize similar sponsorship opportunities. A template questionnaire can be replicated by substituting
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sponsorship types and demographics information germane to the particular trade show. The author hopes the findings in this research provide some general direction for creating a model of corporate sponsorship evaluation in the convention and trade show.

Finally, this study helps show managers and sponsors in the convention and exposition industry understand how to accomplish sponsors' objectives by selecting appropriate sponsorship items. Results of this study will also be a good guide for sponsors to promote their brand message, to become high-profile sponsors, and creating effective and profitable sponsorship.

Limitations

This study was subject to several limitations, which may affect the generalizability or the applicability of the results. This study utilized a convenience sample of respondents at a single convention. As a result, the data may not be entirely indicative of all conventions and trade shows. Given that this study was focused on a rental convention and trade show, managers at other kinds of settings should interpret these findings with caution. However, the findings of this study suggest that understanding the characteristics of sponsorship types, attendee demographics, sponsorship preference, and attendees' attitudes have potential implications for professional practice of sponsorship.

Another limitation of this research is that consumers may not always distinguish sponsors from non-sponsors. It should be recognized that sponsorships are generally used in conjunction with other diverse communication and marketing activities, such as advertising or public relation efforts. That means isolating only the impact of sponsorship to measure attendees' attitudes toward sponsorship might be difficult due to the simultaneous advertising and promotional activities. In addition,
some companies sponsored more than one item as sponsorship activities, it might be hard to measure the sole impact of each sponsorship type.

Also the average longevity of attendees' recognition of sponsors would be different if measurement of recognition were conducted several weeks later after the show instead of on-site.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

There are several suggestions and directions for future research in exploring the impact of sponsorship.

First, there is a need to assess sponsorship across different settings with different convention and trade show areas to enhance generalization of the results. Sponsorship preference in relation to attitudes may be different depending on the type of show. Moreover, additional research should be directed toward experimental analyses on different sponsorship packages.

Second, although the full regression model suggested that preferences for specific sponsorship types, repeated annual attendance, and demographics were key determinants of overall attitudes toward corporate sponsorship, assessing only corporate sponsorship attitudes will not be sufficient. But rather, future studies should examine more carefully the linkages among sponsorship types, demographics, sponsor awareness, longevity of recognition, attitudes, purchase intentions, and actual purchase behavior. By integrating these variables as a collective index of sponsorship impact, the most effective sponsorship evaluation model can be created.

Third, there should be more assessment on sponsorship impact including potential factors, such as physical environment, attendees' desired experience, and their involvement levels in the sponsorship program.
which may influence attendees' attitudes and preference for corporate sponsorship.

Finally, using this research direction as a guide for future sponsorship research would assist in developing a more complete understanding of sponsorship impact.

Conclusions

Sponsorship types as well as the duration of attendance at a show were found to enhance recognition of corporate sponsors in this study. Recognition has its value in terms of influencing the development and depth of brand associations and increasing the chance that a brand or product will be considered and chosen by consumers (Jung, 1999). For sponsors whose companies or products are new to the market, awareness is crucial. Sponsors who already have high recognition want to continue to build a positive relationship with attendees. Therefore, when sponsors want high attendee recognition, event managers can advise them to purchase specific types of sponsorship and offer multiple opportunities for exposure to the sponsors' messages. In case of companies who wish to establish attendees' positive attitudes toward them, companies should concentrate their sponsorship on an exclusive and hospitality-oriented event. Also sponsorship program should be designed to fit the demographic characteristics of attendees.

This study demonstrated close relationship between overall attitudes toward sponsorship and various factors, such as specific sponsorship preference, demographics, and repeated annual attendance. This study was one of the first empirical efforts designed to assess corporate sponsorship impact in the convention and trade show area. The model used in this study might be a guide in testing and understanding spon-
sorship impact. This study also adds to the body of literature on spon-
sorship evaluation.

The nature of convention and trade show creates a unique marketing
opportunity where buyers and sellers interact to promote business. With
such a targeted market, sponsorship dollars may be concentrated to
maximize its impact.
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The UNLV Social Behavioral Institutional Review Board reviewed your request for changes of the subject protocol on September 12, 2002. The changes were approved and work on the project may continue.
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I am a Master of Science candidate in the William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration, University of Nevada- Las Vegas. I am conducting a study for the APRO sow association which will also be my thesis. I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

**Purpose of the Research**

The focus of this research will be on sponsorships. In particular, how to satisfy both show managers and sponsors and to maximize the positive impacts of sponsorships. The purpose of this study is to measure the impact of sponsorships on attendees. This study seeks to understand whether different types of sponsorships and characteristics of attendees, such as the number of days in attendance at a show, differently influence attendees' recognition of sponsors and their overall images of sponsors.

**Benefits of Participation**

The data and analysis will be used not only to further the understanding of how sponsorships are used in the Healthcare Industry, but may be generalized to attendees in other industries. By participating, you will receive an increased understanding of sponsorship. Benefits are (a) documenting types of sponsorships currently used and effective methods to attract and recognize sponsors, (b) providing marketing efforts of show managers to get sponsorships and factors that influence companies to sponsor an event, (c) understanding which sponsorships are influential to the attendee.

**Risks of Participation**

Research risks are minimal and no more risks than associated with everyday life. However, participants might be uncomfortable answering some of the questions asked.

**Procedure to Participation**

If you agree to participate in this research, you will be asked to fill out the attached questionnaire. It will take 2 minutes to fill out the questionnaire.

**Confidentiality**

Your response will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for at least 3 years after completion of the study.

**Voluntary Participation**

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study.
Contact Information
If questions and/or concerns to this research arise, please contact us at 702-699-9972. The principle investigator for this research is Eunju Suh and supervising professor is Dr. Curtis Love. For questions regarding this research, you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 895-2794.

Participant Consent
You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research. I’m requesting a waiver of signed consent. Thank you in advance for your participation and feedback. I greatly appreciate your time and effort.

Principal Investigator
Eun-ju Suh, Master of Science candidate
University of Nevada Las Vegas
Hotel Administration
969 E. Flamingo Rd, 128, Las Vegas, NV 89119
702-699-9972/ dominicaej@hotmail.com

Curtis Love, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
University of Nevada Las Vegas
Department of Tourism & Convention Administration
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 456023, Las Vegas, NV 89123
702-895-3334, 702-895-4870 fax / clove@ccmail.nevada.edu
Attendee Questionnaire

1. Which of the following companies sponsored events/products or services at The APRO Show? Please indicate "Y" for "yes" if the company is a sponsor of the APRO Show or "N" for "no" if the company is not a sponsor of the APRO Show.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name*</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philips Consumer Electronics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenith Electronics Corp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears Contract Sales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Furniture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES Marketing Inc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Line Industries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Touch Inc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIB Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JVC Corp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Appliances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresight Inc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Furniture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Information Systems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Multi Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery Marketing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Club Administrators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please evaluate the importance of the following sponsorship items for you PERSONALLY. Check (X) in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Extremely Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment breaks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals such as breakfast, lunch, or dinner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational sessions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tote bags</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badge holders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote addresses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Banquet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocktail Reception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Station</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Overall, how do you feel about sponsorships by corporations at this show?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Opposed</th>
<th>Somewhat Opposed</th>
<th>Neither Supportive or Opposed</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About you

1. Gender: □ Male □ Female

2. Age: ________________

3. What role do you personally play in the purchase of the products/service of the exhibiting companies?
   □ Final say/Approve Purchase  □ Specify Brand/Vendor
   □ Recommend  □ No role

4. How many times have you attended this show? Check one.
   □ 1 time  □ 2 times  □ 3 times  □ Over 3 times

5. Which day(s) did you attend the show? (Please check all that apply)
   □ Monday, July 22  □ Tuesday, July 23
   □ Wednesday, July 24  □ Thursday, July 25

6. What is the last year of school you completed? (Circle one)
   □ High School  □ Associate Degree  □ Some College
   □ College Degree  □ Graduate Degree

Thank you for your time and cooperation.
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