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ABSTRACT

This study examined brand awareness after a change in sponsor and audience perceptions about the sponsors and the event before and after the change. A survey of the audience at a surfing event was conducted. The findings were that the original sponsor maintained high awareness levels with the audience, particularly awareness of the previously sponsored event, thereby supporting the proposition that long-term sponsorship supports long-term brand awareness.

Secondly, the research found that a change in sponsorship does not necessarily lead to changes in respondents’ perceptions of the event.

Thirdly, the research showed that there was a mismatch in the values of the original sponsor and the event, whereas the current sponsor had a closer match with the event’s values. Sponsorships change fairly frequently and it would be of interest to sponsors to know the extent to which benefits continue to accrue after they have stopped sponsoring an event. Since almost no research has been carried out on residual awareness and awareness decay, this dissertation should contribute to knowledge about the cessation of sponsorships, as well as the broader field of sponsorship knowledge.
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CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

There is a general consensus that sponsorship continues to grow faster than other means of advertising, both locally and internationally. While there is a general slowdown worldwide in advertising, which also affects sponsorship, the latter is expected to grow by 15% in 2001.

The following points should be taken cognisance of when looking at sponsorship:
Does the proposed sponsorship match the values of the sponsoring company? Check that the passion and image the sport communicates is relevant to the sponsor’s products and organisational culture. Is the audience the sponsorship will attract relevant to the product? Can the sport deliver the required numbers? (SASC, 2001).

The objective of the research was to study these problems via the example of a surfing competition. In this way the study considered the impact of the migration from one sponsor to another, in a different industry: from a tobacco company to a retail company.

1.1. Introduction

Sponsorship has grown in South Africa since 1995, thanks largely to South Africa’s post-Apartheid re-admission to the world community, and to the growth in international sport. Sponsorship is one of the fastest growing marketing disciplines and, more than R1bn was spent buying sports sponsorships in South Africa in 1999 (Koenderman, 2000). This growth has now stressed the need for academic research
on this topic. This chapter will state the problem investigated by the study and will provide the objectives to be met, and the hypotheses to be assessed. Justification for the study as well as delimitations, limitations of the scope of the study, and assumptions will also appear in this chapter.

1.2. Statement of the problem

The long-term benefits of sponsorship have been stressed by researchers such as Rajaretman (1995: 139). His conclusions emphasize that sponsorship has a positive effect on corporate image. Moreover Jones and Dearsley (1988) underlined that there is clearly some residual benefit to be gained after a sponsorship has ended. Their research concerned the English premier league soccer championship sponsorship. The context of a ‘sport event’ is different because it appears only once a year. Thus, it is uncertain whether there is a residual benefit when the sponsorship for an annual single sport event ends.

1.3. Statement of the overall objective

The overall objective of the study is to determine how a target audience perceives the change of sponsor of a sport event and to what extent residual benefit is retained by the original sponsor, by studying the change in sponsor, from Gunston to Mr Price, of Durban’s major surfing competition.
1.4. Statement of sub-objectives

1.4.1. Sub-objective 1

To establish, from the spectators’ point of view, if attitudes towards the event are influenced by attitudes towards the corporate sponsors?

1.4.2. Sub-objective 2

To determine whether, and how, the change of sponsorship has changed the spectators’ values and attitudes about the surfing competition.

1.4.3. Sub-objective 3

To determine to what extent the brand equity built up through sponsorship by Gunston has continued since their sponsorship has ended.

1.5. Hypotheses

H1: It is hypothesised that the change of sponsorship does not change the consumer’s perceptions of the event.

H2: It is hypothesised that the perceived values of the event are influenced by the values of the sponsor.

H3: It is hypothesised that a long-term sponsorship affords long-term brand awareness even after the resignation by the sponsor, especially when the sponsors’ name is associated with the competition.
1.6. **Delimitations**

Firstly, the study will be delimited to the Durban beachfront area because this is where the surfing competition takes place. Secondly, the study will be delimited to the population present at the beachfront during the event.

1.7. **Limitations**

The exploratory nature of the study implies that the results cannot be generalized to other events or to the sponsors linked to them.

1.8. **Assumptions**

According to the model developed by Eilander and Koenders (1995, in Meenagh, 1995: 75-76), it may be assumed that the more a consumer/respondent is involved with a certain sponsored object, the more he will be aware of all aspects concerning that particular object, and therefore the greater will be the communication effect of the sponsor on the consumer/respondent.

It may be assumed that the way in which the communication efforts will filter through to the respondents will not differ, regardless of whether they are heavily involved with the given subject or not, but the impact and the timing of these efforts certainly will.
1.9. Justification for the research

Sponsorship has enjoyed a boom since 1995, thanks in large measure to South Africa's re-admission to the world community and to the growth in international sport. It remains one of the fastest growing of the major marketing disciplines and, according to BMI Sports Info 2000 which tracks sports sponsorship annually, more than R1bn was spent buying sports sponsorships in 1999 (Koenderman, 2000).

The study will help event organisers to find new sponsors, especially if it demonstrates that the sponsors’ image remains in the target audience’s mind after the end of the sponsorship. Moreover the study will contribute to increased academic knowledge about customer perceptions and the changing of sponsors. It does not appear as if any similar study has been carried out in South Africa to investigate this relationship.

1.10 Chapter summary

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter states the problem investigated by the study and provides the objectives and sub-objectives to be met, and the propositions/hypotheses to be assessed. Justification for the study as well as delimitations, limitations of the scope of the study, and assumptions also appear in this chapter.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The literature review will cover the definition of the concept of sponsorship, and the concept of brand equity will be defined. Specific attention will be paid to the
benefits and the objectives of sponsorship. Then, the context of South African sponsorship and the legislation around tobacco advertising will be highlighted. Any gaps in the literature concerning the topic of the study will be emphasized.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology
In this section, the research process will be detailed: research design, sampling, data collection, analysis, and validity and reliability of the results.

Chapter 4: Analysis of the data
This part will be composed of the analyses of the questionnaires and the presentation of the findings related to the hypotheses and propositions.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations
The conclusion section will answer the questions related to the objectives and sub-objectives and hypotheses, while the recommendations section will provide alternatives and recommendations for marketing practitioners, as well as suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Through advertising at sporting events, sponsorship of competitions, the use of sport professionals to endorse products, the emergence of business-oriented sports managers, the specific marketing of sports-related goods and services, and an increasing reliance upon associated broadcasting fees, organised sport has become firmly and undeniably linked to the wider economic settings. The growth of sponsorship by private companies and agencies has arguably been the most obvious and public form of commercialisation in sport (Polley, 1998).

While some types of corporate promotional activities, such as celebrity endorsements and cause-related marketing have received much recent attention in the marketing and advertising literature, one increasingly popular strategic activity, event sponsoring, has had comparatively little academic attention. This is surprising in that event sponsoring is directed toward the creation and perpetuation of sports-related events and accounted for almost $11 billion in 1996 (Meenagh, 1998).

Sponsorship has enjoyed a boom since 1995, thanks in large measure to South Africa's re-admission to the world community and to the growth in international sport. It remains one of the fastest growing of the major marketing disciplines and, according to BMI Sports Info 2000 which tracks sports sponsorship annually, more than R1bn was spent buying sports sponsorships in 1999 (Koenderman, 2000).
But recently, the anti-tobacco law has turned the sponsorship field upside down by modifying the legal environment. Sport events are especially influenced as tobacco companies were the major sponsors of these events. This regulation led to changes in corporate strategy for tobacco companies and it has also implemented radical changes in the event industry, as cigarette brands were title sponsors of Durban’s annual events, such as the Rothmans July and the Gunston 500.

Through previous research and literature, the following section will start with a review of the marketing mix and particularly the promotion aspect. Then it will present an appropriate definition of sponsorship from previous research, as well as the benefits related to the use of sponsorship. Finally, after defining the current situation of the event industry in South Africa, the literature will focus on the surfing contest and its sponsors.

2.2 The marketing mix

The marketing mix is the combination of elements that the firm controls in order to influence customers to choose one particular organisation in preference to another (Adcock et al., 1998). According to Kotler (1997: 92), the marketing mix is “the set of marketing tools that the firm uses to pursue its marketing objectives in the target market”. The internal marketing mix groups the Product, the Price, the Place and the Promotion.
2.2.1 The Target Market

Referring to Kotler’s definition of the marketing mix, the concept of a target market might be explained.

Market segmentation is the first step in order to select the target markets. Indeed the total market is often too large to serve. So the company has to break the total market into segments that share common properties. For example, the market segmentation can be based on the customer size (large, medium, small), customer buying criteria (quality, price, service), or buyer industry (banks, professional firms, manufacturing companies) (Kotler, 1997).

As soon the target market to be served has been identified, the marketing mix can be set up. The target market will lead all the choices of the marketing strategy in order to fulfil the needs of the target and therefore maximise sales and profits.

2.2.2 The Product

The American Marketing Association defines a product as “anything which can be offered to a market for attention, acquisition or consumption including physical objects, services, personalities, organisations and desires” (Kotler, 2000: 93). Adcock et al. (1998:152) prefer to define the product from a customer point of view as “everything that the customer receives that is of value in terms of a perceived want, need or problem”. Moreover the product is a multidimensional offering, with both tangible and intangible attributes. In fact the product has two main components. On the one hand there is the ‘basic product’. It represents the essential benefit on offer to the customer but expressed in a product form. On the other hand, there is the
‘real product’ that comprises the basic product plus an additional ‘layer’ of tangible features that make up the real product, such as design and colour, packaging and brand name. Then, the ‘finished product’ will add to the listed product a number of intangible extras that add utility through services, such as delivery, customer services, and perhaps subtle qualities and assurances of distinctive value to the customer (Adcock et al., 1998). Kotler (1997) summarises this view, including as part of the product the following which are both tangible and intangible assets: product variety, quality, design, features, brand name, packaging, sizes, services, warranties and returns.

2.2.3 The Price

The price is what is paid as part of the exchange process, being passed from customer to supplier either as money or in kind. What the customer receives is the composite of the other elements of the marketing mix. If a product is more attractive (added value from additional features) the product is made more valuable to customers. In this case, it might be possible to raise prices to reflect this value (Adcock et al., 1998).

Under price, Kotler (1997) gathers price list, discounts, allowances, payment period, and credit terms.
2.2.4 The place

According to Kotler (1997), place includes the various activities the company undertakes to make the product accessible and available to target customers. It gathers together channels, coverage, assortments, locations, inventory and transport.

The choice of efficient distribution channels relies on knowledge of a particular market. But, more specifically, it relies on the needs and the wants of customers. It may not be possible to satisfy everything a particular customer wants, but that customer’s decision is likely to be based on issues such as cost, convenience and availability. The effectiveness of the availability strategy might be a major concern. Thus, the channel decision can give a competitive edge: an organisation reaching customers and gaining sales because its products reach customers in a more appropriate way than those from competitors (Adcock et al., 1998).

Three elements of the marketing have been defined. The last element, promotion, which is more relevant to this study, will be developed in more detail in the next section.

2.3 Promotion

The promotion aspect of the marketing mix will be explained in the following section through the concept of corporate image, marketing communication, brand equity, brand awareness, the communication process, and the target audience.
2.3.1 Corporate Image

The various associations made between a company or brand, and non-product elements, such as other organisations or individuals, can influence perceptions of the company and its products (Aaker, 1996).

Clearly, there are several key goals associated with corporate sponsorship of events, such as enhanced brand image via associations with positively perceived events, increased goodwill via perceptions of corporate generosity, and elevated brand awareness due to increased exposure (Gwinner, 1997).

2.3.2 Marketing communication

The marketing communication mix consists of five major modes of communications:

- **Advertising**: any paid form of non-personal presentation and promotion of ideas, goods, or services by an identified sponsor.
- **Sales promotion**: a variety of short-term incentives to encourage trial or purchase of a product or a service.
- **Public relations and publicity**: a variety of programs designed to promote and/or protect a company’s image or its individual products.
- **Personal Selling**: face-to-face interaction with one or more prospective purchasers for the purpose of making presentations, answering questions, and procuring orders.
- **Direct marketing**: Use of mail, telephone, fax, e-mail, and other non-personal contact tools to communicate with, or to solicit a direct response from, specific customers and prospects (Kotler, 1997:604).
Perception is the process by which people select, organise, and interpret information to form a meaningful picture of the world.

A company wishes to communicate in order to make its audience aware of the company, feel good about it, and act on the information and their feelings to achieve a particular end result (Sleight, 1989).

### 2.3.3 Brand equity

Brand equity is a set of assets (and liabilities) linked to a brand’s name and symbol that adds to (or subtracts from) the value provided by a product or a service to a firm and/or that firm’s customers. The major asset categories are: brand name awareness, brand loyalty, perceived quality, and brand associations (Aaker, 1996).

Brand loyalty is a key consideration when placing a value on a brand that is to be bought or sold, because a highly loyal customer base can be expected to generate a very predictable sales and profit stream. Moreover, a brand’s value to a firm is largely created by the customer loyalty it commands. And considering loyalty as an asset encourages and justifies loyalty-building programs, which then help create and enhance brand equity (Aaker, 1996).

Perceived quality is a brand association that is elevated to the status of a brand asset for several reasons. Among all brand associations, only perceived quality has been shown to drive financial performance. Perceived quality is often a major (if not the principal) strategic thrust of a business. Perceived quality is linked to, and often drives, other aspects of how a brand is perceived (Aaker, 1996).
Brand equity is supported in great part by the associations that consumers make with a brand. These associations might include product attributes, a celebrity spokesperson, or a particular symbol. Brand associations are driven by the brand identity, that is, what the organisation wants the brand to stand for in the customer’s mind (Aaker, 1996).

### 2.3.4 Brand awareness

Awareness refers to the strength of a brand’s presence in the consumer’s mind. It can be a driver in some categories. It means that this presence will lead the consumer’s choice. Moreover, it usually has a key role to play in brand equity. Awareness measures can reflect in part the scope of the brand’s reach in terms of segments. Increasing awareness is one mechanism to expand the market reach of the brand. Awareness can also affect perceptions and attitudes. Brand awareness reflects both the knowledge and the salience of the brand in the customer’s mind. Awareness can be measured on different levels including the following: Recognition, Recall, Graveyard statistics, Top of mind, Brand dominance, Brand familiarity, and Brand knowledge or Salience (Aaker, 1996).

### 2.3.5 The Communication process

Communication is more than a message being sent. For communication to have taken place, it is necessary for the message that is received to have been understood in the way it was intended. It means that the sender of a message has to have a measure of response reaction to know whether communication has taken place. The
response or feedback enables the sender to develop the message thereby ensuring that the receiver understands it. Communication is therefore a ‘two-way’ rather than a ‘one-way’ process (Adcock et al., 1998).

Moreover the communication takes place in a context, where some interference might be identified, such as noise. The term, noise, in the context of communication, has a wider meaning and is used to identify any extraneous factor, which can affect the transfer of the message. This can even be extended to the effect of external factors on a consumer’s attitude to spending. Messages can also be distorted directly as a result of the processes involved in transmitting them from the sender to the receiver. The message may be incomplete because the sender may not have the full information that should be included in the message. It may be vague because the sender may not know the precise words that should be used in some aspects of the message. The sender may choose the wrong medium for sending the message: the telephone is used when a letter is needed; an item is described verbally when a drawing is needed (Adcock et al., 1998).

### 2.3.6 The Target Audience

When the communication mix is settled, the target market becomes a target audience. The communicator should research the audience’s needs and attitudes, preferences and other characteristics as a prelude to setting communication objectives. The audience may be potential buyers of the company’s products, current users, deciders or influencers. The audience may be individuals, groups, particular publics, or the general public. The key role of the target audience is that it will highly influence the
communicator’s decisions on what is to be said, how it is to be said, when it is to be said, where it is to be said and who is to say it.

The section highlighted all the components of promotion, with particular importance being placed on the target audience. The following section will focus on one specific type of promotion - sponsorship.

2.4 Description of sponsorship

After a theoretical definition of sponsorship, this section will point out the categories and types of sponsorship and the cost of this promotional strategy.

2.4.1 Definition

Bloom and Gundlach (2001) explain that sponsorship began as an extension of philanthropy to enable companies to tie their names to their contribution more directly. Moreover during recent years sponsorship has grown in popularity because it enables companies to avoid some of the inefficiencies of traditional advertising, such as clutter.

The global expenditure on corporate sponsorships was reported as being $US 5 billion in 1989 (Meerabeau et al., 1991). By 1993 this had increased to an amount reported variously as $US 10.8 billion (Meenagh, 1994) and $US 9.6 billion (Cornwell, 1995). The 1988 winter and summer Olympics gained $US 350 million in sponsorship, while each of the fourteen major sponsors of the 1996 Summer Olympics was asked to pay $US 40 million, seven times “what the 1992 Summer Games sponsors paid and ten times what a 1984 sponsor contributed” (Kuzma et al.,
1993: 27). So according to Meenagh (1995), the emergence of commercial sponsorship as an increasingly utilised method of marketing communication represents one of the most significant marketing developments in recent decades. Indeed, growth in this medium is symptomatic of the drive by marketing practitioners to bring forth new and cost-efficient modes of communicating with corporate publics.

Modern sponsorship is a mutually beneficial business arrangement between sponsors and sponsored to achieve defined objectives (Head, 1981). In 1974 a report prepared for the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra further defined sponsorship as:

“the donation or the loan of resources (men, money, materials) by private individuals or organisations to other individuals or organisations engaged in the provision of those public goods and services designed to improve the quality of life” (Head, 1981:2).

This definition seems to be more philanthropic than business-oriented. Sleight (1989: 4) defined sponsorship as:

“a business relationship between a provider of funds, resources or services, and an individual, event or organisation, which offers in return some rights and associations that may be used for a commercial advantage”.

Anderson and Winter (2000) add to this the point that sponsorship is the business link between commercial companies and events or activities, through the provision of funds and services to achieve a predetermined marketing and communication objective; or a cash or in-kind fee paid to a property (typically sport, art, entertainment or causes) in return for commercial potential associated with that property.
Before going further with the marketing implications of sponsorship, the following section will explain the different types of sponsorship.

2.4.2 Categories and types of sponsorship

Sport sponsorship can generally be put under three categories: **title sponsor** where the name of the sponsored event or team is linked with the sponsor e.g. (Bankfin Currie Cup); **supplier or official sponsor** status where the sponsor is recognised as “official sponsor of X”. Another, less popular type in the South African market is the **presenting sponsor category**, where there is typically a title sponsor and a second major sponsor (Old Mutual Two Oceans Marathon Presented by Nike) (Ikalafeng, 2000). To those categories, Vignali (1997) added that of **ownership**. In this case, the company actually owns and co-ordinates the event or property. Golf and tennis tournament are good examples. Moreover he linked the degrees of sponsorship with the amount of money that the sponsor contributes to an event.

Further, Ikalafeng (2000) defines three types of sponsors: those who are integral to the sport; those who are indirectly associated with the sport; and finally those whose image or target market profile is linked to the followers of the sport. In his opinion, each category of sponsorship or sponsor carries with it a set of rights and obligations relating to the usage of the name of the sponsored team, event or athlete, merchandising, branding, leveraging, category limitations and future rights, regardless of the amount of money paid. In other words, he introduced an ethic of self-respect between the sponsor and the sponsored object or persons.
All these categories are based on the financial investment decided by the sponsor. It will cost more to be the title sponsor than it will to simply be the supplier.

Apart from this categorisation of sponsors based on the amount of money involved, Otkar and Hayes (1987) have developed a definition based on the link between the product and the sponsor.

**Strongly linked products** are those where the product or product performance is demonstrated in the sponsored event – ‘This sport involves running fast, running fast is made possible by Adidas shoes, and Adidas are sponsoring it.’

**Linked, but not strongly** - where the product exhibits some reasonable relationship to the event – ‘This sport is brought to you by video, Philips video cameras are recording it, and Philips is sponsoring it.’

**Non-linked** - where the product is related to the event by a relationship to the image of the event or demographics of the event audience – ‘This sport is played by virile people, virile people smoke Marlboro, and Marlboro is sponsoring it.’

From these definitions, it might be pointed out that the levels of sponsorship depend on the levels of involvement of the company both financially and from a product point of view. Moreover the sponsorship cannot be reduced to the event, in other words to the on-site promotion. The sponsorship leverage occurs as soon as the company develops a whole communication mix in order to support the sponsorship expenses.
2.4.3 Sponsorship leverage:

Any sponsorship needs to be supported by a marketing budget. These will typically double the cost of sponsorship. From the point of view of the sponsor, the only cost that matters is the real cost, i.e. what it will cost the company to achieve the objectives set for the sponsorship campaign. Indirect costs of sponsorship are hard for the observer or the seller to estimate since they will be determined by the sponsors’ objectives and hence the level of support activity he wishes to undertake, but typical ratios are one to one or 1 to 1.5 for direct to indirect costs (Sleight, 1989).

The generally accepted standard is that for every Rand an organisation spends, it needs to spend at least twice as much to leverage its sponsorship in order to communicate to its target consumers the connection between the target market, the sport and the sponsor. Moreover, advertising, publicity, word-of-mouth, and the brand exposure from integrated leveraging of the sponsorship go a long way toward establishing a long-term relationship with consumers and creating a halo-effect for the brand (Ikalafeng, 2000). However, most experts argue that the supporting expenditure after purchasing sponsorship rights falls short of acceptable leveraging spend levels. A one-to-one ratio is generally considered the minimum, and internationally it is now considered that for every Rand spent on sponsorship, R3 should be spent on back-up advertising and support (Anderson and Winter, 2000).

To be efficient, a sponsorship has to be part of the whole marketing strategy of a company. It means that the sponsor has to develop its activities partly to link in with the promotional strategy chosen; in this case sponsorship. To understand the implication of sponsorship as a marketing tool, the following section will present the
advantages of sponsorship, the sponsor-sponsee relationship, the influence of the on-site sponsorship and a theoretical model developed by Eilanders and Koender (1995, in Meenaghan, 1995).

2.5 Sponsorship as a marketing tool

Companies embarking on sponsorship marketing programmes need a thorough understanding of global marketing trends, brand positioning, consumer promotions, public relations, event management as well as skills to negotiate effective sponsorship deals (Anderson and Winter, 2000).

While sponsorships may be differentiated operationally from traditional advertising, it is likely that the objectives of most sponsorship programs are, with few significant exceptions, broadly similar to the intended objectives of most advertising campaigns (Meenaghan, 1983).

Like advertising, sponsorships may be undertaken to increase public awareness of a firm and/or to alter a previously established corporate image, to increase corporate sales, or to increase media-exposure levels. By associating their products with a fast, young, exciting and technologically advanced sport, sponsors may hope to link their products with exactly these characteristics.

In terms of image, the immediate thoughts for a company, once it has signed a sponsorship contract, will be to get the company or product name onto anything related to the sponsored organisation. But “it is absolutely no good slapping your
company logo all over the place if it is going to look like an afterthought” (Gillies, 1991:123).

2.5.1 The Advantages of sponsorship

Crimmins and Horn (1996: 12) explained the value of a sponsorship, which is related to the manner in which it enables a company to segment a market based on interests or psychographics, as follows:

“sponsorship improves the perception of a brand by flanking our beliefs about the brand and linking the brand to an event or organisation that the target audience already values highly.”

Sleight (1989) listed the purposes of sponsorship as: name awareness, image reinforcement, media exposure, hospitality, new market development, sales promotion and incentives, workforce communication and motivation, access to decision-makers, community relations, and sampling. He emphasised the fact that sponsorship cannot work alone or be used in isolation from the other communication media. Head (1981) added to these the point that sponsorship offers the most exposure to both success and failure.

Concerning the effects of sponsorship, Eilander and Koenders (1995, in Meenagh, 1995) stated that sponsorship is one of the fields of market communication that has seen hardly any validated, quantitative methods for effect measurement. Common approaches are the monitoring of media exposure on the one hand, and on the other hand, the other effect of sponsorship, the impact on the sponsoring company, is measured by basic market research.
Researchers such as Rajaretman (1995) have stressed the long-term benefits of sponsorship. His conclusions emphasise that sponsorship has a positive effect on corporate image. Moreover, Ikalafeng (2000) emphasises that no sponsor can expect to win affection of consumers in the short term. There has to be a commitment to building the relationship over time - usually three to five years. To illustrate his point of view, he raised two examples of sponsorship commitment. In 1999, cellular giant MTN became the title sponsor of the Two Oceans marathon, which after the Comrades is the most popular ultra marathon, held in scenic Cape Town. Also co-sponsored by Nike, the event, largely due to the leveraging and professional execution of the sponsorship by MTN and Nike, was voted the best-ever ultra-marathon in Africa. Unfortunately, due to change in strategy, MTN did not re-new their one-year commitment. Such corporate behaviour raises questions such as: Why did they sponsor the event in the first place? Other than the burst of short-term awareness, what long-term benefits have they gained? What long-term relationship did they build with the running community? On the other hand, IWISA Maize Meal, through the long-term sponsorship of Kaizer Chiefs and the IWISA Spectacular Charity event, have gained enormous market share and long-term top of mind awareness from their association with South Africa’s premier soccer team and event.

A long-term agreement might thus be considered as the basis of a profitable sponsorship. To illustrate and complement this statement, the next section will emphasise the relationship between sponsor and sponsee.
2.5.2 The Sponsor-Sponsee relationship:

2.5.2.1 A strong relevance to the consumers

Most recently the idea of linking has been studied under the schema congruence theory. Mc Daniel (1999, in Lardinoit and Quester, 2001) investigated a match-up hypothesis where the perceived match of brand attributes with the sponsor’s attributes influences consumer response to such marketing communications. In a study of students’ attitudes after exposure to mock stimuli, findings showed that, for a known brand of automobile, attitudes toward the advertisement were significantly different when the automobile was paired with the Olympics rather than with NHL hockey or PBA bowling. These findings suggest that consumers do pay attention to the relationship between the sponsor and sponsee and evaluate more highly a matched, over a mismatched, relationship (at least with regards to advertising). Likewise, Johar and Pham (1999), in their study of consumer information processing, have shown rather convincingly that consumers utilise the relatedness of a product and sponsor as well as the prominence of a brand in sponsor identification. However, not all authors agree that event linking is important.

Crimmins and Horn (1996) argue that the nature of the link is less important than the marketer’s effort to articulate a relationship. In other words, it is not necessary to find a strong link. Some products may not have them, but rather it is important to build an interpretation of the sponsorship-linked marketing program through advertising. The work of Stipp and Schiavone (1996) and Stipp (1998) would appear to provide significant support of this hypothesis.
2.5.2.2 The sponsorship as a marriage

As a base for their study, Cheng and Stotlar (1999) stated that: if corporations are only attracted to sport’s potential commercial value and have no commitment to managing their future relationship, sport faces the danger of over-commercialised activities that pollute the essences of sport. Marriage and sponsorship both require long-term commitments to assist each party in reaching mutual fulfilment. Another point that might be added to this discussion is that on the one hand the sport industry would be diminished without the support of corporations (Irwin, 1993). And on the other hand, sponsorship can create a symbiotic relationship for sport and corporations (Stotlar, 1993) and they depend upon each other heavily (Schaaf, 1995).

For Cheng (1998), sport sponsorship is based on exchange theory and must be based on mutual respect and trust.

2.5.3 Influence of on-site sponsorship

The unspoken nature of the sponsorship message (Pham, 1992; Quester and Farely, 1997), the peripheral nature of the sponsor’s on-site sponsorship at the event (resulting in a lack of attention granted such sponsorship by the audience) and the weak involvement of the audience attending the event all suggest that a cognitive model would be inappropriate to describe the effects of on-site sponsorship activities (Hastings, 1984; Pham and Vanhuele, 1997). Indeed some authors have disputed any persuasion potential of on-site sponsorship activities, even in cases where longer exposures can be achieved. Crimmins and Horn (1996) and Otker (1988) deny outright the power of on-site sponsorship to generate dramatic changes in corporate
image. Considering the relative stability of consumers’ attitudes, therefore, one might predict that on-site sponsorship alone would be unlikely to provoke attitudinal changes.

Taking into consideration the unspoken nature of the sponsorship message, it could be expected that the audience’s distraction might result in an increased importance of contextual cues. Gorn (1982) suggested that contextual affective cues would be all the more likely to influence attitudinal change when the underlying motivation is low, and this clearly describes the sponsorship context (Pham and Vanhuele, 1997). This argument is also consistent with other views that sponsorship persuades indirectly and by association (Crimmins and Horn, 1996). In other words, the process according to which sponsorship influences attitudes could be described as incidental rather than central (Quester, 1997) and involves low-involvement learning (d’Ydewalle et al., 1988) more akin to classical conditioning or rote learning than to cognitive processing.

### 2.5.4 The Eilander and Koenders Model

The source of this model has been the lack of decent research techniques into the effects of sport sponsorship. There have of course been the so-called exposure measurements, providing the sponsors with a (sometimes very) detailed insight into the amount of ‘free publicity’, like the number of seconds’ television-time, or the number of column centimetres in printed media, but knowing how long you have been on television does not necessarily relate to a standard given effect. Again with the research that measures the awareness levels of sponsors, it is not easy to determine the cause of changes in awareness levels.
The model is based on two basic philosophies:

- It may be assumed that the more a consumer/respondent is involved with a certain sponsored object, the more he will be aware of all aspects concerning that particular object, and therefore the greater will be the communication effect of the sponsor on the consumer/respondent.

- The way in which the communicational efforts will filter through to the respondent will not differ, whether one is heavily involved with a given subject or not, but the impact and the timing of these efforts certainly will.

According to the authors, the model can be applied to any sponsor object, be it a person, a club, an event, a television-program, or a concert hall. Any object can be measured (Eilander and Koenders, 1995, in Meenaghan, 1995).

Within these two hypotheses, the authors define, per sponsored object, four different levels of proximity, which terms they use to distinguish the sponsor’s target group in different segments based on the physical and emotional involvement of the members of the target group with the sponsored object.

- Level 1: visitor to the sponsored object: this level has physical and mental proximity
- Level 2: people interested in the sponsored object: at a certain distance, not visitors, their proximity is mostly mental
- Level 3: people interested in the sponsorship-field to which the sponsored object belongs (sports, arts, music, etc.). These people have an indirect mental proximity to the sponsored object.
Level 4: people not interested in the sponsored object or the sponsorship field.

They have no physical or mental proximity to the sponsored object and/or the sponsorship field.

According to these features, the model can be applied to any object because of its extreme flexibility. By conducting a number of questionnaires per object (at least two, one before and one after the sponsorship) an adequate observation of effects may be obtained (Eilanders and Koenders, 1995, in Meenaghan, 1995). This study focused on the Level one segment. It means that the respondents were visitors to the sponsored object – the surfing competition.

### 2.6 The event industry

According to McDonnell et al. (1999), special events are characterised according to their size and scale. Common categories are mega-events, hallmarks and major events. Events are also classified according to their purpose or to the particular sector to which they belong, for example public, sporting, tourism and corporate events.

#### 2.6.1 The event industry in South Africa

The event industry in South Africa is discussed by Tiassopoulos, (2000: 25-30) as follows:

Event tourism is in its infancy in South Africa – due to the political legacy- but it is estimated that it is set to expand even faster than the 10 to 15% annual growth rate predicted for the tourism industry. It is emphasised that at this stage pre- and post-meeting tourism is a feature of most international meetings. Anything from 500 to
700 people or more who visit South Africa for a single meeting are normally in the A or B income group level. These meeting delegates sometimes bring their spouses and families and stay up to a week within the country.

The following analysis is based on the data provided by SATOUR from three sources: SATOUR’s 1997-2007 and 1999-2008 Calendar of Conferences and Exhibitions, and the SATOUR Calendar of Events. The analyse of these records indicates that the top four event regions in order of importance are Gauteng, Western Cape, Kwazulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape. A further analysis stresses a regional event concentration to be taking place. Most events in Gauteng, for instance, take place in the greater Johannesburg region; in the Western Cape they are mostly organised in and around Cape Town; in Kwazulu-Natal they are found largely in Durban; and in the Eastern Cape they take place for the most part in Port Elizabeth.

Commercial and trade events dominate the current event market in South Africa. These are followed by cultural events. Art and entertainment events occupy the third position. Recreational events occupy a distant fourth position.

2.6.2 Typology of events

2.6.2.1 Major events

Major events, according to Jago and Shaw (1998) are large-scale (usually national or international) special events which are high in status or prestige and which attract large crowds and media attention. They may be expensive to stage, may involve
tradition or symbolism, attract funds to the region, lead to demand for associated services and leave behind legacies or result in urban renewal (Tassiopoulos, 2000).

According to McDonnell et al. (1999), many top international sporting championships fit into this category, and are increasingly being sought after and bid for by national sporting organisations and governments in the competitive world of international major events.

2.6.2.2 Hallmark events

Hallmark events can be defined as follows:

“Major one-time or recurring events of limited duration developed primarily to enhance the awareness, appeal and profitability of a tourist destination in the short and or long term. Such events rely on their success or uniqueness, status or timely significance to create interest and attract attention.” (Hall, 1992: 2).

McDonnell et al. (2000: 12) adds to this definition by saying that the term ’hallmark’ is used to describe a recurring event that possesses such significance, in terms of tradition, attractiveness, image, or publicity, that the event provides the host venue, community, or destination with a competitive advantage. Over time, the event and destination become inseparable. Moreover the authors add to this point that every community and destination needs one or more hallmark events to provide the high levels of media exposure and positive imagery that help to create competitive advantage.

The Mr Price Pro might be considered as a ‘hallmark’, as it is part of the metropolitan strategy to make Durban the playground of South Africa. Furthermore
the event has been recurring since 1969 and had acquired a status in the surfing competitions calendar.

### 2.6.2.3 Mega-events

Tassiopoulos (2000) simply described mega-events as events that can attract very large numbers of event visitors or have a large cost or psychological effects. Getz (1997: 6) defines them as follows:

“Their volume should exceed 1 million visits, their capital costs should be at least $500 million, and their reputation should be of a ‘must see’ event... Mega-events, by way of their size or significance, are those that yield extraordinarily high levels of tourism, media coverage, prestige, or economic impact for the host community or destination.”

Hall’s (1992: 5) definition might help to create a clearer idea of what mega-events are:

“Mega-events such as World Fairs and Expositions, the Soccer World Cup final, or the Olympic Games, are events which are expressly targeted at the international tourism market and may be suitably described as ‘mega’ by virtue of their size in terms of attendance, target market, level of public financial involvement, political effects, extent of television coverage, construction of facilities, and impact on economic and social fabric of the host community”.

### 2.6.3. Event sponsorship

The sponsoring of events give business another medium, which if correctly constructed and managed, can allow businesses to reach a target market in an effective manner that also complements their existing promotional mix. Moreover, according to Geldard and Sinclair (1996), the benefits expected from sponsorship are: increased awareness of company and product, increased product identity with a
particular lifestyle, a means of product and market differentiation, a means of entertaining key clientele, a means of providing merchandising opportunities, a means of product or corporate image building, an opportunity to represent commitment to a particular community. From these benefits, they add to this list exclusivity (the ability to lock a competitor out of an activity), the opportunity to demonstrate products attributes, and the opportunity to generate sales.

When sponsorship of events was in its infancy, many decisions regarding corporate sponsorship reflected the personal interest of the senior management. Nowadays the events must fit the promotional objectives of the sponsoring firm. In other words, event organisers must find companies that have promotional needs that sponsorship can satisfy (McDonnell et al., 2000).

2.7 Surfing

According to Booth (1995) the Hawaiian art of surfing (riding a board across the face of a breaking wave) diffused throughout the Pacific. By the outbreak of the Second World War, surfing was a recognised leisure pursuit on the Pacific rim, particularly southern California, Australia, New Zealand, and Peru as well as South Africa. Surfing developed as a recreation and an organised sport after the war (Booth, 1995).

2.7.1 Ambivalence toward competition in surfing

The sentiments held by many surfers concerning the emergence of surfing is summarised by Bob Pike (1992: 88) who says that:
“he doesn’t like to compete and does not think any of the top board riders do. Moreover from his point of view, it takes too much of the pleasure out of the sport and creates too many jealousies. Competitions are against the spirit of surfing which is supposed to be a communion with nature rather an hectic chase for points.”

Nevertheless surfers recognised that organised competition was essential for public acceptance of their sport (Booth, 1995).

2.7.2 Professional contests

Amateurism never encumbered surfing. Early surfers endorsed and advertised products, wrote newspaper and magazine columns, and made their living from associated industries. Two important developments in professional surfing occurred at the fourth Duke Kahanamoku contest in 1968. First, Kimo McVay, entrepreneur and business manager of the legendary Hawaiian surfer Duke Kahanamoku offered US $1,000 as a first prize; second, two of the organisers, television producer Larry Lindbergh and surfer/promoter Fred Van Dyke proposed an International Professional Surfers’ Association (IPSA). The objective, according to Van Dyke, was to establish a professional circuit and a surfer’s association to govern the sport (Booth, 1995). To compare, at the Mr Price Pro 2001, the prize money were R80000 for the men’s title and R40000 for the women’s title.

2.8 Sponsorship in South Africa

2.8.1 Overview

Since 1994, when South African sport took its rightful place on the international sporting stage after many years of isolation, and global sport brands re-
entered the country, sport sponsorship has grown at exponential rates. Major local telecommunications companies such as Vodacom and MTN, and beer giant, SAB, have led the way, investing millions into the most popular team sports: soccer and rugby, and athletics. According to BMI Sport Info, sport sponsorship has been growing at an estimated 22% annually and accounting for in excess of 20% of most companies’ communication budgets, taking a prominent role in the marketing mix and a large share of the demand creation budget (Ikalafeng, 2000).

According to Anderson and Winter (2000), sponsorship has become the fastest growing segment of the marketing spend globally and has enjoyed dramatic growth in South Africa since 1995 and South Africa’s reintroduction to the international sporting arena.

2.8.2 Context of the Tobacco Law

2.8.2.1 The Law

Smokers who light up in an enclosed public place outside designated smoking areas are liable for a fine of at least R200, according to new tobacco regulations published in the Government Gazette. The new laws also banned all tobacco advertising and sponsorships, and made the sale of tobacco products to children under 16 illegal. All enclosed public places, including workplaces, had to have designated smoking areas by January 1 2001. Among the public places where smoking is restricted to specific areas are airports, trains (where certain carriages could be designated), workplaces, government buildings, classrooms and restaurants. Any signs indicating where tobacco is sold should include a warning about the danger of smoking and the number of a ‘quit’ help line. Obligatory reduction of harmful substances in tobacco
products were started in December 2001, when the tar content per cigarette was legally limited to 15 mg and the nicotine content to 1.5mg (Bennett, 2001).

2.8.2.2 Legal implications of the law

South Africa now has the toughest anti-smoking legislation in the world, together with Finland and Niger. This groundbreaking legislation, hailed by international bodies such as the World Health Organisation, came into effect on January 1 2001 (Harvey, 2001).

Monday, April 23, 1999 saw the end of the advertising of tobacco products and sponsorships by tobacco companies in South Africa. Only contracts that were binding on April 23, 1999 were allowed to run their course. Now, in accordance with the regulations published under the Tobacco Products Control Amendment Act September 29 1999, tobacco advertising and sponsorships are banned in South Africa. The law bans, for example, any symbol or visual or audible message "aimed at the public and designed to promote or publicise a tobacco product or to promote smoking behaviour" (Harvey, 2001).

Several major events, such as the Winfield Super 12 rugby, the Rothmans Cup, the Rothmans July and the Gunston 500 surfing event have had to find new sponsors. The major events would not have any difficulty in replacing their sponsors according to Koenderman, (2000). Moreover he underlines that as sponsorship is growing so fast, many companies are ready to step in if British American Tobacco falls out of the picture. As many events have had tobacco sponsors for a long time, there is now
an opportunity to introduce new blood and new thinking. However, he concludes by saying that smaller events will have problems.

The Rothmans Cup, the Gunston 500 and the Rothmans July all have one thing in common: they are in the process of being renamed after the introduction of the new anti-tobacco legislation. Sponsorships of the former Rothmans Cup and Rothmans July were still ‘up for grabs’, while Mr Price was named as the replacement sponsor for the Gunston 500 surfing competition, which is now known as the Mr Price Pro (Lamberti, 2001).

2.9 The Durban Surfing Contest

2.9.1 Gunston

Gunston is a brand of cigarettes originally from Zimbabwe. R. J. Reynolds has taken control of this brand. The market for this product is predominantly South Africa. As far as a target market is concerned, Gunston cigarettes have a strong taste, which lead it to be a ‘man’s’ cigarette in comparison with Craven A for example which are more women orientated with a menthol taste. Moreover, regarding its image, Gunston is more or less an old-fashioned brand. Some cigarette retailers have stopped stocking it. Nevertheless, the brand was the main sponsor of the Durban surfing contest for the last thirty years, namely The Gunston 500.
2.9.2 The Gunston 500

Originally called the Durban 500, it was later changed to the Gunston 500 since it was Gunston that put up the original prize money of R500. It was promoted as a South Africa versus Australia test match. The winner won cash, the second-placed surfer won a motor cycle and third received a hi-fi set. Today’s contest offers prize money of R1 million and is the world’s longest running professional surfing event. Moreover, it occupies a special place in the heart of South African surfing, having laid foundations for many careers including those of world champions Shaun Thompson, who won it for six consecutive years, Michael Potter the 1989 world champion, and Michael Burness, who won the amateur division many times before turning professional.

Internationally it holds the distinction of being the first professional surfing event held outside of the Hawaiian Islands. In effect this created the professional surfing tour and the ASP.

After surviving for well over 20 years as the ASP's longest serving event besides Bells, government anti-smoking legislation in South Africa has forced Gunston to withdraw as sponsor of the annual Durban WQS event. The Gunston 500 has been a surfing institution since the art and lifestyle of surfing acquired a competition arm. New event sponsors are the department store chain, Mr Price, who have been supporters of the South African surf scene for a number of years (Sargent, 2001).
2.9.3 The introduction of Mr Price to surfing

Mr. Price ventured into surfing in 1994 with the sponsorship of Springbok and professional surfer Greg Swart. South Africa's first professional surf coaching clinic was established in the same year by Pierre Tostee and Greg Swart, and was called Mr. Price Pro Surf Coaching. Back then the vision was born, at a breakfast with Mr. Price's Marketing Director, Robert Du Preez, Greg Swart and Pierre Tostee, that Mr. Price should have it's own credible surf wear brand. The trio agreed that a solid platform of integrity needed to be laid before venturing into a brand, since many fly-by-nights have failed in an attempt to make a ‘fast buck’ off surfing.

The relationship with surfing evolved from the sponsorship of one individual, to sponsorship of the Mr. Price Interclub Tag Team challenge in 1997. The sponsorship of surfing events grew to two events on the 1998 Durban Surf Slam Circuit and six events on the 1999 Vodacom Slam Circuit. The importance of Mr. Price sponsoring the Mr. Price Pro, the event that replaces the Gunston 500 in 2000, was huge. Not only did the event align Mr. Price as one of the most prominent surf event sponsors in South Africa, but also the event itself is on the Association of Surfing Professionals (ASP) world surfing tour - important for the Mr. Price brand as it goes global.

With the platform laid and the stage set, Mr. Price's RED surf brand was launched at the Mr. Price Pro, and RED surf wear became the official apparel supplier to the event. In entering into the sport, Mr. Price have invested in people and events. The result is that they acquired a platform from which to launch RED surf wear (Mr Price Group Ltd, 1999).
Opposite to Gunston, Mr Price is more a family-orientated brand. Indeed the range of products is from clothes to home design and now surf wear. So the target audience is spread. As far as the home design and clothes is concerned, the target seems to be the housewife with young children. As far as the surf wear is concerned, the target audience is young people between 15 and 24 years old, who are interested in surfing or ‘fun’ sports.

2.9.4 The Mr Price Pro

The Mr. Price Pro took over from the Gunston 500, the longest running professional surfing event in the world, keeping Durban on the map as a city that has hosted professional surfing since 1969. The contest is the anchor event of the new beach festival held in Durban since July 2001, which showcased premier international beach sports (Horn, 2000).

In 2001 the Mr Price Pro was held during the Vodacom Beach Africa Festival from 6 to 15 July. The Vodacom Beach Festival activities ranged from a fashion show and beauty pageant, to live entertainment, touch rugby, and beach and street soccer. Concerning surfing activities, the RCI night surfing event took place from the 6th to the 8th. Other activities were long boarding and knee boarding. The Mr Price Pro was the main event featured in the Vodacom Beach Africa Festival.
2.10 Conclusion

As far as the study is concerned, it will adopt the sponsorship definition developed by Anderson and Winter (2000) as follows: sponsorship is the business link between commercial companies and events or activities, through the provision of funds and services to achieve a predetermined marketing and communication objective; or a cash or in-kind fee paid to a property (typically sport, art, entertainment or causes) in return for commercial potential associated with that property. It excludes any philanthropic aim of the sponsor, and moreover it defines the sponsorship as a strategic choice for the company.

The promotion of brand awareness has been central, and explains the reasons for sponsors’ policies of getting their name in increasingly noticeable positions during, particularly televised, play: from advertising hoardings at the perimeter of the playing area, to the competitors’ clothing, and even onto the playing area itself in some sports. The appendage of the sponsor’s name to a competition has additional benefits here, as it brings mention in media coverage (Porley, 1998).

Based on the above literature review, the three following paragraphs refer to each hypothesis; they summarise the main findings of the literature review and establish the relationship between the variables.

First of all it is hypothesised that the change of sponsorship does not change the consumer’s perceptions of the event. Surfing is a high-value sport, as it is perceived as a communion with nature. Although the professional contest has been developed, the surfers still stay close to the spirit of their sport. So it might be hypothesised that
even with a change of sponsor the competition will remain the same, as the competitors are still riding waves with the same inspiration. It means that the values perceived for the Gunston 500 would still be applicable to the Mr Price Pro.

Secondly, it is hypothesised that the perceived values of the event are influenced by the values of the sponsor. Crimmins and Horn (1996) argue that the nature of the link is less important than the marketer’s effort to articulate a relationship. In other words, it is not necessary to find a strong link. Some products may not have them, but rather it is important to build an interpretation of the sponsorship-linked marketing program through advertising. So in other words, the sponsor, totally engaged with the event organisers, is able to develop a message providing its own values. The two sponsors that are part of the study are from totally different backgrounds and industries. Gunston, is a cigarette manufacturer and the other, Mr Price, is in the clothing business. It means that the values they want to transmit to the audience are theoretically different. But, as they use the same medium, the surfing contest, the event itself might transmit different values.

Finally, it is hypothesised that a long-term sponsorship affords long-term brand awareness, even after the resignation by the sponsor, especially when the sponsor’s name is associated with the competition. Cheng and Stotlar (1999) developed the concept of sponsorship as a marriage, which means a lifetime commitment for both partners. This image is true of a long-term commitment - consumers easily identify the link between the sponsor and the sponsee, easier than with a short, one-year contract. Moreover, Ikalafeng (2000) emphasises that no sponsor can expect to win
the affection of consumers in the short term, as was reflected in the comparison between MTN and IWISA.

This chapter has provided an overview of the current state of the literature relevant to the issues being investigated by this research and has highlighted and justified the hypotheses proposed for the study. In the next chapter the methodology used to conduct the research will be specified, explained and justified.
CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

In this section, the research process used for this study will be detailed. The research design, sampling, data collection, analysis of findings, and validity and reliability of the results will be discussed.

3.2 Quantitative Study

The research aims to determine how the target audience perceived the change of sponsors, from Gunston to Mr Price, concerning Durban’s major surfing competition. The study used exploratory research, as the objectives of exploratory research are to develop an understanding of an issue (Crask, 1995:16).

The study was also quantitative. Since quantitative research encompasses any findings, which can be factorised and quantified, it can be applied to the motivations and attitudes, which are the very essence of exploratory research. Quantitative studies can be undertaken on awareness of companies, products and brands, image and attitudes to companies, products and brands, buying practices, selling practices and advertising recall (Hague, 1992: 121). Quantitative research tends to focus on ‘what is now’, that is, what respondents intuitively know and have the facts of, ‘including what the respondents have done’. It can be akin to a snapshot. Its strength lies in the way the science of mathematical analysis and modelling can be
used to explain marketing phenomena by showing the key constructs, their interrelationships and their relative strengths within these interrelationships. Marketers can base their decisions on statistically proven facts with known margins of error (Wright and Crimp, 2000).

Moreover a quantitative study tends to involve a larger sample than a qualitative one, with the emphasis being on numerical measurement and subsequent statistical analysis. These larger numbers are often needed to look at variations by sub-groups within the population. The sub-groups will be defined in the sampling decision section. On the other hand respondents taking part are asked the same questions in the same way. This standardisation means that it is possible to aggregate the results, and then to look at variations in responses to these standardised questions, given by different sub-groups (Smith, 1998).

As the survey is sampling persons according to different ages, educational and income levels, and different races, at a particular point at a defined time, the survey is also cross-sectional (Bailey, 1987).

3.3 Data Collection

The collection of data from the respondents was done by the administration of questionnaires.
3.3.1 Methods

According to Boyd et al. (1989), the face-to-face questionnaire method is particularly appropriate to know what the audience think, and has come to be a very widely used data collection method. Questioning respondents is a widely used research method and, to many, it is seen as the only type of marketing research. Survey research is a quick, efficient and cost-effective way of gaining the required data (Webb, 1992: 68). The presence of the interviewer permits flexibility during the interview. In other words the interviewing can be adapted to the situation, with further explanation or clarification. The questions are given in a fixed order with a fixed wording and the answers also recorded in a standard manner (Webb, 1992: 75).

The event took place from the 9th to the 15th July 2001, which means during the winter school holidays. Interviews were conducted during this week, from Monday to Sunday, at Durban’s beachfront. The interview times were co-ordinated with the competition times, in order to obtain a representative sample of people present throughout the event.

3.3.2 Different types of quantitative data collection methods

There are numerous ways of collecting data; the main methods being face-to-face interviewing, telephone interviews, and the use of self-completion questionnaires. The following sections will discuss each of these techniques.
3.3.2.1 Telephone interviewing

Telephone interviewing is a popular data collection method for business-to-business and consumer research. The key advantages to telephone interviewing are first of all representativeness. Indeed virtually all businesses are accessible by telephone. For consumer research only a very small proportion of the population is now inaccessible, although the research designer must take into account whether omitting non-telephone owners is an issue or not. The interviews can be conducted quickly and making telephone interviews is a fairly cost-effective method. With telephone interviewing the control is easier as the supervisor can check a record of the interview live. It means it helps to minimise the interviewer effect (Smith, 1998).

In contrast telephone interviews do have limitations. First of all, through telephone interviewing, visual aids cannot be shown. The other limitation of the telephone is that it is difficult to keep the respondents’ interest focused on the interview. These are all aspects that give power to the face-to-face interview (Smith, 1998).

3.3.2.2 Self-administered questionnaires and postal research

This approach relates to data collection that takes place without the presence of an interviewer. The questionnaire to be completed by the respondent could be despatched and returned by post, or personally delivered and collected. The postal questionnaire allows respondents to record their behaviour on an ongoing basis. Indeed, self-administered questionnaires have a definite advantage in the collection
of large amounts of detailed information, which it would be extremely difficult to collect from respondents in a face-to-face interview. In certain situations it is important for respondents to check their records and review documentation before entering their reply. Moreover there is some evidence that the self-completion questionnaire encourages honest answers on sensitive topics that the individual may not feel able to talk about over the phone or on face-to-face basis.

One of the biggest concerns with postal research is the difficulty of ensuring that the study receives an adequate response rate. It has to be assumed that respondents will read to the end of the self-completion questionnaire before beginning to answer. This limits the extent to which question sequencing can work, namely from the general to the specific. With a postal questionnaire, there are also limited opportunities for complex filtering, or for branching of questions, for fear of confusing respondents (Smith, 1998).

3.3.2.3 Face-to-face interviews

According to Boyd et al. (1989), the face-to-face questionnaire method is particularly appropriate to know what the audience think, and has come to be a more widely used data collection method. Questioning respondents is a widely used research method and, to many, it is seen as the only type of marketing research (Webb, 1992: 68). The fact that the interview is being conducted face-to-face, and one-to-one, gives the interviewer every opportunity to adapt the interview technique to the complexities and nuances emerging throughout the interview process. It means that the questions can be adapted to the respondents’ personality and it ensures that the respondents feel that justice has been done to their knowledge and feeling regarding the investigated
subject. The interviewer may also see the respondents’ reactions. It means that the interviewer can make observations about the respondent’s home or working environment, which can support the data collection task. Secondly, the face-to-face interviews allow the use of materials to support and explain the concept or the product investigated. Moreover the interviewer can ensure that information is released to the respondents in the right way. Finally, a further advantage is the interviewer can confirm that she/he is talking to the appropriate respondents (Smith, 1998).

The face-to-face interviews can be considerably more expensive than telephone interviews. Another limitation of the face-to-face interview is interviewer bias. This refers to the fact that two interviewers asking the same question, of the same respondent, might obtain different answers, merely because there is an interaction between the personality of the respondent and that of the interviewer (Smith, 1998).

The above section has presented the advantages and disadvantages of each survey method. This study used face-to-face interviews. Survey research is a quick, efficient and cost-effective way of gaining the required data (Webb, 1992: 68).

3.3.3 Different types of face-to-face interviewing

3.3.3.1 In-Home

In-home interviewing is literally an interview conducted within the respondents’ own homes. This form of interviewing gives arguably the best quality interviews since respondents are relaxed and comfortable and have ready access to information that
the survey may require, such as the type and/or number of personal/grocery products in the bathroom or kitchen. It is usually used to record or measure usage of products over a period of time (Ward, 1998).

3.3.3.2 Central Location Interviewing

Central location refers to a hall or a mall. Respondents are recruited from within the vicinity and invited into the hall to take part in the survey. Central location will be chosen as a methodology generally when a new product or advertising concept is to be tested, and several locations may be chosen in key cities. Costs can be higher than comparable in-home studies (Ward, 1998).

3.3.3.3 Mystery Shopping

Where clients wish to evaluate the service their customers receive they might ask a research agency to conduct a mystery customer study for them. Interviewers, posing as customers, are trained to observe the customer service process as well as participating in it. Observational studies are used to measure certain activities: traffic flow, lengths of time between transactional activities or people traffic, for example (Ward, 1998).

3.3.3.4 Street Interviewing

Street interviewing has the advantage over in-home in that specific groups of respondents such as mothers, cinema-goers, fast-food consumers, car buyers and audience of a sport event, depending on the nature of the study, can be identified
very quickly by interviewing in the vicinity of the locations frequented by these
groups. Another advantage is that a larger number of interviews may be obtained in
a shorter period of time. It means the amount of time it takes to locate an eligible
respondent is much shorter than in-home interviewing (Ward, 1998).

The field of study is a surf contest and the awareness of the audience towards the
sponsors. Therefore the easiest way to catch the audience is during the contest at the
location. So, the street interviewing technique fits with the requirements of the
study. Moreover it is an effective method, as it allows a large numbers of interviews
to be obtained in a short period.

The next section will emphasise the sampling and the population required according
to the study objectives.

3.4 Sampling Decision

To conduct this research, there was a need to select a sample of spectators from the
Mr Price Pro surfing competition. Therefore the sampling population involved all
spectators present at the event (at the beachfront) between the 9th and the 15th July

3.4.1 Stratification

In this target population, the first step was to distinguish four main types of
spectators, according to the model developed by Eilander and Koenders (1995, in
Meenagh, 1995):

- The surfers
The surf-aware, but not, or no longer, surfers
The event-friendly, visitors of a large range of events at the beach front
The disinterested in the event

3.4.2 Sampling method

The sampling method was a non-probability one because the chance of choosing a particular universe element was unknown (Boyd et al., 1989: 406). Moreover the cheapest form of sample design is referred to as a convenience sample. This form of sample is very popular in academic research, but also has a useful place in other research. While their projectability is very questionable, convenience samples are extremely useful for hypothesis generation and initial pilot testing. A useful form of convenience sample is a central location study (Lehmann, 1989). According to the features of the study, the respondents were recruited for personal interviews at a fixed location (the beach front). It was thus an intercept sampling method. Such samples are frequently used in moderate to large size sample studies (100-200) that are experimental in character.

The correct sample size is dependent upon the nature of the population and the purpose of the study. By definition, quantitative research requires a large base of interviews in order to arrive at an acceptable measure. Although it is difficult to generalise from project to project, 200 persons were interviewed for this research, which according to Diamantopolous and Schlegelmilch (1997: 16) provides an acceptable sample size.
3.5 Data Analysis

As Tesch (1990: 95) says, “the analysis process is systematic and comprehensive, but not rigid”. The researcher has to ‘segment’ data according to relevant and meaningful groups in order to get a clear and correct synthesis of all the data. Werner and Schoepfle (as quoted by Tesch, 1990) suggest that using computerised programs can make the researcher’s work more efficient.

3.5.1 Data Collection Instrument

Closed ended questions were mainly used in the questionnaire (see Appendix 1) because they take less time to answer than open-ended ones.

Closed ended questions were:

- Classification questions: to classify the respondents into the four predefined levels.
- Other questions: an interval scale was used, which allowed the respondents to evaluate statements from strongly agree to strongly disagree. An interval scale is a scale where differences (intervals) between scale values have meaning (Lehmann, 1989).

According to Miller and Read (1998) the single most popular form of verbal scaling is, in its classic form, a Likert Scale, which appears as follows:

- Agree strongly
- Agree a little
- Neither agree nor disagree, no opinion
- Disagree a little
- Disagree strongly
This variant of the bipolar adjective scale is frequently used in order to obtain a subject’s opinion (Lehmann, 1989) and was used in this questionnaire.

### 3.5.2 Application of questionnaire

Post-school students who were recruited and trained by the researchers conducted the interviews. They were chosen to match the age profile of the anticipated target respondents.

A quota of twenty questionnaires per day and per interviewer was set to ensure collection of the data during the week of the event. The 208 questionnaires collected were checked for completeness and accuracy, resulting in 203 usable questionnaires.

Descriptive analyses were then conducted using S.P.S.S. Version 11, and inferential analyses were done using paired sample t-tests to identify the significance of the results.

### 3.5.3 Data Validity

In order to analyse the field questionnaires, the data were enter into the computer through the SPSS statistical software. A procedure of entering data was set up in order to check records. Indeed a test was run in order to detect that all the data were within acceptable limits and boundaries. Another test was set up in order to check the validity of the data. For instance, has the respondent answered according to the integrity of the questions? For example, as the questionnaire was set up in order to ask the same questions for the two events (in order to do a comparative analysis) answers for both events was needed. These two tests determined that only 203 questionnaires of the 208 were valid.
Following this step the raw data was transformed into variables in order to be easily analysed. To analyse the questionnaire data, the SPSS statistical software was used.

3.6 Conclusion

The research process has been detailed above, from the research design to the validity of the results, resulting in 203 questionnaires that were valid. The following chapter will now described the data analysis, starting with the sample description, and the first qualification questions, followed by an analysis according to the three hypothesis specified in Chapter one.
CHAPTER 4 - ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the analyses of the questionnaires. The analysis and results are structured according to the three hypotheses. Apart from the hypotheses, the first section will describe the sample demographics, and the respondent’s categories.

4.2 Description of the sample

4.2.1 Introduction

Of the 208 administered questionnaires, 203 were valid for further analysis. The following section will emphasise the demographics of the respondents, in particular age and gender.

4.2.2 Demographics

This first section will present the gender and the age of the total sample.

4.2.2.1 Gender

The sample is predominantly male, 62.1% of the respondents. This male predominance might be explained by the nature of the event. A surf competition is
more attractive to men than women. These figures are confirmed by the number of males involved in the practice of surfing.

The following graph reflects the gender of the sample.

**Figure 4.1: Gender Division**
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4.2.2.2 Age

The following graph reflects the age profile of the sample.

**Figure 4.2: Age of the Respondents**

![Age Distribution Chart]

Concerning the age of the respondents, a large majority was between 15 and 24 years. The school holiday period of the event is the main explanation. Moreover the fieldwork took place during the whole duration of the event from the Monday 9th to
the Sunday 15\textsuperscript{th} of July, including weekdays. The fieldwork was divided during the seven days of the contest in order to ease the daily workload. This means that it was difficult to interview working respondents, who were predominantly there during the weekend.

4.2.3 Definition of respondents categories

Now, before going further into the analysis, the first step was to distinguish the main types of spectators, using the model developed by Eilanders and Koenders (1995, in Meenagh, 1995). Questions 1 and 2 in the questionnaire (see Appendix 1) allowed two main categories of spectators to be distinguished. The surf-aware were identified by answering the second question (Do you surf?) by either ‘yes’ or ‘no longer’. This sample class gathered together the respondents who are or have been surfers. According to Eilander and Koenders (1995, in Meenagh, 1995), it may be assumed that the more a consumer/respondent is involved with a certain sponsored object, the more he will be aware of all aspects concerning that particular object, and therefore the greater will be the communication effect of the sponsor on the consumer/respondent.

Concerning the second category, the event-friendly, this sample class was determined by the answer, ‘never surfed’, to this same question.

The following section emphasises the demographics of the two defined sample categories in order to estimate the differences or the similarities between the two samples. The smoking habits will be added to the demographics.
4.2.3.1 Demographics of surf-aware

Of the 203 questionnaires valid for further analysis, 70 respondents qualified as surf-aware. Their answer to question 2 was either ‘yes’ or ‘no longer surfed’.

The following graph reflects the gender division as far as the surf-aware are considered.

**Figure 4.3: Gender division of the surf-aware**

Figure 4.3 demonstrates that surfing is mostly a male sport. Indeed 85.7% of the surf-aware respondents was male.

The following graph reflects the age division concerning the surf-aware respondents.
Figure 4.4 shows that the two defined samples have much the same age structure. The respondents are mainly between 15-24 years old.

4.2.3.2 Demographics of event-friendly

Of the 203 questionnaires valid for further analysis, 133 respondents qualified as event-friendly. It means that their answer to the question 2 was ‘never surfed’.

The age division of the event-friendly does not differ from the total sample, or from the surf-aware sample. The main group remains the 15-24 years old.

The gender is a more interesting variable of differentiation between the two samples. The following graph compares the gender division of the event-friendly respondents with the global sample.
Figure 4.5: Gender division

Figure 4.5 shows that the sample of event-friendly is almost perfectly divided between women and men, with 50.4% female and 49.6% male. Such a categorisation does not confirm the male-orientation of the event.

4.2.4 Conclusion

The analysis of the demographics of the respondents raises two different points. On the one hand, the respondents are mainly between 15-24 years old, which means that these respondents represent the main target audience of “Red”, the Mr Price surf brand. On the other hand, the fact that the surf-aware sample is mostly men, might be due to the fact that surfing is still a more male-orientated sport. Similarly it represents the main target markets of the “surf” brands.

The next section will analyse several general questions about factors that might influence the answers of the respondents concerning the questions specific to the events.
4.3 Introductory questions

4.3.1 Introduction

The following analysis includes questions 1, 5, 6, 35, and 36. These questions are of more general interest for the study. They helped to create a general understanding of the respondents, as well as to qualify the other answers. These questions are about respondents’ sports habits, the general feeling about sponsoring a surf competition, their buying habits from Mr Price and their smoking habits.

4.3.2 Sport Habits

Question 1 was designed to determine the sports attitudes of the respondents.

Figure 4.6: Sport attitudes

A large majority of the respondents (87.2%) consider themselves as sporty, which means that they play sport in an official league or for leisure. The interviewers have reported some misunderstanding concerning this first question: respondents mix up playing and attending. Only 12.8% of the respondents considered themselves as non-sporty. This means that a large part of the sample have already experienced a
sport event. Thus their opinions might be considered as accurate concerning the event.

4.3.3 Perception of the surfing competition

Question 5 was designed in order to estimate the perception of sponsorship of a surfing contest.

**Figure 4.7: Opinion towards sponsorship**

First it might be noticed that none of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement that it makes sense for a surf event to be sponsored. 92.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that it makes sense for a surf event to be sponsored.

Question 5 was designed to test the perception of people concerning the ambivalence between competition and the essence of surfing. This point has been raised in the literature review. However, people now accept the concept of sponsorship, even with a sport like surfing, where the essence is more the communion with nature. The
respondents often added to this response, that the event would not be possible without a sponsor, and that moreover the athletes need to be paid for the entertainment they provide. It is more obvious as far as an international contest is concerned. Another explanation of the strong acceptance of sponsorship is the fact that a large majority of respondents attend or play other sports.

4.3.4 Buying habits relating to Mr Price

Question 6 was the first question relating to Mr Price, and concerned the buying habits relating to Mr Price.

The following graph reflects the buying habits of the respondents concerning the Mr Price products.

**Figure 4.8: Buying habits relating to Mr Price**

![Pie chart showing buying habits](image.png)

Figure 4.8 shows that only 10% of the respondents admit to not buying clothes from Mr Price. This figure means that the remaining 90% of respondents bought either all, most, some or occasionally from Mr Price. Therefore, the respondents might be considered aware concerning the Mr Price group.
4.3.5 Smoking habits

Question 35 was about the smoking habits of respondents, in order to know their general feelings about Gunston. The following graph reflects the smoking habits of the respondents.

Figure 4.9: Are you a smoker?

The Figure 4.9 shows that 33% of the respondents admit to smoking. This ratio is the same for the event-friendly and the surf-aware.

Furthermore as a cigarette brand sponsored the event, the smoking habit might be significant concerning the opinions about the event and the sponsor. But on the other hand, only four respondents acknowledged smoking Gunston cigarettes, which represents only 2% of the sample. So this figure means that the awareness that might be shown during the analysis might be mainly from non-Gunston smokers.

4.3.6 Attendance at the Gunston 500

The following table gather the attendance at the Gunston 500 according to the different sample groups.
As far as the total sample of respondents is concerned, 80.8% attended the Gunston 500 in the past. The surf-aware and the up to 24 years old groups reach over 94% of attendance at the Gunston 500, which is highly interesting for the hypotheses. The event-friendly, the smokers, and women are all around 75% for previous attendance at the surfing contest.

The Pearson Chi-square test concerning the age and the surf habits provided p values respectively of 0.014 and 0.095. These scores mean that the differences for age are significant, but the differences for surf habits are not significant.

4.3.7 Previous name of the competition

The following table gather the knowledge of the previous name of the competition according to the different sample.
In the total sample, 87.2% of respondents knew that the previous name of the Mr Price Pro was the Gunston 500. The most aware groups for this question are the smokers with 92.4% right answer, the surf-aware with 87.1% and the men with 89.1%. The over 24 years old is the only group with a percentage of correct answers under 80%. Nevertheless 74.3% of the respondents of this group knew that the contest was previously named the Gunston 500.

The Pearson Chi-square test concerning the age and the surf habits provided p values respectively of 0.008 and 0. These score mean that the differences for age and surf habits are significant, but for sex and smokers were not significant.

### Table 4.3: Knowledge of the Previous Name of the Competition by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Surf-aware</th>
<th>Event-friendly</th>
<th>Smoker</th>
<th>Non-smoker</th>
<th>Up to 24</th>
<th>Over 24</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.4: Pearson Chi-square Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surf Habits</th>
<th>Smoke cigarettes</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson chi-square Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.8 Conclusion – Introductory questions

The above analysis has been conducted with the total sample. No significant difference has been found between the two groups that have been defined in the first part of the analysis, i.e. surf-aware and event-friendly.

Comparing the 2% of respondents who have smoked Gunston cigarettes and the 59% who admit to at least buying occasionally from Mr Price, the sponsoring aims of both companies are totally different. So the awareness concerning Mr Price might be considered as already high. The point to consider now is which values people associate with the Mr Price brand. Are those values identical to those that Mr Price wants to transmit? And are those values compatible with the sponsorship of an international surf event?
4.4 Hypothesis 1

4.4.1 Introduction

*H1: It is hypothesised that the change of sponsorship does not change the consumer’s perceptions of the event.*

This hypothesis leads to the possibility that the surf event itself may attract the crowd. This argument has to be considered with the fact that the Mr Price Pro is now included in a bigger event which is the Vodacom Beach Festival. It means that the public might be attracted by the activities organised apart from the surfing competition, such as beach-soccer, street soccer, and touch rugby or fashion contests. In order to allow for this bias, the spot where the interviews took place were mostly on the part of the beachfront dedicated to the surfing competition.

The 203 valid questionnaires, attendees at Mr Price Pro were divided into event-friendly (133 respondents) and surf-aware (70 respondents). Concerning the Gunston 500 attendees, the total sample represents 182 responses, the event-friendly being 115 and the surf-aware 67. The difference of 21 respondents between the two events is explained by the fact that they had not attended a Gunston 500.

To determine whether the respondents perceived the events as different or not, the analysis is divided into two parts. The first section emphasises the differences that emerged from the responses. The second part discusses the common points.
4.4.2 General Pattern

As a first comment, both events provide the same pattern as far as the graphical representation of their opinions is concerned. It means that they are seen as almost similar. However the degree of agreement might be important and should be taken into account. Secondly, all adjectives have scored a result over 3.00 (out of a maximum of 5), which means that the respondents are generally in agreement with the adjectives. Therefore the identified differences and similarities have to be interpreted as differing degrees of agreement of the respondents.

The following graphic representations are based on the following formula:
First, a coefficient was assigned to each degree of agreement: 5 for strongly agree, 4 for agree, 3 for no opinion, 2 for disagree and 1 for strongly disagree. The coefficient was multiplied by the number of respondents in that category. The number of respondents was then divided into the total sum in order to obtain a weighted average, which is illustrated in Figure 4.10 below.

**Figure 4.10: Total sample’s opinion about the events**
Paired sample t-tests were then conducted on these weighted averages. The results of these paired sample t-tests are given in the table below:

**Table 4.5 Paired Samples t-tests for Hypothesis 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples t-test</th>
<th>Total Sample Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Event-Friendly Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Surf-aware Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Unique - Gunston 500 Unique</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Authentic - Gunston 500 Authentic</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Leisurely - Gunston 500 Leisurely</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Quality - Gunston 500 Quality</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Innovative - Gunston 500 Innovative</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Rewarding - Gunston 500 Rewarding</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Prestige - Gunston 500 Prestige</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Fun - Gunston 500 Fun</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Fashionable - Gunston 500 Fashionable</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Seductive - Gunston 500 Seductive</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Manly - Gunston 500 Manly</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Sporty - Gunston 500 Sporty</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Pro Spectacular - Gunston 500 Spectacular</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the paired sample t-tests above, several adjectives can be identified as statistically significant (sig. p ≤ 0.05). As far as the total sample is concerned, the two events are perceived as significantly different in terms of the following adjectives: unique, authentic, innovative, leisurely, quality, innovative, prestige, and manly. This opinion of the total sample is also shown in Figure 4.10 above. The following section will detail these perceptions individually.

**Figure 4.11: Event-Friendly Sample’s Opinion About the Events**

![Graph showing the opinion about events for MrPricePro and Gunston500](image)

According to Table 4.5, the significant adjectives identified with the event-friendly sample are the following: unique, authentic, quality, prestige, manly.
According to Table 4.5, the significant adjectives identified with the surf-aware sample are the following: unique, authentic, leisurely, innovative, prestige, manly.

The following section will emphasise the **differences** between the two events assessed statistically by the paired sample test. The following section will begin with the opinion of the total sample, followed by the opinion of the event-friendly and the surf-aware samples.

### 4.4.3 Differences

#### 4.4.3.1 Unique

The table below reflects the percentage of ‘unique’ for the three samples.
TABLE 4.6: RESPONSES OF UNIQUENESS BETWEEN MR PRICE PRO & GUNSTON 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>81.3 %</td>
<td>91.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>88.7 %</td>
<td>79.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>84.3 %</td>
<td>97 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents answered this question in two ways. First of all, the event is unique for Durban. It happens once a year and has no equivalent countrywide. On the other hand, the event is, for the surf-aware, one of the few 6-star rated contests worldwide, which confers it with uniqueness.

For the total and the event-friendly samples, the Gunston 500 is perceived as more unique than the Mr Price Pro is. 91.8 % of the respondents of the total sample considered the Gunston 500 as a unique event but only 81.3 % saw the Mr Price Pro as unique. The equivalent figures are, respectively, 79.7 % and 88.7 % for the event-friendly sample. It means that those respondents are aware of the change and know that Gunston 500 was the former name of the event.

On the other hand, the surf-aware respondents strongly agree with the statement that the Gunston 500 is more unique than the Mr Price Pro, 97 % against 84.3 %. It might be considered that the perception of the surf-aware towards the Mr Price Pro is more positive than the perception of the total sample. The interpretation of such results might demonstrate that the surf-aware category does not see significant difference between the two events.

4.4.3.2 Authentic

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘authentic’ for the three samples.
### Table 4.7: Responses of Authenticity Between Mr Price Pro & Gunston 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>70.9 %</td>
<td>84.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>73.7 %</td>
<td>88.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>65.7 %</td>
<td>86.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both events obtained high scores as far as authenticity is concerned, but overall the Gunston 500 is perceived as more authentic than the Mr Price Pro. Of the total sample 70.9 % perceived the Mr Price Pro as authentic against 84.6 % for the Gunston 500. The authenticity of the Mr Price Pro is perceived less by the surf-aware sample with 65.7 %. The following explanations will stress those facts.

One of the reasons to explain this might be that the respondents’ perceptions are that the organisers, apart from the sponsors, stay the same. First of all, the calendar and the location have been kept. From this point of view they might conclude that the 'spirit’ of a surfing competition has been kept. It means that everything during the contest is run in order to favour the competitors and the competition and not the business. Another explanation to underline this is that the successor of Peter Burness (the Gunston organiser) is Greg Swart, a former five-times SA surfing champion. Indeed he is well recognised in the surfing community. Now working for Mr Price, he has encouraged the introduction and the acceptance of Mr Price in that community.

However, the figures have shown that the two first years of the new sponsor have not been enough to convince the surf-aware respondents, despite the implication of Greg Swart.
4.4.3.3 Leisurely

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘leisure’ for the three samples.

**TABLE 4.8: RESPONSES FOR LEISURE BETWEEN MR PRICE PRO & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>85.7 %</td>
<td>90.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event-friendly</strong></td>
<td>88 %</td>
<td>89.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surf-aware</strong></td>
<td>81.4 %</td>
<td>92.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The leisure aspect is obvious concerning Durban’s surfing contest. It takes place during the winter holiday and at the beachfront. The beach is synonymous with free time and enjoyment. Only five points separate the appreciation of both surfing contests as leisurely by the total sample. 90.7 % of respondents agree and strongly agree with the leisureliness of the Gunston 500 against 85.7 % for the Mr Price Pro. It might be noticed that this difference is only 1.6 points for the event-friendly category but 11.1 points for the surf-aware category. Therefore it means that the surf-aware are more able to consider surfing not only as a leisure, but also as a professional, activity.

4.4.3.4 Quality

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘quality’ for the three samples.

**TABLE 4.9: RESPONSES FOR QUALITY BETWEEN MR PRICE PRO & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>86.2 %</td>
<td>90.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event-friendly</strong></td>
<td>85.7 %</td>
<td>88.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surf-aware</strong></td>
<td>87.1 %</td>
<td>92.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning the quality aspects, the gap between the two events is slight. Indeed the difference is only 3.9 points for the total sample. This difference is greater for the surf-aware - 5.4 points. 92,5 % agree or strongly agree with quality being associated with the Gunston 500 against 87,1 % for the Mr Price Pro. The difference for the event-friendly category is only 3 points - 88,7 % agreed or strongly agreed with quality being associated with the Gunston 500 against 85,7 % for the Mr Price Pro.

4.4.3.5 Innovative

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘innovation’ for the three samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>71,4 %</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>70,7 %</td>
<td>74,8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>72,9 %</td>
<td>83,6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to first make the event recognised by the public and then to perpetuate the spirit, Gunston introduced new innovations every year. One of the most memorable for men was the "Gunston Girls". Another was the live presenting of the scores achieved by the surfers during a round. The scores achieved by the surfers in the water were displayed on surfboards. This is confirmed by the fact that 78 % of the total sample agrees to the statement that the Gunston was innovative, with 74,8 % for the event-friendly and 83,6 % for the surf-aware.

As far as Mr Price Pro is concerned, the major innovation has been to include the surf contest in a collaborative event - "The Vodacom Beach Festival". It means that the crowd is larger during the 10
days of the festival, which peaks at the weekend for the surfing finals. Moreover, Mr Price gives away a lot of merchandise such as tattoos and peaks. Despite this Mr Price Pro is seen as innovative by only 71.4% for the total sample, 70.7% of the event-friendly and 72.8% off the surf-aware sample.

The fact that respondents still call the surf contest, the “Gunston 500”, further supports the fact that the Mr Price Pro is perceived as less innovative. In other words Gunston helped to create this event, and the respondents are well aware of that fact.

4.4.3.6 Prestige

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘prestige’ for the three samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>76.8 %</td>
<td>82.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>76.7 %</td>
<td>80.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>77.1 %</td>
<td>86.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prestige of the Gunston 500 is well recognised by the total sample with 82.5% against 76.8% for the Mr Price Pro, and, for the event-friendly, 74.8% against 70.7% respectively. The difference is again higher as far as the surf-aware sample is concerned.

The Gunston 500 is perceived as more prestigious than the Mr Price Pro. Indeed it was the oldest running surfing contest worldwide and during its thirty years, it built a strong reputation within the surfing competition.
4.4.3.7 Manly

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘manly’ for the three samples.

**TABLE 4.12: RESPONSES FOR MANLY BETWEEN MR PRICE PRO & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>65 %</td>
<td>74,2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>66,2 %</td>
<td>72,1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>62,8 %</td>
<td>77,6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As surfing is mostly a male sport, the pool of respondents identified the event as a "Male Thing". This perception is a general feeling concerning the event. Moreover the crowd was mostly male. The male respondents are highly conscious of this. It should be noted also that the Gunston 500 was seen as more manly than the Mr Price Pro, which is consistent with Gunston cigarette’s manly image.

4.4.4 Similarities

4.4.4.1 Rewarding

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘rewarding’ for the three samples.

**TABLE 4.13: RESPONSES FOR REWARDING BETWEEN MR PRICE PRO & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>85,7 %</td>
<td>87,9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>85 %</td>
<td>86,9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>87,2 %</td>
<td>89,6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents have understood the question concerning the rewarding aspects of both surfing contests with two different meanings. First, the rewards were concerning the City of Durban - that both events worked to make Durban known as a great surfing place and a great holiday destination. The respondents considered both events as great advertising for the Durban tourism activity. Secondly, the prize money was seen as a reward. It means that the competitors are paid sufficiently for the entertainment they provide. In both senses, the events are perceived as rewarding, either for the city or the contestants.

4.4.4.2 Fun

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘fun’ for the three samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>94.6 %</td>
<td>96.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>93.9 %</td>
<td>96.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>95.7 %</td>
<td>97 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The entertainment provided by a surfing contest is perceived by the respondents. A question about the motivations of the respondents’ attendance should have been asked to identify if the entertainment was the real motivation. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that the spectators come to the venue in order to have a good time, which means to have fun watching the surfing.

4.4.4.3 Fashionable

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘fashion’ for the three samples.
The fashion aspect has to be underlined, because surfing has developed its own fashion style (‘surf wear’), and especially with the new sponsor which is a clothing retail chain.

The above responses demonstrate that both surf contests were seen as highly up-to-date and the forerunner of surfing fashion. Indeed the professional surfers are the trendsetters of the surf wear fashion. In addition, several beauty pageants were organised in 2001 during the ‘Vodacom Beach Festival’, like the ‘Southern Comfort’ fashion show. The contestants in this pageant were presented on the stage at the Mr Price tower.

### 4.4.4.4 Seductive

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘seductive’ for the three samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>48.2 %</td>
<td>53.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event-friendly</strong></td>
<td>45.1 %</td>
<td>52.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surf-aware</strong></td>
<td>54.3 %</td>
<td>56.8 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The response concerning this adjective was quite obvious even before the fieldwork. Indeed the respondents would not have been there without being tempted to watch the contest. Moreover the crowd is a good argument to justify the attractiveness of a surfing contest. But these are very low figures compared to those for fashionable.

4.4.4.5 Sporty

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘sporty’ for the three samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>95.1 %</td>
<td>94.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>95.4 %</td>
<td>94.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>94.2 %</td>
<td>94.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was also quite obvious. Both events are obviously sporty. But taking this point further, surfing contests are now fully recognised as proper sporting competitions. Originally they were considered as a leisure activity, but with the increasing professionalism they are now considered as a sport, with their own codified rules.

4.4.4.6 Spectacular

The following table reflects the percentages for ‘spectacular’ for the three samples.
### Table 4.18: Responses for Spectacular - Mr Price Pro & Gunston 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>85.3 %</td>
<td>90.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>84.2 %</td>
<td>88.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>87.2 %</td>
<td>94.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spectacular aspect of a surfing contest is highly dependent on the waves. It means that the surfers are able to perform highly spectacular movements only if the waves allow them to do so. However, even though the Mr Price Pro in 2001 had predominantly small waves, the respondents still perceived the event as spectacular. Thus it can be perceived as a general feeling concerning surfing contests.

### 4.4.5 Conclusion – Hypothesis 1

The differences emphasise the fact that the Gunston 500 is still well perceived by the respondents. The Gunston 500 was synonymous with authenticity, prestige, and uniqueness. Those characteristics might be taken in parallel with the history of the surfing contest in Durban. As the oldest surfing contest to be sponsored, the Gunston 500 acquired such a reputation. The section on ‘similarities’ raised almost all the adjectives that may be related to surfing. Indeed, surfing is perceived as a fun, seductive, fashionable and spectacular activity. The surfing contest is perceived as rewarding because it is an annual rendezvous for visitors and surfers to Durban.

It was hypothesised that the change of sponsorship does not change the consumers’ perceptions of the event. As the above section demonstrates, the Gunston 500 still has a historical advantage. But as far as a surfing contest is concerned, it appears that the event’s image has not suffered from the change of sponsor. The surf spirit is still perceived by the respondents.
The next section will discuss one of the basic requirements of sponsorship, which was identified in the literature review. This is the fact that the image of the event should match the image that the company wants to communicate.

4.5 Hypothesis 2

4.5.1 Introduction

H2: It is hypothesised that the perceived values of the event are influenced by the values of the sponsor

This hypothesis raises two different questions. On the one hand did the Gunston 500 transmit Gunston’s values, and on the other hand does the Mr Price Pro transmit Mr Price’s values?

The same list of adjectives was chosen for the two brands, which reduced the length of the questionnaire for the respondents. These adjectives were selected to represent the main values of both brands.

4.5.2 The Gunston 500/ Gunston

4.5.2.1 Introduction

Before discussing the analysis of this hypothesis, it must be noted that the number of usable questionnaires for this hypothesis was reduced. The number of questionnaires with an opinion about Gunston was only 61, whereas there were 182 questionnaires commenting on the values of the Gunston 500.
The first point to note is that the profiles for the two events’ variables are very different. Indeed only two common points can be identified, namely manly and authenticity. To assess the second hypothesis, firstly the common points will be highlighted, and then the differences will be discussed.

**FIGURE 4.13: MATCH OF VALUES BETWEEN GUNSTON & THE GUNSTON 500**

The figure above illustrates the relationships between Gunston and the Gunston 500 for each of the adjectives, while Table 4.19 below shows the results of the paired samples t-tests for the adjectives.
4.5.2.2 Common Factors

\textit{a) Manly}

\textbf{TABLE 4.20: RESPONSES FOR MANLY BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Event-Friendly</th>
<th>Surf-aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity of Gunston - Gunston 500 Authentic</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunston Leisurely - Gunston 500 Leisurely</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Gunston - Gunston 500 Quality</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunston Innovative - Gunston 500 Innovative</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of Gunston - Gunston 500 prestige</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunston fun - Gunston 500 Fun</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunston Unique - Gunston 500 Unique</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunston Fashionable - Gunston 500 Fashionable</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunston seductive - Gunston 500 Seductive</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunston manly - Gunston 500 Manly</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunston sporty - Gunston 500 Sporty</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{4.5.2.2 Common Factors}

\textit{a) Manly}

\textbf{TABLE 4.20: RESPONSES FOR MANLY BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>73.7 %</td>
<td>74.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>78.3 %</td>
<td>72.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First of all, surfing was considered until recently as a man’s sport. The gender distribution of the surf-aware sample is a good example, with more than 85% of the group being male. The emergence of women in surfing has only happened recently.

Secondly, Gunston is known for strong cigarettes. The emphasis on the taste has been stressed in promotions with the slogan “Rich and Rewarding”. All the slogans were male related words, like “The best tobaccos a man can get”, and the symbol used by Gunston is a cannon. It is easily linked with war and obviously with men.

As the above examples demonstrate, Gunston and the Gunston 500 are closely related as a ‘male’ thing. This explains the fact that the perceptions for the manly aspect of both the Gunston 500 and Gunston cigarettes are similar.

\[ b) \textbf{Authentic} \]

**Table 4.21: Responses for Authenticity between Gunston & Gunston 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>70.5 %</td>
<td>84.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>64.9 %</td>
<td>83.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>79.1 %</td>
<td>86.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70.5 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that Gunston is an authentic brand. This adjective attracts 79.1 % for the surf-aware sample and of 64.9% for the event-friendly sample.

The authenticity of Gunston is based on two assets of the brand. On the one hand, the product does not change. Indeed the taste and the flavour of Gunston are the main aspects considered by the smokers.
Therefore Gunston cigarettes have been unchanged for years. On the other hand, the Gunston 500 is an authentic event as it has been running for thirty years with the same spirit and the same management (Mr. Peter Burness) despite the innovations that have been produced almost every year.

4.5.2.3 Differences

The profile in Figure 4.13 above clearly identifies the differences. The following adjectives can be identified as differences between the values of Gunston and the values of the Gunston 500.

\[ \text{Leisurely} \]

**TABLE 4.22: RESPONSES FOR LEISURELY BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>57.4 %</td>
<td>90.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>56.7 %</td>
<td>89.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>58.3 %</td>
<td>92.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A surf contest is easily identifiable as a leisure activity, but on the other hand the cigarette product is more linked to anti-leisure activities, as leisure is highly linked with well being. Indeed, even if smoking is often seen as an opportunity to relax, people are now well aware of the health danger. The surfing event is internationally recognised and is featuring as one of the main events in Durban’s tourism calendar. In others word, leisure is linked with entertainment. The smoking habit is not entertaining. Indeed all the cigarette boxes now include a warning about the dangers of smoking. So cigarettes are products not linked with a leisure value.
b) Quality

**TABLE 4.23: RESPONSES FOR QUALITY BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>55.7 %</td>
<td>90.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>88.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>58.4 %</td>
<td>92.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between association of quality with the cigarette brand and with the surf contest is firstly due to the fact that only four out of all the respondents have ever-smoked Gunston cigarettes. Therefore it might have been difficult for the respondents to consider the quality aspect of the cigarettes. The quality of the event, though, is more clearly perceived than the quality of the brand. This perception might imply that the sponsorship of surfing by Gunston was an opportunity to improve the quality perception of the product.

c) Innovative

**TABLE 4.24: RESPONSES FOR INNOVATION BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>47.6 %</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>37.8 %</td>
<td>74.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>62.5 %</td>
<td>83.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cigarette product is difficult to change, because consumers are looking for a specific taste linked to the brand. This means that innovation concerning packaging or the tobacco product itself is highly dangerous as this is the main purchasing choice criteria. On the other hand a surf contest has to
introduce innovations every year. The competition itself cannot be modified, but all the surrounding activities need to be renewed in order to attract a larger and newer target audience.

\[ \textit{d) Prestige} \]

\textbf{TABLE 4.25: RESPONSES FOR PRESTIGE BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>49.2 %</td>
<td>82.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>51.3 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>45.9 %</td>
<td>86.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prestige of the Gunston 500 is linked with the fact that the contest is a six-rated international event.

\[ \textit{e) Fun} \]

\textbf{TABLE 4.26: RESPONSES FOR FUN BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>54.1 %</td>
<td>96.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>51.3 %</td>
<td>96.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>58.4 %</td>
<td>97 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96.7% of the total sample perceived the Gunston 500 as entertaining, but only 54,1% perceived this of Gunston cigarettes. For the event-friendly and surf-aware, the percentage for Gunston cigarettes are respectively 51,3% and 58,4%, and for the Gunston 500, 96,6% and 97%.

The opinion is quite simple. The Gunston 500 surf contest provided fun, but this is not true of Gunston cigarettes. Indeed they are considered old-fashioned cigarettes.
f)  **Unique**

**TABLE 4.27: RESPONSES FOR UNIQUENESS BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>65.6 %</td>
<td>91.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>64.9 %</td>
<td>88.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>66.7 %</td>
<td>97 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total, the event-friendly and the surf-aware samples respectively perceive the uniqueness of the Gunston 500 as follow: 91.8%, 88.7% and 97%.

The figures concerning the cigarettes are considerably less - 20 to 30 points less! The Gunston 500 was the first international surf contest in South Africa. Moreover it happened once a year and each year has been innovative in different ways. On the other hand, cigarettes are a daily product. They are advertised continuously throughout the year and buyers are often daily buyers. Therefore there is no uniqueness in the product.

g)  **Fashionable**

**TABLE 4.28: RESPONSES RELATING TO FASHION BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>47.5 %</td>
<td>84.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>45.9 %</td>
<td>80.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>91 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gunston cigarettes are not so popular that they are retailed in all cigarette outlets. Therefore it means that the consumption is decreasing. On the other hand the ‘Gunston girls’ and surfing were highly fashion–orientated.
h) *Seductive*

**TABLE 4.29: RESPONSES FOR SEDUCTION BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>29.5 %</td>
<td>53.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>21.6 %</td>
<td>52.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>41.7 %</td>
<td>56.8 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seductive as a description of the Gunston 500 is not high in the respondent’s minds: the percentages are just above 50%; namely 53,9% for the total, 52,8% for the event-friendly and 56,8% for the surf-aware samples.

Gunston cigarettes are seen as even less seductive, as is shown in the advertising, which uses male images of man as a warrior, with the cannon on the pack as an example.

i) *Sporty*

**TABLE 4.30: RESPONSES FOR SPORTY BETWEEN GUNSTON & GUNSTON 500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gunston</th>
<th>Gunston 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>52.5 %</td>
<td>94.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>56.7 %</td>
<td>94.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>45.9 %</td>
<td>94.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Gunston 500 as a surfing contest is obviously sporty. The percentages in agreement are all above 94% for each of the three samples.

It is interesting to note the relatively strong perception by the public of a link between sport and the Gunston cigarette brand. Surprisingly the percentages of agreement are above 50%; for the total and the event-friendly samples, respectively 52,5% and 56,7%. The surf-aware show more disagreement.
to this point with only 45.9% of agreement of Gunston cigarettes as sporty. Such opinions can be explained by the fact that cigarettes are unhealthy and do not help when playing sport.

4.5.2.4 Conclusion - Gunston

The results show that the values associated with the Gunston cigarette brand do not match the values associated with the Gunston 500 surf contest, except as far as authenticity and the manly aspect are concerned. Indeed a cigarette brand is not associated with sporting activities, and the legal preventative actions (warnings on the pack) emphasise this finding.

So the first conclusion is that the values concerning the brand have not changed due to the change in sponsorship communications. Therefore, as far as Gunston is concerned the hypothesis is not accepted – the values of the surfing event have not been influenced by the values of the sponsor. However, the event did develop a strong awareness among non-smokers, and many of the respondents are still calling the event 'the Gunston 500'.

4.5.3 The Mr Price Pro/ Mr Price

4.5.3.1 Introduction

2001 is only the second year of the event being sponsored by Mr Price and being called the Mr Price Pro. It could be anticipated that a strong match has not yet been developed. To assess the second hypothesis, firstly the common points between perceptions of Mr Price and Mr Price Pro will be highlighted, and then the differences will be discussed.
The figure above illustrates the relationships between Mr Price and the Mr Price Pro for each of the adjectives, while Table 4.31 below shows the results of the paired samples t-tests for the adjectives.
TABLE 4.31: PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST FOR HYPOTHESIS 2: MR PRICE VS MR PRICE PRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Event-Friendly</th>
<th>Surf-Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity of Mr Price - Mr Price Pro Authentic</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Leisurely - Mr Price Pro Leisurely</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Mr Price - Mr Price Pro Quality</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Innovative - Mr Price Pro Innovative</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of Mr Price - Mr Price Pro prestige</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price fun - Mr Price Pro Fun</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Unique - Mr Price Pro Unique</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price Fashionable - Mr Price Pro Fashionable</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price seductive - Mr Price Pro Seductive</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price manly - Mr Price Pro Manly</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Price sporty - Mr Price Pro Sporty</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3.2 Common Points

a) Authenticity

**Table 4.32: Responses for Authenticity between Mr Price & Mr Price Pro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the authenticity of Mr Price as a brand is concerned, the majority of respondents agreed with this statement. Mr Price is considered as an authentic brand.

But regarding the authenticity of the Mr Price Pro, the results are slightly different. The surf-aware do not recognise much authenticity in the Mr Price Pro. On the other hand, the event-friendly category believes that the Mr Price Pro is done in much the same way as the original event, the Gunston 500.

Another interesting point is that women do not really perceive the differences between the two events as far as the authenticity of the Mr Price Pro is concerned. Indeed 50.6% of the female respondents have no opinion or disagree with the statement that Mr Price products are authentic. On the other hand 68.3% of the male respondents agree or strongly agree with the same statement. One possible explanation for this might be the fact that the women are more aware of clothes design or decoration than they are of surfing. Some of the female respondents pointed out the fact that the designs of some of the Mr Price clothes were inspired by other brands.
**b) Leisurely**

**Table 4.33: Responses for Leisurely between Mr Price & Mr Price Pro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>86.2 %</td>
<td>85.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>88 %</td>
<td>88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>82.9 %</td>
<td>81.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it can be noticed that the figures concerning the leisure aspect are highly similar, no matter which sample is considered. 86.2% of the total sample perceived Mr Price as a leisurely brand and 85.7% saw the Mr Price Pro as leisurely. 88% of the event-friendly perceived the brand and the surf contest as equally leisurely. For the surf-aware, the percentages were 82.9% and 81.4% respectively for the brand and the surf contest.

This means that ‘leisure’ is a strong attachment and quality of both the brand and the surf event. Therefore, the match between Mr Price and the Mr Price Pro is very strong. The surf contest constitutes a high potential to develop Mr Price’s brand image. Moreover, Mr Price defines its clothes as ‘weekend material’ and the weekend is leisure time.
c) Innovative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr PricePro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>58,6 %</td>
<td>71,4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>56,4 %</td>
<td>70,7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>62,9 %</td>
<td>72,9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr Price Pro is seen as innovative by 71,4% of the total sample. Concerning the Mr Price brand the opinion is more mixed, with only 58,6% of the total sample agreeing or strongly agreeing.

This perception of innovation concerning the event is linked with the fact that it is only the second year of the Mr Price Pro. On the other hand Mr Price is a well-known brand, which implies that the design has to be more ‘mainstream’. Indeed the philosophy of the Mr Price Group is low-cost, high-volume and low price. Nevertheless, in launching a surf brand, “Red”, Mr Price demonstrated its will to create new opportunities.

d) Fun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr PricePro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>86,2 %</td>
<td>94,6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>85,0 %</td>
<td>94,0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>88,6 %</td>
<td>95,7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
94.6% of the total sample, 94% of the event-friendly and 95.7% of the surf-aware perceive the entertainment value of the Mr Price Pro. The entertaining aspect of the surf contest is easily understandable. First it takes place during the holidays. Secondly, surfing is seen as a ‘fun’ sport.

As far as the Mr Price brand is concerned, the sample’s opinion is just a little lower. 86.2% of the total sample, 85% of the event-friendly and 88.6% of the surf-aware sample perceived the brand as fun. These figures are satisfactorily close for a match between the surfing event and the brand. As was explained for the leisure aspect, the fact that Mr Price defines itself as ‘weekend material’ is probably also the explanation.

**e) Fashionable**

**TABLE 4.36: RESPONSES FOR FASHION BETWEEN MR PRICE & MR PRICE PRO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr Price Pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>76.4 %</td>
<td>83.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>77.4 %</td>
<td>84.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>74.3 %</td>
<td>82.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83.7% of the total sample considers the Mr Price Pro as fashionable, and 76.4% for the Mr Price brand. These figures are similar for the event-friendly and surf-aware groups. This means that the event fits within the Mr Price strategy to be recognised as a fashion brand. In addition, the fashion aspect of the Mr Price Pro is reinforced by fashion shows hosted by the Vodacom Beach Festival.
f) Manly

TABLE 4.37: RESPONSES FOR MANLY BETWEEN MR PRICE & MR PRICE PRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr PricePro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>53.2 %</td>
<td>65.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>50.4 %</td>
<td>66.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>60.0 %</td>
<td>62.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents similarly perceive the manly aspect of the surf contest (62.9% to 66.2%). Half of the total sample (53.2%) and of the event-friendly sample (50.4%) perceive the Mr Price products as manly. As far as this attitude is concerned, the better match came from the surf-aware sample, 62.9% of whom perceive the Mr Price Pro as manly and 60.0% of whom perceive the Mr Price products as manly. As far as this ‘manly’ aspect is concerned, the surf-aware group seems the best target market.

g) Seductive

TABLE 4.38: RESPONSES FOR SEDUCTIVENESS BETWEEN MR PRICE & MR PRICE PRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr PricePro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>37.4 %</td>
<td>48.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>37.6 %</td>
<td>45.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>37.1 %</td>
<td>54.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total sample agrees with the perception that both variables, Mr Price and Mr Price Pro, are not highly seductive. This statement is justified by the fact that both
percentages are under 50 % as far as the total sample is concerned (37,4% for Mr Price and 48,3% for Mr Price Pro).

**h) Sporty**

**TABLE 4.39: RESPONSES FOR SPORTY BETWEEN MR PRICE & MR PRICE PRO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr PricePro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>84,7 %</td>
<td>95,1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>83,5 %</td>
<td>95,5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>87,1 %</td>
<td>94,3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the total sample perceived the sporty aspects of the Mr Price Pro (95.1%) and of the Mr Price brand (84,7%). The surf-aware have slightly higher perceptions of the ‘sport attitudes’ linked with Mr Price. This result might be explained by the fact that the surf-aware sample is more sport-orientated than the event-friendly sample. In other words, those respondents are used to seeing Mr Price sponsoring activities such as lifesaving or rugby teams, for example.
4.5.3.3 Differences

a) Quality

**Table 4.40: Responses for Quality between Mr Price & Mr Price Pro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr PricePro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>70,0 %</td>
<td>86,2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>67,7 %</td>
<td>85,7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>74,3 %</td>
<td>87,1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70% of the total respondents perceived the Mr Price clothes as good quality products. This percentage is lower than the perception of the quality of the event (86,2%). This feeling of quality of the event is much the same for both the event-friendly and the surf-aware respondents. There is no difference either between the perceptions of male and female respondents.

b) Prestige

**Table 4.41: Responses for Prestige between Mr Price & Mr Price Pro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr PricePro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>41,9 %</td>
<td>76,8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>39,8 %</td>
<td>76,7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>45,7 %</td>
<td>77,1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
76.8% of the total sample considered the Mr Price Pro as a prestigious event. This might be explained by the fact that the competition hosts the best international surfers.

Regarding the sponsor, Mr Price is a popular brand but not ‘up-market’ orientated, which explains why it is not seen as prestigious, despite the fact that Mr Price is ‘international’ through their Chilean and Zimbabwean outlets.

c) Unique

**Table 4.42: Responses for uniqueness between Mr Price & Mr Price Pro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr Price</th>
<th>Mr PricePro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>46.3 %</td>
<td>81.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>48.1 %</td>
<td>79.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>42.9 %</td>
<td>84.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The uniqueness of the Mr Price Pro is perceived by the total sample with 81.3% of the sample seeing it as unique. This perceived uniqueness is higher amongst the surf-aware (84.3%). The Mr Price brand is not recognised as unique by the total sample as only 46.3% of respondents agreed with Mr Price being unique. This is implied because of the positioning of the brand as has been discussed in paragraph 4.5.3.2 (c), detailing the perceptions on innovation.

4.5.3.4 Conclusion – Mr Price

The results show that the values associated with the Mr Price brand do match the values associated with the Mr Price Pro surf contest, except as far as quality, prestige
and the unique aspects are concerned. This is understandable as the quality and the
prestige of the contest have been built and achieved over many years, as the event is
now ranked as a six-star event, while Mr Price has been sponsoring the event for
only two years.

So the conclusion is that the values concerning the brand have not changed due to the change in sponsorship communications. Therefore, as far as Mr Price is concerned the hypothesis cannot be accepted – the values of the surfing event have not been influenced by the values of the sponsor.

4.5.4 Conclusion – Hypothesis 2

Mr Price has a closer match of values with the surf contest than Gunston does. Therefore the sponsorship seems more relevant for Mr Price. But on the other hand the perceptions of the event, as the first hypothesis showed, did not change much as far as the values are concerned. The perception of the event remained the same regardless of the change in sponsor.

Gunston created and supported the surfing contest since its start in 1969. The sponsorship has lasted for the past thirty years. Now, the Mr Price Pro has to build its own reputation. The difficulty of this is reflected in the fact that a lot of respondents still call the event “the Gunston 500”.

In terms of the second hypothesis, it can be concluded that the values of the event, as reflected in the perception by the public, is not influence by the values of the title-sponsor.
4.6 Hypothesis 3

4.6.1 Introduction

H3: It was hypothesised that a long-term sponsorship affords long-term brand awareness even after the resignation by the sponsor, especially when the sponsors’ name is associated with the competition.

To find out if this hypothesis could be accepted or not, the respondents were questioned on various issues about Gunston: the slogan, the country of origin and the symbol of the pack. Concerning the slogan, the respondents had to choose one out of five possible slogans. Of the five slogans, two were former Gunston slogans, which were used in former Gunston 500 advertising programs. The question of origin was an open-ended question. The symbol on the pack had to be chosen from five alternatives. Before discussing the awareness of Gunston, it must be pointed out that only 32.5% of the sample was smokers and Gunston smokers only represented 2% of the total sample.
4.6.2 Slogans

**TABLE 4.43: RESPONSES RELATING TO THE SLOGAN OF GUNSTON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Wrong</th>
<th>Chi-square tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 24 years old</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 24 years old</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoker</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Smoker</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the slogans which Gunston used in their advertising, 58.6% of the respondents chose a correct one. The Chi-square test shows no significant differences between the different sample groups. For example, 57.1% of the up to 24 year olds picked the right slogans compared to 61.4% for the people over 24 years old. The event-friendly sample was more aware of the Gunston slogans than the surf-aware sample, 61.7% against 52.9% respectively. The difference between smokers and non-smokers was slight as far as the slogans are concerned.

From this first question about Gunston awareness, the sponsorship appears to have worked well, as the event-friendly respondents and the ’up to 24’ are well informed.
about the slogans, regardless of whether they are smokers or not. To confirm this fact, the next section will investigate the symbol on the pack.

### 4.6.3 Symbol on the Pack

**Table 4.44: Responses relating to the Symbol of Gunston’s Pack**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Wrong</th>
<th>Chi-square tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 24 years old</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 24 years old</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoker</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Smoker</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the total sample is concerned, 62.1% of the respondents are aware that the symbol of Gunston is a cannon. This is quite a high rating. Going further with the analysis, it can be noticed that the men had a higher rate of right answer than the women, respectively 71.4% against 46.8%. The same ratio was observed between smokers and non-smokers, 71.2% against 57.7%, but with less significance as far as the smoking habits is concerned.
As far as the question of symbol is concerned, this finding, which is that the men and the smokers groups are more aware of the symbol of a cigarette pack, indicate that the sponsorship is only a part of communication strategy. Indeed these answers might be explained by the fact that Gunston are male-orientated cigarettes. To extend the analysis, the next section will investigate the origin of Gunston.

**4.6.4 Origin of Gunston**

**Table 4.45 Responses relating to the origin of Gunston**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Wrong</th>
<th>Chi-square tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surf-aware</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>0,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event-friendly</td>
<td>6,8%</td>
<td>93,2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7,9%</td>
<td>92,1%</td>
<td>0,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,8%</td>
<td>92,2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 24 years old</td>
<td>6,8%</td>
<td>93,2%</td>
<td>0,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 24 years old</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoker</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
<td>90,9%</td>
<td>0,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Smoker</td>
<td>7,3%</td>
<td>92,7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>92,1%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question appeared difficult for the respondents because Gunston never focussed its advertising campaign on the origin of the product. In fact, Gunston is originally a Zimbabwean brand, which has since been purchased by RJ Reynolds. As far as this study is concerned, the right answer is Zimbabwe.
The highest percentage of correct answers was found in the surf-aware and the over 24 years old groups, both with only 10%. More than the half of the respondents (54.2%) answered that the Gunston brand comes from the United States of America. This type of answer is easily explained by the fact that most of the famous cigarette brands come from the United States. Another point to raise is the fact that with such chi-square results it is difficult to evaluate which part of the correct answers is due to “right” guess. The lack of significance may be due to the smallness of this part of the sample. As far as the question of origin is concerned, no further findings can be acknowledged.

4.6.5 Conclusion – Hypothesis 3

As the above analysis shows, the awareness of the Gunston brand is high. Many of the respondents were able to identify the slogans and the symbol on the Gunston pack, two elements which are considered as the vehicle of brand awareness. Moreover it must be underlined that even the young generation (up to 24 years old) and women, who were not part of the Gunston target market, successfully answered both these questions. Concerning the origin of Gunston, even Gunston’s target market hardly answered this question correctly, which underlines the fact that Gunston never really communicate it.

Therefore it can be concluded that the awareness of Gunston is relatively high in the total sample. It means that the long-term sponsorship of the surfing contest created a large awareness amongst the spectators. The fact that Gunston has been the title-sponsor for the last thirty years has lead to very high awareness, as is shown by the
fact that many of the respondents still identified the event as the Gunston 500. The third hypothesis is therefore can be accepted.

4.7 Chapter conclusion

Research hypothesis one showed that the change of sponsorship does not change the consumers’ perceptions of the event. The event, regardless of sponsor, supports the surf values. In addition the values linked to Mr Price (fun, fashion) are now also becoming associated with the event. Moreover, despite the continuing impact of the previous sponsor, Mr Price has additionally significantly impacted the event with its core values. Therefore it might be expected over-time a strongest awareness of Mr Price and a progressive weakening of Gunston.

Research hypothesis two suggested a closer match of values between Mr Price and the event, than Gunston and the event. Such results match with the association of the domain of sponsor’s activity and the event’s core activity as found by Quester and Farrelly (1998). But despite the poor match of values between Gunston and the event, Gunston has generated a significant residual awareness, which might be explained by both the duration of the sponsorship agreement and the association with the name of the event.

Research hypothesis three showed a high remaining awareness among the total sample concerning Gunston. It leads to the conclusion that the sponsorship strategy developed by Gunston with the surfing contest over the years created a long-term awareness.
This chapter has presented the analysis of the results and the acceptance/rejection of the three hypotheses. The following chapter will now draw overall conclusions about the study, stressing recommendations for further research.
5.1 Conclusions

The overall objective of the study was to determine how a target audience perceives the change of sponsor of a sport event and to what extent residual benefit is retained by the original sponsor, by studying the change in sponsor, from Gunston to Mr Price, of Durban's major surfing competition.

Research hypothesis one showed that the change in sponsorship has led to changes in respondents’ perceptions of the event. However, the fundamental surfing values have not been lost, but the event seems to have gained the values associated with the new sponsor (e.g. fun and fashion). Therefore, although there is still a strong link with the previous sponsor, it appears as if Mr Price has made significant progress in stamping their image and values on the event. Strengthening awareness of Mr Price and further weakening of the Gunston awareness can be expected over time.

Research hypothesis two showed a mismatch between Gunston and the event, but a reasonably close match between Mr Price and the event. This is consistent with the match-up hypothesis of Mc Daniel (in Lardinois and Quester, 2001) and the association of the domain of the sponsor’s activity and the event’s core activity as found by Quester and Farrelly (1998). Despite Gunston’s poor ‘match-up’ they still maintained high levels of residual awareness, probably due to the length of the
association (thirty years) and the continual repetition of the association via the event name over a long time period.

Research Hypothesis three showed a strong residual awareness concerning Gunston. It leads to the conclusion that long-term sponsorship affords a long-term awareness.

5.2 Limitation

A specific limitation of this study was the use of a non-probability sample, which limits the ability to generalize the findings to other sporting events and to other situations. It would therefore be advantageous to ensure that further work in this field is based on a probability sample, in order to validate the findings of this study.

5.3 Recommendations for further research

The possibility that the residual awareness achieved by Gunston was caused by some other marketing variable was not investigated. Since Gunston was legally prevented from advertising the brand in the media, and did not make use of any other major consumer promotions over the period, it is unlikely that the continued awareness was due to their current or new marketing activities. Nevertheless, it would be worthwhile to investigate the other marketing activities to eliminate the possibility that there were other factors that caused the slow decay of awareness.

A unique aspect of this research study was the length of time that Gunston sponsored the event prior to the resignation of the sponsorship. It could be worthwhile to investigate the effect of the length of sponsorship on the awareness decay process. In other words, the considerable residual awareness may merely be due to the length of
the sponsorship association. Further research on long running sponsorships could thus be worthwhile.

A further area that could be worth studying is where the sponsorship and the location of the event change. Quester and Farrelly (1998) found that a change in location could be related to respondents’ perceptions of an event, and therefore studying a situation where both variables (sponsor and location) had changed could increase understanding of the phenomenon.

In summary, this research has shown the importance of a neglected aspect of sponsorship, namely residual awareness, and has highlighted the importance that a new sponsor should place on activities to generate rapid decay in the previous sponsor’s awareness levels and to even more rapidly establish a strong link between their brand and the event.
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Appendix 1: Questionnaire

No:

Questionnaire

Hi, my name is --------- and I am doing research for a Masters degree on the attitudes of spectators towards the Mr Price Pro surfing competition. Will you answer a few questions? It shouldn’t take longer than about 5 minutes. Your answers will be totally anonymous and treated with confidentiality.

1. Do you attend other sports competitions?
   Rugby ☐1   Other Watersports ☐2   Cricket ☐3   Soccer ☐4   Others ☐5
   Please specify if answered “other”:

2. Do you surf?
   Yes ☐1   No longer surf ☐2   No, never surfed ☐3

3. Did you attend or watch this event previously, before it was sponsored by Mr Price?
   Yes ☐1   No ☐2

4. Do you know the previous name of the competition?
   Right ☐1   Wrong ☐2

I now want to ask you about the sponsorship of the event

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree that it makes sense for a surf event to be sponsored?
   Strongly agree ☐5   Agree ☐4   No opinion ☐3   Disagree ☐2   Strongly disagree ☐1

Now, I would like to find out your feelings about Mr Price.
6. Do you buy clothes from Mr Price?

- [ ] Buy all my clothes from Mr Price
- [ ] Buy most of my clothes from Mr Price
- [ ] Buy some of my clothes from Mr Price
- [ ] Buy my clothes only occasionally from Mr Price
- [ ] Never buy from Mr Price

Now can you tell me to what extent you believe the words, which I will read out, apply to Mr Price. Say whether you “strongly agree”, “agree”, “have no opinion”, “disagree”, or “strongly disagree” as to whether they apply to Mr Price.

**Mister Price**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Authentic</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Leisurely</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Quality</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Innovative</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Prestigious</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Fun</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Unique</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Fashionable</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Seductive</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Strong</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Manly</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sporty</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. What is Mister Price’s current slogan?

..........................................................................................................................................

(write in)

Right 1☐ Wrong 2☐

20. Please mention any other brands that are currently sponsoring this competition

..........................................................................................................................................

(write in)

21. In your opinion, which brands could have sponsored the event, if Mr Price had not taken up the sponsoring:

1.- ..........................................................................................................................................

2.- ..........................................................................................................................................

3.- .............................................................................................................................................
The Mr Price Pro

I would like now to find out your feelings about the “Mr Price Pro” surfing competition. Please say whether you believe the words that I will read out apply to the surfing competition. Say whether you “strongly agree” etc through to “strongly disagree” as to whether they apply to the Mr Price Pro surfing competition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Authentic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Leisurely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Innovative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Rewarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Prestigious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Fashionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Seductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Manly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Sporty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Spectacular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gunston

If they did not know name of the competition or sponsor tell them who it was now.

I would like now to find out your feelings about “Gunston” cigarettes.

35- Do you smoke cigarettes?      Yes ☐      No ☐

36- Do you smoke Gunstons?        Yes ☐      No ☐

37- Did you smoke Gunstons when they were sponsoring the competition?      Yes ☐      No ☐

Please say whether you believe the words I will read out apply to this brand. Say whether you “strongly agree” etc through to “strongly disagree” as to whether they apply to “Gunston”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisurely</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestigious</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashionable</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seductive</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporty</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50- **What were the slogans of Gunston cigarettes?** (you may tick several answers)

- Rich and Rewarding
- Lighten Up
- The best tobaccos a man can get
- Get closer to flavour
- The Taste
- Do I look like I follow the crowd?
- The International Passport to smoking pleasure

51- **From which country does this brand come?**

........................................................................................................................................................................

52- **What is the symbol on the Gunston pack?** (tick one answer)

- a cannon
- a surfer
- a gun
- bullets
- surfboard
- others:

........................................................................................................................................................................

**The Gunston 500**

*I would like now to find out your feelings about the “Gunston 500” surfing competition. Can you tell me whether you believe the words I will read out applied to the surfing competition when it was known as the “Gunston 500”. Say whether you “strongly agree” etc through to “strongly disagree”, as to whether they applied to the “Gunston 500” surfing competition.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53 Unique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Authentic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Leisurely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Quality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Innovative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Rewarding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Prestigious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Fun</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Fashionable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Seductive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Manly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Sporty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Spectacular</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identification**

66. **Sex:**  
- M □ 1  
- F □ 2

67. **Age:**  
- >15 □ 1  
- 15-24 □ 2  
- 25-34 □ 3  
- 35-44 □ 4  
- 45-54 □ 5  
- 55-64 ◯ 6  
- 65+ □ 7

*Thank you for your time and for helping with the research*
Appendix 2: Definition of adjectives

The adjectives used to qualify the events and the brands were defined according to the following definitions, provided by the Concise Oxford Dictionary (1999).

**Authentic**: made or done the same way as an original; of undisputed origin or veracity, genuine.

**Fashionable**: characteristic of or influenced by a current popular trend or style

**Fun**: providing entertainment, amusement, enjoyable

**Innovative**: make changes in something already existing, as by introducing new methods, ideas, or products.

**Leisurely**: relaxed and unhurried.

**Manly**: having or denoting those good qualities traditionally associated with men, such as courage and strength.

**Prestige**: widespread respect and admiration attracted through a perception of high achievements and quality.

**Quality**: the standard of something as measured against other things in a similar kind.

**Rewarding**: providing satisfaction

**Seductive**: tempting and attractive

**Spectacular**: very impressive, striking, or dramatic

**Sporty**: of, relating to, or typical of sports, sportsmen, sportswomen, or sportswear.

**Unique**: being the only one of its kind, unlike anything else.
Appendix 3: Journal Article