

# Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/135160/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Thomas, Robert James, White, Gareth and Samuel, Anthony ORCID:  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4483-4600> 2020. Exploring children's reactions to sponsorship transition: a study of interpersonal and pro-social demands. *Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers* 21 (4) , pp. 419-433. 10.1108/YC-06-2020-1174 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/YC-06-2020-1174>  
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/YC-06-2020-1174>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies.

See

<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.





**Exploring children's reactions to sponsorship transition: a study of interpersonal and pro-social demands.**

Journal:	<i>Young Consumers</i>
Manuscript ID	YC-06-2020-1174.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	children and brands, Brand Management, Sponsorship, Event Diaries

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 Exploring children's reactions to sponsorship transition: a study of interpersonal  
4 and pro-social demands.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 **Abstract**

10  
11  
12 **Purpose** – The aim of this study is to evaluate children's perceptions and attitudes toward  
13 sponsorship transition, specifically the change from Nike to PUMA as kit sponsors for  
14 Manchester City Football Club (MCFC) in July 2019.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 **Design/methodology/approach** – A sample of 368 children, aged between 7 and 16 were  
21 recruited for the study. Utilising electronic diaries, 1,577 diary entries were captured between  
22 February 2019 and March 2020.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 **Findings** – Data reveals that children conceptualise sponsorship as a social exchange, with  
29 sponsoring brands seen as human entities and interaction with them reflecting the dynamism  
30 of social and familial relationships. Consequently, children in this study demanded prosocial  
31 and interpersonal behaviours from sponsors and sponsee during the transition period.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37  
38 **Research limitations/implications** – The research has an immediate and direct application for  
39 brand managers and the sponsee when considering terminating long-term sponsorship. Both  
40 the departing and incoming sponsors can maximise their relationships with these younger fans  
41 through an orchestrated departure, arrival, and dedicated handover.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 **Practical implications** – The findings enable marketing brand managers to effectively evaluate  
49 sponsor transition to maximise opportunities to maintain, and indeed start, brand relationships  
50 with younger fans.  
51  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 **Originality/value** – This is the first study that has examined sponsorship children's responses  
57 to sponsorship transition.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Keywords** – Children and Brands, Brand Management, Sponsorship, Brand Relationships,  
4  
5 Event Diaries.  
6  
7

8 **Paper type** – Research paper  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
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

Young Consumers

1  
2  
3 Exploring children's reactions to sponsorship transition: a study of interpersonal  
4  
5  
6 and pro-social demands.  
7  
8

## 9 **Introduction**

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Sponsorship has been declared a 'huge' industry (Lee and Suh, 2020). It has found resonance  
15  
16 in the world of sport (van Rijn *et al.*, 2019) as it has the capacity to exact significant  
17  
18 commercial leverage (Toscani and Prendergast, 2018), reach substantive audiences  
19  
20 (Woisetschläger and Michaelis, 2012), enhance brand awareness and reputation (van Rijn *et*  
21  
22 *al.*, 2019), and promote fans' identification (Lee *et al.*, 2020). Moreover, sponsorship  
23  
24 represents a sophisticated means of inciting consumption (Dos Santos *et al.*, 2019) and benefits  
25  
26 from fans' affective relationships with their team (Velicia Martín, Toledo and Palos-Sanchez,  
27  
28 2020). It is this relationship between sponsor and team that is the catalyst for the sponsor and  
29  
30 the fan developing a long-term, strategically essential relationship (Thomas, 2014). But despite  
31  
32 fan engagement with sponsorship being categorised as a "behavioural phenomenon"  
33  
34 (Chadwick and Thwaites, 2006), what is known about fan behaviour during sponsorship  
35  
36 transition is limited. This is problematic, as Thomas (2015) indicates that teams within the  
37  
38 English Premier League (EPL) make an almost arbitrary switch from kit sponsor to kit sponsor  
39  
40 every 3–5 years, with at least five teams a season making a transition from one sponsor to  
41  
42 another (www.scoreandchange.com). Adidas and Nike dominate as favoured brands in these  
43  
44 transitional periods, collectively sponsoring 10 of the available 20 teams that make up the EPL,  
45  
46 and the current transition under investigation (Nike to PUMA) is representative of this  
47  
48 continuous shift.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 However, given the almost constant transition in the league, Thomas (2015) suggests that what  
58  
59 we currently know about the transition period between sponsorships is limited and should be  
60

1  
2  
3 considered “insufficient” (p. 240). Such is the paucity that much of the research has been  
4  
5 established to investigate the discontinuation of sponsorship (Chadwick and Thwaites, 2006;  
6  
7 Farrelly, 2010; Kruger *et al.*, 2014; Jensen and Cornwell, 2017; van Rijn *et al.*, 2019) and how  
8  
9 to manage that process (Dick, 2018). Little or nothing is known about the physical, emotional  
10  
11 and strategic transition from the fans’ perspective, and what has been considered has invariably  
12  
13 focused on attitudes toward a new sponsor (Carrillat and Grohs, 2019), sponsor exit (Ruth and  
14  
15 Strizhakova, 2012), and how consumers recall former sponsors (Edeling *et al.*, 2017). To date,  
16  
17 only Thomas and Roeseler (2013) and Thomas (2015) have explored this transition. Their  
18  
19 studies incorporated the DFL Deutsche Fußball Liga or Bundesliga and the EPL, incorporating  
20  
21 leading clubs (Dortmund and Tottenham Hotspur), and concluded that adult fans viewed this  
22  
23 period with cynicism (Thomas, 2015), questioning the “overarching positivity associated with  
24  
25 sponsorship” (Thomas and Roeseler, 2013, p. 188) and the notion that fans engage volitionally  
26  
27 with transition. The paucity is far greater when it comes to children. To date no research has  
28  
29 been undertaken with this key group. This is a significant theoretical gap, as when it comes  
30  
31 brands, children are said to be a “critical constituent group” (Bergstrom and Blumenthal, 2001,  
32  
33 p. 23) with distinct views which lay the ground work for future brand engagement  
34  
35 (Drake-Bridges and Burgess, 2010). Importantly, children are said to collate distinct brand  
36  
37 ideas (Daems *et al.*, 2019) and can articulate and rationalise why they like or dislike a brand  
38  
39 (Lopez and Rodriguez, 2018) from an early age (Jones and Glynn, 2019). Pertinent to this  
40  
41 reach, children are said to be deeply affected and influenced by sponsors brands (Grohs *et al.*,  
42  
43 2012), and particularly sponsoring brands in sport (Bestman *et al.*, 2015). Like their adult  
44  
45 counterparts, children have a strong propensity to purchase club merchandise (Bauer *et al.*,  
46  
47 2008) borne out of an affective bond with the sponsor and team with a sponsors offering  
48  
49 considered a key product for children aged between 7-15 when it comes to their own  
50  
51 independent spending (Mintel, 2018, Mintel,2019). However, we know nothing about their  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 emotions, feelings, and opinions when it comes to sponsorship transition and given the above  
4  
5 the work seeks to explore children's perceptions of sponsorship transition. Adopting a  
6  
7 qualitative approach, the following broad research question was derived to address the research  
8  
9 aim:

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 *RQ1*: How do children react to sponsorship transition?  
16  
17  
18

19 Given the above RQ, this research yields four contributions. Firstly, utilising a unique  
20  
21 methodological approach, we further the theoretical understanding of children's relationships  
22  
23 with sponsors. Secondly, we reveal that children's engagement with sponsors during transition  
24  
25 is fundamentally different to that exhibited by adults. Thirdly, this study offers insight for brand  
26  
27 managers as to how they might interact with children during sponsorship transition , and finally  
28  
29 the study contributes to the literature by providing a solid theoretical foundation for future  
30  
31 research into the sponsorship transition period.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 **Review of the literature**

### 39 *Sponsorship/sports sponsorship*

40  
41 A major predicate for engaging in sponsorship is the opportunity for brands to "create brand  
42  
43 meaning" (Toscani and Prendergast, 2018, p.339) in what is an ever-changing, cluttered, and  
44  
45 capricious business environment (Yuan *et al.*, 2019). Gwinner and Swanson (2003) suggested  
46  
47 that the field of sports is a suitable area for sponsorship as sponsoring brands provide fans with  
48  
49 a collective identity. Thus, fans across a myriad of sports, leagues and countries are theorised  
50  
51 as those with the greatest predilection to volitionally engage with, consume and become  
52  
53 attached to a sponsoring brand (Thomas, 2015). It is this capacity to purchase club merchandise  
54  
55 and, ultimately, become brand resonant in the most lucid of ways that drives sponsorship in  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 this sphere. Fans, then, are “the supreme authority” (Dionísio and Leal, 2008, p.18), and  
4 without them, games, leagues, sports and, indeed, sponsors potentially perish. However, Doyle  
5  
6  
7  
8 *et al.* (2013) advocated that that fan behaviour and fan identification are not fixed entities, and  
9  
10 work by Thomas and Roeseler (2013) found fans to be fickle, capricious entities, wary of  
11  
12 sponsors and reticent in relation to loyalty and commitment. This echoes work by Thomas  
13  
14 (2018), who suggested that sponsorship does not always deepen bonds with fans, and we posit  
15  
16 that these behaviours need to be explored in the context of children, as children make their own  
17  
18 knowledge of the world around them (Agante and Pascoal, 2019).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

### 24 **Sponsorship transition**

25  
26  
27  
28 Grey and Skildum-Reid (2001) indicated that when sponsorship does end, it has the capacity  
29  
30 to personally and collectively damage those involved. This is echoed by Ruth and Strizhakova  
31  
32 (2012), Kruger *et al.*, (2014), Jensen and Cornwell (2017) and Dick (2018), who all suggested  
33  
34 that saying ‘goodbye’ is a distinct process that needs to be managed properly. More emotively,  
35  
36 Cornwell (2014) posited that sponsorship termination and transition can manifest in  
37  
38 perceptions of abandonment by what he refers to as “customers”. Interestingly, and writing  
39  
40 more recently, Grohs *et al.* (2016) found that in a footballing context incorporating one club,  
41  
42 sponsorship duration could impact on this negative perception of the departing sponsor. Dick  
43  
44 and Uhrich (2017) looked at fans’ perceptions of forced versus volitional sponsor exit,  
45  
46 concluding that volitional exit can create intense negativity. Capitalising on this contribution,  
47  
48 and again utilising the lower German football leagues, Dick (2018) evaluated gradual versus  
49  
50 entire sponsorship termination, with the data advocating a sequential departure to avoid censure  
51  
52 and enmity. Outside of the football sphere, Delia (2017) evaluated termination in the context  
53  
54 of a Spanish professional cycling team and the end of the 20-year relationship with its major  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 sponsor, Euskaltel, and found gratitude to be the overwhelming emotion expressed. Hence, the  
4 nominal body of literature reveals significant paradox and suggests that fans, dependent on  
5 sport and context, can be enigmatic and unpredictable. However, it is apparent that the literature  
6 has become fixated on termination rather than on the schematic process that occurs during  
7 transition, and it is this that drives the current research.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 **Children, brands, sponsorship, and fandom**

18  
19  
20

21 Brand preferences are said to form in early childhood (Folkvord *et al.*, 2019). Brand  
22 engagement is a normative feature of young lives (Jones and Glynn, 2019) in which  
23 sociocultural and a myriad of contextual experiences drive engagement (Folkvord *et al.*, 2019).  
24 Early relationships with brands are predicated on perceptual cues such as tangible form, colour  
25 and taste, while the more advanced analytical stage is a time when children, invariably between  
26 the ages of 7 and 11, start to assign subjective meanings to brands (Folkvord *et al.*, 2019). By  
27 11 years of age, these choices are fully developed, and children can express their preferences  
28 and articulate their relationships with brands in a critical and competent manner (Grønhøj and  
29 Gram, 2020). These preferences extend to sport and, as football fans, children are said to have  
30 “powerful” connections to their teams (Tamir, 2019), with football a predominant factor in  
31 their young lives. Fandom provides identity, bonds, immediate friendships (Thomson and  
32 Williams, 2014), popularity and social status (End *et al.*, 2004), and for children, being a fan  
33 is said to satisfy the intrinsic need for “belongingness and acceptance” (Gardikiotis *et al.*,  
34 2014). In terms of sponsorship, empirical investigations dating back over nearly four decades  
35 have established that children understand the purpose and intent of sponsorship from an early  
36 age (Aitken *et al.*, 1986) and have the ability to recall sponsors’ brands in a sports context  
37 (Bestman *et al.*, 2015).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Ledwith (1984) was among the first to recognise that for children, exposure to sponsorship,  
4 particularly televised sponsorship, was a powerful communications tool. This seminal work  
5 concluded that such exposure could result in a positive image being created and a heightened  
6 capacity to recall the sponsoring brand. Building on Ledwith's (1984), Simões and Agante,  
7 (2014) suggest that children constitute "new targets" when it comes to sponsorship (Simões  
8 and Agante, 2014). Children are regularly exposed to professional sport (Kelly et al., 2014),  
9 and are, therefore regularly exposed to sponsorship messages. O'Brien and Vandenburg (2020)  
10 referred to this as an initiation given the centrality of sport, particularly football (Thomson and  
11 Williams, 2014) in children's lives resulting in children being regarded as highly susceptible  
12 (Pettigrew et al., 2013) to the messages provided by sponsors. Sponsoring brands, then, become  
13 part of the child's lived experience and are to be considered as significant relational partners  
14 for children (Simões and Agante, 2014). To that end, this study seeks to explore children's  
15 responses to a transition between these relational partners.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **Context of the research**

35  
36 MCFC is a UK-based Premier League football team. It was taken over by 'The Abu Dhabi  
37 Group' in 2008, making it the sixth richest club in the world, worth \$2.688 billion (Obiero,  
38 2020). It has enjoyed extraordinary success in recent years, winning the Premiership in 2018  
39 and 2019 and the League Cup in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (www.mancity.com). Its current deal  
40 with PUMA will earn the club up to £65 million a season over the next decade (Ducker, 2019),  
41 representing a significant increase in revenue from their previous six-year deal with Nike,  
42 which was worth £20 million a season.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **Method**

#### 54 *Pilot study*

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 After obtaining institutional ethics clearance in September 2018, a pilot study undertaken with  
4 18 participants (11 male and 7 female) in January 2019. Schools were selected in the  
5 Manchester area via official statistics utilising non-probability sampling. Schools were  
6 contacted in an open letter outlining the rationale, and with a specific request for MCFC fans.  
7  
8 46 parental acknowledgements were received with 18 children participating. Parents,  
9 guardians, or responsible adults were fully informed of the nature of the research via an  
10 information pack which also contained ethics documentation. Prior to the actual data collection  
11 potential participants were asked to categorise themselves as either ‘Casual’ fans (C) who  
12 attend 1–9 games per season, ‘Regular’ (R) who attend 10–18 games, or finally ‘Fanatics’ (F)  
13 who attend more than 18 games. Of the 18 children taking part, 14 declared themselves F and  
14 4 as R.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 The main data collection utilised electronic event diaries. This approach offered the opportunity  
30 for participants to provide more accurate insights (Radcliffe, 2013) into their “opinions,  
31 feelings and emotions” (Siemieniako and Kubacki, 2013, p.299) in real time, and remove the  
32 necessity of recalling experiences, situations, or past motivations (van Erde et al., 2005). To  
33 facilitate this ‘real time’ opportunity, respondents were asked to record in their diary each time  
34 they considered the sponsorship transition. An email address was set up to receive diary entries  
35 and participants were asked to send all entries to it.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

#### 46 *Main data collection*

47  
48

49 The main data collection commenced in February 2019 using the same method as the pilot  
50 study. Altogether 368 children took part (249 male, 119 female) between the ages of 7 and 16.  
51 Of the 249 male participants, 83% (206) declared themselves as F and 16% (43) R, while 51%  
52 (60) of female participants F, 41% (49) were R and 8% (10) were C.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 During the 13-month data collection period, 1,642 individual entries were received. Entries  
4 invariably came in blocks, reflecting media coverage, player transfer stories, build-up to the  
5 new season and game days. The approach generated an average of 97 entries per month, 24 per  
6 week, equating to 3 entries per day. Word count varied from a minimum of 15 to a maximum  
7 of 128. Of the 1,642 entries, 4% (65 entries) were deemed to be unconnected and, consequently,  
8 1,577 entries were included in the analysis.  
9

### 17 *Analysis*

20 73 codes were derived supporting three dominant themes of 'Involvement', 'Gratitude' and  
21 'Incumbent Responsibility'. The analyses were authenticated through intercoder agreement,  
22 consisting of the use of an independent coder from faculty who was familiar with the major  
23 theoretical lenses and context of the research. Inter-rater reliability was calculated using  
24 Cohen's Kappa for the resultant codes. Kappa for the initial coding was 'very strong' (0.76)  
25 (Hassan et al., 2019). Both coders subsequently agreed the identification of the above three  
26 themes.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **Findings**

### 42 *Involvement*

45 What was apparent from the initial diary entries was the desire for children to be involved in  
46 the transitional process. Pertinent to the central RQ, there was a deluge of initial entries that  
47 revealed children's disdain for the two sponsors involved for not cementing and facilitating  
48 their relationships with them. The need for personal involvement in the process was palpable,  
49 and children in this study saw transition as very much a personal domain. This was captured in  
50 the following diary entry, which is representative of the major theme:  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *I'm really sad that nobody wanted to talk to us about this. I go to the fanzone every home game,*  
4 *but nobody wanted to tell us anything. I think were [sic] the most important City fans as well*  
5 *[sic] be there for a long time, we should have nown [sic] first. Me and my friends really wanted*  
6 *to have the big picture. We would have been chuffed [slang for 'happy'] with that. [P121, male,*  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
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

aged 12]

This type of entry was replicated for several weeks during the initial stage of data collection. In analysis, it was considered that this might simply be a case of football's personal salience to the individual, but it became clear that this was situationally specific and distanced from the game itself. It was considered, therefore, that when it came to sponsorship transition, children in this study had a narrow latitude of acceptance for change without a 'big picture' dialogue. The next extracts again capture the personal relevance of this sponsorship shift and the need to be involved:

*I've gone to every single game since I was 4 and this [is the] first big change, but it didn't feel special to me as it wasn't like a special announcement. I wanted to know personally because I love the club. [P246, Male, age 12]*

*I don't understand it. If I go to every game at the Etihad [MCFC's stadium] and they know I do, why wasn't I told about this months ago? It's my club, my players, my team, and my little bit of history. I'm gutted [colloquial term for disappointment] to find out second hand. [P10, Male, age 13].*

Children arguably saw this period in the club's history as pivotal, and anomalous to them as fans, and the situational element caused significant intrinsic motivation to be involved. This is potentially good news for any non-incumbent brand as there is the opportunity to capitalise on this articulated desire for involvement. However, in analysis it was considered that there may be a strong 'maven' element to this viewpoint, and such a viewpoint may well have been

1  
2  
3 disseminated more generally through brand publics associated with MCFC. Nevertheless, the  
4  
5 desire to be involved in any capacity was part of a personal value system and very much a  
6  
7 personal goal.  
8  
9

### 10 *Incumbent Gratitude*

11  
12  
13 Pertinent to RQ1, coding revealed gratitude as a major theme. 273 extracts demanded this and  
14  
15 indicated a degree of incredulity that Nike had gone without saying thank you. The following  
16  
17 two extracts capture this:  
18  
19

20  
21 *Nike have just gone! Cheers for that! What about a little bit of “thanks a million you lot, you’ve*  
22  
23 *been awesome as fans and thanks for buying a home and away shirt and getting down to Ashton*  
24  
25 *New road [Etihad Stadium address] to spend all your money”? They should have thanked us*  
26  
27 *big time for that. It’s the right thing when you’ve been there that long. [P36, Female, age 12]*

28  
29  
30 *Is it too much to expect a thank you when you’ve given a company so much? No, its [sic] not!*  
31  
32 *I feel like they’ve [Nike] cadged from us [local term for stealing] and run off. I’m gutted*  
33  
34 *[colloquial term for disappointment] by that. [P147, Female, age 12]*  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 It was apparent in the diary entries that there was disappointment toward the departing sponsor  
40  
41 for a perceived lack of gratitude. However, 301 entries indicated that this could be ameliorated  
42  
43 for if Nike had considered distinct event to mark their departure. This is represented in extracts  
44  
45 from participants 219 and 300:  
46  
47

48  
49 *... why can’t they have a party for us [?] It would make us all feel a bit more wanted and show*  
50  
51 *how important we are to them [Nike] even though they’re going, and we’d talk about that for*  
52  
53 *a long time. [P219, Female, age 13]*  
54  
55

56  
57 *We’ve been Kings of English football for three years and Nike should have a mint [colloquial*  
58  
59 *term for good] party for all the young supporters ....[P300, Male, age 14]*  
60

### *Nonincumbent Gratitude*

Data also revealed that similar expressions of gratitude should be given by the new sponsor. 213 diary extracts indicated that PUMA should take the opportunity express gratitude for the opportunity of being at Manchester City. This is captured in the extracts below:

*We're one of the best teams in the World and PUMA aren't the best manufacturer, so I really think we're doing them a favour and they should acknowledge that. Where's our big HELLO [emphasis in original extract] from PUMA? That's tight [local slang for a lack of generosity] of them. [P9, Male, age 14]*

*Where are the flags, gifts, and party from PUMA? It doesn't have to be dramatic, but I think it would work with us. What they've done so far is pitiful and they should be ashamed. [P237, Female, age 13]*

What we see in the above is a continuity in thinking regarding sponsorship and transition. These demands for gratitude didn't diminish during data collection, and the data indicates that these perspectives, attitudes and indeed, needs may not evolve until they experience several sponsorship transitions.

### *Gratitude and Incentives*

Participants also indicated that both Nike and PUMA should express their gratitude through incentives. 198 entries advocated this such acts foster a relationship with the Nike after departure and begin a relationship with PUMA. The entries from below capture this data stream:

*I've been thinking that Nike should contact us all with a discount code as a thank you and then we'll probably remember them in 10 or 15 years when lots of companies [sponsors] have come and gone. [P14, Male, age 14]*

1  
2  
3 *It would have been buzzing* [colloquial term for exciting] *if they could have sent some vouchers*  
4 *or a money off code to say cheers* [colloquial term for thank you] *for the last 5 years. It would*  
5 *cost them NOTHING* [emphasis in original extract]. (P254, male aged 15)  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Despite this, however, there is no definite indication in the data that there would be an  
12 immediate impact on sales, and while that was not the sole purpose of the paper, there is a clear  
13 indication that attitudes toward both Nike and PUMA as brands could through reciprocity.  
14  
15  
16

### 17 *Incumbent Responsibility*

18  
19  
20  
21 There was a unique data stream where children, exclusively girls, wanted to see Nike and  
22 PUMA engage into a strategic handover. This topic generated 142 extracts: with the two below  
23 capturing this train of thought:  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 *Its [sic] been weeks now since they'd announced this, but wouldnt [sic] it be so much better if*  
29 *they had 10 minutes before a big game the next game to hand over control like they do at the*  
30 *Olympics. Everybody likes that and everybody gets on board with it; the Liverpool game on*  
31 *the 9<sup>th</sup> would be perfect* [Premier League fixture on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2019]. [P53, Female, age  
32 15]  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 *Big game in December against the Reds* [local name for Manchester United] *so we get Nike*  
42 *and PUMA to shake hands and show what a different club we are to all the rest when it comes*  
43 *to behaving well and respecting each other.* [P19, Female, aged 13]  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 This theme also generated 42 instances where participants felt that Nike should assist PUMA  
50 with the transition given the relative size of MCFC and the task of replacing Nike. This element  
51 is captured in the extract below:  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 *Nike should go out of their way to support PUMA and give them a helping hand so PUMA can*  
57 *understand City* [local term for MCFC] *better and get the most from us like Nike did.* [P64,  
58 Female, age 10]  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 This highly personalised desire to see harmony between the sponsors was unique within this  
4 data set. It was analysed as being part of an intrinsic value system, honed at home , where the  
5 individuals may have witnessed individuals offering one another support. In these extracts then,  
6  
7 we again see how human interactions are encoded and transferred onto the sponsor by children.  
8  
9

## 13 **Discussion**

16 The findings overall indicate that children see their relationships with sponsors as they do  
17 human ones. Domestic lessons, observations, and parental conditioning impact on how children  
18 view relationships with sponsors and consequently children give sponsors, a nonhuman entity,  
19 human traits and therefore demand very human interactions with them. Such behaviours can  
20 prove “useful when consumers need help making sense of uncertain situations” (Yang et al.,  
21 2020, p. 4), and we believe that this is the reason why children in this data have demanded  
22 communication, reciprocity, respect, understanding and a need to be at the heart of the  
23 transition process. Furthering this proposition, and borrowing from Kefr’s (1981) Priority  
24 Theory, children demanded to be acknowledged in this transitional period by the sponsors (s)  
25 with this we believe reflecting the dynamics of their familial settings. We believe to make sense  
26 of the transition children were drawing on their own social knowledge to understand an  
27 anomalous event in their relatively young lives.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

### 44 *The full ‘Goodbye’ (gratitude)*

47 This efficacy in evaluating sponsors as a human entity was manifest tin the extracts that  
48 demanded the departing sponsor (Nike) to ‘goodbye’ officially. To that end, the demand for  
49 this seemed predicated on observed behaviours that when a relationship ends there is a  
50 formality that precedes finality. It implies that for children, responding to sponsorship change  
51 is viewed in the same way as responding to relational change. The ‘goodbye’ then almost  
52 seemed to act an explicit conversation where comfort could perhaps be taken, as for many  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 participants it was clear that this this was the first experience of sponsorship transition. We  
4 believe the 'goodbye' was necessary for children as they clearly felt the sponsors departure as  
5 a loss rather than traditional football occurrence. For brand managers, then, this type of  
6 ritualised 'goodbye' could be transformative. Such an event would allow the sponsor to leave  
7 with their reputation intact and leave a lasting impression on this key group. Although the  
8 sponsor is not obligated to conform to such a role, brand managers should be mindful of the  
9 heightened emotions of departure, particularly for those developing a social lens and such a  
10 'goodbye' would be seen as supportive and ultimately affirmative in the mind of a child.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 *The full 'Hello' (reciprocity)*

23  
24  
25 Very much like the demand on Nike to say 'goodbye', there was also an onus on PUMA to say  
26 'hello'. It was palpable that an open, sincere, and very public affirmation would not only be  
27 welcomed by children but also reciprocated by them. Very much like the 'goodbye' the call for  
28 an official 'hello' is indicative of the proposition that children perceive of sponsorship  
29 interaction like human interaction, and sponsors should act in a manner that reflects social  
30 cordiality and the social knowledge children have at that given time. Saying 'hello' is clearly  
31 something that all children have been conditioned to do when meeting new people and that is  
32 a minimum expectation from the sponsor. Consequently, the new sponsor has a defined role in  
33 the mind of the child and that extends beyond match day and simply being on a shirt. To that  
34 end, we do not believe that this sentiment should be dismissed as superficial. It should be  
35 considered as a focused, reflective, and indicative understanding of how children perceive the  
36 problems sponsors face and should therefore address when arriving at a new club.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 *Incentives*

53  
54  
55 From older participants (14+), 143 accounts suggested that after consideration, Nike should be  
56 providing a parting gift or an incentive to maintain a positive mental evaluation of the brand.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This was conceptualised as Nike exhibiting gratitude. The sponsorship literature suggests that  
4 gratitude is commonly used as a mediating construct (Kim et al., 2010) between fan and  
5 sponsor, but in this instance, fans saw it as an integral part of the brand's continuing function  
6 with them, and part of a continued emotional bond, with the element of reciprocity reversed.  
7  
8 Interestingly, this was not predicated on a sense of deal proneness or avarice, but, again,  
9 connected indelibly to this notion of gratitude. It seemed to be conceptualised as a symbolic  
10 gesture rather than something distinct and to be acted upon, and consequently the symbolism  
11 contained within that act was enough to retain the bond. It seems paradoxical to utilise these  
12 ingratiation tools at the end of a relationship, but it was indubitable in the data that such a  
13 simplistic act could be used as a substantive vehicle to reinforce Nike's brand, inject significant  
14 vigour into its perception and assist with WOM and eWOM going forward.

### 28 29 *Empathy*

30  
31  
32 Of additional interest in the extracts above are the inferences and nuanced dictums of  
33 expressions of sympathy for PUMA as a new sponsor entering an agreement where the  
34 incumbent had had an extended and successful tenure in terms of on-field success and contract  
35 extensions. Multiple readings indicated that children in the sample group were exhibiting high  
36 levels of emotional intelligence in this context. To be able to conceptualise the potential malaise  
37 of entering an arrangement where there might be significant reciprocity is problematic, and it  
38 showed a remarkable insight and represented an unexpected addition to the data set. Given the  
39 interpretation of these events, a subsequent review of the literature found that no other research  
40 had revealed or tested this ability to sympathise with new sponsors.

### 52 53 *Mutual support*

54  
55  
56 It seems a strategic paradox that the incumbent brand would actively facilitate the arrival of  
57 another, but the outcome of such a paradox could enhance the transference of positive emotion  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and recall of the incumbent brand. It doesn't seem ideologically coherent but is indicative of a  
4 child's understanding of football and sponsorship. In analysis it was considered that these  
5 statements were evidence of a new football fan who perhaps has a more socially constructed  
6 lens that doesn't reflect the vehemence of previous generations. We say this as the extracts  
7 relating to this do not reflect any known theoretical insight, nor do they support any models  
8 that relate to sponsorship and are therefore indicative of new thinking within this generation.  
9  
10 The application of emotional intelligence to sponsorship is certainly anomalous, and so is a  
11 physical transfer, but given the sentiment behind this, the benefits for Nike 'post-mortem' and  
12 PUMA 'adventu' are clear.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

### 24 **Managerial implications**

25  
26  
27 The first thing to note managerially is that children are a unique cluster when it comes to  
28 sponsorship transition, and the behaviours manifest are very different from those of their adult  
29 counterparts. They have a distinct competence and seem to relate to brands as they would to  
30 other people, and social perception is transferred onto brand perception. Sponsor relationships  
31 are evaluated against expected interpersonal gestures and behaviours that have been witnessed  
32 and encoded outside of sport. To that end, children are not judgemental about leaving or  
33 arriving sponsors and we therefore see none of the traditional enmity or tensions that pervade  
34 the literature. Given this uniqueness, the overriding issue is that of managing expectation and  
35 demands. However, the possibility of acquiescing to children's needs and wants in this  
36 transitional period could pay dividends for both the incumbent and new entrant.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 *Simple social psychology*

51  
52  
53 The recurring theme within the data, regardless of the period, was the necessity of exhibiting  
54 gratitude for the opportunity to have developed a relationship with the fans, or, indeed,  
55 gratitude for the opportunity to develop a relationship. For brand managers, this does require a  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 level of performance on the part of the brand that perhaps has not been considered, but in terms  
4 of generating consumer joy or delight in this transitional period, creating what might be an  
5 unprecedented event, given the complexity of developing brand relationships, could be  
6 beneficial. Brand managers must consider the relative cost against the impact of inducing a  
7 positive psychology at the point of departure and under any circumstance the transference of  
8 involvement and ultimately brand trust and loyalty to a competitor. Therefore, the possibility  
9 of a club-controlled or fanzone-controlled open welcome – or, indeed, goodbye – could be  
10 beneficial for sponsor and sponsee. This may have far more impact than standardised PR and  
11 allows sponsors to become part of social structures far beyond the club. To that end, such  
12 elements can help bridge the abstraction of a brand as a team-based phenomenon and take on  
13 a more dynamic, relevant role, taking advantage of the children’s need for proactive knowing  
14 about brands through these expressions of gratitude. This data indicated that children are  
15 clearly relationally dependent, and brands are very much seen in that context. However, these  
16 processes of gratitude do not need to be complex and most certainly should not reflect a  
17 dominant sponsor ‘faking it’ to elicit a positive response. To that end, this represents an  
18 opportunity for the brand itself to become socialised rather than preoccupied on immediate  
19 ROI. Consequently, the following might be considered to minimise cost and maximise impact:

- 20 • Micro targeting through the club, fanzones and kids’ fanzones
- 21 • Targeting family ticket holders
- 22 • Competition winners
- 23 • An exclusive offer
- 24 • Ticketed event on general sale
- 25 • Enhanced social competence.

26 Such initiatives might also allow the incoming sponsor to manage the perception that they have  
27 simply selected a global marketing vehicle without consideration of the fan base. This, in turn,

1  
2  
3 could enhance brand attachment and the actual purchase behaviours of these younger, highly  
4 impressionable consumers. To that end, it is feasible that sponsorship deals with this age group  
5 may not be temporal (van Rijn *et al.*, 2019). There is the distinct possibility that a brand  
6 manager might continue with a relationship reflective of what Huber *et al.* (2015) referred to  
7 as a friendship.  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 13 14 15 *Incentives*

16  
17  
18 The data relating to the outgoing sponsor suggested that an affective relationship could be  
19 maintained through incentives. These need for incentive; we believe also reflected social  
20 norms. Children has quite possibly been rewarded for being good and had perhaps been  
21 incentivised to be good within their familial surroundings. This expectancy from sponsors  
22 reflected their own lived experiences and factored into how they believed they should be  
23 rewarded for engagement. However, should incentives be considered managerially, a range of  
24 questions emerge, the primary question relating to what constitutes a fair incentive when  
25 departing. A myriad of characteristics could influence this, including age, education, parental  
26 socio-economic status, culture, siblings, expectancy, and a plethora of situational factors. There  
27 are undoubtedly ethical concerns and there is inherent complexity in simply handing out  
28 ‘money off’ opportunities for brands to possibly to maintain a relationship. But it is considered  
29 that children see this as simple a transaction, very much like getting pocket money for doing  
30 something positive, or an expected allowance. What we do know is that offering a low-value  
31 incentive can have the reverse effect and reduce behavioural intentions – and that is  
32 problematic. But the choice of proper incentives is a critical step in strategic planning, and  
33 unsuitable in this context, and frankly, volitional incentives could reduce intrinsic motivation  
34 to engage anyway. Given this we posit that shared knowledge is a far better incentive to  
35 maintain a relationship as this reflects the overall desire to be involved. Hence, to mitigate the  
36 need to ostensibly reward good behaviour, in transition, personalised communications could  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 be created to manage departure, and we believe this would be a much more powerful tool for  
4  
5 managing the transition.  
6  
7

### 8 *Incumbent Responsibility* 9

10  
11 While seemingly at odds strategically, the data revealed that children, predominantly female,  
12  
13 wanted evidence of a smooth transition between the incumbent and non-incumbent sponsor.  
14  
15 With a strong focus on social harmony, children did not see this type of obeisance as conflicting  
16  
17 or a competition, but as a responsibility to enhance and ease the transitional period. But it is  
18  
19 indicative of a focus not seen previously in the sponsorship literature: this constant narrative  
20  
21 did indicate that children are predetermined to want to accept and facilitate sponsorship  
22  
23 relations under the right conditions, with many of those being off the field. Consequently,  
24  
25 participants indicated that they wanted a visible, tangible handover that represented their values  
26  
27 and indicated the rarefied opportunity being afforded to the non-incumbent brand (PUMA).  
28  
29 Consequently, data indicated that a symbolic handover would be appreciated. However, as a  
30  
31 decision-making scenario and given levels of competition in the professional football leagues,  
32  
33 this does seem something of a dilemma. Thus, the tasks here are to address firstly the positive  
34  
35 and secondly the negative impacts. Positively, the following are considerations:  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

- 41 • Impact on perceptual and conceptual development of child consumers
  - 42 • Relational development/PR opportunity
  - 43 • Novelty
  - 44 • Exposure (local, national, international)
  - 45 • Heightened brand awareness/brand perception
  - 46 • Enhanced social competence
  - 47 • Enhanced reputation
  - 48 • WOM/eWOM.
- 49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 There would be some negativity, as such cordiality may provoke fans – older fans with more  
4 established values and a more traditional lens when it comes to rival clubs and sponsoring  
5 brands. Such a handover may not be relevant and could be perceived as a gimmick and be met  
6 with resistance from more established fans.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

### 12 *Dilemma*

13  
14  
15  
16 As stated above, the issue is that any strategic ‘hello’ or ‘goodbye’ can generate several  
17 interactional dilemmas for both brands and possibly also the sponsee. This represents a  
18 dilemma relating to the ability to really neutralise any pre-existing relationships with the  
19 outgoing brand and maximise self-interest. Dealing with this group of fans, then, is  
20 undoubtedly a complex process and the transition period between sponsorships beginning and  
21 ending is seemingly pivotal. Each action has the possibility to enhance or diminish brand  
22 interaction with fans, but it means moving away from conventional and traditional approaches  
23 and maximising the weeks and months between announcement and the new season beginning  
24 in order to capitalise and cement relationships with this key group. To conclude this section  
25 and conceptualise the above, we present a gestalt of potential benefits of engaging with the  
26 elements outlined in the data set. We see the three major themes as interconnected and present  
27 them as such.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

### 45 **The role of the club**

46  
47 Pivotal in this potential shift is the sponsee. We advocate that the club themselves should play  
48 an active part in facilitating and orchestrating the elements outlined above, As key decision  
49 makers , the clubs will actually be aware of a timeline, will hold fan data and will have the  
50 capacity to hold official ‘hellos’, ‘goodbyes’ and symbolic handovers, as demanded in the data.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59 The sponsee is the quintessential gatekeeper and, given children’s evaluation of sponsorship as  
60



1  
2  
3 an interpersonal phenomenon, the sponsee, in this instance MCFC, needs to manage the  
4 personal, psychological, and social experience of long-term sponsorship transition. However,  
5  
6 when simplified, the data aligns with the rudimentary tenets of events management and, to that  
7  
8 end, should not be foreign practice to clubs of this size and with almost unlimited resources.  
9  
10  
11

### 12 13 **Limitations**

14  
15  
16 The transitional period under investigation reflects a period of unprecedented success on the  
17 pitch for MCFC, and that may have influenced the diary entries. Additionally, given the  
18  
19 timeframe of the study, it is conceivable that children had the opportunity to consider the  
20  
21 transition and therefore not all entries may have been spontaneous. Moreover, friendships and  
22  
23 contact between participants cannot be discounted, and neither can peer influence, social  
24  
25 pressures and, indeed, parental influence. MCFC is a global entity and this study did not  
26  
27 incorporate children from outside of the UK who may follow the club. Also, in terms of fan  
28  
29 typology, casual fans – that is, transient fans – were underrepresented in the sample.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **Future research**

36  
37  
38 There should be a continuation of this work to see whether children who support MCFC outside  
39  
40 of the local area share similar attitudes and express the same demands. Additionally, there a  
41  
42 myriad of opportunities to explore this paradigm within football and, indeed, other major sports  
43  
44 across the globe.  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **Conclusion**

49  
50  
51 The work provides revelatory insight into how children encode, feel and experience  
52  
53 sponsorship transition. Data indicates that children see themselves as central actors in this  
54  
55 crucial period, demanding dialogue, acknowledgment and more viscerally genuflect and  
56  
57 obeisance from all parties. Beyond that, data clearly demonstrates that children view transition  
58  
59 in the context of their own human relationships. They apply social norms and collective  
60

1  
2  
3 representations of what is acceptable behaviour when one relationship ends, and another begins  
4  
5 and project this onto the parties involved. This offers new insights for brand managers and  
6  
7 reveals how children want sponsors to work together to facilitate their expectations, enhance  
8  
9 experience and maximise opportunity.  
10  
11

## 12 13 REFERENCES

14  
15  
16 Agante, L. and Pascoal, A. (2019), 'How much is "too much" for a brand to use an advergame  
17  
18 with children?', *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp.287-299.  
19

20  
21 Aitken, P.P., Leathar, D.S. and Squair, S.I. (1986), 'Children's awareness of cigarette brand  
22  
23 sponsorship of sports and games in the UK', *Health Education Research*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp.203-  
24  
25 211.  
26

27  
28  
29 Bauer, H., Stokburger-Sauer, N. and Exler, S. (2008), 'Brand image and fan loyalty in  
30  
31 professional team sport: A refined model and empirical assessment', *Journal of Sport  
32  
33 Management*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp.205-226  
34

35  
36  
37 Bergstrom, A. and Blumenthal, D. (2001), 'Now Hear This: How to Get a Tween's Attention',  
38  
39 *International Journal of Advertising and Marketing to Children*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp.23-30.  
40

41  
42 Bestman, A., Thomas, S.L., Randle, M. and Thomas, S.D.M. (2015), 'Children's implicit  
43  
44 recall of junk food, alcohol and gambling sponsorship in Australian sport', *BMC Public  
45  
46 Health*, Vol. 15, pp.1022-1031.  
47

48  
49 Carrillat, F.A. and Grohs, R. (2019), 'Can a replacing sponsor benefit? Consumer responses  
50  
51 toward a new sponsor in the context of a sponsorship change', *European Journal of Marketing*,  
52  
53 Vol. 53 No. 12, pp.2481-2500.  
54

55  
56  
57 Chadwick, S. and Thwaites, D. (2006), 'Distinguishing between short-term and long-term  
58  
59 commitment in football shirt sponsorship programmes: towards a matrix of management  
60

1  
2  
3 implications', *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 7 No. 3,  
4  
5 pp.11-27.  
6

7  
8 Cornwell, T.B. (2014), *Sponsorship in Marketing: Effective Communication Through Sports,*  
9  
10 *Arts and Events*, Routledge, London and New York, NY.  
11

12  
13 Daems, K., De Keyzer, F., De Pelsmacker, P. and Moons, I. (2019), 'Personalized and cued  
14  
15 advertising aimed at children', *Young Consumers*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp.138-151.  
16

17  
18 Delia, E.B. (2017), 'A digital ethnography of fan reaction to sponsorship termination',  
19  
20 *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp.392-412.  
21

22  
23  
24 Dick, C. (2018), 'Gradual vs entire sponsorship termination: How to manage the ending of a  
25  
26 sponsorship engagement', *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 19  
27  
28 No. 4, pp.433-449.  
29

30  
31 Dick, C. and Uhrich, S. (2017), 'Ending a sponsorship relationship: consumers' responses  
32  
33 toward a forced versus a chosen exit', *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol. 17  
34  
35 No. 2, pp.152-170.  
36

37  
38  
39 Dionísio, P., Leal, C. and Moutinho, L. (2008), 'Fandom affiliation and tribal behaviour: a  
40  
41 sports marketing context', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 11,  
42  
43 pp.17-39.  
44

45  
46  
47 Dos Santos, M.A., Moreno, F.C. and Crespo-Hervás, J. (2019), 'Influence of perceived and  
48  
49 effective congruence on recall and purchase intention in sponsored printed sports advertising',  
50  
51 *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp.617-633.  
52

53  
54  
55 Doyle, J.P., Kunkel, T. and Funk, D.C. (2013), 'Sports spectator segmentation: examining the  
56  
57 differing psychological connections among spectators of leagues and teams', *International*  
58  
59 *Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp.20-36.  
60

1  
2  
3 Drake-Bridges, E. and Burgess, B. (2010), 'Personal preferences of tween shoppers', *Journal*  
4 *of Fashion Marketing and Management*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp.624-633.

5  
6  
7  
8 Ducker, J. (2019), 'Manchester City sign new 10-year kit deal with Puma worth £650 million',  
9 available at: [https://www.telegraph.co.uk/football/2019/02/28/manchester-city-sign-new-10-](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/football/2019/02/28/manchester-city-sign-new-10-year-kit-deal-puma-worth-650-million/)  
10 [year-kit-deal-puma-worth-650-million/](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/football/2019/02/28/manchester-city-sign-new-10-year-kit-deal-puma-worth-650-million/) (accessed 2 June 2020).

11  
12  
13 Edeling, A., Hattula, S. and Bornemann, T. (2017), 'Over, out, but present: recalling former  
14 sponsorships', *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51 Nos 7/8, pp.1286-1307.

15  
16  
17  
18 End, C.M., Kretschmar, J.M and Dietz-Uhler, B. (2004), 'College Students' Perceptions of  
19 Sports Fandom as a Social Status Determinant', *International Sports Journal*, Vol. 8 No. 1,  
20 pp.114-123.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 Farrelly, F.J. (2010), 'Not playing the game: why sport sponsorship relationships break down',  
30 *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp.319-337.

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 Folkvord, F., Bevelander, K., Rozendaal, E. and Hermans, R. (2019), 'Children's bonding with  
40 popular YouTube vloggers and their attitudes toward brand and product endorsements in vlogs:  
41 an explorative study', *Young Consumers*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp.70-90.

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Gardikiotis, A., Tsigilis, N. and Theodorakis, N.D. (2014), 'Children's sport team  
49 identification: social psychological processes and developmental perspectives', *International*  
50 *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 14 , pp.1-13.

51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61 Grey, A.M. and Skildum-Reid, K. (2001), *The Sponsor's Toolkit*, McGraw-Hill, Sydney.

62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1  
2  
3 *Past to Shape the Future of Marketing. Developments in Marketing Science: Proceedings of*  
4 *the Academy of Marketing Science*. Springer, Cham.

5  
6  
7  
8 Grohs, R., Wagner, U. and Steiner, R. (2012), 'An Investigation of Children's Ability to  
9 Identify Sponsors and Understand Sponsorship Intentions', *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol.  
10 29 No. 11, pp.907-917.

11  
12  
13  
14 Grønhøj, A. and Gram, M. (2020), 'Researching family food decision making processes:  
15 highlights, hits and pitfalls when including young children's perspectives', *Qualitative Market*  
16 *Research*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.

17  
18  
19  
20 Gwinner, K.P. and Swanson, S. (2003), 'A model of fan identification: antecedents and  
21 sponsorship outcomes', *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol.17, pp.275-294.

22  
23  
24  
25 Hassan, N.F.B., Suteh, F.B. and Sanusi, A.B.M. (2019), "Fleiss's Kappa: assessing the concept  
26 of technology enabled active learning (TEAL)", *Journal of Technical Education and Training*,  
27 Vol. 11, p. 109-118.

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Huber, F., Meyer, F. and Schmid, D.A. (2015), 'Brand love in progress – the interdependence  
37 of brand love antecedents in consideration of relationship duration', *Journal of Product &*  
38 *Brand Management*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp.567-579.

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
60 Jensen, J. and Cornwell, T. (2017), 'Why do marketing relationships end? Findings from an  
integrated model of sport sponsorship decision-making', *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol.  
31 No. 4, pp.401-418.

Jones, K. and Glynn, M. (2019), 'How children use social media for brand interactions', *Young*  
*Consumers*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp.91-108.

Kefr, N. (1981), 'Impasse / Priority Theory', in Crostini, R.J. (Ed.), *Handbook of Innovative*  
*Psychotherapies*, John Wiley, New York, pp.401-415.

1  
2  
3 Kelly, B., Bauman, A.E. and Baur, L.B. (2014), 'Population estimates of Australian children's  
4 exposure to food and beverage sponsorship of sports clubs', *Journal of Science and Medicine*  
5  
6 *in Sport*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp.394-398.  
7  
8  
9

10 Kim, Y.K., Smith, R. and James, J.D. (2010), 'The role of gratitude in sponsorship: the case of  
11 participant sports', *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 12 No. 1,  
12  
13 pp.48-70.  
14  
15  
16

17 Kruger, T.S., Goldman, M. and Ward, M. (2014), 'The impact of new, renewal and  
18 termination sponsorship announcements on share price returns', *International Journal of*  
19  
20 *Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp.10-25.  
21  
22  
23

24 Ledwith, F. (1984), 'Does tobacco sports sponsorship on television act as advertising to  
25 children?', *Health Education Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 85-88.  
26  
27  
28

29 Lee, H.-W., Cho, H., Newell, E.M. and Kwon, W. (2020), 'How multiple identities shape  
30 behavioral intention: place and team identification on spectator attendance', *International*  
31  
32 *Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.  
33  
34  
35

36 Lee, S. and Suh, Y.I. (2020), 'The severity of a sports-related accident and sponsorship effects:  
37 focusing on the fear appeal theory', *International Journal of Sports Marketing and*  
38  
39 *Sponsorship*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Lopez, A. and Rodriguez, R. (2018), 'Children and their brands: how young consumers relate  
45 to brands', *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp.130-142.  
46  
47  
48

49 Mintel (2018), 'UK Children's Online Spending Habits Market Report', available:  
50  
51 <https://store.mintel.com/uk-clothing-retailing-market-report>. ( accessed 7 August 2020).  
52  
53

54 Mintel (2019), 'UK Clothing Retailing Market Report', available:  
55  
56 <https://store.mintel.com/uk-clothing-retailing-market-report>. ( accessed 7 August 2020).  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 O'Brien, K. and Vandenberg, B. (2020), 'Report on the extent, nature, and consequences  
4 of children and young people's exposure to alcohol advertising and sponsorship', Monash  
5 University; available at <https://doi.org/10.26180/5edde9f0a7a9d> ( accessed 1August  
6 2020).  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 Obiero, G.M. (2020), 'Top 20 richest football clubs in the world 2020', available at:  
13 [https://www.msn.com/en-xl/news/other/top-20-richest-football-clubs-in-the-world-](https://www.msn.com/en-xl/news/other/top-20-richest-football-clubs-in-the-world-2020/ar-BB131ujg)  
14 [2020/ar-BB131ujg](https://www.msn.com/en-xl/news/other/top-20-richest-football-clubs-in-the-world-2020/ar-BB131ujg) (accessed 5 April 2020).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Pettigrew, S., Rosenberg, M., Ferguson, R. and Houghton, S. (2013), 'Game on: do children  
21 absorb sports sponsorship messages?', *Public Health Nutrition*, Vol. 16 No. 12, pp.2197-2204.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Radcliffe, L. (2013), 'Qualitative diaries: uncovering the complexities of work-life  
27 decision-making', *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, Vol. 8 No. 2,  
28 pp.163-180.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Ruth, J.A. and Strizhakova, Y. (2012), 'And now, goodbye: consumer response to sponsor  
34 exit', *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp.39-62.  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Siemieniako, D. and Kubacki, K. (2013), 'Female students' drinking seen through collages and  
40 diaries', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp.296-314.  
41  
42  
43

44 Simões, I and Agante, L. (2014), 'The impact of event sponsorship on Portuguese children's  
45 brand image and purchase intentions', *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 33 No. 3,  
46 pp.533-556.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Tamir, I. (2019), 'I Love You Kid, But...: Intergenerational Soccer Fandom Conflict', *Men  
52 and Masculinities*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp.893-904.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Thomas, R.J. (2018), 'Mapping the perceptions and antecedents of football fans' co-creation  
4 behaviours with sponsoring brands: a pan-cultural study of the European leagues', *Journal of*  
5  
6 *Marketing Management*, Vol. 34, pp. 17-18.  
7  
8  
9

10 Thomas, R.J. (2014), 'An evaluation of the effectiveness of rugby event sponsorship: A study  
11 of Dove Men+Care and the Welsh Rugby Union', *Journal of Product and Brand Management*,  
12  
13 Vol. 23, pp.304–321.  
14  
15  
16

17 Thomas, R.J. (2015), 'Out with the old and in with the new: a study of new kit sponsorship and  
18 brand associations in the Barclay's Premier League', *Journal of Product and Brand*  
19  
20 *Management*, Vol. 24, pp.229–251.  
21  
22  
23

24 Thomas, R.J. and Roeseler, F. (2013), 'An exploratory investigation into the effectiveness of  
25 team kit sponsorship: fans' perspectives of new sponsorship in the German Bundesliga',  
26  
27 *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, Vol. 12 Nos 2/3, pp.177-192.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Thomson, E. and Williams, R. (2014), 'Children as football fans: an exploratory study of  
33 team and player connections', *Young Consumers*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp.323-341.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Toscani, G. and Prendergast, G. (2018) 'Sponsees: the silent side of sponsorship research',  
39  
40 *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp.396-408.  
41  
42  
43

44 van Erde, W., Holman, D. and Totterdell, P. (2005), 'Editorial: special section on diary  
45 studies in work psychology', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*,  
46  
47 Vol. 78 No. 2, pp.151-154.  
48  
49  
50

51 van Rijn, M., Kristal, S. and Henseler, J. (2019), 'Why do all good things come to an end? An  
52 inquiry into the discontinuation of sport sponsor–sponsee relationships', *International Journal*  
53  
54 *of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp.224-241.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Velicia Martín, F., Toledo, L.D. and Palos-Sanchez, P. (2020), 'How deep is your love?  
4 Brand love analysis applied to football teams', *International Journal of Sports Marketing and*  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
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

*Sponsorship*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.

11 Woisetschläger, D.V. and Michaelis, M. (2012), 'Sponsorship congruence and brand image',  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
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

*European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 46 Nos 3/4, pp.509-523.


16 Yang, L.W., Aggarwal, P. and McGill, A.L. (2020), 'The 3 C's of anthropomorphism:  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
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

Connection, comprehension, and competition', *Consumer Psychology Review*, Vol. 3 No. 1,  
pp.3-19.

23 Yuan, S., Huo, C. and Malik, T.H. (2019), 'The negative spillover effect in sports sponsorship:  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
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

An experiment examining the impact of team performance on sponsor's brand trust',  
*International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp.477-494.

Figure 1: Potential sponsor benefits



Young Consumers

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
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