

CIBS

Centre for the International Business of Sport

The CIBS Working Paper Series – no.10

A TYPOLOGY OF AMBUSH MARKETING: THE METHODS AND STRATEGIES OF AMBUSHING IN SPORT

**Nicholas Burton
Coventry University**

**Simon Chadwick
Coventry University**

© 2009

Series editor – John Beech



Centre for the International Business of Sport (CIBS)

CIBS aims to deliver high quality applied research, training, consultancy and networking outputs across a range of sports and in a number of different disciplines.

The activities of CIBS include

- undertaking applied sport research
- providing a range of consultancy activities to the sport industry
- offering the services of retained sport academics
- delivering generic and bespoke sport training programmes
- creating opportunities for networking and collaborative exchange in sport
- working with prospective, actual and previous clients in sport to identify ways in which CIBS can assist them with specific projects

The Centre for the International Business of Sport

Coventry University Business School

Coventry University

5 Priory Street

Coventry CV1 5FB

United Kingdom

Website: <http://www.coventry.ac.uk/researchnet/d/691>

Email enquiries: Simon.Chadwick@coventry.ac.uk

BACKGROUND

As sport sponsorship has grown and developed in importance and sophistication over the past three decades, so too have the efforts made by un-associated brands to capitalize on the financial benefits and media value provided by sport. The need for marketers, sponsors, and officials to acknowledge, understand, and defend against ambushing has been magnified by the staggering growth of sponsorship investment over the past twenty-five years. This study examines ambush marketing further, exploring a new typology of ambush strategies, and offering a unique conceptualization of ambush marketing. The research endeavors to explore the managerial implications for sponsors and commercial rights holders, contributing both theoretically and practically to the management and protection of sponsorship.

As a result of a restructuring of the International Olympic Committee (IOC)'s sponsorship programme by the organizers of the 1984 Los Angeles Summer Olympics, ambush marketing emerged as a significant threat to sport sponsorship, providing marketers with a means of associating with sport properties and event commodities such as the Olympic Games and the World Cup, without contributing financially to the properties in order to secure official associations. By offering would-be sponsors an alternative means of associating with an event, without capital expense, ambush marketing threatens to undermine the investments made by sponsors to commercial rights holders, and devalues sport sponsorship by cluttering the marketing environment surrounding sponsorship.

These concerns are of particular importance for sport sponsors and commercial rights holders, as the investment made by sponsors – and the revenue generated by event organizers – have grown exponentially over the past twenty-five years. Global sponsorship spending in 1984, according to Meenaghan (1991), amounted to approximately \$2 billion; recent estimates of sponsorship investment in the United Kingdom alone project sponsorship expenditures to surpass £1 billion in 2009, with projections leading up to the 2012 London Olympic Games rising. In total, the 2008 international sponsorship industry has been calculated to be worth \$43.5 billion (IEG, 2007), a growth of \$19.1 billion over the previous six years. Moreover, marketing expenditures in leveraging and promoting sponsorship are generally agreed to at least equal, if not exceed, the amount spent securing rights, making sponsorship's overall estimated market value nearly \$100 billion per annum.

Consistent changes to the management of sponsorship rights and protection have since seen value grow immeasurably over time, making sponsorship now a key contributor to sport rights holder's revenues. The development of corporate sponsorship programmes for the 1982 Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup and

the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics gave rise to category exclusivity and commercial rights bundling in sponsorship, key drivers in sponsorship's subsequent growth. As noted by Sandler & Shani (1989), for the 1988 Olympic Games, Coca-Cola spent a total of \$22 million to be the exclusive drinks-category sponsor; estimates from last summer's Games in Beijing have major sponsors, including Coca-Cola, paying three times that amount, with sponsorship investment for major events projected to rise even further as London 2012 approaches. The IOC estimates sponsorship revenues account for 40% of total IOC turnover, with similar shares reported by sport governing bodies worldwide (International Olympic Committee, 2008).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Within the sponsorship literature, ambush marketing research has emerged over the past twenty years as an area of considerable interest, characterized by four predominant themes: (i) an identification of what ambush marketing is and its aims and objectives (Sandler & Shani, 1989; Meenaghan, 1994; Crompton, 2004; Séguin & O'Reilly, 2008); (ii) the use of consumer-based measures of ambush marketing's impact on sponsorship, such as post-event consumer recall sponsorship studies (Sandler & Shani, 1989; Meenaghan, 1998; McDaniel & Kinney, 1998); (iii) the discussion of the ethical concerns surrounding ambush marketing and the morality of ambush campaigns (Meenaghan, 1994; Payne, 1998; O'Sullivan & Murphy, 1998); and (iv) the exploration of the legal implications of ambush marketing efforts, and the measures available to sponsors and rights holders in combating ambush marketing (Townley et al., 1998; McKelvey, 2006; McKelvey & Grady, 2008). Despite the advances made and the introduction to ambush marketing provided, ambushing nevertheless remains a largely underdeveloped field in need of further investigation.

Most recently, ambush marketing research has shifted focus, utilizing a more qualitative methods approach, making use of case study analyses and interviews in place of consumer recall studies. Such an approach has allowed for the renewed investigation of what constitutes ambush marketing, and revealed further insight into how ambush campaigns are perceived within the sport sponsorship community. Séguin & O'Reilly (2008), taking a qualitative methods approach, expand upon our understanding of ambush marketing, suggesting that ambush's role as a factor of – and contributor to – marketing clutter, is of greater concern that the effects of ambush marketing uniquely, a finding worthy of further investigation.

Despite providing an initial understanding of ambush marketing, a number of criticisms can be made of ambush marketing research to date:

first, while a number of counter-ambushing methods have been suggested (Meenaghan 1994, 1996; Hoek & Gendall, 2002; Townley et al., 1998), these strategies have yet to be meaningfully tested or explored, save those involving legal or legislative protection. Likewise, although the discussion of ambush marketing is necessarily rooted in the discussion of sport sponsorship, there is a dearth of research into the actual impact of ambush marketing, from a practical, managerial, or strategic perspective. Finally, and most disconcerting, no definitive understanding of ambush marketing exists, and recent developments in sport marketing have raised renewed concerns over the actual impact of ambushing on sponsors, and what specifically constitutes ambush marketing. The academic understanding of ambush marketing is based on definitions proposed twenty years ago, and based on a limited perspective on the aims, motives, and uses of ambush marketing as a marketing communications tool.

As a result of the growth of sponsorship, and the emergent prominence of ambush marketing as a result, the academic study of ambushing has developed as a contemporary concern of sponsorship research. Unfortunately, to date no conceptualization of ambush marketing exists, and our understanding of ambushing is grounded in studies conducted two decades ago, which arguably do not adequately represent the evolution of ambushing, and the ensuing concerns and issues raised, over the past twenty years. It is in the aim of addressing these limitations that this study endeavors to expand upon our understanding of ambushing, analyzing the methods and strategies prevalent in ambush marketing practice, and creating a unique typology of ambush marketing, proposed herein.

RESEARCH METHOD

In order to look deeper into the problems and issues raised within the existing research base, and to address the outdated and – sometimes irrelevant – view of ambushing taken in past research, a two-stage research process was undertaken. The first phase of research was the development and creation of a database of ambush incidents, based on an in-depth documentary analysis, providing a unique historical perspective to ambush marketing attempts, and the subsequent counter-ambushing strategies taken. Given the nature of ambush marketing, the largely underdeveloped theoretical body surrounding ambushing, and its substantial media presence around major sporting events – particularly given the growing importance of sport sponsorship – the use of print and news media, as well as a number of first-hand observations and accounts of ambushing, provided an initial framework of study.

The document analysis undertaken drew from more than 1000 sources relevant to the study of ambush marketing, guerrilla marketing in sport, parasitic marketing, and sport sponsorship. The sources used were predominantly English- and French- language news items, as well as a collection of German and Polish sources, drawing on the languages spoken and understood by the research team. The works analyzed included print media, web-based news sources, legal documentation, television advertising media, as well as peer-reviewed journal articles and collected ambush marketing visual media. Rather than providing a detailed review and analysis of the content of the collected pieces, the aim of the document analysis was to create a database of incidents of legitimate event sponsorship ambushing. As such, throughout the analysis, dates, events, official event sponsors, ambushers, and the strategies taken both to ambush the event, and to protect against ambushing, were noted, resulting in 350 detailed cases included in the initial database (*See Table 1 for sample entries*).

It is important to note that, for this study only those instances of ambush marketing whose impact on sponsorship is most of interest, have been included. Most major sporting events (such as the Olympics or the World Cup), employ ambush marketing protection teams to investigate often hundreds of potential ambush marketing cases, many of which are simple intellectual property rights infringements, involving the use of trademarks, copyrights, the unlawful manufacturing of merchandise, or the illegal re-distribution of tickets. While cases such as these are of obvious interest to event rights holders, their impact on sponsorship is generally minimal, and can easily be dealt with using cease and desist letters, or the enforcement and protection of an organization's intellectual property. In order to properly assess and understand the nature of ambush marketing as related to sponsorship, for this study only those cases involving the ambushing of direct competitors, incidents drawing international media coverage, multi-national promotional campaigns, or those attempts which garnered preventative or reactionary counter-ambushing efforts were included.

The second phase of research consisted of a series of semi-structured interviews with industry professionals and academic researchers, exploring their knowledge and opinions of ambush marketing, and their perception of its place in sport marketing. Respondents were selected based on experience, either direct or indirect, with ambush marketing at the highest levels, and across a variety of sports, the defense against ambush tactics, or past research on the subject. In total, ten respondents completed interviews, ranging in time from twenty-five minutes to two hours; as well as detailing their experiences with sport sponsorship and ambush marketing, interviewees were also asked to define ambush marketing based on their experiences, and to go in-depth

Year	Event	Ambusher	Ambushee	Action taken / attempted
2008	Summer Olympics: Beijing, China	Gatorade (PepsiCo)	Coca-Cola	Gatorade ran a television spot featuring Chinese athletes counting down to 2008; the ad concluded with a group of children, aged approximately 7-10, in a large Olympic-training style centre playing table tennis counting down to 2012 and 2016.
2006	FIFA World Cup: Germany	Bavaria Brewery	Budweiser	Stadium officials forced fans to remove Bavaria's promotional wear – orange lederhosen promoting Bavaria – and watch the game in their underwear.
1996	UEFA Euro 1996: England	Nike	Umbro	Nike purchased all poster space/advertising sites in and around Wembley Park tube station as a means of promoting the brand during the event; these actions sparked UEFA's pre-emptive measures taken for Euro 2000 and tournaments since (renting all advertising media within 1-3km radii of venues).
1992	Summer Olympics: Barcelona, Spain	American Express	Visa	American Express ran advertisements correctly stating that visitors to Spain 'don't need a visa'; Visa took no official action, and American Express publicly defended their advertising campaign as legitimate and not ambushing.
1984	Summer Olympics: Los Angeles, CA	Nike	Converse	Nike developed murals near the Olympic Games sites featuring Nike-sponsored track athletes, visible from within the Los Angeles Olympic Coliseum, resulting in 42% of American's confusing Nike as an official sponsor of the Games.

Table 1 Ambush Marketing Case Database (Sample)

where possible into the methods, tactics, and strategies used by ambushers, sponsors, and events rights holders alike, in relation to ambush marketing.

The interviews, using a grounded approach, provided a preliminary look into the practitioner perspective on ambushing, representing equally ambush marketers and rights holders, and detailing a unique view of ambushing as both a commercial irritant and viable marketing alternative. The interviews provided a necessary step in addressing the actual implications of ambush marketing, as the existing literature base has given little consideration to the issues facing practitioners. Responses were recorded when permitted, and subsequently transcribed, allowing each to be coded and analyzed, providing further detail to the study. Key themes, such as the nature of ambush marketing, the parallels between marketing and law present in ambush practices, and issues surrounding its legitimacy and the authority of sponsors, guided the interviews, and provided a useful platform in further analyzing the case database created.

DISCUSSION

The Evolution of Ambushing...

In re-examining the history of ambush marketing through the case database, an evolution in the tactics used, the counter-measures taken, and the communications media available to ambushers is apparent. As with sponsorship, whose growth and development over time has been well-documented (Meenaghan, 1998; Crimmins & Horn, 1996), so too has ambushing evolved since its emergence in the 1980s, driven by technological advancements and the growing financial importance of sport marketing. While television advertising continues to be a main vehicle for ambush campaigns during major events, the internet has recently grown into a notable marketing platform for non-sponsors, and offered new and unexplored opportunities for marketers. The appeal of ambushing for companies has only heightened over time, due to the high-cost, undefined-reward environment that typifies sport sponsorship, further emphasizing the challenge facing sponsors.

Also influencing ambush marketing's changing nature have been the counter-ambush mechanisms used by rights holders, an indication of the moderate success enjoyed by event organizers in combating ambush marketers. The earliest tactics employed by ambushers took advantage of easily identifiable and available marketing opportunities being passed over by official sponsors, including signage near event sites and event broadcast sponsorship. However, due to the efforts of sponsors and rights holders to better protect sponsorship, the availability of such opportunities has waned. The IOC, in negotiating television broadcast rights with media partners now restrict the use of the term 'broadcast

sponsor' within their broadcast agreements, obliging broadcasters to police their own advertising partners. The Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) has taken broadcast sponsorship protection a step further, buying and controlling all advertising time during matches, and allotting time to sponsors. As a result, sponsors are not only protected from potential ambush campaigns, but are also forced to better leverage their investment.

Moreover, UEFA has also spearheaded the use and enforcement of marketing exclusion zones surrounding stadia and event host sites, as a result of Nike's Euro 1996 and 1998 FIFA World Cup promotions. These exclusion zones have also been implemented by the Olympics, and are now seen as a required element of any Olympic-host bid, as part of anti-ambush marketing legislation. These exclusion zones have forced ambushers to become more creative and encouraged greater planning for larger, more ambitious ambush campaigns. While ambushing has rarely been strategically managed, these mechanisms have forced ambush marketers to plan better and commit greater time and resources than ever before, to successfully ambush events. For rights holders and sponsors, though, the growing number of ambush marketers, as well as the increased media attention given to ambushing since the 2006 FIFA World Cup, is evidence of ambush marketers' willingness to adapt to these counter measures. Among the methods employed for more recent sporting events, online promotions, viral marketing campaigns, off-site giveaways, and increasingly creative and legally-conscious campaigns, have all served as alternatives to early ambush media, challenging the creativity and authority of official sponsors.

The Practitioner's View...

The evolution of ambush marketing witnessed in the database is also reflected in the views and experiences of sponsorship practitioners in regards to ambushing. A number of recurring themes emerged from the definitions offered by respondents, including an emphasis placed on the role of authority, intended association, and the broad range of techniques used. Most interestingly, each of the respondents – when asked to describe ambush marketing in their own words – re-iterated the difficulty practitioners face in defining ambushing, noting the broad area of activities and tactics used, and the generally grey area that an ambush marketing definition must cover.

One participant (Respondent B), defined ambushing as "a company conducting marketing activity around a sports property... which creates in consumers' mind a link to the event... including a broad spectrum of behaviors and activities". The allusion to the multitude of activities included in ambushing was echoed by other respondents, noting that "you can't limit it to any one medium" (Respondent A) and "no one sentence can define it" (Respondent D). Another definition put forward, "gaining

media exposure for an event for you which you haven't purchased official rights" (Respondent E), highlights the emphasis placed on exposure and awareness by many.

Two interviewees, in response to questions regarding their awareness of ambush marketing as it impacts sponsorship and commercial rights values, stated explicitly that while ambush marketing can pose certain logistical and managerial issues for rights holders, ambush marketing is nevertheless indicative of a valuable property, and as such is not entirely unwelcome. Interestingly, while the interviewees agreed that sponsors must leverage better their investments, and capitalize on the marketing opportunities available to them, each of the respondents stressed the view that sponsorship protection and the defense against ambush marketing is the responsibility of the rights holder, in order to protect investments and justify rising sponsorship costs, rather than that of the sponsor.

Ultimately, the consensus among respondents was an inherent difficulty in summarizing ambush marketing in concise terms, instead referring back the various goals or objectives set, the wide array of tactics available, and ambushing's unlimited scope in terms of reach and applicability. Given this uncertainty, and based on an analysis of the case database and interviews conducted, a new definition of ambush marketing is proposed. In many ways, given the more capitalistic nature of ambush marketing today described by respondents and witnessed in the case database, 'ambush' marketing as a title may be somewhat misleading; rather, the French '*pseudo-parrainage*', or pseudo-sponsorship, is perhaps more applicable. Nevertheless, in re-envisioning ambush marketing communications today, the following definition is proposed:

"Ambush marketing is a form of associative marketing which is designed to capitalize on the awareness, attention, goodwill, and other benefits, generated by having an association with an event or property, without an official or direct connection to that event or property."

Re-Visiting Ambush Strategies...

As well as disputing ambush marketing's nature, past studies on ambush marketing have equally attempted to identify the key tactics or techniques used by ambushers in attacking sporting events and sponsors. Meenaghan (1994), in particular, identified five marketing opportunities typically used by ambushers, categorizing ambush campaigns into the following: sponsoring the broadcast of an event; sponsoring subcategories and leveraging this sponsorship aggressively to overshadow competitor sponsors; buying advertising time surrounding event broadcasts, before and after official telecasts; aligning major promotions, not sponsorship related, with an event and actively leveraging those promotions; and the use of alternative creative means – highlighting the innovation and

dynamism of ambushers, and the plethora of opportunities to ambush events available (1994; 1996). Unfortunately, despite underlining ambush marketing as a marketing communication vehicle for future studies, Meenaghan's breakdown reflected an early view of ambush marketing, directly related to a competitor's event sponsorship, and limited in scope as compared to more recent efforts.

As such, Crompton (2004) updated and expanded upon Meenaghan's categories a decade later, reflecting the change in ambush marketing tactics over time. Crompton, as well as including the sponsorship of event broadcasts and the use of television advertising time surrounding an event as Meenaghan noted, identified a further five potential ambush avenues: the sponsorship of associated entities (other than the organizers/rights holders); the use of advertising media near/in proximity of the event/venues; advertising using a theme or implied association; creating a competitive attraction to distract from the event; as well as suggesting the accidental ambushing of an event due to a lack of diligence on the part of the organizer (2004). Crompton's categorization, like Meenaghan's before, emphasized the marketing opportunities available to ambush marketers, providing a new look at ambushing's reach, previously unexplored.

Based on these categories, a number of comments can be made; as previously noted increasingly in sport broadcast agreements, rights holders are broadcast sponsorship availability, and protecting sponsors more actively. The IOC, in an effort to protect against this form of ambush, now stipulates within their broadcast contracts that media partners regulate advertisements more strictly, and prohibit the use of the phrase 'broadcast sponsor', and variations thereof. Similarly, UEFA, as part of their sponsorship package, purchase all advertising time during their event broadcasts and distribute that time to their sponsors, stopping any broadcast sponsorship ambushing and forcing sponsors to better leverage their associations.

Likewise, based on UEFA's experiences at the 1996 European Championships (and the subsequent 1998 FIFA World Cup), the use of advertising media in and around host venues is now strictly policed by event organizers and local governments, thanks to the advent of marketing exclusion zones surrounding stadia, and the enactment of ambush marketing legislation in Olympic host cities. However, despite the advancement and continued progression of counter-ambush marketing measures, the growth of ambush as a communication tool has only been accelerated, thanks in part to the growth of new media, the remarkable growth of the sport marketplace, and the sophistication of sport sponsorship. While broadcast sponsorship – for the biggest sporting events – is now largely protected against, other opportunities have emerged, and new methods developed. Rather than listing more recent

or contemporary efforts taken by ambushers as categories in the same way as Crompton or Meenaghan, a typological approach has been taken to conceptualizing modern ambush marketing, addressing the fundamental lack of a theoretical conceptualization that has restricted ambush marketing research to date.

In Meenaghan's categorization, all broadcast sponsorship efforts are grouped as one; within this new typology, the distinction is made between sponsors of a member association or club leveraging their tie to an event, and the efforts of a direct competitor of an official sponsor purposely ambushing their rival in an effort to devalue their sponsorship and mislead consumers. As such, this typology is less a categorization of the marketing communications opportunities available to ambushers (e.g., broadcast sponsorship, outdoor advertising media, promotional giveaways), and rather forms a unique perspective on the various objectives and implications of ambush campaigns, the themes and tactics used by ambushing parties, as well as a critical examination of the relationship between ambush marketer and official sponsor.

By analyzing the database created and the practitioner interviews undertaken, twelve newly created types of ambush have been identified, ranging from the direct attack of one organization on a rival, to the unintentional association of a company with an event due to reputation or past marketing efforts (see Table 2). Critically, this typology draws on and evolves Meenaghan's and Crompton's earlier studies and includes a number of the same general themes. However, this new typology better reflects the managerial considerations and underlying marketing communications planning taken by ambush marketers, and focuses less on grouping together efforts in broadly descriptive categories. The twelve types of ambushing identified are further divided into three categories – direct ambush activities, indirect or associative ambushing, and incidental or un-intentional ambush attempts – further highlighting the different strategies, motives, and measures used by non-sponsors to develop an attachment to an event.

Throughout discussions with interview participants and the analysis of past ambush marketing incidents, the twelve types of ambushing reflect a more varied understanding of the aims of ambushers than previously suggested, but also highlights the confusion in identifying what defines ambush marketing. While invariably individual ambushing organizations will have different motives and objectives behind their campaigns, the ultimate impact of their efforts on sponsorship and event-linked marketing has historically been the defining factor in determining ambush marketing. As such, sabotage marketing or promotional giveaways

	Ambush Strategy	Definition	Case Example
DIRECT AMBUSH ACTIVITIES	PREDATORY Ambushing	The direct ambushing of a market competitor, intentionally and knowingly attacking a rival’s official sponsorship in an effort to gain market share, and to confuse consumers as to whom is the official sponsor	Heineken, UEFA European Championships, 2008 Heineken, in an effort to ambush Carlsberg's official sponsorship, created marching band-style "Trom-Pets" (drum hats) for Dutch fans on their way to Bern which also acted as drums, branded with the Heineken logo and name; the company released advertisements featuring Dutch fans travelling to Switzerland, visiting the official Oranje fans camping complex, and Heineken marketing executives plotting ways to ambush the European Championships
	COAT-TAIL Ambushing	The attempt by an organization to directly associate itself with a property through a legitimate link, without securing official event sponsor status. Not to be confused with the oft-used term 'piggy-backing'; while piggy-backing implies acceptance or complicity, coat-tail ambushing refers to the unsolicited association of a company to an event	Nike, Beijing Summer Olympics, 2008 Following Liu Xiang's injury in the men's 110m hurdles, Nike released a full-page ad in the major Beijing newspapers featuring an image of the disconsolate Liu, a Nike-endorsed athlete, and the tagline: 'Love competition. Love risking your pride. Love winning it back. Love giving it everything you've got. Love the glory. Love the pain. Love sport even when it breaks your heart.'
	PROPERTY INFRINGEMENT Ambushing	The intentional use of protected intellectual property, including trademarked and copyrighted property such as logos, names, words, and symbols, in a brand’s marketing as a means of attaching itself in the eyes of consumers to a particular property or event	Unibet, UEFA European Championships, 2008 Betting company Unibet released a series of magazine advertisements in Polish magazine Pitkanonza for online betting on the European Championships, explicitly featuring the words 'Euro 2008' and football in their adverts

ASSOCIATIVE AMBUSH ACTIVITIES (1)	SPONSOR SELF-Ambushing	The marketing communications activities by an official sponsor above and beyond what has been agreed in the sponsorship contract, effectively ambushing the property which they support, and infringing upon other official sponsors	Carlsberg, UEFA European Championships, 2008 Official sponsor Carlsberg extended its promotions beyond the scope of their sponsorship rights, effectively ambushing the other sponsors by going beyond their contractual allowances; as well as their in-stadium promotions and signage, Carlsberg also gave away headbands to fans during the tourney, sporting fake team-colored hair; in the fan zones surrounding the stadium, Carlsberg gave away t-shirts to fans with the Carlsberg marks for those visiting the brand's promotional booth
	ASSOCIATIVE Ambushing	The use of imagery or terminology to create an allusion that an organization has links to a sporting event or property, without making any specific references or implying an official association with the property	Nike, Beijing Summer Olympics, 2008 Throughout their 2008 summer marketing, Nike made considerable use of the number 8, a symbol of luck and fortune in China, as well as a symbol for the Games (whose start date was 08.08.08). Nike use similar design patterns in several shoes and items of clothing, using the number 8, as well as drawing comparisons to the Beijing Olympic Stadium 'Birds Nest' design, and the five rings logo
	DISTRACTIVE Ambushing	The creation of a presence or disruption at or around an event in order to promote a brand, without specific reference to the event itself, its imagery or themes, in order to intrude upon public consciousness and gain awareness from the event's audience	Bentley, The Open Championship, 2008 Bentley set-up a row of cars prominently displayed outside Hillside Golf Club, directly adjacent to Royal Birkdale, the host course of The Open, a means of attracting interest and, in term, deterring from Lexus' official sponsorship of the event

ASSOCIATIVE AMBUSH ACTIVITIES (2)	<p>VALUES Ambushing</p>	<p>The use of an event or property’s central value or theme to imply an association with the property in the mind of the consumer</p>	<p>Puma, European Championships, 2008</p> <p>Advertised their football line during the spring and summer with the slogan "JUNE 2008: TOGETHER EVERYWHERE" - a direct reference to the European Championships being played that month</p>
	<p>INSURGENT Ambushing</p>	<p>The use of surprise, aggressively promoted, one-off street-style promotions or giveaways, at an event, in order to maximize awareness, while minimizing investment and distracting attention away from official sponsors and the event itself</p>	<p>K-Swiss, French Open - Roland Garros, 2008</p> <p>K-Swiss ambushed rivals Adidas and clothing sponsor Lacoste in a one-off guerrilla marketing ploy, setting up an enormous purple K-Swiss branded tennis ball on top of a crashed car, along a major route to Roland Garros</p>
	<p>PRE-EMPTIVE Ambushing</p>	<p>The marketing activities of an official sponsor taken to usurp possible ambush marketing campaigns of rivals, pre-empting ambush activities and deflecting attention away from any official association to the event or property</p>	<p>adidas, European Championships, 2008</p> <p>As part of their marketing surrounding their sponsorship of Euro 2008, adidas produced 16 giant inflatable footballers representing each of the participant countries; each of the players wore their country's shirts, with adidas logos and stripes, including those countries with Nike and Puma sponsorships (e.g.: Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Czech Republic, Turkey...)</p>

	PARALLEL PROPERTY Ambushing	The creation of a rival event or property to be run in parallel to the main ambush target, associating the brand with the sport or the industry at the time of the event, thus capitalizing on the main event’s goodwill	Nike Human Race, International, 2008 Nike organized a global 'counter-event' called 'The Human Race', being run in 24 cities across the world - including Shanghai - starting 7 days following the Olympics and featuring massive international marketing throughout the Olympics centered around Nike and the marathon
INCIDENTAL AMBUSH ACTIVITIES	UNINTENTIONAL Ambushing	The incorrect consumer identification of a non-sponsoring company as an official sponsor, unknowingly or inexplicitly, based on a previous or expected association with an event	Speedo, Beijing Summer Olympics, 2008 Speedo earned considerable media attention throughout the Beijing Games as a result of the success of swimmers in their LZR Racer swimsuits, resulting in the brand being identified as a sponsor and cluttering the market
	SATURATION Ambushing	The strategic increase in the amount of marketing communications around the time of an event by a non-sponsor, in order to maximize awareness of the brand during the event, aggressively marketing the brand around, and maximizing the use of available advertising before, during, and after	Lucozade, Beijing Summer Olympics, 2008 Lucozade, during the Olympic Games, aggressively promoted their brand through print and television adverts, above and beyond their standard marketing, prominently featuring athletes and a variety of sports, in line with the Olympics

Table 2 A typology of ambush marketing

outside a sporting event, while not directly attacking or impacting sponsorship in the majority of cases, nevertheless impacts upon consumer awareness and brand image transfer, thus negatively influencing sponsorship effectiveness.

Moreover, whereas previously ambush marketing's primary aim has been seen as a means of confusing consumers as to whom officially sponsors an event, or to detract from an official sponsorship's media awareness and derive the same brand association benefits as official sponsors, contemporary ambush marketing appears to have evolved into a marketing communication vehicle unto its own. Undoubtedly, in the case of major competitors such as Nike v. adidas, Pepsi v. Coca-Cola, or American Express v. Visa, history has shown that influencing sponsorship success has been and continues to be an element of ambush marketing. However, as one sponsorship executive noted, "ambush marketing is client dependent, and is seen as a different approach to marketing, an opportunity parallel to sponsorship" (Respondent A).

In this light, ambush marketing can be viewed as an alternative to sponsorship for companies, depending on their budget, interests, and brand image; for some organizations, taking a more bold, daring approach to marketing their products or services, utilizing unauthorized and defiant means such as ambushing, represents an alternative means of gaining some of the same benefits of association with an event as sponsorship, while maintaining a connection with their own brand ethos. Throughout the database, certain trends are readily apparent in analyzing those companies actively ambushing, and those sponsors commonly impacted. Less conventional, more trendy and anti-authoritarian brands, such as those emphasized by companies like Nike and Pepsi, appear significantly more likely to ambush sporting events, as compared to their more official-sponsorship focused rivals Coca-Cola and adidas.

However, this new typology presents one particular newly emergent trend in sport marketing, the pre-emptive ambushing of a rival by an official sponsor, which has shifted power away from traditional ambushers. While few cases exist to date, adidas' marketing activities at the 2008 UEFA European Championships represent an acute awareness of the threat posed by competitors Nike and Puma, and a move towards claiming full benefits of their sponsorship association. While not all official sponsors can be expected to preemptively attack known ambushers so blatantly, using ambush marketing techniques to combat ambush marketing is a development worthy of greater investigation.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The aim behind such a typology is to better understand the process and management practices behind ambushing, as a means of better protecting sponsorship and defending against ambush campaigns. While identifying tactics used in the past – such as broadcast sponsorship – has raised awareness of the threat of ambushing and given rise to possible counter-ambush attempts, the continued confusion regarding what constitutes ambush marketing and how to cope with ambush marketing has underlined the need to better assess which campaigns legitimately threaten sponsorship, and to what degree.

In examining past ambush campaigns from the database, collected within the context of this new typology, a distinct shift in paradigms is evident; whilst early in ambush marketing's history, predatory and coat-tail ambush strategies were most prominent, more recently ambush marketing has taken a decided emphasis on associative marketing and the overall capitalization on the value of sporting events. Cases from the 1980s through to the mid-1990s appear to represent a clearer and better-defined competitive relationship between ambusher and ambushee, with a number of attacks explicitly attacking a rival's sponsorship (such as American Express's 'You don't need a visa' Olympic-themed campaigns). However, more contemporary examples, perhaps in line with the dramatic increase in sponsorship value over time, a more indirect, opportunistic approach now more accurately describes ambush marketing.

The emergence of relatively new and unexplored ambush tactics, such as value-based ambushing and self-ambushing, re-affirm the value associated with these mega-sporting events, and the potential benefits sought by organizations recognizing this worth. Brands, this shift would seem to indicate, have taken a much stronger focus on gaining and encouraging some benefit from a presumed association with an event, in place of early suggestions that ambushers sought primarily to detract from sponsorship and negatively impact a sponsor's returns. While in some cases this is surely still a main focus, in capturing attention and drawing consumer awareness away from sponsors, ambushers are ultimately affecting the activities of sponsors, our findings point away from intentional confusion and distraction, towards a broader, more opportunistic and benefit-driven perspective of ambushing.

REFERENCES

Bennett, R. (1986). Meaning and method in management research. *Graduate Management Research*, 13(3).

- Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2003). *Business Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cornwell, T. B., & Maignan, I. (1998). An international review of sponsorship research. *Journal of Advertising*, 27(1), 1-21.
- Coulson, N. (2004). Ambush marketing. *Brand Strategy, February 2004*(179), 32.
- Crimmins, J., & Horn, M. (1996). Sponsorship: from management ego trip to marketing success. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36(4), 11-21.
- Crompton, J.L. (2004). Sponsorship ambushing in sport. *Managing Leisure*, 9(1), 1-12.
- 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*, 45(3), 31-39.
- Flanagan, J.C. (1954). The Critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51(4), 327-358.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Hoek, J. & Gendall, P. (2002). Ambush marketing: more than just a commercial irritant? *Entertainment Law*, 1(2), 72-91
- IEG. (2007). *IEG Sponsorship Report*. Chicago: IEG.
- International Olympic Committee (2008). *Marketing Fact File 2006*. Lausanne: IOC.
- Kane, E. (1985). *Doing Your Own Research: Basic Descriptive Research in the Social Sciences and Humanities*. London: Marion Boyars.
- Lee, M.S., Sandler, D.M. & Shani, D. (1997). Attitudinal constructs towards sponsorship: scale development using three global sporting events. *International Marketing Review*, 14(3), 159-169.
- Lyberger, M.R. & McCarthy, L. (2001). An assessment of consumer knowledge of, interest in, and perceptions of ambush marketing strategies. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 10(2), 130-137.
- McDaniel, S. R., & Kinney, L. (1998). The implications of recency and gender effects in consumer response to ambush marketing. *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(4), 385-403.
- McKelvey, S. M. (2006). Coca-Cola vs. PepsiCo -- A "Super" Battleground for the Cola Wars? *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 15(2), 114-123.
- McKelvey, S., & Grady, J. (2008). Sponsorship program protection strategies for special sport events: are event organizers outmanoeuvring ambush marketers? *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(5), 550-586.
- Meenaghan, J. A. (1983). Commercial sponsorship. *European Journal of Marketing*, 17(7), 5-73.
- Meenaghan, T. (1998). Ambush marketing: corporate strategy and consumer reaction. *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(4), 305-322.

- Meenaghan, T. (1996). Ambush marketing – a threat to corporate sponsorship. *Sloan Management Review*, 38(1), 103-113.
- Meenaghan, T. (1994). Point of view: Ambush marketing: immoral or imaginative practice? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 34(5), 77-88.
- Meenaghan, T. (1991). Sponsorship – legitimising the medium. *European Journal of Marketing*, 25(11), 5-10.
- O'Sullivan, P., & Murphy, P. (1998). Ambush marketing: the ethical issues. *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(4), 349-366.
- Payne, M. (1998). Ambush marketing: the undeserved advantage. *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(4), 323-331.
- Retsky, M. L. (1996). One person's ambush is another's free speech. *Marketing News*, 30(14), 14.
- Sandler, D.M. & Shani, D. (1989). Olympic sponsorship vs. "ambush" marketing: who gets the gold? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 29(4), 9-14.
- Sayer, A. (1992). *Methods in Social Science: A Realist Approach* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Séguin, B., Lyberger, M., O'Reilly, N., and McCarthy, L. (2005) Internationalizing ambush marketing: the Olympic brand and country of origin. *International Journal of Sport Sponsorship and Marketing*, 6(4), 216-230.
- Séguin, B. & O'Reilly, N. (2008). The Olympic brand, ambush marketing and clutter. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 4(1/2), 62-84.
- Shani, D. & Sandler, D. (1998). Ambush marketing: is confusion to blame for the flickering of the flame? *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(4), 367-383.
- Smith, H. (1975). *Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Townley, S., Harrington, D. & Couchman, N. (1998). The legal and practical prevention of ambush marketing in sports. *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(4), 333-348.
- Walliser, B. (2003). An international review of sponsorship research: extension and update. *International Journal of Advertising*, 22(1), 5-40.

Contact author: nicholas.burton@coventry.ac.uk

Nicholas Burton is a PhD student at Coventry University, and researcher for the Centre for the International Business of Sport (CIBS). He currently holds a Bachelor of Sport Management from Brock University, as well as a Master of Science in Sport Management and the Business of Football from Birkbeck College, University of London.

Dr Simon Chadwick is Professor of Sport Business Strategy and Marketing at Coventry University. He is a Director of CIBS, Editor of the International Journal of Sport Marketing and Sponsorship and has worked with organisations involved in sport including the Football Association, Mastercard, the four tennis Grand Slams and FC Barcelona. Professor Chadwick has been widely quoted in various media outlets including the Wall Street Journal, Forbes, Time, Newsweek, The Economist, Bloomberg, CNN, Reuters and the BBC. He is the author of more than 300 books, papers, articles and reports on sport.

***For more information on Coventry University's
Centre for the International Business of Sport
please visit our website at
<http://www.coventry.ac.uk/researchnet/d/691>***