



---

# An investigation into the effects of sporting involvement and alcohol sponsorship on underage drinking

## Keywords

alcohol  
sponsorship  
sports culture  
underage drinking

## Fiona Davies

Lecturer in Marketing, Cardiff Business School  
Aberconway Building, Colum Drive, Cardiff CF10 3EU  
Tel: 02920 875700  
Email: [daviesfm@cf.ac.uk](mailto:daviesfm@cf.ac.uk)

---

## Peer reviewed

---

## Executive summary

---

In the light of increasing concerns about underage drinking in the UK, alcohol marketers have to defend their sponsorship activities against calls for bans or restriction. Alcohol sponsorship of sport, in particular, is seen as making inappropriate connections between healthy pursuits and products which, if used

## Abstract

---

Concerns about underage drinking have led to calls for a UK ban on alcohol sponsorship of sport. Such a ban would have severe financial consequences for many sports, so should not be implemented without thorough consideration of its likely effectiveness. This study investigating the alcohol consumption intentions of 14 and 15 year olds showed that boys who were involved in sport were more likely both to drink alcohol and to get drunk, with awareness of sponsorship enhancing the likelihood of these behaviours. Girls involved in sport, however, showed more negative attitudes than their peers towards alcohol. It is argued that boys involved in sport are socialised into a traditional masculine alcohol and sports culture, which is reinforced by sponsorship. Evidence from studies on tobacco sponsorship suggests that health-related marketing communications and the use of low-alcohol or non-alcohol brands for sports sponsorship could be more effective than a ban in changing the culture.

---

irresponsibly, can cause much harm. The position is complicated by the historical links between alcohol and sport in the traditional masculine culture of the UK, which alcohol sponsorship both capitalises on and perpetuates. However, sponsors make a large financial contribution to UK sport, and many also try



to promote a message of responsible drinking. A ban would have severe consequences for sport, so should not be implemented without evidence that it would have a noticeable effect on underage drinking.

Evidence for effects on product (as opposed to brand) perceptions from sponsorship is mainly from investigations of tobacco sponsorship, and is limited and inconclusive. A study was therefore designed to examine such effects in the context of alcohol. Following a series of focus groups with 14 and 15 year olds, a questionnaire investigating sporting involvement, alcohol consumption and awareness and knowledge of sponsorship was drawn up and administered to a sample of 322 pupils of a similar age. Multiple regression analysis, using the Theory of Reasoned Action framework, was used to test for significant predictors of young people's self-perceived likelihood that they would a) drink alcohol and b) get drunk, on the weekend following questionnaire completion. For boys, being involved in sport predicted greater likelihood both of consuming alcohol and of getting drunk, while adding sponsorship awareness to the equation further improved predictions of consumption. For girls, attitudes towards alcohol were the most significant predictor of both behaviours; sporting involvement was not a significant predictor of either. Sponsorship awareness showed no main effect in predicting girls' intentions, but enhanced the effect of positive attitudes towards alcohol.

Involvement in sport thus brings boys into a culture in which the use of alcohol plays a significant part, and they are influenced by this whether or not they notice sponsors. Sponsorship by alcohol companies plays a part in perpetuating the norms of that culture and reinforcing positive attitudes towards alcohol consumption. There is no evidence of sporting involvement, or moderate drinking messages by sponsors, acting as an incentive for boys to moderate their drinking. The girls in this study are less involved in sport but have more favourable attitudes to alcohol, which are the major predictors of greater likelihoods of drinking and getting drunk.

Solely banning alcohol sports sponsorship would have minimal effect on levels of underage drinking; a serious attempt to weaken the links between alcohol and sport would require wide-ranging measures to stimulate cultural change. Health-related marketing communications should be used to highlight the detrimental effects of alcohol on sporting performance and send the message that alcohol and sport do not mix. The use of low-alcohol and non-alcohol brands for sports sponsorship would allow alcohol marketers to send a more socially responsible message while still promoting their corporate and brand identities.

### Introduction

With tobacco sponsorship now banned in the UK and recent restrictions on junk food advertising, alcohol marketers are becoming increasingly concerned about the future of their sponsorships, especially against the background of rising public concern about the extent of underage drinking. The previously voluntary codes of practice on alcohol advertising have already come under the jurisdiction of the Advertising Standards Authority, but so far sponsorship has remained unregulated. However, as far back as 2001 the World Health Organization (WHO) was calling for all Member States of the European Union to "strengthen measures to protect children and adolescents from exposure to alcohol promotion and sponsorship" (WHO/Europe, 2001), while the Europe-wide study by Anderson and Baumberg (2005) recommends the development of a pan-European policy on alcohol marketing, with the ultimate aim being "no advertising on TV and cinema, no sponsorship, and limitation of messages and images only referring to the quality of the product" (p416). The European Sponsorship Association (ESA) riposte to this report denies any links between sponsorship and alcohol misuse, cites the impact that a sponsorship ban would have on sport and other activities, and states its belief that alcohol companies are already acting responsibly (ESA, 2006).



Sponsorship regulation is perceived as a relatively easy measure that the government could take in order to be seen as addressing public concerns while actually avoiding the more radical social issues underlying young people's abuse of alcohol.

A major problem in this debate is that there is little empirical evidence in support of either position. The body of work on sponsorship (see Walliser (2003) and Cornwell (2008) for reviews of major research areas) has focused on its effects at the brand level rather than the product category level, so there is little data on the impact of heavy use of sponsorship by a particular industry. Furthermore, the alcohol industry can be considered a special case in that the regulation of its advertising makes it more reliant on sponsorship as a promotional tool, while restricting the extent to which a brand image can be conveyed through integrated marketing communications. There are obvious similarities to the situation that existed in the UK regarding the tobacco industry, before tobacco sponsorship was banned. In both situations, a major concern is the effect of promotional activities upon those who are too young to buy the product legally.

This paper now goes on to discuss the reasons that have been advanced for and against a sponsorship ban, and consider the findings of the few studies that have investigated the impact of marketing communications on a product category. It then focuses on sports sponsorships, to which the alcohol industry is the third largest contributor behind sports goods companies and the hotel, travel, leisure and restaurant sector (Mintel, 2006). Results are presented of an empirical study carried out to investigate links between young people's sporting involvement, awareness of sports sponsors and their attitudes and behaviour towards alcohol. Although alcohol brands sponsor other activities as well as sport, the sporting arena was chosen for three reasons: the extent of alcohol sponsorship; the cultural links in the UK between alcohol and sport; and the incongruity which some perceive in the sponsorship of healthy pursuits by a product cited as the third highest risk to health in developed countries (Alcohol Concern, 2007a).

### Alcohol sponsorship: the arguments

The main reasons put forward for banning alcohol sponsorship in the UK relate to increasing concerns about underage drinking. The latest figures from Alcohol Concern (2007b) show that from 2002 to 2005, 58-60% of 11-15 year olds were drinking alcohol, with a drop to 54% in 2006. The amounts consumed by those who drink have increased from a weekly mean of 5 units in the 1990s to 10 units in 2006; boys drink more than girls, but in recent years the amount drunk by boys has stabilised, while the amount drunk by girls continues to rise. Immediate consequences of teen drinking include anti-social behaviour, absence from school due to the effects of drink, and an increase in hospital admissions for underage drinkers, while the full extent of the long-term consequences may yet be unknown. Studies by Gonzalez (1989), Chou and Pickering (1992) and Grant and Dawson (1997) indicate positive associations between early alcohol use and alcohol-related problems in adulthood. The 'gateway theory' (Welte & Barnes, 1985; Kandel et al, 1992; Golub & Johnson, 2001) proposes that alcohol use increases the likelihood of progression to other drugs, while White (2006) believes that excessive alcohol use in the teenage years, before the brain is fully developed, may cause irreversible damage to brain development. Finally, recent UK figures on alcohol-related liver cirrhosis (which takes on average 10-15 years to develop) show that its occurrence among 25-34 year olds has doubled in the past 10 years (Alcohol Policy, 2007). These are certainly good reasons for wishing to reduce underage drinking. While accepting that there are many social and cultural factors affecting the extent to which a young person uses alcohol, agencies such as Alcohol Concern believe that external media influences cannot be discounted, and that the measures proposed by Anderson and Baumberg (2005) should be implemented.

With particular reference to sport, it can be argued that in the light of increased knowledge about the detrimental effects of alcohol upon sporting



performance and the many sportsmen whose careers have been affected by alcohol problems, linking alcohol and sport sends the wrong message. Even small quantities of alcohol may impact on sporting performance through impairing coordination and motor ability, inducing dehydration, interfering with the body's temperature regulation, lowering blood sugar levels or impairing judgment (Edwards, 2000, p.10; Stainback, 1997, pp.49-63). Most medical coaching advice is that serious athletes should abstain from alcohol, or at least consume only minimal amounts (e.g. Berning, 1996), yet there are frequent reports of alcohol-fuelled behaviour by high-profile sportsmen. Williams (2000) describes some of the difficulties faced by coaches in moderating the drinking of young footballers in the face of such examples.

However, opponents of a sponsorship ban do not accept that alcohol sponsorship is a factor in encouraging underage drinking. They believe that the problems are social, caused by the irresponsibility of those who insist on drinking to excess, and young people's disregard for the law (Kolah, 2007). The recent banning of tobacco sponsorship caused great difficulties for sports such as snooker, which relied heavily upon such sponsorship, and a ban on alcohol sponsorship would affect almost all UK sports in some way. While prominent teams and events such as Liverpool FC or the John Smith's Grand National might be prestigious enough to be able to attract alternative sponsors, it could well be the less high-profile sports and events which would suffer most, thus decreasing sporting opportunities for young people. This would be a high price to pay if no effects were seen upon alcohol consumption. Moreover, McDaniel and Mason (1999) found greater public acceptance for an association of beer with sport than for an association of tobacco with sport; although they suggest this might show respondents were not sufficiently concerned about the public health risks of alcohol, it might also indicate that a sponsorship ban, and any possible consequences, would not be well received by the public.

Lancaster and Lancaster's (2003) meta-analysis of studies on tobacco advertising certainly casts doubt on whether a sponsorship ban would have any effect. Their analysis of full or partial advertising bans on tobacco showed that in only 29% of cases was consumption significantly reduced; their belief, supported by a similarly low rate of positive correlation between tobacco advertising and consumption, is that advertising bans have little or no influence on tobacco demand because the advertising itself has minimal influence. Dorsett and Dickerson (2004) also found no statistical relationship between UK alcohol advertising and consumption. Although their research only included persons over 18, their conclusions are supported by Martino et al (2006), whose study of Year 8/9 pupils (aged 12-14) showed that peers and important adults were the greatest influencers of alcohol-related beliefs, with advertising reinforcing positive attitudes only in those who were already drinkers.

Two experimental studies (McDaniel & Heald, 2000; Christensen, 2006) have considered sponsorship links between healthy pursuits and unhealthy products. Both found that incongruence was perceived, with Christensen stating that because there were large differences in both emotional and attitudinal responses to sponsor (tobacco) and sponsee (sports event), the partnership would be rejected in the consumer's mind and no change would take place in their response to the sponsor. McDaniel and Heald suggest using marketing communications techniques rather than bans to negate any effects from an unhealthy product sponsor, for instance highlighting the incongruity of an unhealthy product sponsorship through public service advertising, or ensuring that sporting organisations with unhealthy product sponsors balanced this with the communication of health-related messages. This type of strategy has to some extent been adopted by sponsors keen to be seen as promoting responsible drinking: for instance Coors, owner of the Carling brand, which sponsors Glasgow Celtic and Glasgow Rangers, have featured the managers of these clubs in alcohol responsibility advertisements (Murden, 2004);



Diageo, owner of many sponsoring brands, helps to develop educational materials on alcohol awareness (Diageo, 2007); UK alcohol websites now draw attention to the fact that alcohol should be used responsibly and is only appropriate for adults; and many alcohol companies contribute to the Drinkaware Trust, whose mission is “campaigning and educating to reduce alcohol harm” (Drinkaware Trust, 2007).

### **Product category effects from marketing communications**

While no previous studies have investigated the relationships between sponsorship awareness and alcohol use, many of the arguments put forward in the debate on tobacco sponsorship are relevant. Tobacco marketers also refuted links between their advertising and sponsorship and young people’s smoking, stating that the tobacco market was mature and that promotional activities only encouraged brand switching. Hastings and Aitken (1995) pointed out the key flaw in that argument – that the tobacco market was not a single market but several, one being the market of young smokers, which had to be continually replenished in order for the industry to survive. The same applies to the alcohol market – the alcohol industry needs young people to take up drinking, and in a highly competitive market, each company wants them to drink their brands. Even if no young person drank illegally, a pragmatic marketer would ensure familiarity with brands aimed at the 18-24 market before young people reached that age.

Ledwith (1984) found that secondary schoolchildren were most aware of cigarette brands which were associated with sponsorship of televised sport, while Aitken et al (1986a) found that around a third of late primary schoolchildren and more than half of secondary schoolchildren were aware of cigarette brand sports sponsorships. However, the latter found no significant differences between smokers and non-smokers. This would indicate that sponsorship does raise the brand profile, but does not provide evidence to link this awareness to use of either the brand or the product category. In contrast, studies investigating

children’s perceptions of tobacco advertising (DiFranza et al 1991; Aitken et al, 1986b; Alexander et al, 1983) found that non-smoking children with a more favourable view of cigarette advertising were more likely to become smokers. Thus there may be some difference between the effects of advertising and sponsorship – young people exposed to alcohol sponsorship without associated persuasive advertising may not be drawn towards alcohol.

Kelly et al (2002) found that image advertising (advertising with visuals, as opposed to text only) for tobacco and alcohol brands positively influenced young people’s views about the attractiveness of the product category. As sponsorship only consists of showing the name and possibly brand logo, it could be thought of as analogous to a text advertisement and thus non-influencing; however, visual cues provided by the context (e.g. attractive or admired sportsperson wearing the sponsor’s shirt; sponsor name on fast, sleek racing car) might produce a positive image which could then be transferred to the product category.

Evidence for a link between sponsorship awareness and behaviour comes from Charlton et al (1998), who investigated the sporting preferences, cigarette brand knowledge and smoking status of 12-13 year old boys, and found that those who named motor racing as their favourite televised sport were significantly more likely to name the sponsoring brands Marlboro and Camel. A year later, the boys were again asked about their smoking status; a significantly greater percentage of those who preferred motor racing had become regular smokers (12.8% as against 7.0% of others).

Turning to the current debate on food advertising to children, Ambler (2006) concluded, after reviewing studies commissioned by the UK Food Standards Authority and the UK Advertising Authority’s Food Advertising Unit, that the promotion of particular food brands to children does not have any effect on product category consumption or on overall diet.

It can thus be seen that the evidence for product category effects, particularly those related to



sponsorship, is limited and inconclusive. The current study specifically considers product category effects related to alcohol sponsorship of sport. Before describing the research, the next section of this paper explains why so many alcohol brands are involved in such sponsorships in the UK.

### Alcohol, sport and sponsorship

A main objective of sponsorship is to enhance the image of the sponsoring brand (Cornwell & Maignan, 1998), through association with an activity, individual, team or event towards which the target market already has a favourable attitude and from which a desirable image may be transferred to the brand. Meenaghan and Shipley (1999) found that sports sponsorship in general was associated with the values "healthy, young, energetic, fast, vibrant, [and] masculine"; these are useful associations to have for an alcohol brand, counteracting the negative links of alcohol to anti-social behaviour and addiction.

One of the key determinants of effective transfer of image and positive consumer response to sponsorship is perceived fit or synergy between sponsored property and sponsoring brand (Speed & Thompson, 2000; Gwinner & Eaton, 1999; Kinney & McDaniel, 1996; Koo et al, 2006). In the case of alcohol and sport, this is provided by the long history of cultural links between the two in the UK (Collins & Vamplew, 2002); even before the Industrial Revolution, pubs and their grounds were used as sporting venues and many brewers were active sportsmen who supported community sport in a spirit of social responsibility. The pub and sport also share a tradition of masculine culture, and both sport and alcohol are associated with release from work, relaxation and letting go of inhibitions (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). The massive rise in televised sport has provided additional opportunities for pubs and clubs, who can attract supporters to watch important matches in a sociable atmosphere (Eastman & Land, 1997).

It is not surprising, therefore, that alcohol marketers see sports teams and events as ideal sponsorship properties, and that 33 alcohol companies are

involved in a total of 61 sponsorship deals with various UK sports (Intel, 2006). Regulation of alcohol advertising, which prohibits association of alcohol with youth culture, sexual success, attractiveness, daring or toughness, also increases the primacy of image transfer through sponsorship in developing a positive image for alcohol brands.

### Research questions

If sponsorship of sport by alcohol companies influences young people towards drinking alcohol, then it is to be expected that, in the absence of any other relevant influences, those who are more aware of sports sponsorship are more likely to drink alcohol. However, if sponsors are sending out a clear message on underage drinking, this may deter young people from consuming alcohol. Even if they do drink on occasion, they may respond to responsible drinking messages and therefore be less likely to drink to excess.

To be exposed to alcohol sports sponsorship, a young person must have some interest in or involvement with sport, and even before sponsorship is considered, cultural influences towards drinking alcohol after playing sport and while watching sport may lead young sportspeople and sports fans towards drinking. As the sporting involvement precedes exposure to sponsorship, it seems logical that the research should investigate first whether this is the case, before testing for the influence of sponsorship. Our first two research hypotheses are therefore:

**H1: Young people who are more involved in sport are more likely to drink alcohol.**

**H2: Young people who are more involved in sport are more likely to drink to excess.**

The next question is whether exposure to alcohol sponsorship in the sporting context has an effect on drinking behaviour, additional to any effect found to be



TABLE 1 Characteristics of the sample

		NUMBER			%
		TOTAL NUMBER	MALE	FEMALE	
GENDER	MALE	161			55%
	FEMALE	133			45%
TYPE OF SCHOOL	PRIVATE	35			12%
	CHURCH	56			19%
	WELSH MEDIUM	58			20%
	LOCAL AUTHORITY (LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA)	82			28%
	LOCAL AUTHORITY (HIGHER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA)	63			21%
HIGHEST SPORTING LEVEL REACHED	REPRESENT COUNTRY	20	14	6	7%
	REPRESENT COUNTY, REGION OR CITY	35	24	11	12%
	REPRESENT CLUB/SCHOOL	137	79	58	47%
	NO REPRESENTATION/NOT COMPETITIVE	100	42	58	34%

RESEARCH PAPER

associated with sporting involvement. The following hypotheses are therefore proposed:

**H3: Awareness of sponsorship affects the likelihood of drinking alcohol, over and above any effects of sporting involvement.**

**H4: Awareness of sponsorship affects the likelihood of getting drunk, over and above any effects of sporting involvement.**

## Methodology

The research population for this study was Year 10 (14/15 year old) pupils in a medium-sized Welsh city which, in common with most UK cities, has serious concerns about the alcohol-fuelled behaviour of some of its young people. The literature would indicate that at this age the vast majority have drunk alcohol at

some time, with a significant minority drinking regularly and/or binge-drinking. Following focus groups at which attitudes and beliefs about alcohol, alcohol use, opinions on sponsorship and knowledge of sport sponsors were discussed, a questionnaire survey was piloted and then administered to a sample of young people. In order to survey a wide cross-section of the age group, a stratified sampling procedure was adopted, with a total sample of 322 participants being selected from two local authority schools in contrasting socio-economic areas, one church school, one private school and one Welsh medium school. After removing questionnaires where key questions had been omitted, 294 usable questionnaires were used for analysis. The characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1.

The questionnaire comprised three parts, relating to sport, alcohol and sponsorship. First, a series of questions investigated the respondent's level of involvement with sport, both as a participant and as a spectator, as follows:



1. In a typical week, on how many days do you take part in one or more sports?
2. How important is it to you to take part in sport?
3. How important is it to you to perform well in sport?
4. In an average week, on how many days do you watch sport on television?
5. How many live sporting events have you attended in the last three months?
6. What is the highest level you have reached in any competitive sport?

Questions 2 and 3 were coded on a 7-point Likert scale, Question 5 from 0 (none) to 5 (more than 10), and Question 6 from 0 (non-competitive) to 3 (representing country). Responses to these questions were aggregated to produce an index of sporting involvement (Cronbach alpha = 0.77).

The alcohol section was based around the framework of the Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), which has been used in many studies as a model for predicting alcohol use (e.g. Schlegel et al, 1977; Laflin et al, 1994; Trafimow, 1996; O'Callaghan et al, 1997; Collins, 2002). This theory states that the likelihood of a person carrying out any behaviour (e.g. drinking alcohol) can be predicted from his/her attitude towards that behaviour and his/her subjective norms relating to that behaviour. Subjective norms measure the extent to which significant others (parents, friends, etc.) influence behaviour; they are operationalised as (the likelihood that X would approve of this behaviour) x (how motivated the person is to comply with what X thinks they should do), where X is a significant other person or group. Later modifications to the theory include the addition of other predictors relevant to specific studies; in the context of drinking alcohol, Rimal and Real (2005) included descriptive norms, or

the extent to which respondents subscribed to generally held beliefs (e.g. "students are frequent consumers of alcohol").

Participants in this study were asked to rate the likelihood that they would a) drink alcohol and b) get drunk on the forthcoming weekend, and their attitudes towards these behaviours. Although it is only the respondents' perceived likelihood of drinking that is being measured, Shim and Maggs (2005) discovered that for college students, intentions to drink correlated well with actual behaviour. Attitudes were measured on a scale adapted from that used by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980, pp.261-267) and Oliver and Bearden (1985) to measure attitude toward the acts (Bruner et al, 2001, p.61), with two items being reverse coded.

**Drinking alcohol is:**

Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
Wise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Foolish
Healthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unhealthy
Unpleasant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Pleasant

Attitude towards getting drunk was measured in a similar way. Despite previous studies having achieved acceptable Cronbach alpha values for this scale, this study did not, highlighting the ambivalence of attitudes towards alcohol. As the measure 'Bad... Good' had highest average correlation with other measures, this single statement was chosen as the attitude measure for analysis. Respondents were also asked to evaluate a range of outcomes, obtained during focus group sessions, of drinking alcohol and getting drunk; the correlations of the summed outcome evaluations with the chosen attitude statement ranged from 0.432 to 0.559, comparing favourably with studies cited by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980).

Finally, in this section respondents were asked to rate the extent to which significant others (parents,





## Sporting involvement and alcohol sponsorship

**TABLE 2** Comparison of mean responses, by gender

	GENDER	N	MEAN	STD. DEV'N	EQUAL VARIANCE ASSUMED?	LEVENE'S TEST FOR EQUALITY OF VARIANCES		T-TEST FOR EQUALITY OF MEANS		
						F	SIG.	T	df	SIG.
DAYS TAKING PART IN SPORT **	MALE	161	4.02	1.797	ASSUMED	1.077	.300	6.522	292	.000
	FEMALE	133	2.71	1.613	NOT ASSUMED			6.589	289.968	.000
IMPORTANCE OF TAKING PART **	MALE	161	5.22	1.665	ASSUMED	.058	.810	-5.379	291	.000
	FEMALE	132	4.16	1.689	NOT ASSUMED			-5.371	278.261	.000
IMPORTANCE OF PERFORMING WELL**	MALE	159	5.36	1.697	ASSUMED	1.157	.283	-5.637	288	.000
	FEMALE	131	4.19	1.844	NOT ASSUMED			-5.592	267.487	.000
DAYS WATCH SPORT ON TV **	MALE	161	3.14	2.216	ASSUMED	52.804	.000	7.739	292	.000
	FEMALE	133	1.44	1.373	NOT ASSUMED			8.076	272.015	.000
LIVE EVENTS IN LAST 3 MONTHS **	MALE	161	1.25	1.120	ASSUMED	15.545	.000	3.299	292	.001
	FEMALE	133	.86	.906	NOT ASSUMED			3.365	291.882	.001
HIGHEST SPORTING LEVEL **	MALE	159	1.06	.876	ASSUMED	.083	.774	3.299	290	.001
	FEMALE	133	.74	.797	NOT ASSUMED			3.327	287.973	.001
SPORTING INVOLVEMENT (FACTOR SCORE)**	MALE	157	.38	.987	ASSUMED	4.813	.029	7.653	285	.000
	FEMALE	130	-.45	.813	NOT ASSUMED			7.793	284.993	.000
LIKELIHOOD OF DRINKING THIS WEEKEND	MALE	159	3.35	2.225	ASSUMED	3.466	.064	1.906	287	.058
	FEMALE	130	3.87	2.435	NOT ASSUMED			1.889	264.565	.060
LIKELIHOOD OF GETTING DRUNK THIS WEEKEND**	MALE	157	2.37	1.939	ASSUMED	23.149	.000	3.361	286	.001
	FEMALE	131	3.23	2.401	NOT ASSUMED			3.298	248.666	.001
DRINKING ALCOHOL BAD/GOOD **	MALE	159	3.51	1.702	ASSUMED	4.059	.045	-2.740	289	.007
	FEMALE	132	4.05	1.610	NOT ASSUMED			-2.755	284.076	.006
GETTING DRUNK BAD/GOOD *	MALE	158	2.95	1.974	ASSUMED	.012	.912	-2.446	288	.015
	FEMALE	132	3.52	2.006	NOT ASSUMED			-2.442	277.282	.015
NOTICE SPONSORS AT LIVE EVENT **	MALE	158	5.28	1.878	ASSUMED	.310	.578	-3.296	288	.001
	FEMALE	132	4.56	1.809	NOT ASSUMED			-3.308	282.225	.001
NOTICE TV SPONSORS **	MALE	158	5.58	1.682	ASSUMED	.002	.966	-4.788	288	.000
	FEMALE	132	4.63	1.696	NOT ASSUMED			-4.785	278.104	.000
SPONSORS CORRECT **	MALE	161	8.14	3.688	ASSUMED	.002	.969	4.758	292	.000
	FEMALE	133	6.11	3.584	NOT ASSUMED			4.771	284.396	.000

\*\* Difference significant at 1% level

\* Difference significant at 5% level

RESEARCH PAPER



## Sporting involvement and alcohol sponsorship

**TABLE 3** Summary of correlations for boys

	L'HOOD OF DRINKING	L'HOOD OF GETTING DRUNK	ATTITUDE TOWARDS DRINKING ALCOHOL	ATTITUDE TOWARDS GETTING DRUNK	SUBJECTIVE NORMS FOR DRINKING				SUBJECTIVE NORMS FOR GETTING DRUNK				SPORTING INVOLVEMENT	SPONSOR AWARENESS	SPONSOR RECOGNITION	
					p	f	t	c	p	f	t	c				
L'HOOD OF DRINKING	1	.752	.482	.464	.439	.431	.339	.148	.360	.431	.331	.233	.136	.229	.121	
L'HOOD OF GETTING DRUNK	.752	1	.413	.570	.306	.353	.373	.247	.442	.376	.345	.189	.239	.206	.100	
ATTITUDE TOWARDS DRINKING ALCOHOL	.482	.413	1	.489	.357	.356	.395	.297	.372	.431	.331	.233	.024	.018	.048	
ATTITUDE TOWARDS GETTING DRUNK	.464	.570	.489	1	.265	.364	.370	.308	.525	.434	.478	.430	.136	.088	.143	
SUBJECTIVE NORMS FOR DRINKING	p	.439	.306	.357	.265	1	.435	.524	.381	.554	.341	.466	.386	.091	-.041	.042
	f	.431	.353	.356	.364	.435	1	.362	.272	.386	.843	.303	.119	.098	.136	
	t	.339	.373	.395	.370	.524	.362	1	.481	.517	.386	.918	.542	.090	-.016	.077
	c	.148	.247	.297	.308	.381	.272	.481	1	.362	.268	.442	.901	-.034	-.097	.072
SUBJECTIVE NORMS FOR GETTING DRUNK	p	.360	.442	.372	.525	.554	.386	.517	.362	1	.419	.478	.430	.136	.088	-.018
	f	.431	.376	.431	.434	.341	.843	.386	.268	.419	1	.349	.318	.131	-.083	.138
	t	.331	.345	.331	.478	.466	.340	.918	.442	.478	.349	1	.536	.104	.018	.125
	c	.233	.189	.233	.430	.386	.303	.542	.901	.430	.318	.536	1	-.058	.113	.044
SPORTING INVOLVEMENT	.136	.239	.024	.136	.091	.119	.090	-.034	.136	.131	.104	-.058	1	.345	.400	
SPONSOR AWARENESS	.229	.206	.018	.088	-.041	.098	-.016	-.097	.088	-.083	.018	.113	.345	1	.292	
SPONSOR RECOGNITION	.121	.100	.048	.143	.042	.136	.077	.072	-.018	.138	.125	.044	.400	.292	1	

**TABLE 4** Summary of correlations for girls

	L'HOOD OF DRINKING	L'HOOD OF GETTING DRUNK	ATTITUDE TOWARDS DRINKING ALCOHOL	ATTITUDE TOWARDS GETTING DRUNK	SUBJECTIVE NORMS FOR DRINKING				SUBJECTIVE NORMS FOR GETTING DRUNK				SPORTING INVOLVEMENT	SPONSOR AWARENESS	SPONSOR RECOGNITION	
					p	f	t	c	p	f	t	c				
L'HOOD OF DRINKING	1	.819	.424	.535	.316	.356	.241	.041	.426	.349	.245	.044	.022	-.005	-.016	
L'HOOD OF GETTING DRUNK	.819	1	.428	.509	.225	.345	.131	.008	.403	.413	.218	.011	-.003	-.038	-.050	
ATTITUDE TOWARDS DRINKING ALCOHOL	.424	.428	1	.619	.318	.379	.039	.208	.347	.360	.034	.242	-.211	.010	.056	
ATTITUDE TOWARDS GETTING DRUNK	.535	.509	.619	1	.202	.356	.160	.111	.373	.435	.196	.125	-.026	.124	.057	
SUBJECTIVE NORMS FOR DRINKING	p	.316	.225	.318	.202	1	.308	.285	.130	.709	.210	.141	.072	-.007	.118	
	f	.356	.345	.379	.356	.308	1	.289	.203	.353	.879	.132	.129	-.052	-.127	.042
	t	.241	.131	.039	.160	.285	.289	1	.263	.268	.139	.794	.120	.134	.046	-.133
	c	.041	-.008	.208	.111	.130	.203	.263	1	.150	.113	.217	.918	-.205	.041	-.057
SUBJECTIVE NORMS FOR GETTING DRUNK	p	.426	.403	.347	.373	.709	.353	.268	.150	1	.368	.340	.180	-.065	.133	-.027
	f	.349	.413	.360	.435	.210	.879	.139	.113	.368	1	.105	.095	-.045	-.027	-.006
	t	.245	.218	.034	.196	.141	.132	.794	.217	.340	.105	1	.219	.094	.143	-.071
	c	.044	.025	.242	.125	.072	.129	.120	.918	.180	.095	.219	1	-.253	.065	-.003
SPORTING INVOLVEMENT	-.022	.003	-.211	-.026	-.007	-.052	.134	-.205	-.065	-.045	.094	-.253	1	.158	.220	
SPONSOR AWARENESS			.010	.124	.009	-.127	.046	.041	.133	-.027	.143	.065	.158	1	.163	
SPONSOR RECOGNITION	-.048	-.072	-.067	-.084	-.005	-.074	-.133	-.057	.028	-.040	-.071	-.003	.220	.163	1	

Correlations shown in **bold italics** are significant at 5% level, those shown in *italics* are significant at 1% level

Subjective norms: p = parents, f = friends, t = teachers, c = sports coaches



TABLE 5 Test of partial correlations with sponsor awareness, allowing for likelihood of drinking

GENDER		BIVARIATE CORRELATION WITH AWARENESS OF SPONSORS	PARTIAL CORRELATION WITH AWARENESS OF SPONSORS, CONTROLLING FOR LIKELIHOOD OF DRINKING
MALE	ATTITUDE TOWARDS DRINKING ALCOHOL	.018	.123
	ATTITUDE TOWARDS GETTING DRUNK	.088	.127
FEMALE	ATTITUDE TOWARDS DRINKING ALCOHOL	.010	-.002
	ATTITUDE TOWARDS GETTING DRUNK	.124	.118

No correlations were significant at 5% level.

friends, teachers and sports coaches) would approve of their drinking or getting drunk, and how motivated they were to comply with each of these referents. These measures were multiplied to obtain a subjective norm for each category of referent. In line with the findings of Kuther (2002) that the effects of parental and peer group subjective norms on alcohol use are independent rather than cumulative, subjective norms for different referents were kept separate rather than being combined into one measure.

The sponsorship section asked the extent of agreement with the following two statements:

*When I attend a live sporting event, I usually notice who the sponsors are.*

*When I watch a sporting event on television, I usually notice who the sponsors are.*

Those were averaged into one measure of self-perception of sponsorship awareness. Respondents were then asked to select the correct sponsors for a series of sporting teams and events (Appendix 1). Measures obtained were the number of sponsors correctly identified (maximum 16) and the number of alcohol sponsors correctly identified (maximum 4).

**Initial findings**

Male and female sub-samples showed significant differences on means for almost all measures except those relating to subjective norms (Table 2). Girls were

more likely to drink and get drunk, and had a more positive attitude towards these behaviours, Boys were more heavily involved in sport, took more notice of sponsors and recognised more sponsors (alcohol and non-alcohol). Therefore, further analysis was carried out on the two sub-samples separately.

For both males and females, a large number (35% males, 28% females) indicated they would be “extremely unlikely” to drink this weekend; these are likely to be non-drinkers or young people who drink only very occasionally. While the male distribution was relatively even over the other scale categories, the female distribution looked more ‘U-shaped’, with 25% stating they were “extremely likely” to drink this weekend. 56% of males and 45% of females were “extremely unlikely” to get drunk.

The numbers of sponsors recognised varied between 0 and 16 (maximum possible) for boys, and 0 and 13 for girls. The correlation between total sponsors recognised and alcohol sponsors recognised was 0.72 for boys and 0.78 for girls, both significant at 1% level, therefore there is no reason to believe there is more or less awareness of alcohol sponsors than of any other sponsor category. There was a significant correlation (0.29, significant at 1% level) for boys between self-perception of awareness and the number of sponsors correctly recognised, but for girls this correlation was smaller (0.16, significance 0.06). For boys, levels of sporting involvement (both as player and as spectator) were highly correlated (1% significance) with self-perceived awareness and



recognition of sponsors; for girls the correlation of sporting involvement with recognition was significant, but splitting sporting involvement into 'player' and 'spectator' elements revealed that this was due solely to spectator involvement.

For boys, both sporting involvement and sponsor awareness were significantly correlated with likelihood of both drinking alcohol and getting drunk, and with attitude to getting drunk. However, neither sponsor awareness nor the number of sponsors recognised (whether considering all sponsors or alcohol sponsors only) had significant correlation with attitudes towards drinking alcohol and getting drunk. For girls, sporting involvement had a significant negative correlation with attitude to drinking alcohol, while neither sponsor awareness nor total number of sponsors recognised showed significant correlation with attitudes or behaviours. The number of alcohol sponsors recognised was correlated (0.21, 1% significance) with likelihoods both of drinking and getting drunk.

The lack of correlation between attitudes and sponsor awareness suggests that sponsor awareness is not instrumental in attitude formation. Yet it is possible that such an influence would only occur after some interest in drinking had begun, so a partial correlation analysis was carried out between attitudes and sponsor awareness, allowing for drinking behaviour. The correlations for boys increase slightly, while those for girls decreased, but correlations are still not significant for either gender. It is possible that young people, who are informed in school about the health risks associated with alcohol, perceive the incongruence between a healthy pursuit and an unhealthy product, and so, as suggested by Christensen (2006), sponsorship does not lead to attitude change. Alternatively, attitude change may occur at the brand rather than the product level. A longitudinal study would be required to investigate fully the effects of increased sponsorship awareness on attitudes.

Tables 3 and 4 summarise correlations for boys and girls respectively, while Table 5 shows the partial correlation results.

### Analysis of effects of sporting involvement

A basic multiple regression analysis was performed to predict likelihood of drinking that weekend from attitude towards drinking alcohol and subjective norms relating to drinking alcohol that weekend. As it is possible that subjective norms affect attitudes, interactive terms were included in the regression, but none was in fact significant. A corresponding regression was performed to predict likelihood of getting drunk that weekend. The  $R^2$  values and significant predictors, as shown in the first columns of Tables 6 to 9, confirm that young people of both genders are more likely to drink or get drunk if they have a positive attitude towards that behaviour, and their 'significant others' are more approving (or less disapproving) of that behaviour. For each regression, attitude is more important than any individual subjective norm. Having established that the Theory of Reasoned Action makes valid baseline predictions in this context, Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested by adding sporting involvement as an additional predictor variable in these two regressions. Again, interactive terms were included. The second column of each of Tables 6 to 9 shows  $R^2$  values and significant predictors.

For the male sub-sample, taking sporting involvement into account increased the predictive ability of the regression equation. Thus for boys only, being involved in sport is a significant predictor of likelihood of drinking alcohol and getting drunk. Moreover, the interactive term (SI x ATT) is also significant, indicating that being involved in sport strengthens positive attitudes towards these behaviours. The main effect of attitude is lower for both behaviours than when sporting involvement is not included. For the female sub-sample, however,  $R^2$  has remained the same; being involved in sport has no significant influence on girls' likelihood of drinking alcohol or getting drunk. Attitude remains the strongest predictor of drinking behaviour. Hypotheses 1 and 2 are therefore accepted for boys only, which appears to confirm the enduring importance of the cultural links between alcohol, sport and masculinity.



**TABLE 6** Summary of hierarchical multiple regressions for predicting boys' likelihood of drinking this weekend

PREDICTION FROM ATTITUDES AND SUBJECTIVE NORMS				PREDICTION WITH ADDITION OF SPORTING INVOLVEMENT				PREDICTION WITH FURTHER ADDITION OF SPONSOR AWARENESS				PREDICTION WITH ADDITION OF SPONSOR RECOGNITION INSTEAD OF SPONSOR AWARENESS						
R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t
.37	<i>Const</i>		.053	.42	.05	<i>Const</i>		.017	.46	.04	<i>Const</i>		.014	.42	.05	<i>Const</i>		.010
	<i>Att</i>	.28	.000			<i>Att</i>	.19	.021			<i>Att</i>	.14	.100			<i>Att</i>	.15	.096
	<i>SNp</i>	.25	.003			<i>SNp</i>	.25	.003			<i>SNp</i>	.26	.006			<i>SNp</i>	.24	.010
	<i>SNf</i>	.25	.001			<i>SNf</i>	.29	.000			<i>SNf</i>	.32	.002			<i>SNf</i>	.35	.000
	<i>SNt</i>	.10	.265			<i>SNt</i>	.10	.242			<i>SNt</i>	.12	.279			<i>SNt</i>	.10	.271
	<i>SNc</i>	-.07	.356			<i>SNc</i>	-.02	.881			<i>SNc</i>	.02	.886			<i>SNc</i>	.01	.912
	<i>Att*SNp</i>	-.04	.624			<i>Att*SNp</i>	-.07	.447			<i>Att*SNp</i>	-.06	.520			<i>Att*SNp</i>	-.09	.374
	<i>Att*SNf</i>	.10	.192			<i>Att*SNf</i>	.07	.353			<i>Att*SNf</i>	.03	.663			<i>Att*SNf</i>	.06	.391
	<i>Att*SNt</i>	.14	.168			<i>Att*SNt</i>	.16	.113			<i>Att*SNt</i>	.13	.208			<i>Att*SNt</i>	.14	.190
	<i>Att*SNc</i>	-.10	.292			<i>Att*SNc</i>	-.13	.176			<i>Att*SNc</i>	-.08	.455			<i>Att*SNc</i>	-.06	.544
						<i>SI</i>	.19	.008			<i>SI</i>	.05	.596			<i>SI</i>	.20	.010
						<i>SI*Att</i>	.29	.001			<i>SI*Att</i>	.24	.007			<i>SI*Att</i>	.32	.001
						<i>SI*SNp</i>	-.12	.186			<i>SI*SNp</i>	-.16	.143			<i>SI*SNp</i>	-.10	.318
						<i>SI*SNf</i>	-.09	.326			<i>SI*SNf</i>	-.01	.921			<i>SI*SNf</i>	-.11	.269
						<i>SI*SNt</i>	.03	.752			<i>SI*SNt</i>	.02	.812			<i>SI*SNt</i>	.02	.878
						<i>SI*SNc</i>	-.05	.630			<i>SI*SNc</i>	-.05	.640			<i>SI*SNc</i>	-.05	.632
											<i>Aw</i>	.17	.025			<i>Re</i>	.05	.549
											<i>Aw*Att</i>	.26	.002			<i>Re*Att</i>	.07	.450
											<i>Aw*SI</i>	.11	.141			<i>Re*SI</i>	-.04	.575
											<i>Aw*SNp</i>	.01	.925			<i>Re*SNp</i>	.05	.618
											<i>Aw*SNf</i>	-.14	.141			<i>Re*SNf</i>	-.13	.177
											<i>Aw*SNt</i>	-.05	.654			<i>Re*SNt</i>	.03	.791
											<i>Aw*SNc</i>	-.001	.995			<i>Re*SNc</i>	-.13	.149

Predictors shown in **bold italics** are significant at 5% level, those shown in italics are significant at 1% level.

Att = Attitude towards drinking alcohol  
 SNp = Subjective norm for parents (similarly for friends, teachers, coaches)  
 SI = Sporting Involvement  
 Aw = Sponsor Awareness  
 Re = Sponsor Recognition

\* denotes interactive term, e.g. SI\*Att is the interactive term formed by the product of Sporting Involvement and Attitude towards drinking alcohol

**Analysis of effects of sponsorship**

In order to test hypotheses 3 and 4 – whether awareness of sponsorship affected likelihood of drinking or getting drunk, over and above any effects of sporting involvement, a measure of awareness, with associated interactive terms, was added as an additional independent variable. Two measures of awareness were available: one the self-perception of awareness of sponsorship, and the other the objective measure of the number of sponsors correctly recognised. Each was added separately to the

regression equation described above, and the final two columns of Tables 6 to 9 show the results.

These are interesting, as self-reported measures of awareness are shown to have significant main and interactive effects, while actual recognition of sponsors shows no main effect and interactive effects for only one of the four regressions. Recognition of sponsors is shown to diminish the effect of attitude and parental norms on girls' likelihood of getting drunk; however, attitude remains by far the most significant predictor of intentions in this case.



TABLE 7 Summary of hierarchical multiple regressions for predicting girls' likelihood of drinking this weekend

PREDICTION FROM ATTITUDES AND SUBJECTIVE NORMS				PREDICTION WITH ADDITION OF SPORTING INVOLVEMENT				PREDICTION WITH FURTHER ADDITION OF SPONSOR AWARENESS				PREDICTION WITH ADDITION OF SPONSOR RECOGNITION INSTEAD OF SPONSOR AWARENESS						
R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t
.24	Const		.053	.23	-	Const		.332	.29	.06	Const		.504	.21	-.02	Const		.451
	<i>Att</i>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.000</b>			<i>Att</i>	<b>.27</b>	<b>.022</b>			<i>Att</i>	<b>.30</b>	<b>.009</b>			Att	.20	.149
	SNp	.12	.189			SNp	.18	.082			SNp	.26	.099			SNp	.19	.062
	SNf	.18	.063			SNf	<b>.25</b>	<b>.027</b>			SNf	.21	.082			SNf	<b>.25</b>	<b>.036</b>
	SNt	.15	.086			SNt	.07	.524			SNt	.02	.879			SNt	.03	.814
	SNc	-.10	.302			SNc	-.08	.428			SNc	-.05	.626			SNc	-.03	.812
	Att* SNp	-.12	.204			Att* SNp	-.10	.311			Att* SNp	-.11	.301			Att* SNp	-.10	.365
	Att* SNf	-.05	.576			Att* SNf	-.03	.770			Att* SNf	.03	.744			Att* SNf	-.01	.943
	Att* SNt	.10	.291			Att* SNt	.08	.453			Att* SNt	.11	.290			Att* SNt	.06	.601
	Att* SNc	.01	.882			Att* SNc	-.04	.686			Att* SNc	-.18	.129			Att* SNc	-.11	.388
Predictors shown in <i>bold italics</i> are significant at 5% level, those shown in italics are significant at 1% level. Att = Attitude towards drinking alcohol SNp = Subjective norm for parents (similarly for friends, teachers, coaches) SI = Sporting Involvement Aw = Sponsor Awareness Re = Sponsor Recognition * denotes interactive term, e.g. SI*Att is the interactive term formed by the product of Sporting Involvement and Attitude towards drinking alcohol						SI	-.01	.947			SI	-.06	.567			SI	-.01	.962
						SI*Att	-.08	.449			SI*Att	-.19	.125			SI*Att	-.12	.333
						SI*SNp	.07	.486			SI*SNp	.11	.307			SI*SNp	.07	.520
						SI*SNf	.10	.337			SI*SNf	.14	.226			SI*SNf	.12	.304
						SI*SNt	-.15	.150			<b>SI*SNt</b>	<b>-.25</b>	<b>.047</b>			SI*SNt	-.19	.102
						SI*SNc	-.06	.561			SI*SNc	-.20	.067			SI*SNc	-.08	.454
											Aw	-.05	.648			Re	-.02	.872
											<b>Aw*Att</b>	<b>.27</b>	<b>.029</b>			Re*Att	-.11	.131
											Aw*SI	.004	.978			Re*SI	-.004	.970
											<b>Aw*SNp</b>	<b>-.20</b>	<b>.045</b>			Re*SNp	.13	.171
							Aw*SNf	-.16	.173			Re*SNf	-.09	.360				
							Aw*SNt	.13	.213			Re*SNt	-.03	.771				
							<b>Aw*SNc</b>	<b>.22</b>	<b>.036</b>			Re*SNc	.06	.543				

Self-perceived awareness shows stronger effects – for boys, a significant main effect on both predictions, and an interactive effect for likelihood of drinking alcohol, enhancing the effect of attitude. The predictive ability of the regression for drinking alcohol is increased, but this is not the case for the regression relating to getting drunk. For drinking alcohol, the addition of awareness as a predictor makes the main effect of sporting involvement non-significant (this may be explained by the significant correlation between

these variables for boys, as previously noted), but sporting involvement still plays a part as it enhances the effect of attitude. For girls, awareness shows no main effect, but increases predictive ability of both regressions through interactive effects on attitude and subjective norms. However, for both regressions for girls, attitude is the only predictor significant at 1% level. Hypotheses 3 and 4 are therefore accepted for both boys and girls.



## Sporting involvement and alcohol sponsorship

**TABLE 8** Summary of hierarchical multiple regressions for predicting boys' likelihood of getting drunk this weekend

PREDICTION FROM ATTITUDES AND SUBJECTIVE NORMS				PREDICTION WITH ADDITION OF SPORTING INVOLVEMENT				PREDICTION WITH FURTHER ADDITION OF SPONSOR AWARENESS				PREDICTION WITH ADDITION OF SPONSOR RECOGNITION INSTEAD OF SPONSOR AWARENESS						
R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	$\beta$	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	$\beta$	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	$\beta$	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	$\beta$	Sig t
.38	<i>Const</i>		.002	.42	.04	<i>Const</i>		.000	.42	-	<i>Const</i>		.000	.41	-.01	<i>Const</i>		.002
	<i>Att</i>	.33	.000			<i>Att</i>	.25	.010			<i>Att</i>	.25	.014			<i>Att</i>	.28	.010
	<i>SNp</i>	.16	.064			<i>SNp</i>	.20	.027			<i>SNp</i>	.21	.036			<i>SNp</i>	.21	.044
	<i>SNf</i>	.13	.098			<i>SNf</i>	.09	.260			<i>SNf</i>	.10	.266			<i>SNf</i>	.18	.078
	<i>SNt</i>	.16	.063			<i>SNt</i>	.13	.139			<i>SNt</i>	.10	.404			<i>SNt</i>	.13	.197
	<i>SNc</i>	.01	.863			<i>SNc</i>	.116	.274			<i>SNc</i>	.15	.223			<i>SNc</i>	.11	.329
	<i>Att*SNp</i>	.01	.945			<i>Att*SNp</i>	.03	.770			<i>Att*SNp</i>	.05	.555			<i>Att*SNp</i>	-.002	.985
	<i>Att*SNf</i>	.08	.319			<i>Att*SNf</i>	.05	.537			<i>Att*SNf</i>	.04	.654			<i>Att*SNf</i>	.01	.153
	<i>Att*SNt</i>	.14	.124			<i>Att*SNt</i>	.09	.316			<i>Att*SNt</i>	.05	.567			<i>Att*SNt</i>	.16	.110
	<i>Att*SNc</i>	-.04	.636			<i>Att*SNc</i>	-.05	.540			<i>Att*SNc</i>	-.06	.508			<i>Att*SNc</i>	-.07	.420
						<i>SI</i>	.22	.002			<i>SI</i>	.15	.070			<i>SI</i>	.19	.019
						<i>SI*Att</i>	.19	.041			<i>SI*Att</i>	.20	.078			<i>SI*Att</i>	.14	.156
						<i>SI*SNp</i>	-.05	.606			<i>SI*SNp</i>	-.05	.687			<i>SI*SNp</i>	-.06	.579
						<i>SI*SNf</i>	-.02	.795			<i>SI*SNf</i>	-.02	.885			<i>SI*SNf</i>	-.01	.958
						<i>SI*SNt</i>	.04	.681			<i>SI*SNt</i>	.03	.805			<i>SI*SNt</i>	.06	.592
						<i>SI*SNc</i>	-.14	.217			<i>SI*SNc</i>	-.20	.103			<i>SI*SNc</i>	-.14	.221
											<i>Aw</i>	.17	.025			<i>Re</i>	-.06	.482
											<i>Aw*Att</i>	.01	.928			<i>Re*Att</i>	-.05	.575
											<i>Aw*SI</i>	.03	.713			<i>Re*SI</i>	.04	.628
											<i>Aw*SNp</i>	.03	.792			<i>Re*SNp</i>	-.04	.749
											<i>Aw*SNf</i>	-.06	.536			<i>Re*SNf</i>	-.14	.214
											<i>Aw*SNt</i>	.02	.847			<i>Re*SNt</i>	.07	.514
											<i>Aw*SNc</i>	.08	.505			<i>Re*SNc</i>	-.05	.604

Predictors shown in **bold italics** are significant at 5% level, those shown in italics are significant at 1% level.

Att = Attitude towards drinking alcohol  
 SNp = Subjective norm for parents (similarly for friends, teachers, coaches)  
 SI = Sporting Involvement  
 Aw = Sponsor Awareness  
 Re = Sponsor Recognition

\* denotes interactive term, e.g. SI\*Att is the interactive term formed by the product of Sporting Involvement and Attitude towards drinking alcohol

## Discussion

The results show different patterns for boys and girls. For boys, it appears difficult to disentangle the effects of sponsorship awareness from the effects of being involved in sport. Involvement in sport brings boys into a culture in which alcohol plays a significant part, and they are influenced by this whether or not they notice sponsors. Sponsorship by alcohol companies appears to reinforce these norms. These

results show no evidence that sporting involvement, or moderate drinking messages by sponsors, act as an incentive for boys to moderate their drinking. It is also noticeable that, particularly for predictions of drinking alcohol, the significance of attitude as a predictor lessens noticeably as predictors relating to sport and sponsorship are added, thus indicating the extent of influence of external factors on behaviour. The lack of correlation of either sporting involvement



TABLE 9 Summary of hierarchical multiple regressions for predicting girls' likelihood of getting drunk this weekend

PREDICTION FROM ATTITUDES AND SUBJECTIVE NORMS				PREDICTION WITH ADDITION OF SPORTING INVOLVEMENT				PREDICTION WITH FURTHER ADDITION OF SPONSOR AWARENESS				PREDICTION WITH ADDITION OF SPONSOR RECOGNITION INSTEAD OF SPONSOR AWARENESS						
R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t	R <sup>2</sup>	Inc R <sup>2</sup>	PREDICTORS	β	Sig t
.32	<i>Const</i>		.093	.31	-.01	Const		.139	.33	.02	<i>Const</i>		.070	.37	-.06	Const		.308
	<i>Att</i>	<b>.34</b>	<b>.000</b>			<i>Att</i>	<b>.46</b>	<b>.000</b>			<i>Att</i>	<b>.48</b>	<b>.000</b>			<i>Att</i>	<b>.39</b>	<b>.002</b>
	<i>SNp</i>	<b>.23</b>	<b>.009</b>			SNp	.16	.122			<i>SNp</i>	<b>.21</b>	<b>.060</b>			<i>SNp</i>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.079</b>
	<i>SNf</i>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.038</b>			SNf	.15	.180			<i>SNf</i>	<b>.10</b>	<b>.393</b>			<i>SNf</i>	.13	.238
	<i>SNt</i>	.07	.404			SNt	-.05	.649			<i>SNt</i>	-.04	.736			<i>SNt</i>	-.06	.622
	SNc	-.08	.299			SNc	-.002	.982			<i>SNc</i>	-.02	.824			<i>SNc</i>	-.01	.891
	Att* SNp	-.02	.801			Att* SNp	.01	.941			Att* SNp	.01	.937			Att* SNp	.02	.829
	Att* SNf	.004	.965			Att* SNf	.01	.930			Att* SNf	.01	.912			Att* SNf	.06	.510
	Att* SNt	.03	.750			Att* SNt	.04	.656			Att* SNt	.05	.539			Att* SNt	-.01	.917
	Att* SNc	-.12	.156			Att* SNc	-.15	.096			Att* SNc	-.16	.083			Att* SNc	-.18	.084
Predictors shown in <b>bold italics</b> are significant at 5% level, those shown in italics are significant at 1% level.						SI	-.01	.951			SI	.04	.632			SI	.02	.792
						SI*Att	.16	.156			SI*Att	.11	.358			SI*Att	.21	.066
						SI*SNp	-.06	.588			SI*SNp	-.01	.921			SI*SNp	-.10	.333
						SI*SNf	.03	.811			SI*SNf	.03	.785			SI*SNf	-.04	.706
						SI*SNt	-.17	.110			SI*SNt	-.17	.113			SI*SNt	-.14	.218
						SI*SNc	.11	.205			SI*SNc	.10	.280			SI*SNc	.11	.197
											<b>Aw</b>	.13	.210			Re	-.11	.270
											Aw*Att	.18	.086			Re*Att	-.19	.062
											Aw*SI	.20	.112			Re*SI	.11	.301
											Aw*SNp	-.03	.720			Re*SNp	-.15	.089
											Aw*SNf	-.18	.071			Re*SNf	.11	.235
											Aw*SNt	.04	.666			Re*SNt	-.002	.982
											Aw*SNc	.09	.364			Re*SNc	-.03	.783

Att = Attitude towards drinking alcohol

SNp = Subjective norm for parents (similarly for friends, teachers, coaches)

SI = Sporting Involvement

Aw = Sponsor Awareness

Re = Sponsor Recognition

\* denotes interactive term, e.g. SI\*Att is the interactive term formed by the product of Sporting Involvement and Attitude towards drinking alcohol

or sponsor awareness with attitudes, but the presence of interactive effects between these variables and attitudes when predicting drinking behaviour, suggests that their role is not in forming attitudes towards alcohol, but in reinforcing or validating positive attitudes.

In contrast, for girls, in every regression but one, attitude is the most highly significant predictor of alcohol-related behaviour. Involvement in sport has no

impact on their drinking, either to restrain or encourage it. This may be because the sports which interest them are less associated with alcohol, or that they do not wish to subscribe to the traditional male sporting culture, even when they have an interest in traditionally more masculine sports. Awareness of sponsorship does enhance positive attitudes towards alcohol and has some small influence on the impact of subjective norms, but it has no main effect.





These results do not indicate that banning alcohol sponsorship of sport would have significant effects on young people's drinking behaviour. Girls are less involved in sport but have more favourable attitudes to alcohol, which are the major predictor of greater likelihoods of drinking and getting drunk. Boys with sporting interests appear to be influenced towards drinking and drunkenness by the traditional macho sporting culture rather than the presence of alcohol sponsorship. Alcohol sponsorship does play a part in perpetuating and normalising this culture, and so has some additional influence, but banning it would have little effect on the traditional male practices of drinking after playing sport, watching matches with a beer in hand and so on. Sponsorship acts as a reinforcer of attitudes which are already held, rather than creating attitudes and instigating behaviour directly. It would appear that a ban, on its own, would have little effect apart from drying up a valuable source of sporting revenue. However, the types of measures suggested by McDaniel and Heald (2000), using marketing communications to challenge such established attitudes, could at least promote an alternative point of view.

### **Limitations and suggestions for further research**

In this study, a self-perceived measure of awareness has been used. It is possible that young people may be influenced subconsciously by repeated exposure to sponsorship, and in that case the self-perception would not be a true measure. The questions on recognition of sponsors were intended to provide a corroborative measure – yet, although there was a positive correlation between recognition and awareness, using the recognition measure rather than the perception of awareness gave less significant results. It is possible that, in trying to cover a representative range of sports, the recognition questions were too general. Further studies should be carried out specific to particular sports, confirming the relative extent to which involvement in the sport and sponsor awareness contribute to drinking intentions and behaviour.

It was also considered that young people might develop an interest in drinking prior to becoming aware of sponsors, and that this would subsequently lead them to greater awareness of alcohol sponsors. In that case, the correlation between awareness of alcohol sponsors and drinking behaviour would not be causal; both awareness and drinking behaviour would stem from a prior interest in drinking, rather than from involvement in sport. The study attempted to take this into account by using measures of awareness and recognition of a range of sponsors, not just alcohol sponsors. However, this explanation could well account for the significant correlation between alcohol sponsor recognition and girls' drinking behaviour; the recognition of sponsors is occurring because of knowledge of the sponsoring brand rather than an interest in the sponsored sporting team or activity. A more rigorous investigation of this aspect would be beneficial, and would be best carried out by a longitudinal study which traced children's and teenagers' changing awareness of, and attitudes towards, both alcohol and sporting interests. This would also be useful in investigating whether, how and in what circumstances attitudes towards alcohol are affected by sponsorship.

In view of the findings of Christensen (2006), it would also be worthwhile to investigate the attitudinal and emotional responses of various UK audiences (e.g. adolescents, sportspeople, sports fans) to alcohol sponsors and a range of sports personalities, teams and events. Such a study could indicate how much incongruity is currently perceived in alcohol sports sponsorship, and thus inform the content of health-related marketing communications in this area.

Finally, the study casts little light on any connection of female drinking with sport and its sponsorship by alcohol companies. It would be interesting to study girls who take part in the more traditionally masculine sports, such as football and rugby, which are particularly associated with a drinking culture, to investigate whether they conform to the norms of that culture.




### Conclusions

---

The results of this study indicate that a ban on alcohol sports sponsorship would have little effect on youth alcohol consumption, unless it was part of a much larger campaign designed to break the longstanding links between sport and alcohol in the masculine culture of the UK – and there is no indication at present that the government is considering such radical action. The findings of Lancaster and Lancaster (2003) and McDaniel and Heald (2000) would indicate that public service advertising highlighting the detrimental effects of alcohol on sporting performance, and a requirement for sporting events that alcohol sponsorship should be balanced by health-related marketing communications, could be more effective than a ban in challenging the alcohol and sport culture. Nevertheless, alcohol companies should be wary. Restrictions on junk food advertising have been brought in, even though there is disagreement as to whether these will do anything to counter obesity. A ban on alcohol sports sponsorship would be a relatively easy measure for the government to implement, to show that they are taking concerns about alcohol seriously. If evidence of the effects of alcohol on the health and social fabric of the UK becomes strong enough, at some time, consideration might even be given to implementing the full raft of measures advocated by Anderson and Baumberg (2005).

Forward-thinking alcohol marketers could act strategically now to put themselves in a favourable position in either of these circumstances. Sending out responsible drinking messages may not be sufficient to save their sponsorship from a ban, but many alcohol companies market non-alcoholic wines or beers, such as Kaliber or Stella Artois NA. Using such a product to sponsor their sporting properties would send a socially responsible message to young sports fans and participants, generating favourable PR such as that given to Niquitin when it initiated sponsorship of the BMW-Williams Formula 1 team (Kleinman, 2003). Sportsmen known to be teetotal or to drink responsibly

could be used to promote the brand and the message that alcohol and sport do not mix. Yet a brand name and logo which clearly identified the association of the non-alcoholic brand to other brands in the company's portfolio could ensure that the sponsorship was instrumental in promoting the whole set of brands.

© 2009 International Marketing Reports 

### Biography

---

**Fiona Davies** is a lecturer in marketing at Cardiff University and is a competitive runner and duathlete. She has published extensively in a range of academic journals, including *Journal of Business Research*, *European Journal of Marketing* and *Journal of Marketing Communications*. Her research interests are in sponsorship, particularly in sport and its effects on consumer attitudes and behaviour.

### References

---

- Aitken, P.P., Leather, D.S. & Squair, S.L. (1986a) Children's awareness of cigarette brand sponsorship of sports and games in the UK, *Health Education Research* 1(3), 203-211.
- Aitken, P.P., Leather, D.S. & Squair, S.L. (1986b) Children's opinions on whether or not cigarette advertisements should be banned, *Health Education Journal* 45(4) 204-207.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980) *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Alcohol Concern (2007a) *Health Impacts of Alcohol*. Factsheet retrieved November 2007 from: <http://www.alcoholconcern.org.uk>
- Alcohol Concern (2007b) *Young People's Drinking*. Factsheet. Retrieved November 2007 from: <http://www.alcoholconcern.org.uk>
- Alcohol Policy (2007) *Cirrhosis in young people doubles over last decade*, 21 March. Retrieved November 2007 from: <http://www.alcoholpolicy.net/health/index.html>



## Sporting involvement and alcohol sponsorship

- Alexander, H.M., Callcott, R., Dobson, A.J., Hards, G.R., Lloyd, D.M., O'Connell, D.R. & Leeder, S.R. (1983) Cigarette smoking and drug use in school children: IV - factors associated with changes in smoking behaviour, *International Journal of Epidemiology* 12(1), 59-66.
- Ambler, T. (2006) Does the UK promotion of food and drink to children contribute to their obesity? *International Journal of Advertising* 25(2), 137-156.
- Anderson, P. & Baumberg, B. (2005) *Alcohol in Europe: a Public Health Perspective*. London: Institute of Alcohol Studies.
- Berning, J.R. (1996) Alcohol and athletic performance, Gatorade Sports Science Institute. Retrieved March 2007 from: [www.gssiweb.com/reflib/refs/84/0000000200000025.cfm](http://www.gssiweb.com/reflib/refs/84/0000000200000025.cfm)
- Bruner II, G.C., James, K.E. & Hensel, P.J. (2001) *Marketing Scales Handbook: a Compilation of Multi-item Measures, Volume III*. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Charlton, A., While, D. & Kelly, S. (1998) Boys' smoking and cigarette-brand-sponsored motor racing, *The Lancet* 351 (9099) 376.
- Chou, S.P. & Pickering, R.P. (1992) Early onset of drinking as a risk factor for lifetime alcohol-related problems, *British Journal of Addiction* 87, 1199-1204.
- Christensen, S.R. (2006) Measuring consumer reactions to sponsoring partnerships based upon emotional and attitudinal responses, *International Journal of Market Research* 48(1), 61-80.
- Collins, C.A. (2002) The influence of message framing and previous alcohol consumption on attitudes, perceived norms, intentions, and behaviour related to alcohol use in a college sample, Doctoral Thesis, University of Kansas.
- Collins, T. & Vamplew, W. (2002) *Mud, Sweat and Beers: A Cultural History of Sport and Alcohol*. Berg.
- Cornwell, T.B. (2008) State of the art and science in sponsorship-linked marketing, *Journal of Advertising* 37(3), 41-55.
- Cornwell, T.B. & Maignan, I. (1998) An international review of sponsorship research, *Journal of Advertising* 27(1), 1-21.
- Diageo (2007) The impact of alcohol on society; the social costs of misuse. Retrieved November 2007 from: <http://www.diageo.com/en-row/CorporateCitizenship/Theimpactofalcoholinsociety/>
- DiFranza, J.R., Richards, J.W., Paulman, P.M., Wolf-Gillespie, N., Fletcher, C., Jaffe, R.D. & Murray, D. (1991) RJR Nabisco's cartoon camel promotes Camel cigarettes to children, *Journal of the American Medical Association* 266(22), 3149-3153.
- Dorsett, J. & Dickerson, S. (2004) Advertising and alcohol consumption in the UK, *International Journal of Advertising* 23(2), 149-171.
- Drinkaware (2007) Homepage. Retrieved November 2007 from: [www.drinkawaretrust.org.uk](http://www.drinkawaretrust.org.uk)
- Eastman, S.T. & Land, A.M. (1997) The best of both worlds: sports fans find good seats at the bar, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 21(2), 156-178.
- Edwards, G. (2000) *Alcohol: The Ambiguous Molecule*. London: Penguin Books.
- European Sponsorship Association (2006) ESA resists sponsorship ban for alcohol, Press Release 15 September. Retrieved November 2007 from: [www.europeansponsorship.org/pressDetail.asp?id=151](http://www.europeansponsorship.org/pressDetail.asp?id=151)
- Golub, A. & Johnson, B.D. (2001) Variation in youthful risks of progression from alcohol and tobacco to marijuana and to hard drugs across generations, *American Journal of Public Health* 91(2), 225-232.
- Gonzalez, G.M. (1989) Early onset of drinking as a predictor of alcohol consumption and alcohol-related problems in college, *Journal of Drug Education* 19, 225-230.
- Grant, B.F. & Dawson, D.A. (1997) Age at onset of alcohol use and its association with DSM-IV alcohol abuse and dependence: results from the National Longitudinal Alcohol Epidemiologic Survey, *Journal of Substance Abuse* 9, 103-110.
- Gwinner, K.P. & Eaton, J. (1999) Building brand image through event sponsorship: the role of image transfer, *Journal of Advertising* 28(4), 47-57.
- Hastings, G.B. & Aitken, P.P. (1995) Tobacco advertising and children's smoking: a review of the evidence, *European Journal of Marketing* 29(11), 6-17.
- Kandel, D.B., Yamaguchi, K. & Chen, K. (1992) Stages of progression in drug involvement from adolescence to adulthood: further evidence for the gateway theory, *Journal of Studies in Alcohol*, 53, 447-457.
- Kelly, K.J., Slater, M.D. & Karan, D. (2002) Image advertisements' influence on adolescents' perceptions of the desirability of beer and cigarettes, *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* 21(2), 295-304.
- Kinney, L. & McDaniel, S.R. (1996) Strategic implications of attitude-toward-the-ad in leveraging event sponsorships, *Journal of Sport Marketing* 10(3), 250-261.
- Kleinman, M. (2003) NiQuitin CQ to sponsor BMW Williams F1 team, *Marketing*, 17 April: 3.



- Kolah, A. (2007) Why legislators are wrong to call time on alcohol brands' involvement in sponsorship. *Sponsorship News*, 13 March.
- Koo, G., Quarterman, J. & Flynn, L. (2006) Effect of perceived sport event and sponsor image fit on consumers' cognition, affect, and behavioral intentions, *Sport Marketing Quarterly* 15(2), 80-90.
- Kuther, T.L. (2002) Rational decision perspectives on alcohol consumption by youth: revising the theory of planned behavior, *Addictive Behaviors* 27, 35-47.
- Lafini, M.T., Moore-Hirschl, S., Weis, D.L. & Hayes, B.E. (1994) Use of the theory of reasoned action to predict drug and alcohol use, *The International Journal of the Addictions* 29(7), 927-940.
- Lancaster, K.M. & Lancaster, A.R. (2003) The economics of tobacco advertising: spending, demand, and the effects of bans, *International Journal of Advertising* 22(1), 41-65.
- Ledwith, F. (1984) Does tobacco sports sponsorship on television act as advertising to children? *Health Education Journal* 43(4), 85-88.
- McDaniel, S.R. & Heald, G.R. (2000) Young consumers' responses to event sponsorship advertisements of unhealthy products: implications of schema-triggered affect theory, *Sport Management Review* 3(2), 163-184.
- McDaniel, S.R. & Mason, D.S. (1999) An exploratory study of influences on public opinion towards alcohol and tobacco sponsorship of sporting events, *Journal of Services Marketing* 13(6), 481-499.
- Martino, S.C., Collins, R.L., Ellickson, P.L., Schell, T.L. & McCaffrey, D. (2006) Socio-environmental influences on adolescents' alcohol outcome expectancies: a prospective analysis, *Addiction* 101, 971-983.
- Meenaghan, T. & Shipley, D. (1999) Media effect in commercial sponsorship, *European Journal of Marketing* 33(3/4), 328-347.
- Mintel (2006) *Sponsorship UK*. London: Mintel.
- Murden, T. (2004) Old Firm's goal is to promote safe drinking. *Scotland on Sunday*, 18 April.
- O'Callaghan, F.V., Chant, D.C., Callan, V.J. & Baglioni, A. (1997) Models of alcohol use by young adults: an examination of various attitude-behaviour theories, *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 58(5), 502-507.
- Oliver, R.L. & Bearden, W.O. (1985) Crossover effects in the Theory of Reasoned Action: a moderating influence attempt, *Journal of Consumer Research* 12(3), 324-340.
- Rimal, R.N. & Real, K. (2005) How behaviors are influenced by perceived norms: a test of the theory of normative social behavior, *Communication Research* 82(8), 389-414.
- Schlegel, R.P., Crawford, C.A. & Sanborn, M.D. (1977) Correspondence and mediational properties of the Fishbein model: an application to adolescent alcohol use, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 13, 421-430.
- Shim, S. & Maggs, J. (2005) A cognitive and behavioral hierarchical decision-making model of college students' alcohol consumption, *Psychology and Marketing* 22(8), 649-668.
- Speed, R. & Thompson, P. (2000) Determinants of sports sponsorship response, *Academy of Marketing Science Journal* 28(2), 226-238.
- Stainback, R. (1997) *Alcohol and Sport*. Champaign, Illinois (cited in Collins and Vamplew, 2002).
- Trafimow, D. (1996) The importance of attitudes in the prediction of college students' intentions to drink, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 26(24), 167-188.
- Walliser, B. (2003) An international review of sponsorship research: extension and update, *International Journal of Advertising* 22(1), 5-40.
- Welte, J.W. & Barnes, G.M. (1985) Alcohol: the gateway to other drug use among secondary-school students, *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 48, 329-336.
- White, A.M. (2006) Alcohol and the adolescent brain. Retrieved November 2007 from: <http://www.duke.edu/~amwhite/Adolescence/index.html>
- Williams, R. (2000) Football: wild things. *The Guardian*, 12 August: 1.
- World Health Organization/Europe (2001) Reducing alcohol harm to young people: Europe's Health Ministers say "the time to act is now!". Press release EURO 03/01. Retrieved March 2007 from: <http://www.who.dk/cpa/pr01/pr0003e.htm>



## Sporting involvement and alcohol sponsorship

### APPENDIX 1 Questions used to measure knowledge of sponsors

(CORRECT ANSWERS, AT TIME OF STUDY, ARE IN BOLD TYPE)

THE SHIRT SPONSOR OF CARDIFF FOOTBALL CLUB IS: (PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER)

BRAINS                      REDROW HOMES                      ARRIVA TRAINS                      ROCKPORT                      DON'T KNOW

THE SHIRT SPONSOR OF LIVERPOOL FOOTBALL CLUB IS:

CARLING                      GUINNESS                      **CARLSBERG**                      GROLSCH                      DON'T KNOW

THE SHIRT SPONSOR OF CHELSEA FOOTBALL CLUB IS:

VODAFONE                      DREAMCAST                      CARLSBERG                      **EMIRATES**                      DON'T KNOW

THE FOOTBALL PREMIERSHIP IS SPONSORED BY:

CARLING                      COCA COLA                      **BARCLAYS**                      AXA                      DON'T KNOW

THE RUGBY UNION SIX NATIONS TOURNAMENT IS SPONSORED BY:

LLOYDS TSB                      ROYAL BANK OF SCOTLAND                      BARCLAYS                      NAT WEST                      DON'T KNOW

THE SHIRT SPONSOR OF THE WELSH RUGBY UNION TEAM IS:

ROCKPORT                      PRINCIPALITY                      RED DRAGON RADIO                      **BRAINS**                      DON'T KNOW

THE RALLY OF GREAT BRITAIN IS SPONSORED BY:

FORD                      **NETWORK Q**                      RAC                      AA                      DON'T KNOW

THE GRAND NATIONAL IS SPONSORED BY:

JOHN SMITHS                      BODDINGTONS                      JOHNNIE WALKER                      SMIRNOFF                      DON'T KNOW

THE LONDON MARATHON IS SPONSORED BY:

MARS                      NIKE                      **FLORA**                      GUINNESS                      DON'T KNOW

THE OLYMPIC GAMES IN ATHENS 2004 HAD MANY SPONSORS.  
WHICH OF THESE COMPANIES WERE INVOLVED IN OLYMPIC SPONSORSHIP?  
(CIRCLE YOUR ANSWERS – YOU MAY SELECT AS MANY AS YOU WISH)

MCDONALDS	CARLSBERG	SONY	TAG HEUER
AMERICAN EXPRESS	KODAK	PEPSI	<b>HEINEKEN</b>
VISA	<b>SAMSUNG</b>	CARLING	<b>PANASONIC</b>
BURGER KING	SEIKO	<b>COCA COLA</b>	SMIRNOFF

Copyright of *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship* is the property of International Marketing Reports Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.