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## Executive summary

The history of Olympic sponsorship can be traced most notably to the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles, and the commercialization of the Games[[1]](#footnote-1), which was spearheaded so efficiently by Peter Uebberoth. As organiser of the Summer Olympic Games in LA, Ueberroth took the Games to an historic $250m surplus, changing the face of the event forever. Uebberoth essentially took a loss-making venture (the debts accumulated as a result of the Montreal Games in 1976 which took 30 years to repay), and the Games into one of the most profitable sports events in history.

Uebberoth’s commercial approach led to the development of the TOPS (The Olympic Partner Programme) in 1985, which constitutes the official list of Olympic sponsors for each Games[[2]](#footnote-2). Separated into tiers, and shaped by an ever-growing list of rules and regulations, Olympic sponsorship has become more contentious in recent years. The most significant recent issue to emerge from the sports sponsorship literature is the issue of ambush marketing. Ambush marketing refers to the practice of aligning a brand with a particular event (such as the Olympic Games) without having paid to become an official sponsor. This practice has led to notable success for some companies (e.g. MasterCard) and has led to significant legislative action taken on the part of Olympic organising committees, and the IOC, as a means of protecting their official sponsorship income.

The IOC recently issued a guide to Rule 40 of the Olympic Charter for athletes and agents[[3]](#footnote-3) that provides an overview of new sponsorship laws focused on minimising the threats that it poses. The inclusion of Rule 40 has led to some controversy, with some athletes arguing that it impacts them unfairly. The advent of ambush marketing has also led to many Olympic sponsors being detrimentally affected by competitors and non-sponsors (e.g. the success of Dr. Dre headphones at the 2012 Games, or the successful, highly-visible marketing activity of non-Olympic sponsors MasterCard, Nike and Sony during 2012 Games-time).

An excellent example of ambush marketing in the London 2012 Games can be attributed to Nike. Nike’s ‘Volt Shoe’ was worn by many Olympic champions, including Mo Farah and Ashton Eaton. Nike's Global Creative Director for the Olympics, Martin Lotti, created the shoe. Lotti’s very title seemed audacious given that Nike were not an official sponsor (although rivals Adidas were). The move by Nike was, seemingly, a stroke of marketing genius. Nike were able to circumvent strict LOCOG sponsorship guidelines as athletes are allowed to choose whichever shoes they feel would offer them the greatest advantage to their athletic performance. Nike’s efficient targeting and engineering of a high quality shoe, in addition to their extensive consultative efforts with Olympic athletes, meant their use among Olympic athletes was widespread. An extremely eye-catching colour meant the shoes stood out – literally from the podium – across sports and across the national teams that wore them. In addition to their highly leveraged use of social networking to promote their *Find Your Greatness* campaign, their innovative shoe design elevated Nike to the position of official sponsor in most consumer’s minds – despite not being one. It is certainly possible to argue that Nike fared better than rivals (and official sponsors Adidas) in this context.

The negative impact of Olympic sponsorship also emerges prominently within the literature, as does the need for sponsorship activity to exploit the benefits of social networking far more effectively. A related concept that emerges from the literature constitutes concerns over the commodification of the athlete within the context of brand protectionism. In July 2012, for example, a number of US athletes protested against IOC regulations via Twitter during the Games. Their protestations were based on the fact that they were unable to promote personal sponsors with whom they had signed personal endorsement deals. This remained a pertinent issue for many athletes who could not, without the help of such deals, continue to fund their training.

## Olympic sponsors

There were, overall, 53 corporate sponsors of the London 2012 Olympic Games. In addition to the 11 Worldwide Partners (or TOP sponsors) of the Games, three ‘tiers’ of sponsors emerged. The seven Tier One sponsors were awarded rights over domestic sponsorship, with seven further Tier Two sponsors and 28 official providers and suppliers at Tier Three level. Worldwide partners constitute Acer, Atos, Coca-Cola, Dow, GE, McDonald’s, Omega, Panasonic, P&G, Samsung & Visa. Tier One partners were BMW, BP, British Airways, British Telecom, EDF and Lloyds TSB. Tier Two supporters were Adecco, ArcelorMittal, Cadbury, Cisco, Deloitte, UBS and Thomas Cook. Tier Three partners were Aggreko, Airwave, Atkins, CBS Outdoor, Crystal CG, Eurostar, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP, G4S, GlaxoSmithKline, Gymnova, Heathrow Airport, Heineken UK, Holiday Inn, John Lewis, McCann Worldgroup, Mondo, Nielsen, Populous, Rapiscan Systems, Rio Tino, Technogym, Thames Water, The Boston Consulting Group, Ticketmaster, Trebor and Westfield.

According to Keynote (2013), Olympic sponsors contributed an estimated overall £1bn to the Games, with some brands faring better than others in their ROI (Return on Investment). TOP Olympic (worldwide) partners such as McDonald’s and Coca-Cola contributed approximately £100m each in sponsorship deals, whereas Tier One sponsors (e.g. Adidas) contributed around £40m. Tier Two sponsors contributed around £20m each, with Tier Three sponsors (e.g. John Lewis) contributing around £10m each.

The same 2012 partners, supporters, and providers and suppliers sponsored both the Olympic and Paralympic Games. However, the Paralympic and Olympic Games had separate worldwide partners, with Visa, Ottobock, Samsung and Atos, as well as its international partner Allianz sponsoring the former. Sainsbury’s was chosen to become the Official Supermarket Partner of the London 2012 Paralympic Games in a deal worth an estimated £20m, and also the commercial partner of the British Paralympic Association (BPA) to the end of 2016 (a sponsor role also held by BT).

The move by Sainsbury’s constitutes an interesting change in the way that sponsors interact with the Paralympic Games. This was the first time that a corporate sponsor had chosen only to sponsor the Paralympic Games without also investing in the Olympic Games.

The issue of how to measure sponsorship impacts remains a cogent issue for official sponsors, as does the issue of how to control ambush marketing. Both concepts emerge with some force in the literature, which is reflected in the frequent references to both in the academic and non-academic sources listed in this resource. The underuse of social media also emerges as a pertinent issue for corporate sponsors.

Concerns also exist over the ethical nature of Olympic sponsorship. For example, the controversy surrounding Dow Chemical continues, as does the apparent contradiction of the health legacy goals of the 2012 Games sponsored by McDonald’s and Cadbury. A debate exists with regard to the need for the IOC to ban the sponsorship of the Games for all manufacturers of junk food and unhealthy carbonated drinks for future Games, particularly attributable to the effect that such sponsorship might exert on children. Official Olympic sponsor Atos also received negative press during the Paralympic Games due to its role in developing the ‘back- to-work’ fitness tests required in new legislation by the British Department of Work & Pensions (designed to ensure that individuals in receipt of disability benefit could prove their inability to work).

Ultimately, the issue of Olympic and Paralympic sponsorship constitutes a dynamic, fascinating area of study, one which requires knowledge of a diverse legal, political and corporate landscape if the issues that shape it are to be truly understood.

## Introduction to this resource

The purpose of this resource is to provide an extensive annotated bibliography focusing on sponsorship of the 2012 Games. An annotated bibliography is a list of citations to books, articles, and documents. Each citation is followed by a brief descriptive and evaluative paragraph (the annotation). The purpose of the annotation is to inform the reader of the relevance, accuracy, and quality of the sources cited.

The resource begins by presenting an annotated bibliography of market research reports and IOC documents, followed by an extensive list of peer-reviewed academic journal articles that focus on Olympic Games sponsorship. The resource then moves to a presentation of relevant periodicals (such as *Marketing Week*), before concluding with a list of books pertinent to the subject at hand.

### London 2012 sponsorship: Market research reports & databases

This section of the annotated bibliography lists market research reports and databases that focus on sports sponsorship at the London 2012 Games.

* Routledge Online Studies on the Olympic and Paralympic Games

This website provides an excellent resource for scholars of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, including a wealth of Olympic publications. For example: *Tomlinson, A. "Chapter 4-Olympic survivals: The Olympic Games as a Global Phenomenon: Chapter taken from The Global Politics of Sport: The Role of Global Institutions in Sport ISBN: 978-0-415-34601-6." Routledge Online Studies on the Olympic and Paralympic Games 1.9 (2012): 42-56.* It is recommended that scholars interested in the topic of Olympic sponsorship visit this online database for further elucidation.

* YouGov Olympic Sponsors Buzz Boost. Available from:<http://research.yougov.co.uk/news/2012/08/24/olympic-sponsors-buzz-boost/>

This article provides an overview of the YouGov BrandIndex London 2012 Olympic sponsorship report which provides instructive, current statistical data pertaining to the impact of the Olympic Games on official sponsors.

* Keynote Report (2013) Sports Sponsorship.

This report provides a comprehensive and elucidating overview of sports sponsorship activity in 2012, paying special attention to the impact of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games on sports sponsorship activity. The report includes the lack of sponsorship of women’s sports, controversies surrounding Olympic sponsorship and sponsorship activity surrounding the London 2012 Olympic & Paralympic Games.

* Mintel Report (2011) London Olympics: What the Games Mean for Business

This report assesses London’s preparations for the 2012 Olympic Games, and outlines their anticipated impact on a range of leisure and retail sectors. It also examines consumers’ expectations of and attitudes towards the Games. Developed by a leading research company, the report can be considered comprehensive and high-quality. However it should be noted that it is a pre-Games report and, as such, does not contain many of the more current observations provided by the earlier referenced KeyNote report. ?check line spacing?

### London 2012 sponsorship: IOC documents

This section of the annotated bibliography contains a list of relevant IOC documents, including the recently developed LOCOG Rule 40 Guidelines which exist to prevent ambush marketing. These sources are illuminating, given that they have been developed by the IOC. The Rule 40 Guidelines are instructive in informing researchers of the way in which ambush marketing has changed the Olympic legislative field, and the way in which such legislative changes are now being enforced and challenged.

* LOCOG (2011) Rule 40 Guidelines*.*

This document provides clarification on the LOCOG Rule 40 Guidelines, developed specifically as a means of countering the threat of ambush marketing. This document is accessible online at: <http://www.london2012.com/mm/Document/Publications/General/01/25/29/32/rule-40-guidelines_Neutral.pdf>

* International Olympic Committee (2012) Olympic Marketing Fact File: 2012 Edition.

This document contains a useful reference document relating to London 2012 Olympic marketing facts and figures. It is available from: <http://www.olympic.org/Documents/IOC_Marketing/OLYMPIC-MARKETING-FACT-FILE-2012.pdf>

* International Olympic Committee (2008) Olympic Marketing Fact File: 2008 Edition.

This document contains a useful reference document relating to Beijing 2008 Olympic marketing facts and figures. It is available from: <http://www.olympic.org/Documents/marketing_fact_file_en.pdf>

* IOC (2012) Marketing Report

This document provides a comprehensive marketing report of the marketing activity surrounding the 2012 Games. It begins with forewords by IOC President Jacques Rogge and Lord Sebastian Coe. It discusses marketing activity, broadcasting, sponsorship (discussed at length), ticketing, licensing and merchandising, the Olympic brand, and brand protection. It is replete with relevant, up-to-date facts and figures and can be considered an extremely useful resource. It is accessible online at:

<http://www.olympic.org/Documents/IOC_Marketing/London_2012/LR_IOC_MarketingReport_medium_res1.pdf>

* IOC Marketing: Media Guide 2012

This document provides an interesting instructive guide to the media covering the London 2012 Games, and provides useful insights into broadcasting, brand protection and other pertinent issues surrounding coverage

of the Games. It is accessible online at:

<http://www.olympic.org/Documents/IOC_Marketing/London_2012/IOC_Marketing_Media_Guide_2012.pdf>

* IOC Lists of Right-Holders – Broadcasting (London 2012)

This document provides a list of IOC rights holders for the 2012 Games. It is accessible online at: <http://www.olympic.org/Documents/IOC_Marketing/London_2012/London-2012-Olympic-Games-List-of-Rights-holding-Broadcasters.pdf>

* The Olympic Partner TOP Programme

The Olympic Partner TOP Programme constitutes the official list of sponsors of the 2012 Games. The TOP Programme is based on a tier system, with many different tiers, and levels of sponsorship available for corporate sponsors. This document provides an overview of them. It is accessible online at: <http://www.olympic.org/sponsors>

### London 2012 Olympic sponsorship: Journal articles

This section of the annotated bibliography provides a list of peer-reviewed academic journal articles that focus on sponsorship of the London 2012 Games. The concept of ambush marketing emerges with particular prominence within the literature and appears to constitute a clear focus of research in the sports sponsorship field. Methodological issues in the measurement of sponsorship impact also emerge as a key theme. This resource constitutes a timely and up-to-date bibliographic resource of particular relevance to those interested in sponsorship issues focused on the London 2012 Games.

* Hartland, T.,
Williams-Burnett, N. (2012) Protecting the Olympic brand: winners and losers. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* **20** (1), 69-82. 14p. 2 Charts.

This paper considers the measures that have been put in place to protect brands and official sponsors of the London 2012 Olympic Games in an attempt to drive out the practice of ambush marketing. This includes the legislative measures (later passed as law) in London 2012’s Olympic bid that existed as a means of protecting official sponsors from ambush marketers. This paper proposes that the Act goes far beyond its valid remit of preventing ambush marketing and is likely to restrict severely companies and other event organisers from pursuing their legitimate business practices. The article reports exploratory research that reveals 2,284,414 potential infringements of the Act and considers ramifications for companies who engage in marketing activity during the Games but who are not official sponsors.

* Palomba, M. (2011) Ambush marketing and the Olympics 2012. *Journal of Sponsorship.* **4** (3), 245-252. 8p.

This paper defines ambush marketing and discusses attempts by governments and other stakeholders of the Olympic Games in attempting to prevent it. Specifically, the paper explains the use of 'an association right' and the laws in place to prevent ambush marketing at the London Olympics in 2012.

* Kenyon, J., Palmer, C. (2008) Funding and sponsorship; the commercial impact of the 2012 London Olympic games–some considerations.*Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies.***2** (1), 29-44.

This article discusses the commercial relationships that exist between Olympic sponsors, the IOC and the bodies responsible for delivering London 2012 Olympic Games. It highlights ethical implications that have emerged as a result of this relationship, and focuses on tensions between world-wide and domestic sponsorship for the Olympics. The article also focuses on domestic funding issues and perceptions of the authors that the (funding of the) Games have become, to an extent, subject to the whims of commercial sponsorship.

* Grady, J., McKelvey, S., Bernthal, M.J. (2010) Olympic legislation vis-à-vis the rights and interests of stakeholders. *Journal of Sponsorship.* **3** (2), 144-156. 13p.

This article is instructive in its consideration of the development of event-specific legislation by the IOC (as a means of protecting the interests of the Olympic movement and its official sponsors from ambush marketing), and of its impact on host country legislation and trademark laws as a condition of the host city contract. Policy concerns are raised, as are concerns relating to commercial freedoms, and the impact of such legislation on local stakeholders. The study includes a consideration of event-specific legislation from Beijing, Vancouver and London.

* Deighton, P. (2012) Industry Insider. *Sport Marketing Quarterly.***21**(2), 68-69. 2p.

This article, published in the *Sport Marketing Quarterly,* provides an interesting industry insight by Paul Deighton, the Chief Executive officer of the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (LOCOG). His insights provide an interesting account of official LOCOG perceptions of Olympic Games sponsors and marketing activities.

* Ritchie, C. Technology enabled sponsorship strategies (2011) *Journal of Sponsorship.***4** (2), 105-115. 11p. 2 Black and white photographs.

This article focuses on the use of technology enabled strategies – a pertinent topic given concerns that have emerged post-Games of the underuse of social networking technology by Olympic sponsors as part of their Games campaigns. The article provides interesting case studies of best practice in technology enabled sponsorships and identifies some key criteria essential to making such partnerships a success. Case studies include IBM and Wimbledon, Avaya and the 2010 Winter Olympics, Cisco and London 2012, Mitel and the PGA European Tour 2010 and Ryder Cup, Platform Computing and Red Bull Racing, and CSC and Virgin Racing. The article is useful for researchers interested in the concept of the use of Olympic sponsorship and other sporting mega-events as a means of marketing technology companies.

* Taylor, C. R. (2012) The London Olympics 2012: what advertisers should watch. *International Journal of Advertising.***31**(3), 459-464. 6p.

This article identifies five key issues that advertisers should follow at the London Olympics: 1. the continued growth of sponsorships and whether there is greater effort to measure the effectiveness of sponsorships; 2. digital advertising's role in the Olympics; 3. how advertisers in traditional media, especially television, capitalize on the high viewership of the Olympics; 4. the trend towards Olympic sponsors considering corporate social responsibility issues in advertising; 5. the degree to which ambush marketing during the Olympics continues to occur. The article provides a useful reference for the most pertinent issues affecting sponsors at the Games, and can be cross-referenced effectively against the actual outcomes of sponsorship activity at the Games.

* Yelkur, R., Tomkovick, C., Pennington, J. (2012) The Alchemy of Olympics Advertising & Sponsorship: Turning the Games into Gold.*Journal of Management Policy and Practice.***13** (2), 34-45.

This study replicates and extends the research design of Tomkovick & Yelkur (2010) by studying all publicly traded Olympics advertisers and sponsors of the Summer and Winter Olympics between 2000 and 2010 to examine if they experienced financial gains. The results of the study indicate that Olympics advertisers outperform the S&P 500 for the four-week period surrounding these Games. Additionally, stock prices of the firms which both advertised and sponsored the Olympics outperformed those of firms which advertised in these Olympic telecasts but were not official Olympics sponsors. Implications for advertisers and researchers are presented as are study limitations and future research directions. This article provides useful reading for researchers performing comparative work surrounding the use of the Olympic Games by non-sponsors and sponsors. It is interesting to consider the relative success of MasterCard, for example, as compared to Visa (official sponsor) during the Games.

* Meenaghan, T. (2013) Measuring Sponsorship Performance: Challenge and Direction.*Psychology & Marketing.***30** (5), 385-393.

The article states that global sponsorship expenditure is forecast to reach US $53.3 billion in 2013. The article focuses on the need for improved methodologies for evaluating the returns resulting from sponsorship investments. This article forms part of a special issue of *Psychology and Marketing* and subsequently, it is recommended that readers visit the entire issue in addition to this article. The special issue brings together a series of papers from leading edge practitioners and academics and critically reviews certain current approaches to evaluation, research methodology, and recently developed models which quantify the value generated by sponsorship investment. The aims of the special issue are to increase levels of understanding and interaction between the academic community concerned with researching sponsorship and the practitioner community charged with managing sponsorship. It is strongly recommended that researchers who are interested in the measurement of the impact of Olympic sponsorship should use this special issue as a key starting point in the appreciation of methodological issues that surround it.

* Meenaghan, T., McLoughlin, D., McCormack, A. (2013) New Challenges in Sponsorship Evaluation Actors, New Media, and the Context of Praxis.*Psychology & Marketing.***30** (5), 444-460.

This paper seeks to address the implications for performance measurement in the changes that have recently emerged in sponsorship strategies. The article identifies one such change as the extent to which major sponsors now view sponsorship more holistically and strategically as a platform to address an entire range of stakeholder groups enabled by sponsorship. It also discusses the increased usage of social media in sponsorship and its capacity to engage and connect with sponsorship audiences. It finally seeks to identify challenges associated with sponsorship evaluation issues and the current quality of evaluative techniques used within the marketing industry.

* Dowling, M., Robinson, L., Washington, M. (2013) Taking advantage of the London 2012 Olympic Games: corporate social responsibility through sport partnerships.*European Sport Management Quarterly*(ahead-of-print).1-24.

Written by leading academics in the field of sport and leisure policy, this research explores the ways in which corporate organisations leveraged corporate social responsibility (CSR) through a sport initiative that was conceived, implemented and mediated by the British Olympic Association (BOA) preceding the London 2012 Olympic Games. This research employed a case-based methodology, utilising semi-structured interviews with senior directors and managers within National Governing Bodies (NGBs) and corporate organisations. Findings include: corporate leveraging to achieve subtle human resourcing objectives; indirect involvement and market research into the Olympic Games; and the increase of corporate capital. This research concludes that CSR relationships in sport can be innovative and creative but require objective alignment, appropriate timing and the management of expectations. The paper is particularly useful to researchers interested in the relationship between Olympic sponsorship and CSR.

* Kourovskaia, A.A. and Meenaghan, T. (2013) Assessing the financial impact of sponsorship investment.*Psychology & Marketing.***30** (5), 417-430.

This article outlines an effective approach to the problem of assessing the financial impact of sponsorship investment – a particularly useful resource for researchers seeking to understand the impact of Olympic sponsorship on brands such as Visa and Proctor & Gamble. Based on a number of inter-related proprietary models the approach provides the tools to measure the brand financial uplift created by a sponsorship programme and the shareholder value thus created. The paper uses the MBO model, ie, the Millward Brown Optimor model, which has proved successful in capturing the effectiveness of sponsorships and in forecasting financial performance of a brand in previous studies. The implementation of the MBO approach is outlined as a five-step process. The paper concludes that the complex tasks involved in assessing the financial impact of sponsorship investment and the impact on shareholder value can be rigorously addressed through the application of these tools and highlights its use for sponsorship managers.

* Alexandris, K. et al. (2012) Testing a Hierarchy of Effects Model of Sponsorship Effectiveness.*Journal of Sport Management*. **26** (5), 363-378.

This article tested the application of an alternative hierarchy of effects model (affect, cognition, and conation) in the context of sponsorship. Activity involvement and team attachment (affect) were proposed to influence sponsor image and attitudes toward sponsorship (cognition), which in turn were proposed to influence consumer behavioral intentions (conation). Fans of a professional basketball team in Greece (N = 384) participated in the study. The results provided support for the alternative hierarchy of effects model and its application in the context of sponsorship. Team attachment (affect) was shown to have both a direct and indirect relationship with behavioral intentions (conation), through its influence on sponsor image and attitudes toward sponsorship (cognition). Furthermore, the attraction dimension of involvement was shown to influence team attachment. The theoretical and managerial implications of these results are discussed. The paper is interesting to researchers and sponsors interested in further understanding the links between sponsorship of a sports team, team attachment and behavioural intention.

* Pettigrew, S. et al. (2013) Game on: do children absorb sports sponsorship messages? *Public health nutrition.*1-8.

The notion that children may have been targeted by McDonald’s and Cadbury’s as part of the Olympic Games is an interesting one, and has formed the backbone of many ethical debates. This study is relevant to this discussion as it sought to explore children's implicit associations between popular sports and a range of sports sponsors. N=164 Australian Children (aged 5-12 years) participated in an activity using magnets bearing the logos of numerous sports and sponsors. They were invited to arrange the magnets on a whiteboard without being advised that the activity related to sponsorship. Seventy-six per cent of the children aligned at least one correct sponsor magnet with the relevant sport. Just over half the children (54%) correctly matched the most popular sport (an Australian Football League team) with its relevant sponsor (a fast-food chain). The article concluded that it provided some support for the argument that sports sponsorship could effectively reach child audiences, and that this carried potentially worrisome implications for sports sponsorship campaigns that included the use of fast-food, alcohol and confectionary-based products and companies. The study did not, however, investigate the relationship that matching sponsors with sports may have enacted on the behaviour of the children.

* Fenton, W. (2009) The global sponsorship market.*Journal of Sponsorship.***2** (2), 120-130.

This article addresses concerns about a slowdown in sponsorship activity, largely as a result of macro-economic factors (e.g. global recession). This article provides an analysis of a large sample of international sponsorship deals that were signed and reported during 2007 and confirms that sponsorship is still very much regarded as a valid technique by marketing departments struggling to reach ever-more diverse publics in ever-more compelling and relevant ways. The paper provides an interesting overview of data and information pertaining to the ongoing issue of the efficacy of sports sponsorship to the overall marketing strategy of corporations.

* Deitz, G.D., Evans, R.D., Hansen, J.D. (2012) Sponsorship and shareholder value: A re-examination and extension.*Journal of Business Research.*

While research generally supports the idea of a positive relationship between sponsorship agreements and shareholder wealth, the relationship remains unclear for several sponsorship categories. This paper subsequently addresses this concept, and replicates and extends prior research on official product and Olympic sponsorship announcements. It reported a significant positive shareholder wealth effect associated with an initial official product sponsorship announcement, but that the effect was not present in the renewal of such announcements. It also reported conflicting views from prior research regarding Olympic sponsorships. The article is pertinent given the conflicting experiences of official Olympic sponsors of the 2012 London Games and allows for a deeper understanding of why 2012 sponsors may not have realised the gains that they may have initially projected.

* Mazodier, M., Quester, P., Chandon, J. (2012) Unmasking the ambushers: conceptual framework and empirical evidence*. European Journal of Marketing.***46** (1/2), 192-214.

This article is of interest to companies and to researchers interested in the effect of disclosure, by a company or organisation, of the negative effects of a non-sponsors ambush marketing activities. The study employed an experimental approach to research the effects of disclosure, by sports events organisers, of the actions of firms that have conspired to ambush official event sponsors. Two successive experiments were conducted; the first study used a student sample (n=120) and a fictitious brand, and the second study used a before-and-after experiment with control groups (n=480), using four real brands and print disclosure articles. Data were collected from six French metropolitan areas and analysed using Repeated Measure ANOVA and MANOVA. The study reported that ambush marketing disclosure is associated with lower attitudes towards the ambusher’s brand. Practical implications indicate an effective alternative strategy to legal protection for official sponsors and event organisers.

* Meenaghan, T. and O’Sullivan, P. (2013) Metrics in Sponsorship Research — Is Credibility an Issue?*Psychology & Marketing.***30** (5), 408-416.

This article considers the way in which business fail to measure sponsorship effectiveness effectively, and also considers the problematic nature of the metrics employed. As a result, this paper proposes a critique of current evaluative practice in the evaluation of sponsorship effectiveness. In particular, it focuses on media exposure and sponsorship awareness. It illustrates the latitude provided by these metrics and the variability of outcomes that can be extracted from their use or - in some cases - potential abuse. Such latitude in conceptualization and application can extend to having the same sponsorship programme receive quite radically different evaluations based on the same raw data. This raises serious questions about the credibility and effectiveness of current sponsorship measurement. This paper is extremely interesting to researchers and practitioners interested in the validity of the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness, and in the ramifications that this carries for policy and practice.

* Bodet, G. and Lacassagne, M. (2012) International place branding through sporting events: a British perspective of the 2008 Beijing Olympics. *European Sport Management Quarterly.***12** (4), 357-374.

This study researched the use of international sports events as a means of branding a location ‘internationally’ through brand association transfer. Based on social representation theory and an abductive research strategy, a survey was carried out among British citizens to identify their opinions about the Olympic Games and the city of Beijing following the organisation of the Games in August 2008. Analysis found that few clearly positive elements were transferred and several negative associations remained among the sample group. Overall, the study confirmed the value of sporting events in place branding strategies but highlighted some additional limitations, such as the transfer of negative elements and a lack of media control. This carries interesting implications, particularly for researchers and practitioners interested in tourism, and the use of mega sporting events in marketing a location.

* Pitt, L. et al. (2010) Event sponsorship and ambush marketing: Lessons from the Beijing Olympics.*Business Horizons.***53** (3), 281-290.

This article uses a case study of the Beijing Olympic Games in 2008 to identify the impact of ambush marketing on the IOC and official sponsors. A case study of the Li Ning Affair forms the basis of discussion (Olympic sponsor Adidas was ambushed by lesser-known Chinese sportswear company Li Ning, whose namesake founder was the most decorated Chinese Olympian and who lit the Olympic flame at the 2008 Beijing Olympiad). Data collected immediately following the closing of the Beijing Games isolates what the authors refer to as the Li Ning Effect — or, being incorrectly identified as an official sponsor — and the positive effects this has on measures of brand attitude and recommendation. The article presents seven lessons about ambush marketing which sponsors and those considering sponsorship opportunities may find of interest. This article is informative in its use of the term *Li Ning Effect* and of its analysis of this phenomenon and appears to emerge as a key reader in the ambush marketing field as a result.

* Messner, M. and Reinhard, M. (2012) Effects of strategic exiting from sponsorship after negative event publicity.*Psychology & Marketing*. **29** (4), 240-256.

Research on the effects of event sponsorship has focused mainly on the consequences for brand equity of the association between a sponsor and a sponsored event. However, the effects of management's decision to exit from a sponsorship have received little empirical consideration. This is pertinent given the fact that some official Games sponsors received negative publicity (e.g. Visa). This study consequently examined (a) the impact of a sponsor's corporate reputation on consumer responses to the strategic exit from a controversial sponsorship, and (b) the role that perceived trust in the decision plays in determining the outcomes. Results emphasised the fact that strategic exiting from a controversial sponsorship (i.e., possible doping scandals at the event) could carry potentially positive consequences for the sponsor's image when the decision was a trusted one, but that detrimental consequences could also occur when the exiting was attributed to overly self-serving reasons. This concept is pertinent to studies of sports sponsorship as it relates directly to the life-cycle management of sponsorship campaigns.

* Ellis, D., Scassa, T. and Séguin, B. (2011) Framing ambush marketing as a legal issue: an Olympic perspective.*Sport Management Review.***14** (3), 297-308.

This paper provides another study of ambush marketing during the Olympic Games, and examines the emerging trend of host countries using legislation to protect the Olympic brand. It also discusses Canada's Olympic and Paralympic Marks Act in depth. The authors consider the consequences of placing ambush marketing in a legal context from both a legal and a business management perspective. The paper is of particular interest to scholars interested in the use of a Canadian case study and in the legal ramifications of the application of ambush marketing-focused law.

* Walraven, M., Koning, R.H., van Bottenburg, M. (2012) The effects of sports sponsorship: A review and research agenda*. Marketing Review-Helensburgh.* **12** (1), 17.

This paper presents a literature review that forms the foundation for the development of an integrated framework of sponsorship outcomes. This paper extends previous conceptual work in that all kinds of sponsorship effects are considered, not only brand equity effects (normally a focus of such studies). The article concludes that several areas of the study of sponsorship effects remain unexplored, in particular the effects of sponsorship on the relations between sponsor and stakeholders. Opportunities for further research have been translated in specific research propositions and as such, this article forms a valuable resource for researchers, particularly those interested in advancing research and in formulating a contribution to existing knowledge in this field.

* Mazodier, M. and Merunka, D. (2012) Achieving brand loyalty through sponsorship: the role of fit and self-congruity*. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science.***40** (6), 807-820.

This article explores the assumption by brand managers that brand loyalty can be increased through the use of sponsorship activities, and the nature by which this process occurs. Findings confirm that sponsorship exposure exerts a positive impact on brand affect, brand trust, and brand loyalty, and attributes this to the effect of self-congruity with an event, and the perceived fit between the event and the brand, and the positive effect that this exerts on brand affect. Brand affect is ultimately identified as an important mediator of sponsorship effects. This paper is therefore of use to researchers interested in the process by which sponsorship positively affects brand loyalty.

* Rennie, L. (2010) The pros of amateurs: How amateur sports can put a sponsorship strategy at the top of the podium.*Journal of Sponsorship.***3** (4), 338-347.

It is interesting that many sports sponsorship studies have focused on high net worth professional sports and leagues. However, sports sponsorships of smaller amateur sports and sports events can still offer a wealth of potential for brands to meet their marketing objectives, forming the focus of this article. Sponsoring the national sport organisation (NSO) of an Olympic sport is identified as an alternative to becoming an official Olympic sponsor, and the benefits for customer engagement (while requiring a much smaller investment) are highlighted. This paper is innovative and useful to policy makers, brand managers and scholars as it discusses an array of best practices with respect to the negotiation and activation of an NSO sponsorship. With support from the literature, the paper demonstrates how a brand’s image and equity can be positively impacted by creating relevant intersections between the brand, the sport and its participants at both the competitive and recreational level. The piece is strengthened by the author’s experience with managing such a relationship between a financial institution, the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, and winter sport NSO, Alpine Canada Alpin.

* Rahman, M. and Lockwood, S. (2011) How to ‘use your Olympian’: the paradox of athletic authenticity and commercialization in the contemporary Olympic Games.*Sociology*. **45 (**5), 815-829.

This article builds on the relatively burgeoning literature that surrounds the concept of the commercialisation of the Olympic Games (post-1984). The article adds interestingly to this discussion by focusing on the conceptual emergence of Olympians as commodities that promote the brand of the Olympics. This concept has begun to emerge with some force, particularly given the advent of ambush marketing and the heightening complexity of rules and legislation to which the athlete has become subject as a means of preventing it. It is likely that this concept will form the basis of a larger field of research in coming years and, as such, papers focusing on the concept provide an early insight into the phenomenon.

### London 2012 sponsorship: Periodicals

This section of the annotated bibliography lists periodical articles that focus on sponsorship activity surrounding the London 2012 Games. While the articles could not be considered an academically robust source, they nevertheless provide elucidating material pertaining to statistical facts and figures, case studies, industry perceptions and insights that can effectively inform research activity, policy and practice.

* Sebastian, J. (2012) 2012: The year in sport sponsorship.  *Marketing Week* [online]. [12 July 2012].

This article appeared in *Marketing Week* and provides a useful summary of key talking points from the Games. The article includes Cadbury’s Sports vs Stripes campaigns, viral content used by Adidas, the new ways that sponsors were able to connect with their audience, and the successful nature of the Paralympic Games 2012 for sponsors. It also comments on Sainsbury’s decision to sponsor only the Paralympic Games. The advent of new technology in Olympic sponsorship was also noted. The article also discussed the use of sponsorship in other sports events such as the Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) and the £150m Emirates sponsorship of Arsenal Football Club and as such provides a useful quick-reference resource.

* Parsons, R., Joseph, S. (2012) Adidas is winner of the Games as fellow sponsors lose pace. *Marketing Week.* **35** (31).

This article argues that most brands have largely failed to lift its brands standing among consumers, despite the millions that have been spent by corporations on Olympic sponsorship. It also profiles Adidas and argues it has emerged as the clear winner among official partners to the Olympics, with its sponsorship of Team GB provoking a surge of positive sentiment to the brand. It also comments on criticisms of McDonald’s and Coca-Cola’s by IOC President Jacques Rogge and others.

* Bruce, P. (2012) An Exercise in Olympic Vanity. *Canadian Business.* **85** (13).

This article comments on the expensive nature of Olympic sponsorship; for example, from 1988 to 2012, the Olympic Partner programme grew significantly, with a ten-fold increase in revenue from $96 million for the Calgary and Seoul Games, to $957 million for the Vancouver and London Games. The article questions the true value of Olympic sponsorship. This article and others of its kind are interesting to juxtapose against methodological (academic) studies that address the potential difficulties in measuring sponsorship impact.

* BA and Olympic sponsorship: How being bold paid off.*Marketing Week* <http://www.marketingweek.co.uk/sectors/travel-and-leisure/ba-and-olympic-sponsorship-how-being-bold-paid-off/4004639.article>.[11 July 2012].

The article comments on the innovative nature of the BA Olympic campaign and its successful use of patriotism. As such it provides an interesting quick-reference piece on an Olympic sponsor case study.

* Pilger, J. (2012) Blair, Olympic deals and why another world is possible*. New Statesman.* **141**( 5115).

This article profiles the case of Dow Chemical, appeals made to Lord Coe to reject them as an official sponsor due to their role in the manufacturing of Agent Orange and the calamitous effects that the chemical still carries for millions of Vietnamese children and questions the spirit of the Games. The article is interesting from a political perspective, and also forms interesting reading for anybody who is interested in the ethical implications of Games sponsorship.

* BP switches its Olympic focus from practical to emotional.*Marketing Week.* **35** (24).

This article discusses the way in which BP is changing the tone of their Olympic sponsorship to reflect a more emotional message, thanking the ‘home team’ (volunteers, athletic ambassadors, groundsmen, all the people behind the scenes), and their use of social media. In this sense, it provides a useful case study/profile of a leading Olympic sponsor.

* Snoad, L. (2012) Brands line up for the longer run. *Marketing Week.* **35** (12).

This article reflects on the impact of the current economic environment in heralding a change of pace for hospitality programmes around this summer's Games, with public inclusivity and long-term benefits now the goal. It comments that, in straitened financial times, corporate hospitality can be a tricky subject for brands to get right, and that it is important to find the balance between creating a fun, meaningful experience for clients, stakeholders and contacts at events like the Olympics, without appearing too ostentatious. It profiles a shift from ostentatious corporate hospitality to a more social image and briefly profiles a number of sponsors. The article provides a useful current observation of the effects of macro-economic factors (austeric climate) on corporate hospitality and on the way in which this is perceived by consumers.

* Boudway, I. (2012) Don't Mess With The Keeper of the Rings.*Bloomberg Businessweek.* 4284.

This article comments on the aggressive nature of Olympic legislation in terms of protecting the Olympic branding, and provides a wealth of examples of the way in which small businesses have been prevented from using Olympic themes in their marketing. This is a particularly interesting piece for researchers and small business owners interested in the study of small businesses and the impact that the Games has exerted on their activities.

* Bacon, J. (2012) Flying the brand flag for British Airways*. Marketing Week.* **35** (47).

The article reflects on BA’s journey from a loss of more than £500m in 2010 to a more successful early tenure under new marketer Frank Van Der Post. Van Der Post is interviewed, and talks in some depth about the role of the 2012 Games in BA’s sponsorship and marketing campaigns. This article therefore provides an interesting case study of an official Games sponsor, and insight into how the London 2012 Games sponsorship fitted into the overall strategy of the brand.

* Beer, J. (2012) How to Brand Crash the Olympics. *Canadian Business.* **85** (13).

This article discusses the extreme lengths that Olympic marketers and Games organisers go to in order to protect official Olympic sponsors. The threat of ambush marketing is discussed, as are methods of circumventing official marketing laws for non-sponsors of the Games. This provides an interesting practitioner/industry-led view of the phenomenon of ambush marketing that could be effectively compared with the academic articles (earlier cited) that also focus on ambush marketing and its effects.

* Joseph, S. (2012) Lloyds: sponsorship laws are oversensitive.*Marketing Week* [online]. [8 September 2012].

The article explains how official Olympic sponsors are calling on the IOC to find a more pragmatic way to enforce its sponsorship rules, with a case study of Lloyds discussed. Social media is a particular concern highlighted in the article. This is a particularly interesting piece, given the potentially negative ramifications that the over-zealous enforcement of laws could exert on both official sponsors and non-sponsors of the Games.

* London 2012 Olympic Sponsorship Roundup.*Forbes.com.* [7 August 2012].

The article provides a round-up of sponsorship activity surrounding the Olympic 2012 Games, provided by Forbes.com. It discusses the TOPS Programme, and provides a brief overview of every official 2012 Games sponsor. It provides a useful quick reference piece on Olympic sponsorship activity.

* London 2012: Brand winners.*Marketing Week* [online]. [13 August 2012].

This article reflects on the best marketing activity that took place around the 2012 Games. It includes Adidas ‘Take the Stage’, BA ‘Home Advantage’, and P&G ‘Proud Sponsor of Mums’ campaigns, and non-official sponsors ‘Beats’ by Dr Dre (an ambush marketing campaign). Also Nike’s (non-official) ‘Find your Greatness’ campaign and Paddy Power’s ‘We Hear You’ campaigns are covered. Visa’s (official sponsorship) campaign was referred to as a ‘loser’ in the article, providing a real-world example of the *Li Ning* effect (cited earlier in this resource as part of an academic study of the phenomenon of successful non-official sponsorship of the Beijing Games).

* Montlake, S. (2012) 'Lonely' Crystal Is Only Chinese Sponsor In London Olympics*. Forbes.com* [8 February 2012].

This article provides an overview of the Olympic sponsor tier system, and explains how only one Chinese company (CG Crystal, a digital imaging firm), paid to be part of London 2012. The article considers the reason for this. This provides an interesting case study for researchers who are interested in the concept of global marketing.

* Coe, S. (2012) Lord Coe urges sponsors to explain their Olympic role. *Marketing.* (00253650), 5-5. 3/4p. 1 Colour photograph.

This article provides an interesting insight into sponsor management by the IOC and LOCOG. The article reports on comments made by LOCOG Chairman Lord Sebastian Coe, who urged marketers to promote the roles they have played in making the 2012 Olympic Games a possibility. Topics include Coe's claim that journalists refuse to understand how the Games are funded, his suggestion that sponsors create a positive narrative illustrating their Olympic involvement, and why spirits company Diageo chose not to sponsor the Olympic Games. Coe’s comments are interesting given the findings of some academic studies that reported the positive effect that disclosure can mete out on official sponsors in the context of ambush marketing narratives.

* Parsons, R. (2012) McDonald's preps 'biggest' Games campaign*. Marketing Week* [online]. [27 June 2012].

The article profiles McDonald’s Olympic campaign. The campaign is profiled as McDonalds largest Olympic campaign to date, having spent a total of £10m – and its adoption of a focus of celebrating the personal stories of the people working at the Games. This article is of interest to those researching the potential ethical implications that arise in the consideration of sponsorship of a sports event by a fast-food chain.

* Craggs, N. (2012) *title? Marketing.* 28-30. 3p. 3 Colour photographs.

The article profiles sportswear company Adidas' marketing director for Great Britain Nick Craggs and his work on the company's marketing campaign for the 2012 Olympics. This provides an interesting practitioner view on the threats of ambush marketing campaigns (in this case, from rival sportswear company Nike), a discussion of Adidas' marketing strategy for their sponsorship of the Olympics, and the importance (to Adidas) of Team Great Britain winning gold medals in the Games. Given the successful sponsorship activities of Adidas during the Games, this forms an interesting insight into the management of the campaign.

* Non-sponsor brands rein in London 2012 adspend*.* Marketing (00253650), 5-5. 3/4p. 2 Colour photographs.

The article profiles brands Unilever, Nestlé, and MasterCard, whose competitors are sponsoring the 2012 Olympic Games, and discusses why these brands are not spending money on Olympic advertisements or sponsorship, why it made sense for sportswear brand Nike to compete with rival brand Adidas during the games, and a discussion of the amount that sponsor brands are spending on Olympic advertising. This is a useful article to reference when observing the actual financial outcomes of the aforementioned brands and their Olympic-sponsor rivals’ campaigns during the 2012 Games.

* Olympic brands must look beyond London.*Marketing Week* [online]. [1 August 2012].

The article considers how Olympic brands need to begin planning immediately for Rio 2016 and provides an overview of how brands such as Proctor & Gamble and McDonald’s are doing just this. This article could be of benefit to individuals interested in the long-term planning of sponsorship campaigns and activity.

* Barnett, M. (2012) Olympic data won't make happy reading for sponsors.*Marketing Week* [online]. 24 July 2012].

This article suggests that Olympic sponsors will cherry-pick data to show they got what they wanted from their investment, and also comments that it is hard to believe they wouldn't have achieved better results if they had spent their money elsewhere. It reports a *Marketing Week* in-depth investigation into the sponsors' use of social media, finding that their Olympic associations are more often proving to be negative than positive. It reports data from a YouGov survey that shows that on the day Britain picked up the Olympic torch, the Twitter buzz began, but since that time the Olympics have delivered mostly unwelcome attention, with controversies covering any subject from chips to tax exemption. This is an elucidating piece, and matches well with academic studies that have been conducted on the methodological problems associated with the measurement of sponsorship impacts. It carries interesting insights for both academics and practitioners.

* Smith, J. (2012) Olympic Hurdles for Advertisers: The Games' Unique Rules and Restrictions.*Forbes.com.* [24 July 2012].

The article profiles the intricacies of being an official Olympic sponsor in terms of the rules and regulations that they are subject to. It references the Olympic Marks and Imagery Usage Handbook in its discussion of ambush marketing and its attempts to stop it. It also provides a long list of regulations that appear in the Handbook. This includes similar data to that which can be referenced in official IOC documents and that which is discussed in a wider context in academic studies of the same concept, but the value of this article is that it provides a sponsors-eye view of the phenomenon.

* Mitchell, A. (2012) Olympic legacy: inspiration that sticks. *Marketing* (00253650). 28-30. 3p. 7 Colour photographs.

The article discusses the success of marketing campaign and sports sponsorship following the 2012 Olympic Games. As such it provides useful statistical/financial data. It discusses reasons as to why Olympic sponsors such as Visa and Lloyds spend non-Olympic years marketing the Games (in addition to the year of the Games itself), the return on investment (ROI) gained by Olympic sponsors in 2012, and how companies like Puma and Sky committed a form of ambush marketing by sponsoring teams and athletes instead of the Games.

* Olympic lessons: How to avoid ambush marketing rules.*Managing Intellectual Property.* 223.

The article focuses on intellectual property issues, and comments on how many of Britain's biggest brands seemed to be openly breaking the recently introduced IOC ambush marketing rules. It comments on the fact that LOCOG have sent very few cease-and-desist letters to businesses that have appeared to circumvent its rules, and highlights the fact that there have been no court actions to date. It profiles a number of campaigns including Vodafone at Canary Wharf, Tesco, and Robert Dyas.

* Olympic sponsors stuck in the slow lane.*Marketing Week.* **35** (25).

This article comments on the travel problems and marketing hyper-activity at Terminal 5 at Heathrow Airport caused by the ‘Olympification’ of T5. It comments more widely on the time restrictions on sponsors and how this requires them to flood the market with imagery over a relatively short time period. This article is interesting in that it raises the potentially negative issue of flooding the market with Olympic imagery – something that might desensitize consumers to the power of Olympic sponsorship.

* Olympics in Focus. *Marketing.* (00253650), 9-13, 5p, 8 Colour photographs, 1 Chart.

The article profiles several brands who engaged in interesting, newsworthy campaigns during the London 2012 Games. It includes a case study of how Google launched an Olympics hub on its social networking site Google+, what eyeglasses manufacturer Specsavers did to capitalize on an error that confused the flags of North and South Korea, and how sportswear company Nike sabotaged rival Adidas and ambush marketed the Olympics. As such the article contains useful case studies that researchers and practitioners might find of interest.

* Handley, L. (2011) Paralympics is no leap of faith for 2012 sponsors.*Marketing Week.* **34** (29).

The article comments on the value of the Paralympic Games to sponsors, and considers how the Paralympic Games are becoming a potentially far more interesting sponsorship proposition to corporations than has historically been the case in previous Games.

* O'Reilly, L. (2012) Post-Olympic TV ad market to fall flat. *Marketing Week* [online]. [8 January 2012].

The article discusses the fact that post-Olympic TV revenues have not reflected forecasts – and provides a useful source of facts and figures of this nature.

* Puma under investigation over 'gold medal' release.*Marketing Week.* **35** (23).

The article explains how Puma is being investigated by Olympic chiefs after being accused of ignoring restrictions on non-sponsors using terms such as 'Games' and 'gold medal' in their communications. The case study brings into focus a practical example of the wider issue of the realities involved in legislating against ambush marketers and attempting to protect official sponsors.

* Knight-Adams, O. (2012) Refreshing Approach.*Event**.* Oct, 16-16. 1p.

This article presents an interview with Olivia Knight-Adams, the sustainable games project coordinator for Coca-Cola. Knight-Adams discusses her role, recognizes the ISO20121 international standard as an effective tool for Coca-Cola's corporate sustainability strategy, and evaluates the social value of the Olympic sponsorship of Coca-Cola. As such, the article provides an interesting official sponsor-view of the value of the Games, and raises the concept of social value of sponsorship as a means of connecting with the consumer.

* Samsung*. Marketing.* (00253650), 41-41. 1p. 4 Colour photographs.

The article discusses the marketing initiatives of the mobile phone company Samsung that have resulted in its nomination for the journal's 2012 Marketer of the Year award. Topics include Samsung's positioning as a lifestyle brand, a viral exchange with a consumer involving a drawing of a dragon, and the sponsorship of the 2012 Olympic Games. It can be considered a brief, quick reference case study of a successful London 2012 sponsor.

* Joseph, S. (2012) Sir Martin Sorrell: 'Olympic legacies stalling'.*Marketing Week* [online]. [17 December 2012].

The article discusses how London 2012 sponsorship legacies are being hampered by economic constraints. WPP chief Sir Martin Sorrell has warned that London 2012 sponsors may struggle to complete their long-term legacy initiatives claiming that some brands' commitment to their post-Olympic campaigns are already starting to ‘fluctuate’ because of a lack of economic visibility. The piece provides an interesting industry-view of the effect of macro-economic constraints on the realisation of Olympic legacies.

* Joseph, S. (2012) Sponsors eye 2012 legacies.*Marketing Week* [online]. [16 May 2012].

The article comments on the way in which Olympic sponsors such as Cisco, Coca-Cola and EDF Energy have claimed that their London 2012 sponsorship can deliver long-term social value. It references examples such as

GE, who used its sponsorship of the Beijing Games to spur a restructure of its entire sales approach, and Cadbury, who is using the 2012 Games to put in place a framework for measuring the social impact of its marketing.

* Barnett, M. (2012) Sponsors fall short of gold standard in first social media Olympics.*Marketing Week* [online]. [23 July 2012].

The article reports research that reveals that London 2012 sponsors must use social media in a more sophisticated way if their messages are to reach a global Olympic audience. It seems that despite heavy Twitter activity by spectators of the Games, most of the Olympic sponsor brands do not yet appear to be strongly associated with the Games on Twitter. YouGov's BrandIndex tool also shows that few of the sponsors appear to be significantly benefiting from their association with London 2012. The article features a Q&A with the Proctor & Gamble Project Director which asks about P&G’s social media strategy. The article is elucidating in a field of study that will no doubt increase significantly over the next Olympiad, providing interesting statistics and arguments as to why social media must be used much more efficiently by Games sponsors in future Games.

* Mitchell, A. (2012) Sponsors on the Starting Blocks. *Marketing.* (00253650), 24-26, 3p, 5 Colour Photographs, 3 Charts.

The article explores brand recognition among official sponsors of the 2012 Olympic Games, commenting on the different levels of sponsorship that a brand can choose (worldwide partner, official ‘provider’), which brands are being most closely associated with the Games (regardless of sponsorship), and data pertaining to citizens' spontaneous recall of Olympic sponsors.

* Costa, M. (2011) Sponsors run risk of ambush at Olympics.*Marketing Week.* **34** (41).

The article reports on the dangers of ambush marketing for Olympic sponsors, and reports results of a *Marketing Week* commissioned study that finds that the British public wrongly named MasterCard, Nike and Sony as official Games sponsors. It provides interesting statistics regarding brand activity of major sponsors and their rivals during the Games, based on official and ambush marketing activities.

* Clark, N. (2012) Survey: McDonald's 'poor fit' with Games*. Marketing.* (00253650). 5-5, 2/3p, 1 Colour photograph.

The article looks at fast-food chain McDonald's and its sponsorship of the 2012 Olympic Games. It reports the results of a consumer survey concerning the appropriateness of sponsorship of sporting events by companies that sell unhealthy foods. Comments from a McDonald's spokesperson are presented and the article provides interesting reading for researchers interested in the ethical nature of Games-time sponsorship.

* Rosenblum, A., Konrad, A., Keating, C., Roberts, D., Benner, K. (2012) The (Big) Bucks Behind the Olympics. *Fortune.* **165** ( 8).

This article provides a financial profile of the Games, from the first modern games in Athens in 1896 to the current day. It profiles interesting examples such as the security spend on the 2012 London Games, the $100m raised by US Swimming per annum from its 300,000 strong membership fees, and the GB rowing team's Olympic budget of circa $43 million. It also provides useful breakdowns on television rights revenue over different Olympic Games. It can be considered a useful quick reference for case studies and financial data pertaining to an historic (financial) account of the Games.

* Gillis, R. (2012) The future of sports sponsorship. *Marketing.* (00253650), 10-11, 2p, 4 Colour photographs.

The article examines the use of sports sponsorship in marketing and public relations, focusing on sponsorship of the 2012 Olympic Games. The article reports a dilemma for companies which are official sponsors of the Games, considering the effect of their garnering exclusive rights on the potential alienation of the sports spectators who attend the Games. This inconvenience factor seems to have emerged with some force in the case of Visa, the only card that could be used at Games venues, and which subsequently led to negative consumer perceptions of the brand.

* Reynolds, N. (2013) The Games Plan. *Marketing.* (00253650), 15-15, 1p, 2 Colour photographs.

The article discusses initiatives to attract sponsors for the 2014 Commonwealth Games. Topics include the comments of the marketer Ty Speer, the possibility that the athlete Usain Bolt will attend the games, and comparisons between the Commonwealth Games and the 2012 Olympic Games. This article provides a brief practitioner-led view of marketing issues surrounding sporting mega-events.

* Author? (2012) The most branded Olympics ever.*Managing Intellectual Property.* (223).

This article looks at the way in which London 2012 Games became the most branded games in history, and discusses key marketing issues such as the threat of ambush marketing, anti-ambush marketing laws, the regulations on advertising and trading around Olympic events, and the IP (intellectual property) work that surrounded the extensive protection of London 2012 branding, fonts and logos.

* Benady, D. (2012) The Olympic Journey. *Marketing*. (00253650), 32-33, 2p.

The article focuses on outdoor advertising during the 2012 Olympic Games. Topics include brand management and marketing campaigns, corporate sponsorship of the Olympic Games, advertising management by the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games (LOCOG), and the best locations for outdoor advertising including airports, the London Underground tube transportation system, and train terminals. It provides an interesting niche study of the use of marketing and sponsorship activity during Games-time.

* Killion, A. (2012) The Real Battle For Olympic™ Gold*. Adweek.* **53** (26).

The article discusses how Olympic athletes often do not profit financially from the Games, due to restrictions levelled upon them by the IOC. The article provides an interesting case study of Nick Symmonds, US middle-distance runner, who auctioned off a tattoo space on his body to Hanson Dodge Creative for $11,100.It provides interesting case studies such as British Olympian Sally Gunnell, who was banned from unfurling the Union Jack in an advertising photo shoot for Easy Jet because competitor British Airways paid a reported $40 million for sponsorship rights. Many other interesting examples are given and the piece raises the interesting issue of how athletes have very little control, or ability to profit, from sponsorship activity in the way that they might feel should be open to them. This raises the spectre of the commodification of the Olympic athlete and provides case studies pertaining to such a contentious issue.

* The Sponsors.*Creative Review.* **32** (8).

The article profiles how many Olympic sponsors have actually received negative press as a result of their involvement in the Games. Much of this is attributed in the article toLOCOG's ‘draconian approach’ to 'protecting' its sponsors, which includes the introduction of 'brand exclusion zones', in which only official sponsors will be able to advertise, restricted trading in and around the Olympic Park and other event zones, and the issuing of heavy fines to any non-sponsors, however small, who attempt to use the Olympics in any form to promote products or events. The article contains interesting profiles of the way that some companies have been innovative in their campaigns and secured a positive result. The article can be considered a notably critical take on Olympic sponsorship laws and activities.

* Allen, F.E. (2012) There Is Nothing Wrong With 'Ambush Marketing' at the Olympics.*Forbes.com.* [26 July 2012].

This article constitutes a guest post by Jim Andrews, Senior Vice President for Content Strategy at IEG, a sponsorship consulting company. The article discusses ambush marketing, and argues that it is not, in fact, evil, and that it does not harm the Olympic brand. This constitutes an interesting industry-led view of ambush marketing, its ethical standing and its value.

* Joseph, S. (2012) Twitter distances itself from Olympic ambushers.*Marketing Week* [online]. [6 August 2012].

The article discusses how Twitter, Facebook and YouTube have defended their ‘hands-off’ approach to enforcing Olympic advertising restrictions on non-sponsors – for example, the use of Twitter by Dr Dre’s headphone brand, and the concerns of many athletes (who launched a Twitter protest against the International Olympic Committee's (IOC) Rule 40), who are currently forbidden to mention their own sponsors during an Olympic Games. The article quotes Lewis Wiltshire, Head of Sports Partnerships at Twitter, and Kristin Thayer, Head of Platform Partnerships at Facebook, thus providing an interesting insight into the views of social media heads. The issue of social networking at future Games appears to be rising in its prominence as a key issue for marketers so this article appears interesting from this respect.

* Victors and Spoils. *Economist.* **404** (8794), 20-22, 3p, 2 Colour photographs, 1 Chart.

The article by the *Economist* looks at the commercial side of the Olympic Games. It describes the corporate sponsorship system used by the International Olympic Committee (IOC), in which a small number of ‘top Olympic partners’ (TOPs) pay large sponsorship fees and control their commercial category. This provides a quick reference, accessible example to TOPS partners (also accessible, and discussed at greater length within the IOC TOPS/marketing documents referenced earlier in this resource).

* Hall, E. (2012) Want to Try an ‘Olympic Fry-Up’ in UK Café? Think Again. *Advertising Age.* **83** (23).

The article discusses the use of LOCOG regulations in the protection of official sponsors. The article comments that this kind of clampdown might have been expected in 2008 Beijing but not at the 2012 London Games. The article provides a number of interesting examples of such activities.

* McElhatton, N. (2012) Why Coe didn't thank Olympic sponsors. *Marketing*.(00253650).3-3, 1/2p.

The article discusses corporate sponsorship of the 2012 Olympic Games and argues that it was vital to the Games' success (a fairly basic proposition, given the requirement for private sector funding in all Olympic bids!). Nevertheless, the article is interesting in that it raises the fact that Lord Coe’s closing ceremony speech did not mention a thanks to Olympic sponsors.

### Sponsorship of Olympic Games: General

This section of the annotated bibliography provides a list of resources that relate to Olympic Games pre-2012. It offers interesting historical data and a variety of pertinent observations, including the way in which sponsorship and marketing activities have been undertaken at the Games, how the nature of sponsorship has changed over subsequent Olympiads, and how Olympic sponsors and non-sponsors have continued to develop their long-term strategies surrounding sponsorship and marketing of the Olympic Games.

* Crow, Dean, and Hoek (2003) Ambush marketing: a critical review and some practical advice. *Marketing Bulletin.***14** (1), 1-14.

This article provides an early discussion of the threat of ambush marketing. It argues that the consternation of its detractors rest on ethical assumptions that have no standing in court, stating that case law to date (at the time of the study) indicated that many alleged instances of ambushing were, in fact, quite legitimate. This paper examines a range of activities classified as ambushing and argues that marketers need to consider ambushing in legal terms – as either passing off or breach of trademarks. The paper is interesting as an historical document that profiles the sporting and Olympic landscape prior to the IOC’s escalation in laws regarding ambush marketing, and prior to the London 2012 bid’s inclusion of the intention to pass national law to make ambush marketing illegal at the 2012 Games.

* Dolphin, Richard R. is the author Richard R Dolphin or Dolphin and R. Richard? Needs tweaking accordingly but not sure which is right (2003) Sponsorship: perspectives on its strategic role.  *Corporate Communications: An International Journal.***8** (3), 173-186.

This article reflects on the extent to which sponsorship has moved away from being a philanthropic approach to communication and has taken a key role as a strategic approach to marketing (and thus corporate) strategies. The article also reflects on the difficulties of measuring the success of sponsorship programmes (noting that organisations will judge success in different ways), reflects on the controversial aspects of some sponsorship programmes and examines groups at which sponsorship may be targeted. Interestingly, this methodological issue persists in the present day. It provides an interesting comparative paper to the issues facing sponsors at the time of the 2012 Games.

* Farrell, K.A., Frame, W.S. (1997) The value of Olympic sponsorships: who is capturing the gold? *Journal of Market-Focused Management.* **2** (2), 171-182.

This article is interesting as it utilises data from the 1996 Atlanta Summer Olympic Games to measure the value of Olympic sponsorship. Using stock return data, the analysis found that the shareholders of sponsoring firms earned negative average abnormal returns around announcement of Olympic sponsorship agreements. This finding, consistent with an agency cost explanation of corporate investment practices, was found to be robust to variation in a number of firm- and sponsorship-specific variables. Results suggested that utilising Olympic sponsorship in the marketing communications mix may not be value-enhancing. This is a very interesting observation given that the paper was published 16 years prior to the 2012 Games in 1997, and which is also supported by many subsequent studies that reflect a lack of positive economic impact (including sponsorship return) on the Games since that time (and immediately post-2012). This paper, among others, raises the timely question of why the economic impact of Olympic Games appears to be reflected in a significantly positive way in bid documents and other forecasts, while historic data consistently appears to reflect the fact that no positive economic impact is likely to exist.

* Slater, J. (1998) Changing partners: The relationship between the mass media and the Olympic Games. *Fourth international symposium for Olympic research*. London, ON: University of Western Ontario, 1998.
* Brown, G. (2002)Taking the pulse of Olympic sponsorship.*Event Management.***7** (3), 187-196.

This article provides an interesting overview of sponsorship activity surrounding the Sydney 2000 Games, including an interview with the Director of Marketing for the Sydney Organising Committee of the Olympic Games (SOCOG) and major Olympic sponsors.

* Stotlar, D.K. (1993) Sponsorship and the Olympic winter games.*Sport Marketing Quarterly.***2** (1), 35-43.

The purpose of this study was to assess the ability of consumers in the United States to identify sponsors of the 1992 Winter Olympic Games and to differentiate among types of involvement. As such, it provides interesting observations for researchers and marketers interested in studies of consumer perceptions of official Olympic sponsors and the effect of Olympic sponsorship on brand image, using the 1992 Games as a case study. Generally, the report identified that consumers were not able to differentiate among the types of involvement of current IOC and USOC (United States Organising Committee) sponsors.

* Crompton, J.L. (2004) Conceptualization and alternate operationalizations of the measurement of sponsorship effectiveness in sport.*Leisure studies.***23** (3), 267-281*.*

This article presents a model that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of alternate measures of sponsorship, and which has been developed to address the methodological flaws associated with the use of media equivalency values to measure sponsorship impact. Media equivalency values are discussed within this article as flawed, as they frequently inflate the real value of media coverage and measure only the extent of media output with no insight as to whether people actually absorbed the message. It also critiques studies that rely on measurement of changes in consumers’ awareness by measuring people’s recall of a sponsor’s name being associated with an event, noting that recall as a method is notoriously faulty. This article is of benefit to researchers and practitioners who are interested in critically addressing the methodological faults that affect the measurement of sponsorship among target audiences.

* Tripodi, J.A., Hirons, M. (2009) Sponsorship Leveraging Case Studies–Sydney 2000 Olympic Games.*Journal of Promotion Management.***15** (1-2), 118-136.

This article investigates the need to balance an investment in Olympic Games sponsorship with the commercial requirement needed to produce a net return on funds. It presents three product category case studies from the Sydney 2000 Olympics to illustrate this point. Sponsors’ leveraging strategies and competitors’ ambush marketing tactics are outlined and assessed in terms of their sponsorship awareness levels via four distinct yet inter-related longitudinal surveys. The use of longitudinal data is a strength of the study and offers an interesting insight into sponsorship issues using the 2000 Games as a case.

* Farrelly, F., Quester, P., Greyser, S.A. (2005) Defending the co-branding benefits of sponsorship B2B partnerships: the case of ambush marketing.*Journal of Advertising Research. New York.* **45** (3), 339.

This global study analyses ambush marketing from the perspective of the sponsor and sport entity as partners in a business-to-business relationship. While it remains a real threat to the strategic co-branding objectives sought from the relationship, the article takes the position that ambush marketing is not necessarily as dangerous to sponsors as it has been in the past. The article explains how sponsors can use ambushers’ attacks to their advantage by drawing attention to issues of legitimacy, by enhancing brand or corporate authenticity, and by appealing to consumers increasingly wary of disingenuous brands. The findings of this study confirm the potential to approach the sponsorship relationship as a co-marketing alliance to optimise co-branding objectives and to negate the effects of ambush. This study provides an interesting discussion of the ways in which official sponsors can counter ambush marketers, and the findings seem to support those of other studies that indicate the potentially powerful effects of disclosure on ambush marketers.

* Preuss, H., Kai, G., Séguin, B. (2008) Ambush marketing in China: Counterbalancing Olympic sponsorship efforts.*Asian Business & Management.***7** (2), 243-263.

This paper provides an empirical insight into the perception and use of ambush marketing on the People's Republic of China public television network CCTV5 (the official Olympic broadcaster), by examining the commercials used by various corporations during its coverage of the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens. A five-point categorisation is presented to distinguish between various methods of ambushing. An analysis of 40 commercial spots was carried out, based on China's 2002 Olympic Symbol Protection Law, as well as a comparison of ambush marketing on Chinese CCTV5 with nine other nations. The study offers an interesting media analysis and approach to the concept of ambush marketing, drawing on cultural considerations affecting the nature and scope of Chinese broadcasting.

* Samitas, A., Kenourgios, D., Zounis, P. (2008) Athens’ Olympic Games 2004 impact on sponsors’ stock returns.*Applied Financial Economics.* **18** (19), 1569-1580.

This article uses an event-study analysis and bootstrapping in order to assess the market value of business sponsorship of the Olympic Games 2004. Results of the study reported a marginal positive impact of sponsorship announcements on international and national sponsors’ stock returns, and a more sizeable return for the stock returns of smaller firms.

* Wally, S., Hurley, A.E. (1998) The torch stops here: Olympic sponsorship and corporate reputation.*Corporate Reputation Review.***1** (4), 343-355.

This study examines how corporate involvement in the Olympic Games enhances corporate reputation via an investigation of the impact on companies of sponsoring the Olympics, the magnitude of such sponsorship, and the duration of sponsorship. After controlling for financial performance, results indicated that Olympic sponsorship greatly impacted and positively improved corporate reputation. Length of sponsorship and monetary level of sponsorship did not appear to have a significant effect on measures of corporate reputation. While interesting from the perspective of reported outcomes, this analysis is also interesting from a methodological perspective (given concerns over the limitations of measuring sponsorship effects), and from the perspective that the ROI of sponsorship activity for official sponsors of the London 2012 Games provided mixed results in terms of impacts on corporate reputation.

* MacAloon, J.J. (2008) ‘Legacy’ as managerial/magical discourse in contemporary Olympic affairs*. The international journal of the history of sport.***25** (14), 2060-2071.

This article critically explores the semantics and pragmatics of legacy discourse among central administrative players in the Olympic Movement, using an ethnography of Olympic speeches (IOC administration, candidate city committees, transnational consultants). The article shows how legacy discourse generates a perception of common and laudable purpose while flattening standards of expertise and reinforcing the IOC administration's preferred model of franchiser/franchisee relations with other Olympic bodies. This article is of particular interest to ethnographic researchers.

* Crompton, J.L. (2004) Sponsorship ambushing in sport.*Managing Leisure.***9** (1), 1-12.

This article identifies and discusses seven potential ambush marketing opportunities for non-sponsors. It also highlights the fact that official sponsors receive little legal protection from ambushing, which, since the time the paper was written has changed notably. The paper concludes with a discussion of the ethics of ambushing. This resource provides an interesting earlier study in the phenomenon of ambush marketing pre-IOC legislation to protect Olympic sponsors and reflects effectively how the sporting landscape has changed in this respect. It also adds to the dialogue on the ethics of ambush marketing.

* Papadimitriou, D., Apostolopoulou, A., Dounis, T. (2008) Event sponsorship as a value creating strategy for brands.*Journal of Product & Brand Management.***17** (4), 212-222.

This article highlights how a strategic and brand-building approach has been adopted in the context of national-level Olympic partnerships. Using a multiple case study analysis, and collecting data via the use of semi-structured interviews, the study included seven of the ten Grand National Sponsors that signed agreements with ATHOC, the Organising Committee of the 2004 Athens Olympic Games. With the exception of two firms, the majority of the Grand National Sponsors reported no clear or measurable objectives and limited consideration to strategic or brand-related initiatives in their decisions to invest in the national Olympic sponsorship programme. However, they did report plans to invest resources to leverage their rights, even though in most cases no specific evaluation processes had been designed. This research reflected a relatively poor recognition of the role of sponsorship in creating value and building a corporate brand, and the authors recommend that corporations considering becoming involved in sport sponsorship should adopt a more strategic approach in the sponsorship solicitation and management process.

* Benoit, S., O'Reilly, N.J. (2008) The Olympic brand, ambush marketing and clutter*. International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing.***4** (1), 62-84.

This article reflects the findings of ten in-depth interviews with worldwide Olympic Programme (TOP) sponsors and senior executives of the Olympic marketing programmes, representing a unique investigation into sponsorship using the Olympic brand. Specifically, this research examines ambush marketing and advertising clutter from a corporate point of view. Results suggest these issues remain a threat to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and its corporate partners. Some essential elements the IOC must address, according to the authors, include: (a) brand management; (b) brand protection; (c) protection of sponsors' rights; (d) consumer education; (e) fully integrated marketing communications programme and (f) National Organising Committees (NOCs)' education in marketing and brand management. The article concludes that corporate partners must activate their sponsorship rights and work, in close collaboration with the IOC and NOCs, to truly understand the Olympic brand and integrate it into their own marketing communications programme aimed at consumers.

* Seguin, B., Richelieu, A., O'Reilly, N. (2008) Leveraging the Olympic brand through the reconciliation of corporate and consumers' brand perceptions.*International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing.***3** (1), 3-22.

This article reflects research that seeks to understand this dichotomy that exists between corporate and consumer brand perceptions, and seeks to provide the Olympic brand with insightful direction as a result of the author’s observations. The authors offer specific recommendations to the IOC and their partners. The article is instructive in considering a wide body of research pertaining to this issue, specifically with regard to studies that the IOC have themselves supported.

* McDaniel, S.R (1996) Ambush marketing revisited: an experimental study of perceived sponsorship effects on brand awareness, attitude toward the brand and purchase intention.*Journal of Promotion Management.***3** (1-2), 141-168.

The results of this experimental study identify the fact that consumers seemed unable to distinguish between official and ambush sponsors. While the study is relatively old, its findings are still similar to observations of the London 2012 Games – i.e. that many consumers thought that non-official sponsors (e.g. MasterCard) were official sponsors. It is interesting to compare this article with current studies to ascertain why this effect still seems to be emerging. The study also reported that measures of purchase intention indicated that ambushers consistently did as well as, or better, than official sponsors.

* Ishikawa, S.D., Stotlar, K., Walker, M.L. (1996) Olympic games marketing in Japan.*Sport Marketing Quarterly.***5,** 17-26.

This study investigated Japanese consumers' reactions to Olympic sponsors in Japan. The study found that consumers were confused about the classification and identity of sponsors (a finding reflected in the wider literature). This article provides an interesting case study of Olympic sponsor impact outside the Olympic host country.

* McKelvey, S., Grady, J. (2008) Sponsorship program protection strategies for special sport events: Are event organisers outmanoeuvering ambush marketers.*Journal of Sport management.****22*** *(5), 550-586.*

This article examines the implementation and effectiveness of a variety of evolving sponsorship programme protection strategies focused at reducing the threat of ambush marketing, including: pre-event education and public relations initiatives; on-site policing tactics; contractual language in athlete participation and spectator ticket agreements; and the enactment and enforcement of special trademark protection legislation.

* Papadimitriou, D., Apostolopoulou, A. (2009) Olympic sponsorship activation and the creation of competitive advantage.*Journal of Promotion Management.***15** (1-2), 90-117.

This study explores the leveraging activities of sponsors of the 2004 Athens Olympic Games using data collected via the use of semi-structured interviews. The study reported that the more active sponsors invested in and utilised a number of leveraging methods, including advertising, sales promotions, and special events, whereas the less active sponsors appeared to have missed the opportunity to utilise their Olympic sponsorship to gain a competitive advantage.

### London 2012 sponsorship: Books

The final section of this annotated bibliography lists books that focus on the subject of sponsorship of the Olympic Games.

# Amis, J.M., Cornwell, T.B. (2005) *Global Sport Sponsorship (Sport Commerce and Culture).* Berg Publishers.

Global Sport Sponsorship constitutes the first text to provide a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary analysis of the global sports sponsorship industry. Contributors to the book constitute leading scholars from the fields of marketing, management, sociology, cultural studies, tourism, and gender studies and topics include the strategic nature of global sport sponsorship; the role of celebrities in global advertising, controversies surrounding conventional norms of what constitutes 'acceptable' sponsorship, the utilisation of sponsorship in the construction of global alliances, using sponsorship to negotiate local markets, and the development of effective methods of evaluation. Global Sport Sponsorship is instructive reading for both academics and practitioners. It also includes a chapter on ambush marketing.

* Poynter, G., MacRury, I. (2009) *Olympic cities: 2012 and the remaking of London.* Ashgate Publishing.

This text draws upon historical, cultural, economic and socio-demographic perspectives to examine the role of a sporting mega-event in promoting urban regeneration and social renewal. The text compares cities that have or will be hosting the Games, explores the political economy of the Games and discusses the changing role of the state in creating post-industrial metropolitan spaces. It evaluates the changing perceptions of the Olympic Games and the role of sport in the global media age in general, assessing the implication of 'mega-event' regeneration policies for local communities and their cultural, social and economic identities, with specific reference to east London and the Thames Gateway. Price £65.

* Davis, J.A. (2012)*The Olympic Games Effect: how sports marketing builds strong brands.* Wiley, 2012.

This publication constitutes a newly revised and fully updated second edition of *The Olympic Games Effect.* It provides sports marketing and branding insights into the promotion of the Games, and explains how both the Olympics and other sporting mega-events carry great potential for sponsors to generate a worthy return on their investment. The book references past Olympic Games to explain the attraction of the event to sponsors, and contains a significant amount of historical data. It also contains business strategies and recommendations for companies hoping to make more effective sponsorship decisions. Price £19.99.

* Desbordes, M., Richelieu, A. eds. (2012) *Global Sport Marketing: Contemporary Issues and Practice.* Routledge.

This text provides a study of the opportunities and threats posed by a global sports market. It outlines the tools and strategies that both marketers and managers are able to utilise in order to effectively exploit these opportunities. The book surveys current trends, issues and best practice in international sport marketing, providing a useful blend of contemporary theory and case studies from the Americas, Europe and Asia. It assesses the impact of globalization on teams, leagues, players, sponsors and equipment manufacturers, and highlights the central significance of culture on the development of effective marketing strategy. *Global Sport Marketing* could be considered key reading for any advanced student, researcher or practitioner working in sport marketing or sport business.

* Girginov, V. (2012)*Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: Making the Games. Vol. 1*. Routledge.

The *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games* provides an authoritative and comprehensive account of the world’s greatest sporting and cultural event. The book provides a historic account of the establishment of the 2012 Games from inception, through the successful bidding process and the planning and preparation phase, to delivery, and to the post-Games period and legacy. The book is written by a world-class team of international Olympic scholars and offers an analysis of the social, cultural, political, historical, economic and sporting context of the Games. The book is divided into two volumes. *Volume One: Making the Games,* examines the build-up to London 2012, covering key topics such as: the bidding process, planning and decision making, financing the Games, developing the infrastructure, engaging national and international governing bodies of sport, engaging the UK public, engaging a global public, developing a legacy programme, and the Cultural Olympiad. The book includes personal accounts of key stakeholders (sports administrators, politicians, athletes, spectators), and constitutes essential reading for anybody with a personal or professional interest in the Olympic and Paralympic Games, global culture or the development of sport.

# Girginov, V. (2013) *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: Volume Two: Celebrating the Games.* Routledge.

The *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games* constitutes the second part of Girginov’s Handbook and is therefore considered an essential companion piece to Volume 1. *Volume Two: Celebrating the Games,* examines the period of competition and the immediate post-Games period, and includes key topics such as: London’s engagement with the world, sport, spectators, volunteers, media and communications, commerce, retail and consumption, documenting London 2012, the legacy of the 2012 Games for London, the UK and the Olympic Movement.

* Masterman, G. (2012)*Strategic sports event management.* Routledge.

*Strategic Sports Event Management: Olympic Edition* provides students and event managers with an insight into the strategic management of sports events of all scales and nature. It provides a framework that offers the reader a planning process that can be used to understand the importance of adopting a strategic approach to sports event management, and shows the reader how to implement successful short and long-term sports event management strategies. International case studies offer a real-world insight into sports event management issues, and a case study taken from the Beijing Olympiad is applied to each chapter*... Strategic Sports Event Management: Olympic Edition* builds on the substantial success of the first edition of this text.

* Chadwick, W., Arthur, D. (2012) *International Cases in the Business of Sport*. Routledge.

International Cases in the Business of Sport focuses specifically on the analysis of high profile cases studies within the management of sport businesses. The book adopts a highly international perspective, taking case studies from a diverse range of sports, including football, rugby, baseball, athletics, cricket, motor sports and sailing. The book offers cutting edge analysis of professional sports case studies, and a strong blend of academic and practitioner analyses. The combination of both makes this text a worthy inclusion in the reading list of practitioners, academics and scholars.

* Kapsi, N., Beneki, E. (2011) *The Business of Olympic Games Sponsorship: Incentives and Rewards.* Kerkyra.

This text explores the way in which business and the Olympic Games have always maintained close ties, from ancient to modern times. Issues such as sponsor revenues, the Olympic marketing programme, protection of the Olympic symbol, opportunistic marketing (now generally referred to as ambush marketing), broadcasting rights and online promotion are all examined.

### Ferrand, A., Luiggino, T., Camps i Povilli, A. (2006) [Routledge Handbook of Sports Sponsorship: Successful Strategies](http://www.amazon.com/Routledge-Handbook-Sports-Sponsorship-Successful/dp/0415401119/ref%3Dsr_1_9?ie=UTF8&qid=1368275233&sr=8-9&keywords=olympics+sponsorship).

The *Routledge Handbook of Sports Sponsorship* provides a comprehensive guide to the successful management of sport sponsorship. From the development of an appropriate strategy to the implementation of the sponsorship operation through to post-event analysis, this book offers an authoritative reference for large and small events. The text also provides an accessible review of the legal issues associated with marketing, copyright and contracts in print, television and radio sponsorship, illustrated with a wealth of case studies. This includes sports marketing and sports management theory, a stage by stage analysis of the sponsorship process, the roles of different key stakeholders in the process, a thorough explanation of copyright and contract law for sports sponsorship, and major international sports sponsorship case studies examined from concept stage through to post-event analysis. The *Routledge Handbook of Sports Sponsorship*provides key reading for students and a valuable reference for professionals in sports law, sports management, sports marketing and brand management.

* Ferrand, A., Chappelet, J., Sequin, B. (2012) *Olympic Marketing.* Routledge.

This text is the first of its kind to explain the principles of Olympic marketing and to demonstrate how they can be applied successfully in all other areas of sports marketing and management. The book outlines a strategic and operational framework based on three types of co-productive relationships (market, network and informal) and explains how this framework can guide professional marketing practice. Containing case studies, summaries, insight boxes and examples of best practice in every chapter, this book constitutes useful reading for all students and practitioners working in sports marketing, sports management or Olympic studies.

* Masterman, G. (2007)*Sponsorship: For a return on investment.* Butterworth-Heinemann.

This text seeks to provide a unique insight into the use of sponsorship as a means of achieving a positive return on investment (ROI) for corporations. It constitutes the first text to provide in-depth coverage of sponsorship in the sports and leisure industries, and provides a conceptual framework for the development, planning, implementation and evaluation of strategies for sport, art, music and community sponsorship campaigns. The book considers sponsorship issues from the perspective of both rights owners and sponsors. A broad range of examples and case studies are included.
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