

The importance of context in understanding football fans' reactions to corporate stadia naming rights sponsorships

GILLOOLY, Leah, MEDWAY, Dominic, WARNABY, Gary and GRIMES, Anthony

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/26161/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

GILLOOLY, Leah, MEDWAY, Dominic, WARNABY, Gary and GRIMES, Anthony (2020). The importance of context in understanding football fans' reactions to corporate stadia naming rights sponsorships. *European Journal of Marketing*. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>



The importance of context in understanding football fans' reactions to corporate stadia naming rights sponsorships

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-03-2018-0174.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Sponsorship, Fit, Naming rights, Stadia, Sport, Fans

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The importance of context in understanding football fans' reactions to corporate stadia naming rights sponsorships

Abstract

Purpose: This study explores fans' reactions to corporate naming rights sponsorship of football club stadia, and identifies a range of contextual factors impacting these reactions.

Design/methodology/approach: A qualitative, quasi-ethnographic research design is adopted, focusing on three football clubs in North West England. Data are gathered through online message board discussions, focus groups and auto-ethnographic approaches.

Findings: Geographic, image and functional dimensions of sponsorship fit are noted as contextual factors in determining fans' reactions to corporate stadium names. It is also proposed that some forms of fit (in particular geographic fit) are more important than others in this regard. Beyond issues of fit, three additional contextual factors are identified that potentially influence fans' reactions to corporate stadium names: prior involvement with the club by the sponsor; fans' perceived impact of the sponsorship investment; and whether the stadium is new or long-established.

Research implications: Future research might examine the relative importance and implications of the identified contextual factors, alongside seeking other potential areas of contextual framing.

Practical implications: Sponsorship naming rights negotiations need to be sensitive to a variety of contextual factors. Furthermore, sponsors would do well to have a good awareness of their own brand image and its congruency with the identity of the club and fan base.

Originality/value: This nuanced, qualitative analysis extends existing, quantitative-based research by identifying a range of contextual factors which shape fans' reactions to corporate stadium naming.

Keywords: sponsorship; fit; naming rights; stadia; sport; fans

Article classification: Research paper

Introduction

The trading of stadia naming rights, or ‘selling home’ (Boyd, 2000), has become a widespread aspect of sports sponsorship over the last 40 years. This practice differs from other sports sponsorships, typically relating to kits and events, which are examined extensively in the marketing literature (e.g. Bruhn and Holzer, 2015; Gwinner and Eaton, 1999; Grohs *et al.*, 2015; Kwon *et al.*, 2016; Madrigal, 2000; Nufer and Bühler, 2010; Roy and Cornwell, 2003). Specifically, stadia and their surroundings are places to which fans, and others, may feel strongly attached (see Boyd, 2000; Reysen *et al.*, 2012).

Such attachment was evident in the 2011 debacle over the renaming of Newcastle United Football Club’s St James Park stadium, so named since 1880, to the ‘Sports Direct Arena’. The club’s owners argued that this change signaled the financial potential of Newcastle United to prospective sponsors, and that the former name was no longer “commercially attractive” (BBC, 2011). In response, fans took direct action, painting the original name on the stadium’s perimeter wall (BBC, 2012); and by 2013, the old name was reinstated (Edwards, 2012), suggesting that fan reactions to corporate stadium names are an important element in their potential as sponsorship vehicles.

Given the prevalence of corporate stadium (re) naming and the scale of investment it continues to attract in football/soccer¹ and other sports/entertainment venues (Vuolteenaho *et al.*, 2018), the practice remains an under-developed research area within the sponsorship literature, which to-date has taken a predominantly survey-based, quantitative approach (e.g. Nakazawa *et al.*, 2016; Eddy, 2014; Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2014; Reysen *et al.*, 2012). In this regard, significant work has been carried out by Woisetschläger *et al.* (2014) in this journal, examining factors influencing fans’ reactions to the corporate renaming of Borussia Dortmund’s stadium. Existing studies emphasise a binary dimension of fan acceptance or resistance to stadium renaming. Resistance emanates from perceived threats of corporate stadium (re) naming to both club distinctiveness and fans’ self-identity as followers of the

¹ The term “football” is subsequently used throughout this paper, privileging the voice of the fans studied. However, it is recognised this could be substituted for “soccer” in a North American context.

1
2
3 club (Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2014; Reysen *et al.*, 2012). By contrast, a key factor influencing
4 acceptance is the fit between sponsor and club (Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2014).
5
6
7
8

9 These existing quantitative studies provide a critical contribution to understanding fan reactions to
10 naming rights sponsorship. However, no two sponsorships (including naming rights) are necessarily
11 the same, and all parties in the relationship (sponsor, rights holder, fans and other stakeholders) are
12 able to contribute towards a range of contextual factors that combine to form unique sponsorship
13 cases. Nonetheless, Reysen *et al.* (2012) note the lack of any detailed examination of how context
14 might influence fans' reactions to corporate stadium re-naming. Addressing this lacuna serves as a
15 central motivation for this study. The paper adopts a detailed, contrasting case-based (Stake, 2005)
16 qualitative inquiry approach. In so doing, it adds a layer of complexity to existing quantitative work,
17 by shedding further insight on the importance of context in underpinning fans' reactions to naming
18 rights sponsorship and the resulting explanations offered. The research is framed by one central
19 research question: What are the contextual factors influencing fans' reactions to the corporate
20 (re)naming of their team's football stadium?
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 In addressing this question, the paper develops two key contributions. First, in line with previous
38 studies, it is recognised that different dimensions of sponsorship fit can act as contextual factors in
39 determining fans' reactions to corporate stadium names. However, building on this existing work, it is
40 proposed that certain forms of fit, and thereby certain aspects of context, are more important than
41 others in this regard. The second contribution proposes that there are additional, and previously
42 undocumented, contextual factors beyond fit (both sponsored-property related and sponsor-related)
43 that combine to shape fans' reactions to corporate stadium renaming. Overall, the research reveals that
44 because contextual factors are so highly variable, there is no simple and replicable strategic marketing
45 communications formula for the application and implementation of naming rights sponsorships in
46 football or beyond.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The research is based on three English football clubs that have all undergone corporate stadium re-
4 naming within the last 20 years. Two cases involve relocated and newly built stadia. However, the
5 location of the third club's stadium has remained unchanged for over a century. The paper begins with
6 a discussion of extant literature on corporate stadium (re)naming, before focusing on theoretical
7 frameworks relating to sponsorship fit, gratitude and social identity theory, which have relevance to
8 the interpretation of empirical data. The research approach is outlined, before findings are presented
9 and discussed. The paper concludes by discussing theoretical contributions, managerial implications,
10 limitations and areas for future research.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Corporate stadium (re)naming**

23
24 As with other sponsorship contexts, an important motivation for corporate entities to engage in
25 stadium (re)naming is brand awareness (Crompton and Howard, 2003), resulting from a greater
26 number of brand name mentions, mostly via media reporting (Reysen *et al.*, 2012). This can facilitate
27 the sponsor's brand image enhancement (Roy and Cornwell, 1999), brand positioning (Hartland *et al.*,
28 2005) and sales (Lough and Irwin, 2001). Occasionally, corporate stadium naming seems intertwined
29 with corporate social responsibility (Plewa and Quester, 2011), particularly at a local level. Thus,
30 where sponsors are perceived to have made a significant contribution to providing the local
31 community with a new stadium, they are viewed more favourably (DeSchraver and Jensen, 2003).
32 Previous work on corporate naming rights sponsorship has also examined its impact on variables
33 including brand attitude, word-of-mouth intention (Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2014) and purchase
34 intention (Eddy, 2014).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Many empirical studies of corporate stadium renaming have focused on US college sports (e.g. Eddy,
51 2014; Reysen *et al.*, 2012). Similar work in a European professional team sports context has tended to
52 examine football; perhaps unsurprising given the game's popularity and the prevalence of corporate
53 stadium naming in the sport (Vuolteenaho *et al.*, 2018). In this context, studies of fan reactions to
54 corporate stadium (re)naming have identified some negative outcomes, manifest in fans' hostility
55 towards sponsors; refusal to use a stadium's new name (Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2014); anger; and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perceived harm to the distinctiveness of the team (Reysen *et al.*, 2012; Boyd, 2000). The Newcastle
4 United example above illustrates how this can lead fans to demand that an original, non-corporate
5 stadium name be reinstated. Such occurrences may create negative publicity, potentially causing the
6 sponsor's brand more harm than good (Crompton, 2014). Alternatively, where fans believe the club
7 benefits significantly from a naming rights agreement, or where there is a strong perceived fit between
8 naming sponsor and club, resistance is reduced (Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2014).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 Eddy (2014) suggests the naming rights landscape in US college sports is similar to that in many other
19 sports worldwide, indicating that the actual sport itself does not have significant bearing on fan
20 reactions to corporate stadium naming. What is perhaps more relevant here, is context at a club level
21 (Eddy, 2014), including factors such as differences in club financial security, which may influence
22 reactions to corporate stadium renaming (Reysen *et al.*, 2012). The between-club variability of such
23 contextual factors proves problematic for generalising from existing quantitative studies, and
24 highlights the value of the qualitative approach adopted here in capturing rich and nuanced data on the
25 phenomenon. A greater understanding of the contextual factors (and their interaction) that shape fan
26 reactions to stadium naming rights sponsorships should facilitate practitioner decision making in this
27 area (Chen and Zhang, 2011). One factor which has attracted considerable attention in previous work
28 on sponsorship is the fit between club and sponsor.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Sponsorship fit**

44
45 Fit has been conceptualised in terms of complementarity (Aaker and Keller, 1990), and the logic of a
46 particular brand sponsoring a particular property (Olson and Thjømmøe, 2011). Thus, fit might be
47 broadly defined in terms of similarity, consistency, 'making sense' (Simmons and Becker-Olsen,
48 2006), and a perceived logical connection between sponsor and sponsee (Speed and Thompson,
49 2000). Higher perceived levels of fit (or congruity) between sponsor and sponsored property can lead
50 to more favourable attitudes towards naming rights sponsors (Chen and Zhang, 2011). Considerable
51 empirical evidence exists to support the influence of fit on consumer responses to sponsorship
52 (Petrovici *et al.*, 2015; McDaniel, 1999), including: sponsor identification (Johar and Pham, 1999);
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attitude towards the sponsor (Bruhn and Holzer, 2015; Gwinner and Bennett, 2008; Olson and
4 Thjømøe, 2011; Weeks *et al.*, 2008; Becker-Olsen and Hill, 2006; Rifon *et al.*, 2004; Roy and
5 Cornwell, 2003); attitude towards the sponsorship (Mazodier and Merunka, 2012; Simmons and
6 Becker-Olsen, 2006); sponsor brand image (Grohs and Reisinger, 2014); and purchase intention
7 (Speed and Thompson, 2000). Equally, perceived incongruity (or mis-fit) can harm evaluations of -
8 and the equity attached to - both sponsor (Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2010) and sponsored property (Groza
9 *et al.*, 2012). However, articulation of fit in formal announcements of naming rights sponsorships can
10 aid positive brand attitude formation for incongruent sponsors (Skard and Thorbjørnsen, 2017).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 The literature on sponsorship fit is extensive (see Olson and Thjømøe, 2011) with studies adopting
23 different conceptualisations and measures of the fit construct (see Exhibit 1 in Olson and Thjømøe
24 (2011) for an overview). Fit is frequently divided into either direct (functional/product-related) fit, or
25 indirect (image-based) fit (McDonald, 1991; Gwinner, 1997). Furthermore, Olson and Thjømøe
26 (2011) suggest that overall fit may comprise elements of sponsor product relevance, attitude
27 similarity, geographic similarity, audience similarity and sponsorship duration. It would thus appear
28 that fit is multidimensional, comprising functional, geographic and image-based dimensions. These
29 can be considered as bases of fit upon which fans might draw in articulating their reaction towards a
30 corporate stadium name. Regardless of the dimensions included, sponsorship fit may be enhanced by
31 prior attitude towards the sponsor (Nakazawa *et al.*, 2016); perceived sponsor sincerity
32 (Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2010); sponsor's regional identification; and perceived benefits (often
33 financial) to the sponsored property (Woisetschläger and Haselhoff, 2009). This last aspect relates
34 closely to notions of gratitude inherent in conceptualisations of sponsorship, often used to articulate
35 fan acceptance of corporate money in sport.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Sponsorship and gratitude**

55 Sponsorship has been contrasted with advertising in terms of goodwill (McDonald, 1991; Meenaghan
56 1991, 2001), with the former received in a "halo of goodwill" generated by the perceived benefit
57 accruing to the sponsored property, most notably at the individual sports club level (Meenaghan,
58
59
60

1
2
3 2001: 101). Here, goodwill is defined as “the positive attitude consumers convey toward a sponsor
4 that supports and facilitates an event, team, or cause in which they are passionate” (Dees *et al.*,
5 2008:81). This differential response towards sponsorship (cf. advertising) has led scholars to suggest
6 gratitude – defined as “the positive recognition of benefits received” (Emmons, 2004:5) – as a
7 sponsorship outcome (Kim *et al.*, 2018). Gratitude is, therefore, deemed to include a sense of
8 appreciation, goodwill, and a resultant disposition to act positively towards the source (Fitzgerald,
9 1998). This urge to act through feelings of gratitude links with notions of reciprocity (Kim *et al.*,
10 2018; Morales, 2005; Palmatier *et al.*, 2009).

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 In the context of sports teams, feelings of gratitude can mediate the relationship between sponsorship
23 and consumer outcomes, such as word-of-mouth and purchase intention (Kim *et al.*, 2018; Kim *et al.*,
24 2010). Feelings of gratitude might be driven by altruistic motives being attributed to the sponsorship,
25 perceived value of the sponsorship received (Kim *et al.*, 2018; Tsang, 2007), and perceived effort of
26 the sponsor (Morales, 2005). The latter two can be seen as ‘investments’ by corporate entities in
27 achieving marketing outcomes. However, in a sports sponsorship context, Kim *et al.* (2018) found
28 that perceived investment (as distinct from the perceived value/benefit to the recipient) did not have a
29 significant impact on gratitude. There are also, arguably, first-mover advantages, with early sponsors
30 engendering greater levels of gratitude than later, so-called, ‘bandwagon’ sponsors (Meenaghan,
31 2001).

32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 **Social identity theory**

46
47 Jones (2000: 283) identifies football fandom as a “serious leisure activity”, where participation (or
48 not) can be explained with reference to *social identity theory* (Tajfel, 1974). Social identity refers to
49 “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a
50 social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that
51 membership” (Tajfel, 1981: 255). Further, social identity theory posits that people are motivated to
52 enhance their self-concept (or self-esteem) by becoming members of social groups and making social
53 comparisons that bolster the status of the ‘ingroup’ (to which they belong) at the expense of the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 'outgroup' (Hogg and Abrams, 1988). This is particularly relevant with spectator sports, where fans
4 are more likely to favour supporters of their own club, which they see as an extension of themselves,
5
6 whilst criticising those from opposition clubs (Fink *et al.*, 2009).
7
8
9

10
11 Any threat to the status of the ingroup (e.g. supporters of a particular club) is thus a threat to the self-
12 esteem of its members. When individuals experience (or fear) negative evaluations of the ingroup,
13
14 they are motivated to employ identity-maintenance strategies to protect their self-concept (Tajfel and
15
16 Turner, 1979). These fall into three categories; social mobility, social creativity and social
17
18 competition strategies (Doyle *et al.*, 2017). *Social mobility* strategies include leaving the group or
19
20 psychologically (and overtly) distancing oneself from it (e.g. by using detaching pronouns, such as
21
22 'they' rather than 'we', or not wearing apparel signalling group membership; Cialdini *et al.*, 1976).
23
24 Such actions are characterised as CORFing (Cutting Off Reflected Failure; Snyder *et al.* 1986), and
25
26 regarded as realistic options only for those who do not identify strongly with the group (Fink *et al.*,
27
28 2009). *Social creativity* strategies include downplaying the importance of the dimension(s) on which
29
30 intergroup comparisons are made (e.g. sporting performance), shifting parameters to allow for more
31
32 favourable ingroup evaluations (e.g. to the size and nature of support in the stadium), or changing the
33
34 composition of the outgroup to facilitate more positive comparisons (Tajfel and Turner, 1979).
35
36 Alternatively, members may seek to reframe negative evaluations as positive ingroup attributes (e.g.
37
38 from 'aggressive and hostile' to 'strong and passionate'). They could also seek to protect their identity
39
40 by re-categorising the entire group as belonging to a superior superordinate group, or by identifying
41
42 with a particular sub-group that is less inferior than other sub-groups (Blanz *et al.*, 1998). *Social*
43
44 *competition* strategies involve seeking to improve the relative standing of the ingroup by diminishing
45
46 that of the outgroup; either physically through violence and intimidation, or verbally via hostile
47
48 criticism, ridicule or derogation of the outgroup - termed 'blasting' by Cialdini and Richardson
49
50 (1980).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 A club's stadium arguably constitutes an important aspect of fan identity, representing not merely an
59
60 association to the club brand (Ross *et al.*, 2006), but part of the fan's extended self (Belk, 1988) and a

1
2
3 place within which fans feel emotional and topophilic embeddedness (Edensor and Millington, 2008).
4
5 As such, stadium renaming by a corporate sponsor could be a threat to ingroup distinctiveness (Eddy,
6
7 2014; Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2014), to the point that it triggers identity-maintenance strategies (Doyle
8
9 *et al.*, 2017) and concomitant resistance to that renaming (Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2014; Reysen *et al.*,
10
11 2012). Here, framing the corporate sponsor as an ‘outsider’ to be resisted helps galvanise ingroup
12
13 consistency. Other *social creativity* strategies (Doyle *et al.*, 2017) can be employed in response to
14
15 corporate stadium sponsorship. For example, fans might reinforce positive aspects of the ingroup
16
17 (Wann and Branscombe, 1995) by developing a shared positive reaction to their club’s sponsors
18
19 (Dalakas and Levin, 2005; Madrigal, 2000), and ultimately allowing for the sponsor to be included in
20
21 the ingroup. Questions of whether, when and why football fans consider a stadium sponsor to be a
22
23 threat to their self-concept, and which, if any, identity-maintenance strategies they employ in
24
25 response, are clearly important and potentially complex. This suggests that social identity theory
26
27 provides a useful lens through which to develop a deeper understanding of fan reactions to corporate
28
29 stadium naming rights sponsorship.
30
31
32
33
34

35 **The clubs**

36
37 This study examines three football clubs, located in Greater Manchester, UK, which have changed
38
39 their stadia names in the last 20+ years to one associated with a corporate sponsor. One club, Bolton
40
41 Wanderers, has (re)named its stadium three times in this period. The first instance coincided with a
42
43 move from Burnden Park, where the club had played since 1895, to the newly built (and corporately
44
45 named) Reebok Stadium in 1997, with a subsequent corporate renaming to Macron Stadium in 2014.
46
47 Both Reebok and Macron are sportswear brands. In August 2018, the club announced a third
48
49 renaming to the University of Bolton Stadium (Bolton Wanderers FC, 2018). This took place after the
50
51 data collection phase of the study and was therefore not discussed by participants.
52
53
54
55

56
57 The second club, Manchester City, also represents an example of corporate naming of a newly built
58
59 stadium, following relocation from Maine Road, where the team had played since 1923, to a new
60
stadium in East Manchester in 2003 (originally built for the 2002 Commonwealth Games and then

1
2
3 known as the City of Manchester Stadium). In 2011, the club agreed a deal with Manchester City
4 Council (the stadium owners), securing control of naming rights in return for an increase in rent
5 payments. A 10-year naming rights deal was subsequently signed with the airline operator Etihad
6
7
8
9 (Taylor, 2011).
10

11
12
13 The final club, Oldham Athletic, has played at its current stadium since 1899. Until 2014, this stadium
14 was called Boundary Park, but was renamed SportsDirect.com Park following a five-year naming
15 rights deal with this sportswear manufacturer/retailer (BBC, 2014). At the time of the research, these
16 clubs played at different levels within the English professional football league structure: Manchester
17 City in the Premier League (top tier); Bolton Wanderers in the Championship (second tier); and
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 Oldham Athletic in League One (third tier).
30

31 **Method**

32 As noted above, previous studies of corporate stadium (re)naming in the sponsorship literature have
33 employed survey-based, quantitative approaches. However, this is not the most effective approach for
34 gaining the rich and ‘thick’ (Geertz, 1973) phenomenological insights from fans, befitting the current
35 research question. Accordingly, this study’s findings draw on various qualitative data sources
36 resulting from a quasi-ethnographic research approach (Murtagh, 2007). Phase one involved engaging
37 fans from Manchester City and Bolton Wanderers in online message board discussions on the
38 (re)naming of their clubs’ stadia, drawing on principles of netnography (Kozinets, 2015). Permission
39 was sought, but not received, from Oldham Athletic fan message boards; accordingly, the club was
40 not included in this phase. The researchers identified themselves on message boards and clearly
41 outlined the purpose of the research. Permission was requested to use data from message board
42 participants, and only quotes pertaining to such permissions being granted are presented below.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 The second phase involved focus groups with fans of the three clubs, each involving between four and
57 six participants, moderated by one or two of the authors. Focus groups lasted between 45-60 minutes,
58 and were based around a series of open-ended topic prompts informed by previous message board
59
60

1
2
3 discussions. Thus, at the broadest level, questions covered issues such as like/dislike of relevant
4 corporate stadium names and the reasons for this, and the relationship between corporate stadium
5 names and financial investment in the club. Several club-specific prompts were included where
6 relevant (e.g. the change of corporate names was discussed with Bolton fans). Focus group
7 moderation guided discussions but allowed for diversion from topics in line with prevailing
8 conversations. One focus group (Manchester City fans) took place at a nearby university, while the
9 others were undertaken at pubs in Bolton and Oldham. As Oldham Athletic fans had not been
10 included in the previous phase, two focus groups were held with them.

11
12
13 Recruitment of focus group participants used a combination of purposive and snowball sampling
14 approaches (Bryman, 2004), as it was important to identify fans with a high level of attachment to the
15 clubs, where the stadium (re)naming might be an issue of interest, or even concern. It was not,
16 therefore, the intention to select focus group participants representative of all fan types, were this even
17 possible (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Initial participant recruitment took place via advertisements posted
18 on message boards and social media, through supporters' associations, and from researchers' personal
19 contacts. Those responding positively to participation in the study were then asked to recommend
20 other fans who may wish to take part, in order to widen the sample.

21
22
23 All focus group participants received a £10 Amazon gift certificate as a 'thank you' for giving up their
24 time. Participants ranged in age from 20-69, of which 14 were male and four female. This ratio is
25 indicative of the recognised gender split in English football fans (EFL, 2015). Prior to their
26 participation, and in order to provide balance between transparency and the avoidance of priming
27 effects, participants were instructed that the purpose was to understand fans' reactions to changes in
28 the name of their club's stadium, including their associated thoughts, feelings and behaviours. All
29 participants gave consent to include quotes in the publication of research findings. Table 1 provides
30 an overview of participants for each focus group. No evidence was found for the effect of any
31 demographic variables (e.g. gender, age) on responses given. All focus groups were transcribed and,
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

together with the downloaded transcripts of online message board threads, this amounted to 150 pages of text as a rich and multi-voiced fan discourse.

Table 1: Focus group participants

Manchester City	Oldham Athletic (Group 1)	Oldham Athletic (Group 2)	Bolton Wanderers
4 males Aged between 40 and 55	5 males Aged between 20 and 69	3 males 2 females Aged between 25 and 65	2 males 2 females Aged between 25 and 69

A third, auto-ethnographic phase involved two researchers attending matches at the three clubs, to spend time amongst fans. On these occasions, the researchers also walked the immediate environs of the stadia to ascertain connections with current/former stadium names in the built urban fabric; e.g. in street names or local businesses. Observations were documented in field notes.

Following Abdallah and Langley (2014) and Heracleous (2006), analysis began from the position of viewing all data (message board posts, focus group transcripts and field notes) as text. Against the broad backdrop of the central research question (i.e. determining what contextual factors might influence fans' reactions to the corporate (re) naming of their team's football stadium), the researchers undertook an inductive and iterative form of thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). This involved building up an initial set of themes after coding the message board data and then reorganising, revising and modifying them following the coding of focus group data and field notes. Emphasising a need for quality and reflexivity checks, the process was initially undertaken independently by each researcher. Subsequently, recognising the importance of confirmability in qualitative research (Lincoln and Guba, 1982), the authors met and collectively reviewed, negotiated and, where appropriate, merged their independent data interpretations. This allowed for further

1
2
3 modification of key themes to emerge as part of a final, iterative negotiation step in the analysis. The
4 findings emerging from this process are presented and discussed below.
5
6
7
8

9 **Contexts of sponsorship fit**

10 In explaining reactions towards particular naming rights sponsors, fans drew on a number of fit-based
11 narratives, which appear intertwined with identity maintenance strategies. While fans did not employ
12 the term 'fit' in their explanations, notions of different bases of fit were clearly articulated, suggesting
13 that the fit concept (however expressed) resonates with fans and is employed in appraising naming
14 rights sponsorships.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 To understand fan conceptions of fit, it is helpful to start with a Bolton fan's statement that "'proper'
25 stadium names would be either the location of the stadium – what road they're on or the district"
26 (Bolton fan g), emphasising the importance of connections to the surrounding area. This logic
27 seemingly extends to sponsors with local links, evidenced in Bolton fans' positive reactions to the
28 former 'Reebok' stadium name, a brand with origins in the town. Here, these 'local' bases of fit were
29 the first to be proposed by fans, suggesting that geographic fit is a starting point for fan acceptance of
30 a naming rights sponsor. This is consistent with previous studies concerning the role and importance
31 of geographic fit (Olson and Thjømmøe, 2011; Woisetschläger *et al.*, 2017). It reflects how English
32 football clubs are deeply embedded in towns and cities (Edensor and Millington, 2008) with attempts
33 to relocate them being met with fierce resistance, as exemplified by the case of Wimbledon FC's
34 relocation to Milton Keynes (Goldblatt, 2014). Equally, football fandom is traditionally rooted in
35 support for a *local* club, which can become a manifestation of fans' wider self-identity as both fan of
36 the club and resident and/or native of a particular town, city or region (Edensor and Millington, 2008;
37 Giulianotti, 2002). Thus, narratives of geographic fit to articulate acceptance of naming rights
38 sponsorships are indicative of wider social forces in English football, of which potential sponsors
39 must be aware.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Between Etihad and Manchester City there was no obvious geographic fit, but fans were flexible in
4 finding other forms of “symmetry” (Manchester City fan b) between sponsor and club to explain their
5 acceptance. This included notions of congruency in values and image between these two entities:
6
7

8
9 “I like the fact that it was a new, up and coming company, the same as us. There’s a whole
10 new image for the club... We’re going into the Champions League where, quite frankly,
11 we’re not really wanted. We’re coming in as competitors to teams that have had it their own
12 way for donkey’s years and have looked down on us. And that was the impression I got about
13 Etihad as well. They’re suddenly coming into this market” (Manchester City fan b).
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Here, fit is apparently expressed in terms of a perceived degree of alignment between Etihad and the
21 club, in terms of their similar organisational and competitive strategic positioning. With reference to
22 social identity theory, this reflects a socially creative identity maintenance strategy, whereby club,
23 fans, and sponsor are categorised as belonging to a superordinate group (Blanz *et al.*, 1998) of vibrant,
24 anti-establishment interlopers or challengers. This suggests that, in the absence of geographic fit, fans’
25 attitudes towards a stadium naming sponsor can arise from their understanding of its relative brand
26 positioning within the market, and thus its perceived identity (i.e. image fit).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The cases presented here indicate that fans employ narratives of fit to articulate acceptance of
38 corporate naming rights sponsors in a somewhat hierarchical manner, firstly seeking to explain
39 acceptance based on geography. Where this is absent, fans sequentially broaden and increasingly
40 abstract their appraisals to include image fit as a basis for acceptance. Whilst this shows how fit is an
41 important contextual factor in determining fans’ reactions to corporate stadium names, it also
42 demonstrates their willingness to work hard to accept a corporate stadium name and be flexible in
43 seeking bases of fit to support this decision. This suggests fans have a strong desire to find
44 congruence between sponsee and sponsor (Simmons and Becker-Olson, 2006), and to maintain the
45 ingroup consistency associated with the social identity of being a loyal fan (Tajfel, 1982; Wann and
46 Branscombe, 1995).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As well as employing narratives of image fit to explain acceptance of corporate stadium names, fans
4 also draw on these narratives to articulate resistance (either actual or hypothetical) towards certain
5 corporate stadium names. For example, citing the sportswear manufacturer and retailer Sports Direct,
6 Bolton fans imagined a hypothetical scenario whereby functional fit would be cancelled out by a poor
7 image compared to other potential sponsors:
8
9
10
11
12

13 “I think it’s different, isn’t it... I’m trying to give a good example... I know Sports Direct is
14 still sportswear but its association... [participant makes negative gesture]. Macron and
15 Reebok are sportswear, you know, good sportswear so they still got good... I don't know, it’s
16 a positive brand, isn’t it?” (Bolton fan a).
17
18
19
20
21

22 These negative associations may be a reflection of fans’ perceptions of Sports Direct as a low-quality
23 sportswear brand, or perhaps their understanding of its corporate social responsibility practices: at the
24 time of data collection, a major news story surfaced about Sports Direct’s ‘gulag’-like working
25 conditions and poor contractual practices in the UK (Goodley and Ashby, 2015).
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Fans also employ strategies to reinforce a positive self/fan identity by openly expressing resistance
33 towards perceived undesirable sponsors on an image/ethical level. One example was the highlighting
34 of perceived unacceptable stadium names from other (not necessarily rival) clubs, as well as
35 hypothetical sponsor examples based on existing companies. These explanations were informed by
36 fans’ views of a sponsoring brand’s relative market positioning, with suggestions that a bad stadium
37 name is one linked to a brand perceived as representing cheapness or low value (i.e. poor image fit).
38 Thus, it was suggested that Home Bargains, a UK-based discount retailer, would be “embarrassing” as
39 a stadium name sponsor because “other fans would take the mickey” (Oldham fan h). Those fans
40 openly criticising the perceived poor fit of corporate naming sponsors for other club stadia in this way
41 are engaging in socially competitive identity-maintenance strategies (Doyle *et al.*, 2017); consciously
42 or unconsciously presenting an outgroup for comparison as a way of rationalising the suitability of
43 their own club’s stadium naming arrangements. This is arguably an example of ‘blasting’ (Cialdini
44 and Richardson, 1980), with fans reinforcing the perceived fit of *their* team’s naming rights sponsors
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 through an ‘at least we’re not as bad as...’ narrative. Thus, by ridiculing another team’s sponsors, fans
4 protect their own ingroup identity.
5
6
7

8
9 Alongside sponsor brand image, fans apparently have difficulty in reconciling certain sponsor product
10 categories with the image of their club and the resulting expression of their self-identity as a fan. In
11 particular, there is resistance to the idea of payday loan providers as sponsors: “The danger is we’d
12 have been called something like the Wonga Stadium... We wouldn’t want to be associated with that”
13 (Bolton fan c). The stigmatisation (Goffman, 1963) of this particular product category reflects the
14 perceived negative impact such companies have on working class communities in which football is
15 often ardently followed – an example, perhaps of poor image/ethical and geographic fit combined. As
16 one Oldham Fan explained:
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 “Anybody with intelligence would not go with Wonga... Because it’s a lower class area. I
27 mean, there’s higher-class areas and lower-class areas... So how do you expect the lower
28 educated of Oldham to deal with things like that? They go, “Right, I need some money now,
29 I’ll get a loan.” (Oldham fan a).
30
31
32
33
34

35 Here, resonating with Ruth and Simonin (2003), fans react negatively to perceived threats to the
36 wellbeing of vulnerable people within their club’s wider community.
37
38
39
40

41 Similar concerns were expressed regarding sponsors in the gambling sector, a subject that has
42 attracted attention and debate in media, policy, and academic spheres (e.g. BBC, 2016; Gambling
43 Commission, 2014; Lamont *et al.*, 2011). From a purely functional fit perspective, there is a clear
44 product attribute connection (Smith, 2004) between gambling and sport, as sport accounts for
45 approximately 13% of the total global gambling market (Statista, 2017). However, most participants
46 considered gambling a negative product category and gambling companies as undesirable sponsors:
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 “It will happen sooner or later, you just hope you are not the first one... a company like
55 that... a betting company, eventually it will get rights to a stadium and you don’t want that”
56 (Bolton fan b).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Thus, fans appear to prioritise image/ethical fit over functional fit in determining reactions to
4 particular corporate stadium names. When confronted with a potential sponsor whose perceived
5 ethical record or stance does not match that desired of their club, the language of image fit is
6 employed as a narrative device to explain resistance. Thus, fans appear to have a threshold up to
7 which they will employ socially creative identity maintenance strategies, emphasising fit alignment
8 between the sponsor and the club, or even re-categorising both parties into a superordinate group
9 based on shared or similar aspects of their image (see Blanz *et al.*, 1998). Conversely, if this threshold
10 is breached, fans cast the sponsor as a threat to ingroup consistency (Tajfel, 1982), employing
11 alternative narratives of fit that disassociate their club and, by association, themselves from 'toxic'
12 brands. Consequently, potential sponsors must be aware of the attributions fans make to particular
13 product categories and the extent to which they are prepared to accept certain naming rights sponsors
14 into their ingroup.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Additional contextual factors influencing fan reactions**

32 Beyond issues of sponsorship fit, analysis reveals three additional contextual factors that potentially
33 influence fans' reactions to corporate stadium names. These are prior involvement with the club by
34 the corporate sponsor; fans' perceived impact of the sponsorship investment; and whether the stadium
35 is new or long-established. In appraising the impact of these contextual factors, notions of gratitude
36 appear exigent, alongside previously mentioned identity maintenance strategies.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Prior involvement with the club*

46 A layer of contextual complexity is added to fans' reactions to corporate stadium renaming when
47 taking into account previous involvement with the club. With Reebok (Bolton) and Etihad
48 (Manchester City), for example, these brands first engaged in shirt sponsorship of the respective
49 teams prior to signing stadium naming rights deals. Equally, both Manchester City and Etihad are
50 owned by Abu Dhabi's ruling Al Nahyan family. Thus, it would appear that sponsors can ease the
51 path to corporate stadium name acceptance by gradually escalating the scale of their involvement
52 (sponsorship or otherwise), thereby demonstrating increasing commitment to the club. This process
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 allows fans to reinforce the sponsor's positive aspects as a member of the ingroup (Wann and
4 Branscombe, 1995) based on synergy and even oneness with the club, rather than employing identity
5 maintenance strategies involving disassociation and resistance:
6
7
8

9 "I think it's also a positive that Etihad as a sponsor is now so inextricably linked with the
10 club... Perhaps no other company in our history has been so closely linked to the club... It's a
11 brand that I associate with the City takeover and our recent resurgence as one of the most
12 successful clubs in England. The company increasing their sponsorship to include the stadium
13 and campus only further emphasises my positive view of the brand" (Manchester City fan p).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 This echoes aspects of *commitment and consistency* theory (Cialdini, 2009). Thus, fans who had
23 previously accepted, and even welcomed, the involvement of a corporate entity with their club (e.g. as
24 a shirt sponsor, major investor or owner), are inclined to remain consistent with this position when
25 evaluating the appropriateness of that same company, or one in the same broad product category, as a
26 stadium naming rights sponsor.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Evidence from beyond this study also suggests that a sponsor's prior involvement with the club might
36 even help offset fan concerns about image/ethical fit discussed above, specifically in terms of
37 perceived negative sponsor product categories such as gambling. For example, shortly after data
38 collection took place, an announcement was made that the stadium of Stoke City Football Club (a
39 Premier League team) would be renamed after the gambling brand Bet365 (De Menezes, 2016).
40
41 Based on the insights from fans in this study, it might be expected that such a deal would elicit
42 significant resistance, yet this did not occur. Rather, this naming rights deal was reported in the press
43 as strengthening the sponsor's association with the club, reflecting the fact that the owners of Bet365
44 also own Stoke City, and that Bet365 was already the club's shirt sponsor (De Menezes, 2016). Here,
45 it seems, prior involvement with the club by Bet365 helped ameliorate any negative associations that
46 fans might hold of gambling brands as naming rights sponsors. Specifically, the stance fans adopt
47 with regard to a corporate sponsor may be affected by positions they have previously assumed
48 towards that same organisation in its relationships with their club. This illustrates not only the
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 influence of contextual factors on fan reactions to corporate stadium naming, but also how this can
4 vary between cases; something sponsors must be cognisant of when considering pursuing stadium
5 naming rights deals.
6
7
8
9

10 11 *Perceived impact of sponsorship investment*

12
13 Prominent in all discussions with fans, both on message boards and in focus groups, was the issue of
14 money. Thus, while certain brands and product categories are perceived as carrying negative
15 connotations as potential stadium names, when faced with the reality of a sponsoring brand with a
16 potentially problematic image, fans also deploy counter-discourses, espousing a desire to distance
17 themselves from the corporate naming rights sponsor, but appreciating the importance of the financial
18 investment. These typically trade-off the corporate stadium name with the financial benefits accruing
19 to the club:
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 “I would prefer not to be associated with a business like Sports Direct. But like people have
29 said, if they give you the money, then you take the money.” (Oldham fan i)
30
31
32
33
34

35 This suggests that fans can, to some extent, rationalise acceptance of a naming rights sponsor with a
36 poor image if the financial rewards are significant enough. One Manchester City fan emphasised this
37 pragmatic approach by fans to the contemporary commercial realities of football:
38
39
40

41 “...whatever it takes to get that money, do it. I’d even accept a crap name. I wouldn’t like it.
42 Don’t get me wrong. I wouldn’t like it. But if it was enough money involved, I’d accept
43 anything... It’s the way football is. You need that money” (Manchester City fan b).
44
45
46

47 This echoes Woisetschläger *et al.* (2014), who suggest that the benefits received through sponsorship
48 can mitigate resistance to corporate stadium naming. The perceived financial impact of the naming
49 rights sponsorship thus emerges as a powerful contextual factor, which in this study, manifests itself
50 in contrasting ways depending on what is at stake for fans.
51
52
53
54

55
56
57
58 What fans consider to be a fair financial return for the naming rights to a stadium apparently differs in
59 scale according to the current resources of their club: “you’d need to know that naming it Macron or
60

1
2
3 whatever has made a significant impact to your club” (Bolton fan a). The phrase, “significant impact”
4 was referred to frequently by fans of all three clubs as constituting the ability to buy (and pay wages
5 for) players. This supports findings that team performance is the most salient dimension used by fans
6 when comparing themselves to other clubs (End *et al.*, 2002). Where fans felt that sponsorship money
7 received was insufficient to facilitate such player purchases, or might only cover the wages of
8 perceived inferior players, willingness to accept a corporate stadium name receded.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 Building upon the assertion that fans wish to protect their self-identity from threats presented by
19 sponsorship from negatively-viewed brands/products, further nuance is added if that sponsorship can
20 ensure the club’s survival, or at the very least prevent its relegation to a lower league. Club survival
21 could be viewed as the ultimate fair return for stadium naming rights, even if the name involved
22 constitutes a potential threat to fans’ self-identity in other ways, because without the club any nexus of
23 fans’ identity formation is lost. The fact that Oldham is a club struggling for financial survival (Frost,
24 2017) illustrates this, with sponsorship monies from Sports Direct perceived to “keep [the] club
25 going” (Oldham fan d) in a context where rumours were “going around that the players haven’t been
26 paid” (Oldham fan j):
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 “To be quite honest with you, they can change...Boundary Park every year for the next 10
38 years and give us a million pounds for it and I’ll be over the moon..., because that will keep
39 my club going, that. That’s all I’m bothered about.” (Oldham fan d)
40
41
42

43 It is therefore suggested that fans will prioritise team survival as the ultimate identity consideration,
44 leading them to justify acceptance of corporate stadium renaming where they perceive the benefit to
45 be worth the financial trade-off.
46
47
48
49
50

51 However, where fans’ overriding desire to ensure club survival is facilitated by money from a source
52 they perceive to be in some way undesirable, the commitment displayed towards the sponsor is
53 tempered with a degree of reluctant acceptance. Thus, whilst Oldham fan f articulated his appreciation
54 of the sponsorship money (“Initially, I didn’t like it. But then, as soon as I saw the money involved;
55 thank you, from me personally”), there was no evidence that this reflected genuine gratitude and a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 willingness or obligation to reciprocate. Indeed, when asked directly whether the naming rights
4 sponsorship would affect their purchase behaviour of the sponsor brand's products, Oldham fans
5 declared it would make "no difference" (Oldham fan e). They were happy to accept the corporate
6 sponsorship money, but with no reciprocal obligation in terms of their attitudes towards or patronage
7 of the sponsor brand.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15 By contrast, Manchester City fans displayed a willingness to use the corporate stadium name,
16 demonstrating greater gratitude for monies received: "If they're going to back us with money, the
17 least I can do is back them" (Manchester City fan b). In fact, fans' gratitude included reciprocal
18 commitment by making a conscious, active effort to consider the Etihad brand when making purchase
19 decisions. A distinction can be drawn between the outcomes of the financial investment through
20 naming rights sponsorship for Manchester City and Oldham. With the former, the scale of the
21 investment has facilitated a significant upturn in team performance, allowing the club to invest in
22 superstar players who have propelled the club to success in league and cup competitions:
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 "Nowadays, I always call it the Etihad because finance has become crucial to our
33 development on the pitch. If a sponsor is willing to financially support the club, I'm happy to
34 publicise their name" (Manchester City fan b).
35
36
37
38

39 Therefore, the sponsorship investment at Manchester City is regarded by fans as facilitating success.
40 This, combined with the positive image fans have of the sponsor, leads them to display their gratitude;
41 manifest in a willingness to endorse, promote and, in some cases, use the Etihad brand.
42
43
44
45
46

47 Unlike Manchester City, sponsorship investment at Oldham does not seem to facilitate on-pitch
48 success, merely club survival. Where acceptance of sponsorship money is seen more as a trade-off in
49 which the benefit to the club outweighs the negative associations of the sponsor brand, fans appear to
50 demonstrate less allegiance to the naming partner. Thus, Oldham fans continue to use the Boundary
51 Park stadium name in everyday discourse, and claim no elevated purchase intentions towards
52 SportDirect.com as the sponsor brand. Hence, this naming rights deal was variously referred to by
53 Oldham fans as "money for old rope" (Oldham fan b) or "free money" (Oldham fan g).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Considering Fitzgerald's (1998) definition of gratitude as comprising appreciation, a sense of
6 goodwill and a resultant disposition to act, the findings relating to Manchester City support the
7 contention that gratitude may be driven by the perceived value of the sponsorship (Kim *et al.*, 2018;
8 Tsang, 2007). However, in cases where fans might hold more negative associations of the naming
9 rights sponsor, as with Oldham, they are likely to show reluctant acceptance of the money, with no
10 real conversion of this into gratitude or feeling the necessity to reciprocate – perhaps because the
11 negative image of the sponsoring company makes it unworthy of such action.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *New vs. established stadia*

23
24 The cases examined in this paper represent examples of corporate naming rights sponsorship for
25 newly built (Bolton and Manchester City) and long-established (Oldham) stadia. Differences in fan
26 reactions to corporate stadium renaming for newly built versus long-established stadia have been well
27 documented (Anonymous, 2018; Crompton and Howard, 2003). Anonymous (2018) discuss how fans
28 are generally accepting of corporate names for newly built stadia not imbued with an existing name,
29 and which have not yet acquired the status of “memory places” (Boyd, 2000) where fans fondly
30 remember past footballing triumphs and experiences. This helps explain results from Vuolteenaho's *et*
31 *al's* (2018) study of 193 European football clubs, showing a higher percentage of sponsor-named
32 stadia for post-1990 venues (59.2%) than for older facilities. Similarly, for Bolton and Manchester
33 City, fans' general acceptance of the corporate names for their current stadia was – at least partially –
34 explained by the fact that both clubs had relocated to these in recent times:
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 “I have no issues with the naming of the stadium after a sponsor as there is very little ‘history’
48 here” (Manchester City fan e).

49
50
51 “To be honest, I didn't mind because it was a totally new stadium” (Bolton fan c).
52
53
54
55

56 However, evidence suggests there are additional complexities to consider in terms of fans' real and
57 imagined reactions to corporate stadium (re)naming and the wider context of stadium longevity.
58
59
60

1
2
3 For example, both Manchester City and Bolton fans contrasted the acceptance of corporate naming
4 rights sponsors for their current newly-built stadia with a hypothetical resistance to the renaming of
5 former long-established stadia:
6
7

8
9 “I would have been passionately opposed to Maine Rd being rebranded. It had a history and
10 an identity that is extremely important to fans. A rebranding just would not have worked,
11 much like it didn't as St James's Park [Newcastle United's stadium], for the same reasons...

12
13
14
15 You simply cannot rebrand a stadium which has had a name for 100 years, people are too
16 attached to it” (Manchester City fan p).

17
18
19
20 “I would have been totally disgusted [had they renamed Burnden Park]. I don't think I could
21 have accepted that” (Bolton fan c).
22
23
24
25

26
27 Yet even within this hypothetical realm, there was no indication from these fans that they would have
28 engaged in CORFing (Snyder *et al.*, 1986), or social mobility-based strategies for identity
29 maintenance (Doyle *et al.*, 2017), such as withdrawing their support for the club or switching
30 allegiance to another. It appears, therefore, that such hypothesising allows fans to feel as though they
31 are reasserting some power against any perceived over-commercialisation of football, permitting them
32 to enact a form of ‘safe’ resistance (albeit attitudinally), free of any negative financial or image-
33 related consequences for their club.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Significantly, with both Bolton and Manchester City, the survival of neither club was particularly at
45 risk at the time of data collection, and thus fans were not faced with a wider existential threat to their
46 identities as fans. This was not the case for Oldham, where the club was in a precarious financial state,
47 as discussed earlier. This may help to explain why Oldham fans, who had witnessed the corporate
48 renaming of their long-established stadium, were keen to employ social creativity strategies, selecting
49 club survival as the primary basis for their identity maintenance, and thereby a means to justify their
50 reluctant acceptance of the corporate name.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusion

1
2
3 This paper set out with one central research question, namely to determine the contextual factors
4 influencing fans' reactions to the corporate (re) naming of their team's football stadium.
5

6
7 The findings indicate that fans articulate such reactions in terms of various dimensions of sponsorship
8 fit, which contribute towards the maintenance of their self-identity. This aligns with the work of
9 others, such as Woisetschläger *et al.* (2014). Adding to this work, it is also proposed that fans
10 prioritise some forms of fit over others, with geographical connections between corporate naming
11 sponsor and club being particularly salient in allowing fans to maintain an ingroup consistency and
12 self-identity position that supports naming rights acceptance. Where these geographical connections
13 are absent, fans appear to seek out other forms of fit relating to alignment between the values and
14 image of the corporate naming sponsor and their club, which can also facilitate acceptance of a
15 corporate stadium name; this reflects a socially creative identity maintenance strategy. Functional fit
16 is also recognised by fans, but appears to be overridden by image fit. In sum, both the different types
17 of sponsorship fit, and then how those might be prioritised, emerge within this paper as important
18 contextual factors in shaping fans' reactions to corporate stadium (re) naming. This represents the first
19 key contribution of this study.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36
37 A second contribution is the surfacing of three additional contextual factors that may further influence
38 fans' reactions to the corporate (re) naming of their team's football stadium. The first of these is prior
39 involvement with a club by a sponsor. Critical to this is visible evidence or knowledge amongst the
40 fan base of a sponsor's previous substantive commitment to their club. This appears to influence
41 reactions to a corporate stadium name by reinforcing the perceived positive aspects of fit between the
42 sponsor and football club as sponsee, and mitigating any apparent negative aspects.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Another additional contextual factor relates to the perceived impact of sponsorship investment on a
53 club's fortunes, whereby an apparent positive impact appears to make fans more likely to rationalise
54 or overlook aspects of poor fit that might easily threaten their self-identity. Put simply, larger and
55 more lucrative stadium naming rights deals may be more likely to reduce resistance to naming rights
56 sponsorships that have perceived poor fit with the club. Furthermore, fans' perceptions of what is 'fair
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 financial return' from a stadium naming rights deal may vary according to the club's financial
4 resources, with the bar being set far lower in this regard for cash-poor clubs, as is evident from the
5 views of Oldham Athletic fans above.
6
7
8
9

10
11 An additional point here relates to how fans' perceived impact of sponsorship monies from naming
12 rights deals interacts with notions of sponsor image fit. Where such sponsorship investment is
13 perceived to facilitate on-pitch success, and comes from a sponsor with a perceived positive image,
14 fans appear to display genuine gratitude towards that sponsor, as was seen in the case of Manchester
15 City fans who spoke of a greater willingness to purchase Etihad products. In contrast, where the
16 naming rights sponsor has a perceived negative image, and where that sponsor's investment can only
17 preserve but not necessarily enhance the club's performance and status, fans can display a more
18 reluctant acceptance of the sponsorship and the associated stadium name. This was the case with
19 Oldham Athletic fans, who showed little reciprocal purchase intention (and thus, little true gratitude)
20 towards SportsDirect.com as a corporate naming rights sponsor.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 A third additional contextual factor influencing fans' reactions to the corporate stadium (re)naming
36 relates to newly built versus established stadia. Specifically, findings here support existing research
37 (Vuolteenaho *et al*, 2018), suggesting that established stadia are always likely to be a more
38 troublesome target for naming rights deals, and consequently less likely to deliver a full range of
39 positive outcomes for the sponsor. This is due to their status as "memory places" (Boyd, 2000) for
40 fans. However, if a club with a long-established stadium is in a precarious financial state, then
41 corporate renaming of the stadium may become more viable if it can deliver a perceived fair financial
42 return that can ultimately preserve rather than threaten fans' identity by ensuring club survival. This
43 was the case with Oldham Athletic, where the renaming of Boundary Park to SportsDirect.com Park
44 was accepted – albeit reluctantly and without true gratitude towards the sponsor – due to the parlous
45 state of the club's finances.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furthermore, no two sponsorships or clubs will necessarily display identical combinations of
4 contextual factors, meaning fan reactions to stadium naming rights deals may vary accordingly. On
5 the one hand, this makes it more difficult to predict fan reactions to any given stadium naming rights
6 deal. However, consistent with Firestone's (1993) concept of case-to-case translation as a form of
7 generalisability, the detailed descriptions of the cases presented will permit an evaluation of the extent
8 to which identified combinations of contextual factors are present in other cases or situations (Polit
9 and Beck, 2010), both within and outwith football. Nonetheless, the evident variability of contextual
10 factors for the cases discussed in this paper suggest that the strategic marketing communications
11 formula for naming rights sponsorships in football, and indeed sport more generally, cannot simply be
12 replicated.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Managerial implications**

27
28 In terms of its managerial implications, this study identifies that sponsorship naming rights
29 negotiations need to be sensitive to the variety of contextual factors relating to local club conditions,
30 including a club's financial state, sporting performance, and the age of the stadium. Moreover, prior
31 investment by the sponsor can smooth the way to fan acceptance of a naming rights sponsorship deal.
32 This points to potential naming rights sponsors starting with smaller sponsorship assets (e.g. pitchside
33 hoardings, shirts, etc.) to weave the sponsor's presence into fans' quotidian understandings and
34 discourses. Such an approach allows the sponsor to demonstrate commitment and build familiarity,
35 trust and credibility with a club's fan base, before embarking on a significant stadium renaming deal.
36 Sponsors should also be ready to scale-up their investment in a naming rights deal in line with higher
37 club performance to deliver notions of 'fair financial return'. In addition, it would appear evident that
38 naming rights sponsors would do well to have a good awareness of their own brand image and its
39 congruency with the existing identity of the club and fan base.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Limitations and areas for future research**

57
58 This study has examined how various contextual factors might influence fans' reactions to corporate
59 stadium (re)naming, focusing on three football clubs based in the North West of England, all of which
60

1
2
3 are contextually unique. Future research could seek to identify other forms of contextual framing
4 affecting fans' reactions to naming rights sponsorship deals, arising in, for example, the relative
5 league position of football clubs, or the landscape of professional football and associated fan bases in
6 other countries. Another contextual focus for future research is to examine how fan reactions to
7 stadium naming rights alter over time with the inevitable turnover of corporate sponsors. Specifically,
8 as we move into the second, and sometimes third, generation of corporate naming sponsors for
9 football stadia (as in the case of Bolton), there is more work to be done in examining how the fans'
10 reactions to an existing corporate naming deal for their club's stadium might be affected (negatively
11 or positively) by the perceived success of previous naming rights sponsorships. Examination of the
12 contextual factors influencing fans' reactions to corporate stadium names in other sports, beyond
13 football, is also an area of future potential research interest. Such studies could usefully build on the
14 theoretical contributions and managerial implications from this paper to help inform naming rights
15 sponsorship decision-making.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Further building on the above research, another line of future potential enquiry could involve trying to
34 determine the relative importance or weighting of those different contextual factors identified as
35 influencing fan reactions to corporate stadium naming rights sponsors. For example, is there a relative
36 threshold of fair financial return on naming rights investment, above which fans are prepared to trade
37 off additional sponsorship income for higher levels of perceived fit? In addition, in the above findings
38 fan narratives of gratitude towards sponsors have been explored, highlighting differences between
39 genuine gratitude, characterised by notions of reciprocity, and more reluctant acceptance, with no
40 contingent impact on purchase intention of the sponsor brand or club-related goods and services. Field
41 studies using sales data might helpfully contribute to further advancing this perspective on differing
42 fan reactions to corporate naming rights sponsors and to sports clubs as recipients of sponsorship
43 monies. In relation to the latter, for example, could reluctant acceptance of naming rights sponsorship
44 have consequences for the club in terms of fans' match-day practices – e.g. fans' behaviour in the
45 stands, or their pre- and post-match dwell time and associated additional spending within the stadium?
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This study predominantly explored the views of ‘local’ fans (although the message board phase of the
4 research did allow for participation from a more geographically dispersed fan base). Therefore, future
5 research might look to examine differences in reactions to corporate stadium (re) naming between
6
7 local and more dispersed fan bases. For example, as professional sports become increasingly global in
8
9 their reach, will fan reactions and the narratives employed shift away from notions of geography and,
10
11 as such, should sponsors focus on identifying and cementing alternative bases of fit to facilitate
12
13 acceptance?
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **References**

21
22 Aaker, D.A. and Keller, K.L. (1990), “Consumer evaluations of brand extensions”, *Journal of*
23
24 *Marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 27-41.

25
26
27
28 Abdallah, C. and Langley, A. (2014), “The double edge of ambiguity in strategic planning”, *Journal*
29
30 *of Management Studies*, Vol 51 No. 2, pp. 235-264.

31
32
33
34 Anonymous, (2018), REFERENCE WITHHELD FOR BLIND PEER REVIEW.

35
36
37
38
39 BBC. (2016), “Gambling ads criticised on first day of Australian Open”, available at:
40
41 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-australia-35259767> (accessed 10 March 2017).

42
43
44
45 BBC. (2014), “Oldham Athletic: Boundary Park to become SportsDirect.com Park”, available at:
46
47 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/football/28144525> (accessed 23 February 2017).

48
49
50
51 BBC (2012), “St James' Park graffiti: Michael Atkinson admits painting stadium”, available at:
52
53 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-tyne-17077966> (accessed 01 February 2018).

54
55
56
57
58 BBC (2011), “Newcastle rename St James’ Park the Sports Direct Arena”, available at:
59
60 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/football/15668207> (accessed 21 April 2016).

1
2
3
4
5 Becker-Olsen, K.L. and Hill, R.P. (2006), "The impact of sponsor fit on brand equity: The case of
6 nonprofit service providers", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol 9 No. 1, pp. 73-83.
7
8

9
10
11 Belk, R.W. (1988), "Possessions and the extended self", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 15 No.
12 2, pp. 139-168.
13
14

15
16
17 Blanz, M., Mummendey, A., Mielke, R. and Klink, A. (1998), "Responding to negative social
18 identity: A taxonomy of identity management strategies", *European Journal of Social Psychology*,
19 Vol 28 No. 5, pp. 697-729.
20
21
22
23

24
25
26 Bolton Wanderers FC. (2018), "Welcome to the University of Bolton Stadium", available at:
27 <https://www.bwfc.co.uk/news/2018/august/welcome-to-the-university-of-bolton-stadium/> (accessed
28 28 August 2018).
29
30
31

32
33
34 Boyd, J. (2000), "Selling home: Corporate stadium names and the destruction of commemoration",
35 *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 330-346.
36
37
38

39
40
41 Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), "Using thematic analysis in psychology". *Qualitative Research in*
42 *Psychology*, Vol 3 No 2, pp. 77-101.
43
44
45

46
47 Bruhn, M. and Holzer, M. (2015), "The role of the fit construct and sponsorship portfolio size for
48 event sponsorship success: a field study", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 5/6, pp. 874-
49 893.
50
51
52

53
54
55 Bryman, A. (2004), *Social Research Methods* (2nd edition), Oxford University Press, Oxford.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2011), *Business Research Methods* (3rd edition), Oxford University Press,
4
5 Oxford.

6
7
8
9 Chen, K.K. and Zhang, J.J. (2011), "Examining consumer attributes associated with collegiate athletic
10 facility naming rights sponsorship: Development of a theoretical framework", *Sport Management*
11
12 *Review*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 103-116.

13
14
15
16
17 Cialdini, R.B. (2009), *Influence: Science and Practice* (5th edition), Pearson Education, Boston, MA.

18
19
20
21
22 Cialdini, R.B., and Richardson, K.D. (1980), "Two indirect tactics of image management: Basking
23
24 and blasting", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 406-415.

25
26
27
28 Cialdini, R.B., Borden, R.J., Thorne, A., Walker, M.R., Freeman, S. and Sloan, L.R. (1976), "Basking
29
30 in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.
31
32 34 No. 3, pp. 366-375.

33
34
35
36
37 Crompton, J.L. (2014), "Potential negative outcomes from sponsorship for a sport
38
39 property", *Managing Leisure*, Vol. 9 No. 6, pp. 420-441.

40
41
42
43 Crompton, J.L. and Howard, D.R. (2003), "The American experience with facility naming rights:
44
45 opportunities for English professional football teams", *Managing Leisure* Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 212-226.

46
47
48
49 Dalakas, V. and Levin, A.M. (2005), "The balance theory domino: How sponsorships may elicit
50
51 negative consumer attitudes", in Menon, G. and Rao, A. R. (Eds.), *NA-Advances in Consumer*
52
53 *Research Volume 32*, Association for Consumer Research, Duluth, MN, pp. 91-97.

54
55
56
57
58 Dees, W., Bennett, G. and Villegas, J. (2008), "Measuring the effectiveness of sponsorship of an elite
59
60 intercollegiate football program", *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 79-89.

1
2
3
4
5 De Menezes, J. (2016), "Stoke City to rename Britannia the bet365 Stadium after reaching deal to
6 expand capacity beyond 30,000 mark" *The Independent*, available at:

7
8
9 [https://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/premier-league/stoke-city-to-rename-britannia-the-](https://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/premier-league/stoke-city-to-rename-britannia-the-bet365-stadium-after-reaching-deal-to-expand-capacity-beyond-a6994626.html)
10 [bet365-stadium-after-reaching-deal-to-expand-capacity-beyond-a6994626.html](https://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/premier-league/stoke-city-to-rename-britannia-the-bet365-stadium-after-reaching-deal-to-expand-capacity-beyond-a6994626.html) (accessed 26 July
11
12
13
14 2018).

15
16
17
18 DeSchraver, T.D. and Jensen, P.E. (2003), "What's in a name? Price variation in sport facility naming
19 rights", *Eastern Economic Journal*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 359-376.

20
21
22
23
24 Doyle, J.P., Lock, D., Funk, D.C., Filo, K. and McDonald, H. (2017), "'I was there from the start':
25 The identity-maintenance strategies used by fans to combat the threat of losing", *Sport Management*
26 *Review*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 184-197.

27
28
29
30
31
32 Eddy, T. (2014), "Measuring effects of naming-rights sponsorships on college football fans'
33 purchasing intentions", *Sport Management Review*, Vol. 17 No. 3, 362-375.

34
35
36
37
38
39 Edensor, T. and Millington, S. (2008), "'This is Our City': branding football and local
40 embeddedness", *Global Networks*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 172-193.

41
42
43
44
45 Edwards, L. (2012). "Newcastle United sponsorship deal with Wonga will see St James' Park
46 reinstated as stadium name" *The Telegraph*, available at:
47
48 [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/football/teams/newcastle-united/9596399/Newcastle-United-](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/football/teams/newcastle-united/9596399/Newcastle-United-sponsorship-deal-with-Wonga-will-see-St-James-Park-reinstated-as-stadium-name.html)
49 [sponsorship-deal-with-Wonga-will-see-St-James-Park-reinstated-as-stadium-name.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/football/teams/newcastle-united/9596399/Newcastle-United-sponsorship-deal-with-Wonga-will-see-St-James-Park-reinstated-as-stadium-name.html) (accessed 21
50
51
52
53
54 April 2016).

1
2
3 EFL (2015), "Infographic: 2015 Fan Survey", available at:

4
5 <http://www.efl.com/news/article/2015/infographic-2015-fan-survey-2784954.aspx> (accessed 27
6
7 February 2017).

8
9
10
11 Emmons, R.A. (2004), "The psychology of gratitude: An introduction", in Emmons, R.A and
12
13 McCullough, M.E. (Eds.), *The Psychology of Gratitude*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, pp.
14
15 3-16.
16
17

18
19
20 End, C.M., Dietz-Uhler, B., Harrick, E.A. and Jacquemotte, L. (2002), "Identifying with winners: A
21
22 reexamination of sport fans' tendency to brag", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 32 No. 5,
23
24 pp. 1017-1030.
25
26

27
28 Fink, J.S., Parker, H.M., Brett, M. and Higgins, J. (2009), "Off-field behavior of athletes and team
29
30 identification: using social identity theory and balance theory to explain fan reactions", *Journal of*
31
32 *Sport Management*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 142-155.
33
34

35
36
37 Firestone, W. A. (1993), "Alternative arguments for generalizing from data as applied to qualitative
38
39 research", *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 16-23.
40
41

42
43 Fitzgerald, P. (1998), "Gratitude and justice", *Ethics*, Vol. 109 No. 1, pp. 119-153.
44
45

46
47 Frost, R. (2017), "Oldham Athletic challenge winding-up petition brought by HMRC" available at:
48
49 <https://www.insidermedia.com/insider/northwest/oldham-athletic-challenge-winding-up-petition>
50
51 (accessed 13 September 2017).
52
53

54
55
56 Gambling Commission (2014), "Sponsorship of British sporting clubs by gambling operators",
57
58 available at: [http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Sponsorship-of-British-sporting-clubs-](http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Sponsorship-of-British-sporting-clubs-by-gambling-operators.pdf)
59
60 [by-gambling-operators.pdf](http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Sponsorship-of-British-sporting-clubs-by-gambling-operators.pdf) (accessed 10 March 2017).

1
2
3
4
5 Geertz, C. (1973), *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Basic Books, New York.
6
7

8
9
10 Giulianotti, R. (2002), "Supporters, followers, fans, and flâneurs: A taxonomy of spectator identities
11 in football", *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 25-46.
12
13

14
15
16 Goffman, E. (1963), *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood
17 Cliffs, NJ.
18
19

20
21
22 Goldblatt, D. (2014), *The Game of Our Lives: The Meaning and Making of English Football*,
23 Penguin, UK.
24
25

26
27
28 Goodley, S. and Ashby, J. (2015) "A day at 'the gulag': what it's like to work at Sports Direct's
29 warehouse," *The Guardian*, 9th December, available at:
30
31 <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/dec/09/sports-direct-warehouse-work-conditions>
32
33 (accessed 22 June 2017).
34
35
36
37
38

39 Grohs, R. and Reisinger, H. (2014), "Sponsorship effects on brand image: The role of exposure and
40 activity involvement", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 5, pp. 1018-1025.
41
42
43
44

45 Grohs, R., Reisinger, H. and Woisetschläger, D.M. (2015), "Attenuation of negative sponsorship
46 effects in the context of rival sports teams' fans", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 11/12,
47
48 pp. 1880-1901.
49
50
51
52

53 Groza, M.D., Cobbs, J. and Schaefer, T. (2012), "Managing a sponsored brand: The importance of
54 sponsorship portfolio congruence", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 63-84.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Gwinner, K. (1997), "A model of image creation and image transfer in event sponsorship",
4
5 *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp.145-158.
6
7

8
9 Gwinner, K. and Bennett, G. (2008), "The impact of brand cohesiveness and sport identification on
10
11 brand fit in a sponsorship context", *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp.410-426.
12
13

14
15 Gwinner, K.P. and Eaton, J. (1999), "Building brand image through event sponsorship: The role of
16
17 image transfer", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 47-57.
18
19

20
21
22 Hartland, T., Skinner, H. and Griffiths, A. (2005), "Tries and conversions: are sports sponsors
23
24 pursuing the right objectives?", *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 6
25
26 No. 3, pp.20-29.
27
28

29
30 Heracleous, L. (2006), *Discourse, Interpretation, Organization*, Cambridge University Press,
31
32 Cambridge.
33
34

35
36
37 Hogg, M.A. and Abrams, D. (1988), *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup*
38
39 *Relations and Group Processes*, Routledge, London.
40
41

42
43 Johar, G.V. and Pham, M.T. (1999), "Relatedness, prominence, and constructive sponsor
44
45 identification", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 299-313.
46
47

48
49 Jones, I. (2000), "A model of serious leisure identification: The case of football fandom", *Leisure*
50
51 *Studies*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 283-298.
52
53

54
55
56 Kim, Y., Smith, R.D. and Kwak, D.H. (2018), "Feelings of gratitude: a mechanism for consumer
57
58 reciprocity", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 307-329.
59
60

1
2
3 Kim, Y.K., Smith, R. and James, J.D. (2010), "The role of gratitude in sponsorship: The case of
4 participant sports", *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 48-
5 70.
6
7
8

9
10
11 Kozinets, R.V. (2015), *Netnography*, Sage, London.
12
13

14
15
16 Kwon, E., Ratneshwar, S. and Kim, E. (2016), "Brand image congruence through sponsorship of
17 sporting events: A reinquiry of Gwinner and Eaton (1999)", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp.
18 130-138.
19
20
21

22
23
24 Lamont, M., Hing, N., and Gainsbury, S. (2011), "Gambling on sport sponsorship: A conceptual
25 framework for research and regulatory review", *Sport Management Review*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 246-
26 257.
27
28
29

30
31
32 Lough, N.L. and Irwin, R.L. (2001), "A Comparative Analysis of Sponsorship Objectives for US
33 Women's Sport and Traditional Sport Sponsorship", *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp.
34 202-211.
35
36
37

38
39
40 Madrigal, R. (2000), "The Influence of Social Alliances with Sports Teams on Intentions to Purchase
41 Corporate Sponsors' Products", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 29 No.4, pp. 13-24.
42
43
44

45
46
47 Mazodier, M. and Merunka, D. (2012), "Achieving brand loyalty through sponsorship: the role of fit
48 and self-congruity", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 40 No. 6, pp.807-820.
49
50
51

52
53
54 McDaniel, S.R. (1999), "An investigation of match-up effects in sport sponsorship advertising: The
55 implications of consumer advertising schemas", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 163-
56 184.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 McDonald, C. (1991), "Sponsorship and the Image of the Sponsor", *European Journal of Marketing*,
4
5 Vol. 25 No. 11, pp. 31-38.
6
7

8
9 Meenaghan, T. (2001), "Understanding sponsorship effects", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 2,
10
11 pp. 95-122.
12
13

14
15 Meenaghan, T. (1991), "Sponsorship: Legitimising the medium", *European Journal of Marketing*,
16
17 Vol. 25 No. 11, pp. 5-10.
18
19

20
21 Morales, A.C. (2005), "Giving firms an 'E' for effort: Consumer responses to high-effort firms",
22
23 *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 806-812.
24
25

26
27 Murtagh, L. (2007), "Implementing a critically quasi-ethnographic approach", *The Qualitative*
28
29 *Report*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 193-215.
30
31

32
33 Nakazawa, M., Yoshida, M. and Gordon, B.S. (2016), "Antecedents and consequences of sponsor-
34
35 stadium fit: Empirical evidence from a non-historic stadium context in Japan", *Sport, Business and*
36
37 *Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 407-423.
38
39

40
41 Nufer, G. and Bühler, A. (2010), "How effective is the sponsorship of global sports events? A
42
43 comparison of the FIFA World Cups in 2006 and 1998", *International Journal of Sports Marketing*
44
45 *and Sponsorship*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 33-49.
46
47
48

49
50 Olson, E.L. and Thjømmøe, H.M. (2011), "Explaining and articulating the fit construct in
51
52 sponsorship", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 57-70.
53
54

55
56 Palmatier, R.W., Jarvis, C.B., Bechkoff, J.R. and Kardes, F. R. (2009), "The role of customer
57
58 gratitude in relationship marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 73 No. 5, pp. 1-18.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Petrovici, D., Shan, Y., Gorton, M. and Ford, J. (2015), "Patriot games? Determinants of responses to
6 Chinese and foreign sponsors of the Beijing Olympics", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 68 No. 6,
7
8 pp. 1324-1331.
9

10
11
12
13 Plewa, C. and Quester, P.G. (2011), "Sponsorship and CSR: is there a link? A conceptual
14 framework", *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 22-38.
15
16
17

18
19
20 Polit, D. F. and Beck, C. T. (2010), "Generalization in quantitative and qualitative research: Myths
21 and strategies", *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, Vol. 47 No. 11, pp. 1451-1458.
22
23
24

25
26 Reysen, S., Snider, J.S. and Branscombe, N.R. (2012), "Corporate renaming of stadiums, team
27 identification, and threat to distinctiveness", *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 350-
28
29 357.
30
31

32
33
34 Rifon, N.J., Choi, S.M., Trimble, C.S. and Li, H. (2004), "Congruence effects in sponsorship: The
35 mediating role of sponsor credibility and consumer attributions of sponsor motive", *Journal of*
36
37 *Advertising*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 30-42.
38
39
40

41
42
43 Ross, S.D., James, J.D. and Vargas, P. (2006), "Development of a scale to measure team brand
44 associations in professional sport", *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 260-279.
45
46
47

48
49 Roy, D.P. and Cornwell, T.B. (1999), "Managers' use of sponsorship in building brands: service and
50 product firms contrasted", *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 1 No. 4,
51
52 pp. 33-48.
53
54
55

56
57
58 Roy, D.P. and Cornwell, T.B. (2003), "Brand equity's influence on responses to event
59 sponsorships", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 12 No. 6, pp. 377-393.
60

1
2
3
4
5 Ruth, J.A. and Simonin, B.L. (2003), “‘Brought to you by Brand A and Brand B’ Investigating
6 Multiple Sponsors’ Influence On Consumers' Attitudes Toward Sponsored Events”, *Journal of*
7
8 *Advertising*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 19-30.
9

10
11
12
13 Simmons, C.J. and Becker-Olsen, K.L. (2006), “Achieving marketing objectives through social
14 sponsorships”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 70 No. 4, pp. 154-169.
15
16
17

18
19
20 Skard, S. and Thorbjornsen, H. (2017), “Closed-ended and open-ended fit articulation:
21 Communication strategies for incongruent sponsorships”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51
22
23 No. 7/8, pp. 1414-1439.
24
25
26

27
28
29 Smith, G. (2004), “Brand Image Transfer Through Sponsorship: A Consumer Learning Perspective”,
30
31 *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 20 No. 3/4, pp. 457-474.
32
33

34
35 Snyder, C.R., Lassegard, M. and Ford, C.E. (1986), “Distancing after group success and failure:
36 Basking in reflected glory and cutting off reflected failure”, *Journal of Personality and Social*
37
38 *Psychology*, Vol. 51 No. 2, pp. 382-388.
39
40
41

42
43 Speed, R. and Thompson, P. (2000), “Determinants of sports sponsorship response”, *Journal of the*
44
45 *Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 226-238.
46
47
48

49 Stake, R.E. (2005), *Multiple Case Study Analysis*, Guilford Press, New York.
50
51

52
53 Statista. (2017), “Statistics and facts on sports betting”, available at:

54
55 <https://www.statista.com/topics/1740/sports-betting/> (accessed 10 March 2017).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tajfel, H. (1974), "Social identity and intergroup behaviour", *Information (International Social*
4 *Science Council)*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 65-93.
5
6
7

8
9 Tajfel, H. (1981), *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*, Cambridge
10 University Press, Cambridge.
11
12

13
14
15 Tajfel, H. (1982), "Social psychology of intergroup relations", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 33
16 No. 1, pp. 1-39.
17
18
19

20
21
22 Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1979), "An integrative theory of intergroup conflict", in Austin, W.G. and
23 Worchel, S. (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Brooks-Cole, Monterey, CA, pp.
24 33- 47.
25
26
27

28
29
30 Taylor, D. (2011), "Manchester City bank record £400m sponsorship deal with Etihad Airways",
31 available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/football/2011/jul/08/manchester-city-deal-etihad-airways>
32 (accessed 23 February 2017)
33
34
35

36
37
38 Tsang, J.A. (2007), "Gratitude for small and large favors: A behavioral test", *The Journal of Positive*
39 *Psychology*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 157-167.
40
41
42

43
44
45 Vuolteenaho, J., Wolny, M. and Puzey, G. (2018), "'This venue is brought to you by...': The
46 diffusion of sports and entertainment facility name sponsorship in urban Europe", *Urban Geography*,
47 1-22, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2018.1446586>.
48
49
50

51
52
53 Wann, D.L. and Branscombe, N.R. (1995), "Influence of identification with a sports team on
54 objective knowledge and subjective beliefs", *International Journal of Sport Psychology*. Vol. 26, No.
55 4, pp. 551-567.
56
57
58
59
60