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INTRODUCTION

Sponsorship as a marketing tool has grown remarkably during the last two decades, especially with respect to endorsement of worldwide sport events. Overall, global expenditures are forecast to reach $37.7 billion in 2007, up 11.9 percent from $33.7 billion in 2006 (anonymous 2007). Events like the Formula One, the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup™ have become fully globalized in terms of media coverage. Therefore, especially many large international companies use the FIFA World Cup™ as a platform for building, strengthening and maintaining their brand equity. For a sponsorship license, enabling the sponsors to market the partnership with the 2006 FIFA World Cup™ worldwide, companies have spent about $53 million US each (anonymous 2006). Hence, companies that engage in sponsorship have to be sure about the effectiveness of their investment (Johar, Pham, and Wakefield 2006), which can be endangered if too many official sponsors share a visitor’s attention. To maintain exclusivity for the official sponsors, FIFA has limited their number to fifteen “Official Partners” and six “National Partners” whom paid $17 million US each for local advertising rights. Still, sponsors do not seem to be satisfied with the granted exclusivity.

While too many sponsors will most likely result in reduced sponsorship effectiveness for a single sponsor, a second-and probably more severe—threat is the activity of ambush marketers. Ambush marketing is defined as “the practice whereby another company, often a competitor, seeks association with the sponsored activity without payment to the activity owner” (Meenaghan 1994, 77). Despite enhanced legal precautions to protect the interests of official sponsors (Townley, Harrington, and Couchman 1998), many examples of ambush marketing in the context of the FIFA World Cup™ can be found (e.g., Nike, O2, and Puma).

Existing research on ambush marketing focuses on describing the phenomenon and examining strategic issues related to the practice of ambush marketing (e.g., Collett and Johnson 2006; Crompton 2004; Crow and Hoek 2003; Ettorre 1993; Farrell, Quester, and Greyser 2005; Meenaghan 1994; Meenaghan 1998a; Meenaghan 1998b; Payne 1998), ethical and legal issues (e.g., Crompton 2004; McKelvey 2003; McKelvey 2006; O’Sullivan and Murphy 1998; Townley, Harrington, and Couchman 1998; Uphoff, Massey, and Brown 2006) and consumer perceptions of ambush marketing (Grohs, Wagner, and Vstecka 2004; Lyberger and McCarty 2001; McDaniel and Kinney 1998; Mizerski, Mizerski, and Sadler 2001; Sandler and Shani 1989; Shani and Sandler 1998). However, research revealed only one study that deals with the effects of ambush marketing on brand evaluation (McDaniel and Kinney 1998). Moreover, existing studies evaluate the effects of ambush marketing at only one point in time. The predominance of the research on brand effects of sponsorship is either static (e.g., Becker-Olsen and Simons 2002; Javalgi et al. 1994; Lardinoit and Quester 2001; Menon and Kahn 2003; Pope and Voges 1999, 2000; Ruth and Simonin 2003; Speed and Thompson 2000; Stipp and Schiavone 1996; Turley and Shannon 2000) or is based on data using different respondents over time, making it impossible to analyze effects on the individual level (e.g., Easton and Mackie 1998; Nebenzahl and Jaffe 1991; Quester and Farrelly 1998; Stipp 1998). As a consequence, further studies are needed in order to obtain insights about the effects of ambush marketing strategies on brand evaluation over time.

In the present paper, we (1) use learning theory to develop a dynamical perspective of sponsorship and ambush marketing effects on brand perception and (2) investigate the proposed effects based on a panel survey that was conducted before and after the 2006 FIFA World Cup™.

In accordance with these research objectives, the paper is organized as follows. First, we briefly describe our rationale for choosing the two brands that are used in this research. Second, we briefly discuss the theoretical background of the study and develop our hypotheses based on existing literature. After describing the methodology, we present the results of the empirical analysis, which is based on panel data gathered from 254 respondents. The paper concludes with a discussion of the key findings and their managerial implications to both official sponsors and ambush marketers.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Before we conceptualize the influence of sponsorship and ambush activities on brand perception, it is useful to define our understanding of a term “brand”. Following Farquhar (1989) and consistent with new interdisciplinary definitions of brand equity (e.g., Srinivasan, Park, and Chang 2005), we define brand equity as added value that a product has due to its brand. From a perspective of learning, brand equity can be seen as a node in the mind of an individual, which is connected to product-related attributes, utility-expectations, pictures, and emotions (Erderm et al. 1999). Repeated confrontation with stimuli from marketing management (such as advertising, sponsorship, and ambush marketing), from the environment (social networks), and due to personal experiences lead to an enforcement of associative connections in a consumer’s mind (Martindale 1991; Till 1998).

Following Keller (1993), brand awareness and brand associations (image) are important dimensions that contribute to brand equity. Brand awareness relates to the strength of a brand in memory, and the likelihood and ease with which the brand will be recognized or recalled under various conditions (Silverman, Sprott, and Pascal 1999). Brand image is defined as “perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumer memory” (Keller 1993).

The favorability, strength, and uniqueness of brand image permit the brand to be strategically differentiated and positioned in the consumer’s mind. These associations can be built, strengthened, and maintained when consumers gain awareness of stimuli related to the brand. International sport events like the FIFA World Cup™ are promising suppliers of pictures, episodes, experiences and stories that may be relevant for building new associations. These
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associations are predominantly—but not exclusively—communicated by mass media.

We propose that the process of building new associations between a brand and an event is identical for both sponsorship and ambush marketing practice, unless an individual realizes that he or she falsely associated a company with an event. In this case, existing attitudes about ambush marketing might play an important role (Lyberger and McCarthy 2001). Accordingly, in the next section, we develop our hypotheses about sponsorship effects on three brand constructs (brand awareness, brand image, and brand equity) in general, and, discuss specific aspects of information processing in the case of sponsorship versus ambush marketing.

In existing research, explanations of effects are often based on learning and consistency theories (Dean 2002, Olson and Thjomoe 2003). For instance, the mere exposure effect suggests that, in the absence of other stimuli (Baker 1999), repeated exposure to a stimulus will lead to a positive affective reaction (Zajonc 1968). In a similar manner to advertising, sponsorship is often directed to respondents in a situation, in which they pay relatively low attention to the stimulus (e.g., because of concentrating on the sports event). Therefore, the stimulus must be repeated several times in order to attract the respondent’s attention (Baker 1999). This study proposes that respondents need to be exposed to the stimulus several times in order to recall it effectively, so that the association of the sponsor-brand stimulus to the sponsor is the result of a learning process. Several studies find evidence for a positive effect of sponsorship recall on brand perception (e.g., Becker-Olsen and Simmons 2002; Javalgi et al. 1994; Lardinoit and Quester 2001; Menon and Kahn 2003; Pope and Yoges 1999, 2000; Ruth and Simonin 2003; Speed and Thompson 2000; Stipp and Schiavone 1996; Turley and Shannon 2000). Therefore, we propose:

\[
H_{1a,b,c}: \text{If a sponsor is recalled, (a) brand awareness, (b) brand image, and (c) brand equity will be evaluated significantly more favorably.}
\]

We expect the degree of change in brand awareness, brand image, and brand equity to be stronger for individuals who only recall/learn that the brand is linked to sponsoring (ambushing) in the second survey in comparison to the individuals who recall/remember the brand in both surveys. In the latter group, the information that the brand is connected to the event was learned before the first survey was conducted. From a perspective of learning, this assumption is justifiable as follows: A change in attitude can be seen as a hypothesis-testing process in which new information, for example, a sponsorship stimulus, is compared to existing attitude toward the sponsoring brand (Hoch and Deighton 1989, 3). It can be argued that existing attitudes toward a sponsoring brand prevent the processing of new information. The dominance of existing attitudes results in a confirmatory processing of new stimuli (Erdem et al. 1999, 307). Following Gettys and Fisher (1979), individuals only change their attitudes when it is predominantly evident that the existing attitude is wrong. This phenomenon is also referred to as “blocking” (van Osselaer and Alba 2000, 1). Hence, we hypothesize that:

\[
H_{2a,b,c}: \text{Learning the association between a sponsor (ambusher) and an event will lead to a more favorable change in the evaluation of (a) brand awareness, (b) brand image, and (c) brand equity than will remembering the association.}
\]

However, whether a change in attitude occurs and the direction in which that change occurs also depends on an individual’s prior knowledge about the sponsoring (ambushing) brand, the sponsored object, and existing attitudes (e.g., toward sponsorship or ambush marketing in general).

We propose that the event image (Grohs, Wagner, and Vsetecka 2004; Speed and Thompson 2000), the attitude toward commercialization of sports events, and the attitude toward ambush marketing (Lyberger and McCarthy 2001) influence the change of brand awareness (brand image, brand equity) over time. Based on the learning perspective as described above, we expect a positive influence of the event image on the change of the dependent brand constructs (awareness, image, and equity). Moreover, we expect the change of the brand constructs to be more favorable if the existing attitude toward commercialization and ambush marketing is positive. Therefore, the following set of hypotheses is stated:

\[
H_{3a,b,c}: \text{A positive event image has a positive impact on the change of (a) brand awareness, (b) brand image, and (c) brand equity over time.}
\]

\[
H_{4a,b,c}: \text{A positive attitude toward commercialization of an event has a positive impact on the change of (a) brand awareness, (b) brand image, and (c) brand equity over time.}
\]

\[
H_{5a,b,c}: \text{A negative attitude toward ambushing has a positive impact on the change of (a) brand awareness, (b) brand image, and (c) brand equity over time.}
\]

We state hypothesis \(H_6\) for both official sponsor and ambush marketer in a similar manner. We do not expect a negative reaction of individuals against ambushing brands if individuals are (and remain) unaware of the fact that the recalled brand is not the official sponsor. However, we specify \(H_6\) for the group of individuals who recall the ambush marketer in \(t=1\) and recall the official sponsor in \(t=2\). For this recall group, we expect a negative effect of attitude toward ambushing on the ambushing brand, and a positive effect on the officially sponsoring brand. Hence,

\[
H_{6a,b,c}: \text{A negative attitude toward ambushing has a negative impact on the change of (a) brand awareness, (b) brand image, and (c) brand equity over time, if the sponsor is identified as being an ambush marketer.}
\]

METHODOLOGY

Stimuli and Sample

Our analysis focuses on Lufthansa and Emirates airlines in order to analyse ambush marketing and sponsorship effectiveness in comparison. Lufthansa gained attraction with its ambush strategies in the run-up of the 2006 FIFA World Cup™. As the official partner of the German soccer team, but not of the 2006 FIFA World Cup™, Lufthansa launched a vast variety of activities to associate the brand with the 2006 FIFA World Cup™. Lufthansa’s ambushing activities may have reduced the effectiveness of Emirates’ promotional efforts as the official airline sponsor of the 2006 FIFA World Cup™. Currently, Emirates has expanded heavily into the German market. To achieve higher brand awareness worldwide, sponsorship is one of Emirates’ corporate communication instruments. Besides the 2006 FIFA World Cup™, Emirates made headlines in the soccer world by signing a $ 195 million US sponsorship contract with the Premier League Club Arsenal London in 2004 (Owen 2004) and other teams in Europe (Paris St. Germain, Hamburger SV).

We tested our hypotheses through an online study using a web survey design. In contrast to face-to-face studies, online surveys do
not require personal interviews to be conducted and therefore avoid interviewer effects which could be an issue in this context (Duffy et al. 2005, 617). The sample was derived from an existing list of registered users of an online research portal which consists of more than 5,000 individuals who have registered their personal information (including email addresses). Invitations for participation in this study were sent out to 2,000 individuals one week before the first match of the 2006 FIFA World Cup™ started. In order to ensure a high response rate, a number of prizes were drawn in a small lottery. Between May 29th and June 7th, we collected data from 433 German respondents, equaling a response rate of 21.7 %. Individuals were not notified that they would be contacted a second time. One week after the tournament final, a second invitation was sent to the 433 participants of the first round. A total of 254 respondents (58.7 %) participated in the second survey, in which a two-part questionnaire had to be completed. About 60 % of the respondents were male, with an average age of 29.2 (8.3 Std.-dev.). The focus on younger people does not affect the interpretation of the findings because all respondents could be target groups of the examined sponsor/ambusher.

### Questionnaire Development and Measurement

In order to measure sponsor and ambush recall, the questionnaire asked respondents to name airline brands that they could recall as sponsoring of the FIFA World Cup™ (Tripodi et al. 2003). Following Baker et al. (1986) and Keller (1993), we decided against asking for ad/sponsorship recognition, because the measurement of recognition would be subject to several biases, that is, interest of a person in the brand (Bennett, Henson, and Zhang 2002, 177) and, more importantly, to a bias in the second survey.

Sponsor-related variables were measured using multi-item scales. All items are measured on 7-point Likert-type scales, with anchors of 1=strongly agree and 7=strongly disagree. Based on Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000), three items (“I can recognize X among other competing brands,” “Some characteristics of X come to my mind quickly,” and “I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of X”) were used to measure a sponsor’s brand awareness (α=.903; ρc=.915; VE=.782) and four items were used to measure overall brand equity (α=.957; ρc=.960; VE=.858). We measured brand image (α=.901; ρc=.904; VE=.612), consisting of attribute (comfort, safety, variety of connections, customer friendliness) and non-attribute (likeability, innovativeness) components using six items that are regularly used in the literature (e.g., Verhoeef, Langerak, and Donkers 2004; Mitchell 1986). Attribute components are closely linked to quality, whereas non-attribute components represent a brand’s personality and imagery from a consumer perspective. We used a scale from Woisetschläger (2007) to measure event-image (α=.926; ρc=.929; VE=.724) and scales from Lee et al. (1997) and Lyberger and McCarthy (2001) to measure attitude toward commercialization (α=.825; ρc=.848; VE=.650) and attitude toward ambush marketing (α=.902; ρc=.897; VE=.686).

Notably, the coefficient alpha is larger than .7, which is the threshold generally proposed in the literature (Nunnally 1978), and composite reliabilities are larger than .6 for all constructs (Bagozzi and Yi 1988). Moreover, discriminant validity between the constructs is given, since none of the squared correlation coefficients between any of the constructs exceeds the average variance extracted for a construct (Fornell and Larcker 1981). We also checked for measurement invariance over time, as proposed by Baumgartner and Steenkamp (2006), and found the constructs to be sufficiently (partially metric) invariant.

### RESULTS

Before we consider the tests of our hypotheses, we analyzed descriptive results of our study. Results of sponsorship recall before and after the 2006 FIFA World Cup™ are shown in Table 1.

In the first survey, almost nearly as many individuals recall the ambush marketer Lufthansa as sponsor (25.6 %) as recalled Emirates (28.0 %). The other respondents either could not recall any brand (35.0 %), or recalled other airline brands (11.4 %). After the event, 57.1 % of the respondents recalled Emirates. Recalls of the individuals who remembered Emirates in the first survey remained very stable, while 45.7 % of the respondents who named another brand initially learned that they were wrong. 35.0 % of the second-survey respondents who did not recall a sponsor in the first survey named Emirates, while 16.9 % of that group named Lufthansa.

Regarding the stability of brand awareness, brand image, and brand equity over time, Lufthansa is notably evaluated more favorably with respect to brand equity, and the ratings are stable between the two measuring points. In contrast, Emirates gained from being linked to the event in terms of brand awareness and brand equity. The improvement of brand image over time is marginally significant (Table 2).

In a next step, we analyze the relation between sponsorship recall and brand awareness (image, equity) for the two measuring points. Results shown in Table 5 indicate no significant effects for Lufthansa before and after the event. For the official sponsor Emirates, we find significant positive relations between sponsorship recall and brand awareness (brand image) before the event, and significant and even stronger relations between recall and all three
constructs after the event. Hence, \( H_{1a,b,c} \) must be rejected in the case of Lufthansa for both time points, whereas we find evidence for \( H_{1a,b,c} \) for Emirates in the first (second) survey.

As a first result, we can conclude that the level of brand evaluation is more positive in interaction with the recall of communication stimuli in the case of the official sponsor Emirates. Therefore, in the following paragraph, the data of two measurement points is analyzed to assess the change over time and the role of moderating constructs that influence this process.

As stated in \( H_2 \), we expect that the brand constructs will be more stable in the group that recalls the sponsor/ambusher marketer twice in comparison to the group that recalls the sponsor/ambusher only in the second survey. Results in Table 4 only indicate support for \( H_{2b} \) only in the case of Emirates. All other hypotheses must be rejected.

Finally, the influence of existing attitudes (event image (\( H_{3a,b,c} \)), attitude toward commercialization (\( H_{4a,b,c} \)), and attitude toward ambushing (\( H_{5a,b,c} / H_{6a,b,c} \)) on the change of the three brand constructs over time is analyzed with regression analysis for four different groups of respondents (all; respondents who identify the same brand twice as sponsor; respondents who identify the sponsor in the second survey; respondents who identify the ambush marketer in the first survey and the official sponsor in the second survey). Results are depicted in Table 5.

Most of the relations between attitude (toward commercialization of an event) and the change of the three dependent brand constructs are not significant, but have the algebraic sign in the proposed direction. The lack of significance could also be a result of small sample sizes in the groups analyzed. Because the size of the proposed effects is small, a larger sample size could lead to more significant results (Hair et al. 2006, 416). The change of brand equity is mostly unaffected by existing attitudes, while more significant results can be found for brand awareness and brand image. Overall, most of the hypotheses must be rejected, except for \( H_{3a} \) and \( H_{5b} \) for the official sponsor Emirates and \( H_{6a,b} \) for the ambush marketer Lufthansa.

However, a meaningful result indicated is that attitude toward ambushing shows a positive effect on the official sponsor for two recall groups, whereas the influence on the ambushers brand image is negative. The strongest negative effect of attitude toward ambushing can be found for the group of respondents that recalls Lufthansa as sponsor in the second survey only. This finding shows that the measurement of recall alone for assessment of communication effectiveness could provide misleading results. Linking recall and change of brand constructs over time is important for a reliable assessment of the positive (negative) consequences of marketing communications.

### IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Based on our results, several implications for the brand management can be derived. In the next section, we briefly discuss general implications of our findings. In a following step, conse-

### TABLE 2

Mean values and standard deviations of brand constructs in t=1, 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Lufthansa Pre</th>
<th>Lufthansa Post</th>
<th>Change b</th>
<th>Emirates Pre</th>
<th>Emirates Post</th>
<th>Change b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>2.03 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.04 (1.01)</td>
<td>-0.02 n.s.</td>
<td>4.69 (1.88)</td>
<td>4.35 (1.81)</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand image</td>
<td>2.63 (0.91)</td>
<td>2.70 (1.00)</td>
<td>-0.08 n.s.</td>
<td>3.61 (1.35)</td>
<td>3.50 (1.32)</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall brand equity</td>
<td>3.88 (1.92)</td>
<td>3.80 (1.81)</td>
<td>0.09 n.s.</td>
<td>5.14 (1.59)</td>
<td>4.91 (1.61)</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a mean value (standard deviation)
b significance of change (Pre-Post) (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, n.s.=not significant)

### TABLE 3

MANOVA (Recall on brand constructs in t=1,2)

| t=1 | Lufthansa (Wilks Lambda: .992, Sig. n.s.) | Emirates (Wilks Lambda: .922, Sig. ***)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recalled a</td>
<td>not recalled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig./Eta²</td>
<td>recalled not recalled Sig./Eta²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>1.91 (0.79)</td>
<td>2.04 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand image</td>
<td>2.63 (0.79)</td>
<td>2.62 (0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. brand equity</td>
<td>3.75 (1.91)</td>
<td>3.94 (1.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| t=2 | Lufthansa (Wilks Lambda: .986, Sig. n.s.) | Emirates (Wilks Lambda: .846, Sig. ***)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recalled a</td>
<td>not recalled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig./Eta²</td>
<td>recalled not recalled Sig./Eta²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>1.92 (0.75)</td>
<td>2.10 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand image</td>
<td>2.55 (0.83)</td>
<td>2.78 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. brand equity</td>
<td>3.80 (1.69)</td>
<td>3.77 (1.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a mean value, lower number indicate a better evaluation (standard deviation)
quences for official sponsors and ambush marketers are presented. One consequence of our results is that, in spite of extensive legal efforts to restrain ambush marketing activities, ambush marketing poses a threat to official sponsors of events. Indeed, Lufthansa did not profit from the ambush marketing activity in the specific period of time but, most likely, the positive consequences of the sponsorship by Emirates were influenced negatively.

Furthermore, a conclusion of our examination is that the communication effect for the official sponsor Emirates is strong, while there is no significant effect for the ambush marketer Lufthansa. Therefore, the strategic alternatives presented by Cliffe and Motion (2005) have to be adjusted, in the sense that mass events can also be used to raise a brand’s image and equity to a degree, even when a brand is relatively unfamiliar to most consumers before the event.

Thus, for official sponsor partners, it is important to take the necessary precautions to ensure that the effectiveness of the partnership is not weakened by ambush strategies of their competitors.

TABLE 4
Change in brand evaluation over time by recall groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in brand awareness a</th>
<th>Change in brand image</th>
<th>Change in overall brand equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emirates recalled in both surveys (n=70)</td>
<td>0.52 (1.43)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.72)</td>
<td>0.32 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emirates recalled only in 2nd survey (n=75)</td>
<td>0.61 (1.31)</td>
<td>0.43 (1.08)</td>
<td>0.22 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of difference btw. groups</td>
<td>0.09 n.s.</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>-0.10 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lufthansa recalled in both surveys (n=28)</td>
<td>-0.07 (0.69)</td>
<td>0.09 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.10 (1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lufthansa recalled only in 2nd survey (n=21)</td>
<td>0.27 (0.96)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.82)</td>
<td>-0.44 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of difference btw. groups</td>
<td>0.34 n.s.</td>
<td>0.14 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.54 n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a mean (t=1)-mean (t=2) (standard deviation), positive values indicate a more favorable evaluation over time.

TABLE 5
Effects of existing attitudes on change in brand evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in brand awareness a</th>
<th>Change in brand image</th>
<th>Change in overall brand equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Image (overall, Emirates)</td>
<td>-0.164**</td>
<td>-0.040 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.025 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Image (Emirates recalled in both surveys)</td>
<td>-0.165 n.s.</td>
<td>0.073 n.s.</td>
<td>0.094 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Image (Emirates recalled only in 2nd survey)</td>
<td>0.105 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.001 n.s.</td>
<td>0.105 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Image (LHA recalled 1st, Emirates recalled 2nd)</td>
<td>-0.304 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.035 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.086 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Image (overall, Lufthansa)</td>
<td>0.044 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.035 n.s.</td>
<td>0.134**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Image (Lufthansa recalled in both surveys)</td>
<td>-0.083 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.036 n.s.</td>
<td>0.144 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Image (Lufthansa recalled only in 2nd survey)</td>
<td>-0.157 n.s.</td>
<td>0.139 n.s.</td>
<td>0.041 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Image (LHA recalled 1st, Emirates recalled 2nd)</td>
<td>-0.241 n.s.</td>
<td>0.119 n.s.</td>
<td>0.076 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialization (overall, Emirates)</td>
<td>0.051 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.041 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.092 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. (Emirates recalled in both surveys)</td>
<td>-0.058 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.149 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.129 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. (Emirates recalled only in 2nd survey)</td>
<td>-0.051 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.083 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.087 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. (LHA recalled 1st, Emirates recalled 2nd)</td>
<td>-0.232 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.260 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.173 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. (overall, Lufthansa)</td>
<td>0.010 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.038 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.120*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. (Lufthansa recalled in both surveys)</td>
<td>-0.100 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.172 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.211 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. (Lufthansa recalled only in 2nd survey)</td>
<td>-0.030 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.231 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.263 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. (LHA recalled 1st, Emirates recalled 2nd)</td>
<td>-0.243 n.s.</td>
<td>0.169 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.153 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Ambushing (overall, Emirates)</td>
<td>-0.021 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.095 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.005 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambushing (Emirates recalled in both surveys)</td>
<td>-0.147 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.348***</td>
<td>0.057 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambushing (Emirates recalled only in 2nd survey)</td>
<td>-0.045 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.219*</td>
<td>-0.067 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambushing (LHA recalled 1st, Emirates recalled 2nd)</td>
<td>0.028 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.242 n.s.</td>
<td>0.038 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Ambushing (overall, Lufthansa)</td>
<td>0.008 n.s.</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td>0.103 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambushing (Lufthansa recalled in both surveys)</td>
<td>0.275 n.s.</td>
<td>0.148 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.255 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambushing (Lufthansa recalled only in 2nd survey)</td>
<td>0.465**</td>
<td>0.651***</td>
<td>0.157 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambushing (LHA recalled 1st, Emirates recalled 2nd)</td>
<td>0.204 n.s.</td>
<td>0.236 n.s.</td>
<td>-0.064 n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a linear regression on construct’s mean (t=1)-mean (t=2)
possible misuse are closed by regulations of the event organizer before signing a sponsorship contract. However, companies that decide to follow an ambush marketing strategy should concentrate on using the gaps (e.g., sponsorship of national teams during a sport event) in the communication strategy of their competitor. Moreover, they should try to avoid negative associations which can be the consequence if legal arguments with official sponsors arise, or if the motives of the ambusher become too obvious to the public.

Further research should focus on gaining a deeper understanding about the effect of existing attitudes (and their change over time) on the brand over time. Additionally, a broader concept of brand image should be applied, because we focused more on attribute than on non-attribute components of brand image. Replications should consider that a higher number of respondents might be required to identify effects. Moreover, this study should be replicated in different contexts (event and brand-related) to generalize the results reported in this study.
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