Understanding Sport Sponsorship

INTRODUCTION

Sponsorship, in its essence, is based on a mutual exchange between a sport entity and a corporation (Copeland, Frisby, & McCarville, 1996; McCarville & Copeland, 1994). This reliance on exchange theory suggests that both entities can simultaneously provide and receive benefits. Thus, a symbiotic relationship can be attained. In the case of adidas’s sponsorship of the New Zealand All Blacks rugby team, Motion, Leitch, and Brodie (2003, p. 1083) noted that “in sponsorship both the sponsor and the sponsored activity become involved in a symbiotic relationship with a transference of inherent values from the activity to the sponsor.” In the United States and many other nations, sport organizations have aggressively marketed themselves to sponsors in an effort to obtain the funds necessary to operate programs. Seaver’s research with 50 of the top U.S. sponsors indicated that 10% of sponsoring companies get more than 1300 proposals per year (Seaver, 2004). North American 2012 sponsorship spending was projected to reach $18.9 billion, up 4.1% over 2011 (“2013 Sponsorship Outlook,” 2013).

The major areas of the economy where sponsorship spending is apportioned remained constant over the last few years and have been noted below (www.sponsorship.com/Resources/Sponsorship-Spending.aspx):

- Sports: .................................................. 69%
- Entertainment: ....................................... 10%
- Cause Marketing: .............................. 9%
- Arts: ................................................... 5%
- Festivals/Fairs: ............................... 4%
- Associations and Member Organizations: .... 3%

Financial expenditures on sponsorship activities were not limited to North America. Total global spending for 2012 was projected at $51 billion (www.sponsorship.com/Resources/Sponsorship-Spending.aspx), with projections for a 13% growth through 2015 (pwc.com/sportsoutlook). International corporate spending also escalated in 2012 as

Pacific Rim countries accounted for $11.9 billion, and Central and South America spent an additional $5.4 billion. Various other regional spending accounted for $2.2 billion, bringing the worldwide 2012 total to $451 billion. With an increase of 14.8% above 2007 revenues, it seems sponsorship presents an opportunity for the growing list of multinational companies (www.sponsorship.com/Resources/Sponsorship-Spending.aspx).

There is an increasing need for sport administrators and managers to understand the methodologies of this marketing component. Sponsorship has been defined as “a cash and/or in-kind fee paid to a property (typically sports, arts, entertainment, or causes) in return for access to the exploitable commercial potential associated with that property” (Ukman, 2004a, p. 154).

Some concerns exist as to whether the sports sponsorship field is saturated or will continue to grow in the years ahead. There is also an emerging trend toward both convergence and competition between sport and entertainment. This can be seen when the network that secures broadcast rights for a league leverages those rights for cameo appearances of popular athletes. The leagues also suggest product placement in television shows with items like team jerseys or background screens of league games. According to Spanberg (2011) “Each of the major leagues has one, if not several, executives working on vetting and making pitches to be included in shows and movies” (p. 22). This is an exciting but complicated trend. If a player is used in a TV shot wearing his jersey at the team stadium, the process requires negotiations with the player’s agent, the league for use of its licensed jersey, and the owner of the stadium. Yes, it’s a crazy world we live in.

Another trend noted by Price-Waterhouse-Cooper is that sport managers must develop more sophisticated measures for sponsorship activities (“PwC Outlook,” n.d.). Historically, sport properties have pursued and negotiated with sponsors in a singular and direct manner. However, Burton and O’Reilly (2010) forecast that sponsors may be trending toward developing “sponsor alliances” wherein groups of sponsors band together and negotiate collectively with sport properties. Burton and O’Reilly ask, “What if the sponsors from all major North American sports were to form a syndicate?” (p. 21). This would surely constitute a shift in power and propel massive changes across the industry. Just a thought.

Many sports are heavily engaged in sponsorship (e.g., professional football, basketball, tennis and golf) while others are less involved. From high school sports to college programs to professional leagues, everyone seems to want to be involved in sport sponsorship. The potential is so great that the Carroll Independent School District in Texas hired a full-time director of sponsorships. San Antonio opted to hire an agency with the school district, keeping 35% of the revenues (“A Tale of Two Districts,” 2003). High schools in Texas and North Carolina went so far as to pursue naming rights for their fa-
cities, a practice once reserved for professional teams. One high school near the Dallas-
Fort Worth airport secured $4 million from Dr. Pepper to place a logo on the school’s
roof to be seen by airline passengers (Popke, 2002). High school state athletic associa-
tions are also moving into the sponsorship realm. Revenues for “all sports—all champi-
onships” range from a high of about $500,000 (California) to a low of $200,000 (New
Mexico). In all, about 24 of the 50 high school athletic associations have some type of
sponsorship program (Carey, 2012).

At the collegiate level, about 10% of income for the National Collegiate Athletic As-

sociation (NCAA) Division I programs comes from sponsorship revenue with the aver-
age sponsorship for an NCAA Division I institution at $1.13 million (Drayer, Shapiro,
& Morse, 2012). The trend in major college athletic departments has been to outsource
their sponsorship and media rights to agencies. IMG College and Learfield Communi-
cations are the leading agencies. IMG College represents almost 100 of the premier in-
stitutions and has been actively engaged in packaging portfolios of teams for select
sponsors. Similarly, Fishbait Marketing secured the rights for 33 college bowl games
through the Football Bowl Association in 2012. This would allow sponsors to negotiate
with Fishbait for opportunities across several games. These creative one-stop-shopping
scenarios mimic many of the advantages of the International Olympic Committee’s
TOP program. The NCAA granted exclusive marketing rights to Turner Sports and
CBS Sports, who run their Corporate Champions and Corporate Partners program.

Professional sport leagues have been able to increase sponsorship revenues substan-
tially over the years. Control over the league’s sponsorship is continually a topic in owners’
meetings. Many owners want to preserve marketing rights for the team while others,
principally in small-market cities, advocate league-wide sponsorships where revenues are
shared equally across all teams.

In an effort to minimize the overabundance of signage inside sport stadiums, some
professional teams (e.g., Florida Marlins with the 2012 Marlins Park) began to segment
their stadiums. This concept involved the development of sponsor zones, each dedi-
cated to a single sponsor extending from banners on parking lot light poles to entrances
and culminating with field, court, and scoreboard signage inside the facility. Similarly,
the MetLife Stadium in New Jersey and the Daytona International Speedway opted for
branded entrances as additions for 2012/2013.

Park and recreation departments are also engaged in sport sponsorship activities. Be-

yond the longstanding traditions of sponsors for Little League teams and outfield sig-

nage at the ballpark, some park and recreation managers are exploring new ground. For
example, Gatorade signed a deal with Virginia Beach Parks and Recreation Department
in which Gatorade did not pay an upfront fee but based their fee on product sales. They
provided $6,000 for the first 1,600 cases of Gatorade sold, $3,000 for the next 1,600,
and $1,000 for every additional 1,600 cases sold. The entire sponsorship fee amounted
to $15,000 over three years.

What initially attracted sponsors to sport is the ability to reach consumers in a less
cluttered environment than traditional advertising (Pitts & Stotlar, 2013; Skildum-
Reid, 2012). The clutter in advertising is such that the average consumer is exposed to over 5,000 messages every day. Sponsorship had the potential to deliver advertising messages more effectively than established advertising channels. However, sport may now have become oversaturated. According to Skildum-Reid (2012), many sport events have become cluttered with title sponsors, presenting sponsors, supporting sponsors, cam-sponsors, official product sponsors, pouring rights, and licensing rights. Clutter and dilution are in direct opposition to what sponsors want. She also noted that the clutter and overabundance of signage is atrocious. What sponsorship intends to do is “connect with people through something they care about” (Skildum-Reid, 2012, p. 3).

As an example of the clutter issue, Spanberg (2012a) noted that fans at a NASCAR race are exposed to 2,000 brand images compared to about 200 at the average MLB game. Clutter interrupts rather than enhances the audience’s experience with the event. In a cluttered market, many sponsors are seeking alternatives to mainstream sport, moving instead to action or extreme sports. Not only have they found these markets less cluttered, but the events have a strong psychographic pull with 18–24-year-old consumers (Cordiner, 2002).

Several authorities note sponsors are changing their strategy for sponsorship. The emerging theme is fewer, bigger, better. Poole (2003, p. 14) said that sponsors “would rather spend more money on bigger properties than spread their sponsorships around to more numerous, smaller properties.” In 2010, the University of Michigan moved to a “less is more” stance for their sponsorship. Their goal was to reduce clutter and provide better service to their marketing partners by decreasing the total number of sponsors. A similar trend was seen at the World Cup in soccer where the number of sponsors was reduced to 28—15 partners plus official suppliers and licensees. Seaver’s corporate survey revealed the same trend. One executive commented, “We are doing fewer programs in the coming year; however, the programs that we’re staying with will be bigger and better” (Seaver, 2004, p. 19). Another said, “What we’ll be doing, we’ll be doing at a higher level. Big impact is better for us, we feel, than a lot of small sponsorships. This will affect the second-tier sports and the number of people we will be talking to” (p. 20).

The issue of clutter also affects the methods with which sponsors choose to communicate with consumers. Researchers at an event in Holland found that some sponsors were labeled “uncool” because their presence was too obvious, while sponsors that had relevant activation were perceived more favorably. According to Ukman (2003a, p. 2), “There is a huge gap between how marketers want to reach people and how people want to be reached.” Similarly, Dan Migala, author of the industry insider newsletter “The Migala Report,” noted that sponsorships are most effective when they enhance the participant’s experience rather than detract from it. Visiting with participants in the New York City Marathon, Dan found that they particularly liked the activation by Gatorade and Dunkin’ Donuts who provided refreshments during the event. UPS also enhanced the runners’ experiences by having its Big Brown trucks deliver runners’ personal belongings from the starting area to the finish line (Migala, 2007b). Thoughtfully designed sponsorships can bridge the gap between interruption and enhancement.
SPONSORSHIP BACKGROUND

In the early history of sport marketing, sponsorship activities often served the interests of corporate CEOs—as if they were saying, for example, “Let’s sponsor golf, because I like golf.” This allowed company executives to mix socially with elite athletes and also to provide client entertainment activities. However, these rationales have almost disappeared in the modern era of sport sponsorship. Nevertheless, most major sporting events continue to provide hospitality areas as part of sponsorship packages where executives can meet with celebrity-athletes before and after the competition. Notwithstanding these possibilities, greater sophistication evolved after the 1980s and 1990s, with the introduction of philanthropy to sport sponsorship.

There has been a considerable amount of debate about whether companies engage in sponsorship activities for philanthropic reasons or for financial benefits. Moreover, an interesting new term was recently introduced into the realm of business management. Strategic philanthropy has been defined as “a company’s long-term investment in an appropriate cause that does measurable good in society while enhancing the company’s reputation with key audiences” (Jones, 1997, p. 33). In 2004, IEG began conducting seminars on strategic philanthropy for its corporate clients. The seminars focused on “Leveraging Philanthropy with Marketing” and “Putting Hope and Heart into Sales” (“Strategic Philanthropy,” 2004). Social responsibility has been an aspect of corporate philosophy for many years and numerous sport causes have benefited as a result. Corporations have donated to many different programs, and through this corporate giving, they have assisted programs in art, sport, medicine, and culture. However, corporate motives must be examined.

Whether or not a company engages in altruistic philanthropy, research has shown that consumers are influenced by a company’s charitable activities. It has been found that 14% of consumers sought out companies with viable corporate philanthropy programs and 40% saw a company’s corporate citizenship as a tie-breaker when deciding which company to patronize (Jones, 1997). Research also showed that the overlay of a cause could lead to increased purchase intent if there is little difference between brands on quality and price. However, the positive effects of cause-related marketing appear to diminish as the difference in competing brands increases (Roy & Graeff, 2003). There are many corporations that tie sport and cause-related marketing together. Verizon Wireless sponsors a team of professional women cyclists who volunteer to give any winnings to HopeLine, Verizon’s initiative to help victims of domestic violence. They also created a program through HopeLine, and the Miami Heat collected wireless phones, handsets, batteries, and accessories from any carrier at the Verizon Wireless kiosk inside the stadium and refurbished them for victims of domestic violence (“HopeLine Success Stories,” n.d.).

While it may seem ludicrous, some corporate officers talk about “owning a cause” (Jones, 1997, p. 36), which sounds more like a marketing strategy than true philanthropy. But, according to Jones (1997, p. 34), “It [doesn’t] take long for consumers to see these tactics as sales pitches thinly veiled in the guise of social activism.”
Granted, there may be corporations that engage in sport sponsorship for truly philanthropic reasons. However, the record shows that charitable approaches have limited success in securing corporate sponsorships. Corporate self-interest has been considerably more viable as a motivation for involvement with sport sponsorship. (A closer look at the reasons why businesses would be attracted to sport is detailed in Chapter 3.)

Some of the more prominent justifications reveal that sport is attractive to sponsors because it can provide a cross-sectional demographic exposure when compared to other marketing avenues. The diverse demographics represented by many sport activities and events is crucial to corporations, and thus, to the creation of potential sponsorship affiliations.

Sponsoring sport often adds a double exposure for sponsors with on-site promotional activities and media coverage. Typically, when an athlete wins a major tournament or event, their picture shows up on media websites and newspapers across the country. One sport marketer commented that you can buy the back page of *Sports Illustrated*, but you can’t buy the front.

On the other hand, not all sponsorship is positive or even intentional. For example, an interesting yachting incident occurred when an America’s Cup boat sponsored by Oracle obtained significant exposure for its sponsor by capsizing under the Golden Gate Bridge during the race. The overturned boat was in range of television and news cameras, and it appeared on networks and newspaper front pages worldwide, displaying the sponsor’s name. Although it was not the type of publicity that the sponsor had in mind, people around the globe turned their newspapers sideways to read the sponsor’s name on the side of the boat.

**DEPENDENCE ON SPONSORSHIP**

There are some authorities who believe that sport has become overly dependent on corporate sponsors to meet expenses. Two examples show that too much dependence on sponsors could have disastrous effects. In China, an international badminton tournament was canceled when sponsors pulled out during an economic downturn. Also, during the economic difficulties from 2008–2009, the LPGA lost several Title sponsors.

Dependence on sponsorship monies is also evident with colleges and universities that rely on corporations and sponsorship revenues for additional income. The University of Nebraska pooled all of its sponsorship and media assets and signed a 13-year agreement with IMG. Including the sponsorship rights held by the athletic department, the total value of the 13-year package was $143 million (University of Nebraska Board of Regents, 2008). Nike has all-sport agreements with 20 top college programs while adidas has deals with about 15, including Texas A&M University and the University of Michigan, which both switched in 2008 from Nike to adidas. The Texas A&M deal was reportedly worth $60 million in cash and merchandise with a $6.5 million signing bonus. Relative newcomer Under Armour also has a significant group of universities under contract. Many educational institutions have realized the kinds of benefits associated with sponsorship deals:
1. Free equipment
2. Stadium advertising
3. Supplements to coaches’ salaries
4. Television revenues for regular and post-season games.

Colleges and universities in the U.S. have realized profits in the millions of dollars from corporate-sponsored football bowl games. The Bowl Championship Series games payout figures have been staggering. For 2013, the per-team payout for the BCS Bowl, Tostitos Fiesta Bowl, FedEx Orange Bowl, Allstate Sugar Bowl, and the Rose Bowl (presented by Visio) were $18 million. With the change in bowl championship structure beginning in the 2013–14 season, the payouts were not determined at press time.

In an attempt to gain greater control over sponsorship, the NCAA, along with many professional sports teams, has imposed rules regarding the size of corporate logos that can be displayed on team uniforms and equipment because of overt commercialization. However, in a lawsuit against the NCAA, apparel companies questioned the NCAA’s motives when the bowl game corporate sponsors were allowed to place logos that exceeded the legal size limits on uniforms during the post-season games.

Major League Baseball (MLB) also implemented rules about the size of logos on bats after the All Star Game when a player held his bat up to the camera to display its oversized logo: a promotion ski racers have been known to do at the end of a race as well.

The National Football League (NFL) and the National Hockey League created significant controversy by controlling the display of logos on player apparel. Their regulations state that manufacturers must pay the league a fee for the right to display their marks during a game. Thus, an NFL player who has an endorsement deal (see Chapter 5) cannot display a corporate logo on his shoes if the shoe company has not paid the league a rights fee. To illustrate the height to which this controversy has risen, the NFL fined Chicago Bear player Brian Urlacher $100,000 for wearing a hat with logos of Gatorade’s competitor on a team media day. Gatorade is an official sponsor of the NFL.

MLB has not operated without controversy in this area either. MLB owners relinquished their rights to sign exclusive team agreements with uniform shoe manufacturers. Previously, each individual team could sign with a single company (e.g., adidas with the New York Yankees). However, in an out-of-court legal settlement, the uniform rights for all teams now reside with Major League Baseball Properties. In another control-oriented issue, the Baltimore Orioles attempted to stop three players from promoting Pepsi products because the team had an agreement with Coca-Cola. In 2012, the NFL contracts for rising stars Andrew Luck and Robert Griffin III contained clauses that required the player to make “good faith efforts” to work with team sponsors (Mullen, 2012). The question at hand appears to be, Who has the right to control player sponsorships, the player or the League?

**CREATING WIN-WIN-WIN STRATEGIES**

According to Skildum-Reid (2012) the old win-win (property-sponsor) focus left out the most important aspect of sponsorship, the sponsor’s target market. The number one
connection in the sponsorship equation is “the connection between the sponsor’s brand and the target market” (p. 17). Thus we have win-win-win. This is “the number one concept that drives best practice” (p. 16). Sports activities and corporations can create symbiotic relationships that are greater than the sum of the separate entities. Ukman (2004b, p. 2) reported that “combining the assets of allied organizations creates sponsorship platforms in which the whole is worth more than the sum of the individual parts.” Sport managers want to increase their revenues and the exposure of their programs. Coincidentally, sport sponsors want to increase their revenues and the exposure of their products. A sport sponsorship arrangement can fulfill these needs for each organization. Kim Skildum-Reid (2012) goes one step further and recommends a win-win-win protocol that includes not only the sponsors and the organization, but the consumer (participant or spectator) as well. In general, corporations are interested in marketing their products and services to potential customers. If sport can provide a vehicle for this endeavor, then a successful relationship can be established. The task for the sport marketing professional is to make it clear to the sponsor just how this can be accomplished through his or her organization or event. It is also critical that sponsorships enhance the experience of the participants and spectators rather than detract from it.

**CONTROVERSIES**

Not everyone agrees that involvement with corporate sponsorships is beneficial for sport. Sport marketers should, therefore, be aware that not all members of the community embrace their involvement with certain corporate sponsors. Many feel that blending alcohol and tobacco with the healthful benefits of sports is hypocritical; as a result, there have been several moves on the part of government entities and regulating bodies to restrict alcohol and tobacco advertising in sport settings.

**Tobacco and Alcohol Sponsorship**

Considerable debate surrounded a European Union ban on tobacco advertising in sport. The French government has had a ban in place for many years and has been pushing the application of legislation throughout Europe. The restrictions on tobacco sponsorship in sport vary across Europe. While a ban in the United Kingdom went into effect in 2006, the German government contended that smoking was a health issue, and therefore, should be within the control of the individual nations. Most of the alcohol and tobacco sponsorship has eroded in Europe although the heavy dependence of Formula One racing on tobacco sponsorship was an exception. This led some organization executives to plan for races at venues in countries more sympathetic to tobacco advertising (Currie, 2004).

The Australian government adopted legislation to restrict tobacco advertising, but the regulations allow events of “international significance” to apply for an exemption. The Canadian government also enacted legislation that restricted the display of tobacco advertising in sport. As of 1998, sport and cultural groups got a five-year reprieve from the government’s tough tobacco advertising restrictions (Danylchuk, 1998). Existing
signage was allowed to remain through 2000, and from 2000–2003, advertising by tobacco companies was limited to on-site displays and relegated to the bottom 10% of the sign (Danylchuk, 1998).

The French, Canadian, and Australian governments are but a few of those taking action on the issue. There may be many more in waiting, including measures in the United States resulting from a settlement between various states and the tobacco industry that addressed payments for medical coverage for smokers.

In the U.S., the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act (Tobacco Control Act) became law in 2009. It gave the Food and Drug Administration the authority to regulate the manufacture, distribution, and marketing of tobacco. This legislation banned “tobacco product sponsorship of sporting and entertainment events under the brand name of cigarettes or smokeless tobacco” (FDA, 2012, “What the Tobacco . . .” section, para. 2).

The controversy of beer advertising has not been as well publicized as tobacco. Internationally, the laws vary between countries. The NCAA has also restricted alcohol advertising such that beer and wine products (not exceeding 6% alcohol by volume) are allowable, provided such advertisements do not compose more than 14% of the space in the NCAA publication (e.g., game program) devoted to advertising or not more than 60 seconds per hour of any NCAA championship programming, and that such advertisements or advertisers incorporate “Drink Responsibly” educational messaging. Alcohol advertising is not permitted at NCAA Championship events (NCAA, n.d.).

Virtual Signage

Virtual signage has been one of the recent developments that challenge both sport marketers and event owners. With the technology behind virtual signage, “advertisers can insert their logo or brand message on the field in football, behind the batter in baseball, along the glass in hockey and more, all from a remote operation in real-time” (Sportvision, n.d., para. 1). A variety of sport organizations allow for use of this technology while others restrict or prohibit its use. Major League Baseball (MLB) has been the most prolific user, placing virtual ads behind home plate in regular and post-season play. Other sports have also explored the use of this new technology. World Wrestling Entertainment, the X-Games, and various professional tennis tournaments have readily implemented virtual signage. The controversy centers around control of the images that are presented on the field. Many facility owners convinced sponsors to purchase stadium advertising with the idea that these signs would be seen on television. However, with this technology, not only could existing stadium advertising be blocked out, but a competitor’s advertising could be inserted via this computer technology.

Another point of contention has been the inclusion of sponsor signage in video games. Electronic Arts (EA), one of the leading producers of video games, has used a marketing theme: “If it’s in the game, it’s in the game.” Up to this point, they have included signage in almost all of their games. Many sport marketers feel that these actions present an excellent opportunity to market to children in an authentic environment. EA
Sports Director of Sports Marketing commented that “video games are a perfect vehicle for companies to target an attentive teenage audience” ("EA Sports," 1998). There are, however, others who believe that this step represents another unconscionable intrusion into society.

In summary, the relationship between sport organizations and sponsors must include advantages for all parties. This win-win-win situation can provide market value and higher profits for corporations, and increase operating revenues for sport organizations and events. An overall view of the sponsorship process is provided in the Best Practice section that follows. The task for a sport marketing professional is to make it clear to the sponsor just how this can be accomplished through a particular sport organization or event.

**Best Practice**

**Sponsorship Evaluation Model**

**INPUT**
- Corporate Marketing Objectives
  1. Increase consumer awareness
  2. Improve corporate image
  3. Increase product trials
  4. Competitively price products
  5. Build brand relationships
  6. Reward top accounts
  7. Increase customer satisfaction
  8. Increase market share
     a. USA
     b. Europe
     c. Asia
     d. Australia
     e. Africa
     f. Latin America
  9. Reward top salespeople
  10. Increase distribution efficiency
  11. Obtain target market data
  12. Improve communication with target market
  13. Obtain top media position
  14. Sustain competitive advantage
  15. Improve employee motivation

**FILTER**
- Expendable Sponsorship Components
  1. Venue Signage
  2. Hospitality tents
  3. In-game promotions
  4. Program Advertising
  5. Sales Kiosks
  6. Ticket Access
  7. Target Market Access
     a. On-site
     b. Extended
  8. Media Coverage
     a. Local
     b. National
     c. International
  9. Conventions
  10. Cross Promotion
  11. Titles/Name Rights
  12. VR Supplier

**ACTIVATED COMPONENTS**
- 1. Venue Signage
- 2. Hospitality tents
- 3. In-game promotions
- 4. Program Advertising
- 5. Sales Kiosks
- 6. Ticket Access
- 7. Target Market Access
     a. On-site
     b. Extended
- 8. Media Coverage
     a. Local
     b. National
     c. International
- 9. Conventions
- 10. Cross Promotion
- 11. Titles/Name Rights
- 12. VR Supplier

**EVALUATION PROTOCOL**
- 1. Recall/Recognition Surveys
   a. On-site consumers
   b. Hospitality sites
   c. Multi-market (market specific)
   d. USA
   e. Europe
   f. Australia
- 2. Employee/Staff Survey
- 3. Market share measures
  a. In each market
  b. Pre-event
  c. Post-event
- 4. Top of Mind Research
  a. Pre-event
  b. Post-event
- 5. Event Demographics

**OTHER MARKETING ACTIVITIES**
- 1. Traditional Media Buys
- 2. Point of Purchase
- 3. Sales Promotions
- 4. Cause-related marketing
- 5. Personal Selling
- 6. Public Relations Campaigns

**FEEDBACK LOOP**

**RESIDUAL MEASURE DATA**