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Corporate Sponsorship and University Campuses: Determining the Effectiveness of University Sponsorship Efforts at Pittsburg State University

Michaela Joines
Research Questions and Hypotheses

RQ1: What sponsors of PSU can stakeholders most easily recognize?

RQ2: Does a sponsor’s perceived local presence or national reach affect stakeholders’ perception of the benefits of the sponsor?

RQ3: What are factors that determine a high level of fit between a university and a sponsor?

H1: University stakeholders will rate the community involvement of local sponsors higher than national sponsors.

H2: Recognition of on-campus activity will result in positive attitudes toward sponsors.
Phases of Study

Phase 1

Interviews with a total of 8 students, faculty, alumni, and community members associated with Pittsburg State University

Phase 2

Survey completed by 156 alumni, students, and faculty.
Findings | Sponsor Recall

Select sponsor awareness of national beverage and food vendors and sports apparel companies, and 5-7 high-visibility local sponsors.

32 sponsors recalled by multiple respondents.

15 sponsors recalled 5+ times.

- 5 national sponsors – Coca-Cola, Pepsi, Adidas, Nike, Barnes and Noble
- 10 local sponsors – Ron’s Supermarket, Labette Bank, Pitsco, Watco, Crossland Construction, Millers Professional Imaging, National Pizza Company, Names and Numbers
Findings | National vs. Local Benefits

**National Sponsors**
- Financial resources
- Promote a sense of national relevance

**Local Sponsors**
- Strong community relationships
Findings | Factors of Congruity

Pittsburg State associations

Gorilla Mascot | Athletics | Education | College student lifestyle

Congruent Companies

Athletic apparel brands | Education services | Health care systems | Banks |
Affordable restaurants
Findings | Community Involvement

Local sponsors rated higher than national sponsors in terms of community involvement ($t=10.557$, $p=.000$).

Local sponsors considered more beneficial for contributing to the economic health of the community.

Partnerships with local sponsors function as catalysts for positive energy among businesses and residents.
Findings | Sponsor Activity On Campus

The more active a sponsor on campus, the more positively stakeholders rated their attitudes towards that sponsor ($r=.401$, $p=.000$).

**Recognized methods of sponsor activity**

- Internships
- Scholarships
- High-visibility promotions
Usefulness of Research

Improves understanding of how to access and harness the marketing potential of sponsorship.

For Universities

Better understanding of how to offer the best experience for partnering companies.

Draw companies to higher levels of sponsorship based on empirically-shown benefits.

Improve and manage stakeholder perception of sponsorship activities.
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