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Abstract

Driven by their high profile and ability to affect social change, most professional sports teams proactively engage in corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives. To implement such programs, sports teams regularly form partnerships with not-for-profit organisations (NPOs) that are primarily focused on addressing social issues. As highlighted in previous CSR partnership literature, for both organisations, these social alliances provide the opportunity to achieve marketing outcomes. For example, sports teams may leverage these relationships to increase fandom levels or generate higher match attendance among existing and new supporters. For NPOs, such an alliance may help them reach wider audiences, thereby generating greater visibility and potential funding. Yet while in theory social alliances are carefully developed to achieve marketing objectives, the reality is that their effectiveness is relatively unknown. Consequently, both academicians and practitioners are unsure whether these alliances actually work, especially in the context of consumer reactions to social alliances in professional sports. This is because existing research has not captured a holistic perspective of consumer responses to each firm within the alliance. This research has subsequently addressed this gap via the exploration of consumer reactions to social alliances in the context of professional sports. Significantly, this research examines the consumer response to each organisation in the social alliance but from the perspective of the consumer network associated with the sports team (fans) and the consumer network associated with the NPO (donors, funders and volunteers). Thereby, extending on extant research.

This study’s program of research incorporated an extensive literature review where an initial conceptual model concerning consumer reactions to social alliances in a sporting context was developed. By using a hierarchy-of-effects theoretical framework, this model incorporated antecedents to awareness as well as the cognitive, affective and conative elements of the consumer behaviour process. Following on from this, given the paucity in existing theory directly relating to the consumer response to social alliances in the context of professional sports, interviews were conducted with sports team and NPO managers responsible for the execution of social alliances to develop a conceptual model more reflective of industry practice. A sequential mixed-methods design was therefore incorporated where the qualitative component generated variables to be tested in the quantitative component.
In total, 17 face-to-face, in-depth interviews were conducted, to gain insight into communication mechanisms used to generate social alliance awareness, and to clarify each firm’s desired consumer-related outcomes from their social alliances. This enabled a deeper understanding of the factors impacting social alliance effectiveness. These participants highlighted four main behavioural mechanisms used to stimulate social alliance awareness among sports team and NPO consumers: 1) televised match viewership; 2) live game viewership; 3) website visits; and 4) social media engagement. In conjunction with consumer identification and consumer trust, developed from social identity and relationship marketing theory respectively, these formed the six antecedents to social alliance awareness in this study’s final proposed conceptual model. Participants also indicated the type of marketing outcomes they expected to leverage from their social alliances, including: 1) awareness generation; 2) donations; 3) increasing team association; 4) match attendance; and 5) merchandise purchasing. In combination with two additional outcomes identified in previous literature – word-of-mouth for the sports team and for the NPO – the conative elements of the conceptual model were revised.

Following the qualitative phase, to ascertain responses towards two organisations within a social alliance, online questionnaires were distributed to consumers aligned with the Australian Cricket Team and consumers aligned with their NPO partner the McGrath Foundation. This consisted of a sample of 504 Australian Cricket Team consumers and 355 McGrath Foundation consumers. The data analysis techniques included exploratory factor analysis (EFA), followed by structural equation modelling (SEM), incorporating confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural modelling. Lastly, multigroup analysis was conducted to compare the reactions among the two disparate consumer groups.

The research findings from the quantitative phase showed an overall positive reaction to this social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and the McGrath Foundation. Specifically, respondents found out about the social alliance through televised game viewership, live game viewership and social media engagement. Both consumer identification and consumer trust also played a significant role in generating social alliance awareness, leading to knowledge of the social alliance partner within each consumer group. Once knowledge was developed, attitudinal evaluations were formed, which resulted in various positive outcomes for both the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation. As suggested by social exchange theory, consumers on both sides of the alliance showed an intent to donate, increase team association, attend matches, spread sports team word-of-mouth, purchase sports team merchandise, and
communicate NPO word-of-mouth. The multigroup testing also showed that the moderating effect of these associated consumer groups was especially prevalent regarding conation. More specifically, McGrath Foundation consumers demonstrated a stronger intent to donate, increase team association, attend matches, spread sports team word-of-mouth, purchase sports team merchandise, and spread NPO word-of-mouth.

Various theoretical implications have been drawn from this study's research findings. First, a more comprehensive perspective of the social alliance process has been obtained, via the interviews with sports team and NPO managers that generated a better understanding of social alliance input. This was followed by gathering insight into social alliance output through consumer responses to each organisation in a social alliance. As such, the second theoretical implication concerns measuring separate consumer reactions to both a sports team and NPO within a social alliance, which has not previously been captured in extant research. Third, this research has answered the call for more insight into influences on awareness in an alliance setting by analysing the effectiveness of behavioural and attitudinal antecedents generating social alliance awareness. Fourth, it has extended the theory by analysing CSR awareness and subsequent CSR knowledge, which up until now has been fairly scant. Lastly, this study has contributed to consumer behaviour theory by demonstrating the elicited hierarchy-of-effects sequence in two associated consumer groups towards two organisations in a social alliance. It has therefore extended on the seminal work of Murray and Vogel (1997) who also utilised a hierarchy-of-effects to gauge stakeholder responses to CSR.

There are also several recommendations for sports team and NPO managers from this study’s findings as a means of furthering the adoption of best practice. First, the interview process revealed that both sports team and NPO managers generally approached social alliance practice unsystematically. Thus, it is recommended that managers develop more deliberate, systemised objectives and evaluation tools to better guide social alliance strategy and implementation. Second, through the data collection process it was shown that most NPO managers adopt poor consumer management practices. It is therefore recommended that sports team managers only form social alliances with NPOs that adopt sound consumer database and consumer engagement strategies. Third, given the lack of effectiveness of some social alliance communication mechanisms as identified in the quantitative component of the study, it is recommended that sports team and NPO managers adopt a more integrative communication strategy to maximise efficacy, such as a joint website. Fourth, the confirmation of a rigid consumer behaviour process identifies the various touchpoints managers can use to stimulate
consumer reactions to social alliances. Lastly, the movement from associated consumer of the parent organisation to partial consumer of the partner organisation among two consumer groups in this study, highlights an emerging consumer segment for each organisation. It is therefore recommended that both sports team and NPO managers view partial consumers as an additional target market they can reach. They can also use social alliances to develop loyalty among existing consumers.
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“We know that as a football club, we can make a difference and are very much in the frame as social influencers.” (Steven Trigg, CEO, Carlton Football Club)
Figure 1.0: Chapter one roadmap
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1.8 THESIS STRUCTURE
1.9 SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS
1.1 Background

Many professional sports teams, governing bodies and athletes are actively involved and committed to social pursuits (Babiak et al. 2012; Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010; Paramio-Salcines, Babiak & Walters 2013; Rowe, Karg & Sherry 2018). For example, since 2002 the Boston Red Sox has generated approximately US$94 million in charitable contributions to over 1,500 not-for-profit organisations (NPOs), making it the most community focused sports team in United States (US) baseball (Boston Red Sox Foundation 2016). The world football (soccer) governing body, Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), has implemented 250 global aid/awareness programs including in the areas of HIV/AIDS, conflict resolution, gender equality, intellectual disabilities, peace building and youth leadership (FIFA 2013).

This social focus extends into Australia where many professional sports teams engage in prosocial activities. For example, the Melbourne Victory soccer team has partnered with the Starlight Children’s Foundation that provides charitable activities including ward visits and ticket donations for seriously ill children (Melbourne Victory 2018). Furthermore, for the first time in its history, two teams in the Australian Football League (AFL) played a match in support of lesbian, bisexual, gay, transgender and/or intersex (LBGTI) inclusion (AFL 2016). In addition, a National Rugby League (NRL) team, Canberra Raiders provided 800 hours of community service to various social programs such as youth education and first aid training (Canberra Raiders 2018).

Such examples show how most professional sports teams in Australia actively implement corporate social responsibility (CSR) frameworks to achieve prosocial goals. CSR has been defined as “all company activities that demonstrate the inclusion of social and environmental concerns in business operations and in interactions with stakeholders, as well as in accordance with the ambition levels of corporate sustainability” (Pérez & Rodriguez del Bosque 2015, p. 486). In the context of professional sports teams, they are often well placed for CSR activities given their high-profile, passionate fan bases, mass media and communications power, youth appeal, positive health impacts, access to diverse stakeholders, and ability to address key issues such as social inclusion (Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Filizöz & Fişne 2011; Inoue, Kent & Lee 2011; Smith & Westerbeek 2007).
As part of their CSR strategy development, many sports teams enlist an NPO partner with a primary focus of addressing social issues. Such partnerships, or ‘social alliances’ as they are commonly known, have long been utilised as a tool for tackling social problems (Arya & Salk 2006; van Tulder et al. 2016; Waddock 1988). Consequently, these social alliances are becoming more prevalent as a means of enacting CSR (Burton et al. 2017; Peloza & Ye 2013; Seitanidi & Crane 2009), almost reaching “paradigmatic status in society” (van Tulder et al. 2016, p. 1).

In general, firms that enter a social alliance often expect to receive some return or “reciprocal benefit” (Burton et al. 2017, p. 323). For sports teams, such relationships enable the achievement of various social responsibility goals while providing access to expertise on social issues (Kihl, Babiak & Tainsky 2014). For NPOs, sports team associations can strategically leverage brand awareness among new and existing audiences (Peloza & Ye 2013). In both cases, these two entities look to one another to drive their respective agendas and achieve organisational objectives. Being a socially responsible entity is of particular pertinence for professional sports teams as many professional sports teams individually operate as an NPO (Breitbarth et al. 2015). This means that both professional sports teams and their NPO partners are dependent on the relationships they have with key community stakeholders. Consequently, many of these organisations are forced to adopt a more business-like approach to their CSR and other practices and procedures, to uphold accountability, transparency and effectiveness (Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Choi 2014; Maier, Meyer & Steinbereithner 2016). Therefore, professional sports teams and NPOs can no longer ignore CSR or implement CSR superficially.

Despite professional sports teams both in Australia and globally increasingly turning to NPOs as part of their CSR remit (Rowe, Karg & Sherry 2018), in both practice and academia little is known about their effectiveness by way of measurement and evaluation (Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Kihl, Babiak & Tainsky 2014), particularly the impact of these relationships on consumer behaviour (Yuksel, McDonald & Joo 2016). This lack of overall knowledge, adversely affects social alliance input, negatively impacting the considerable time and monetary investment that go into these relationships (Kihl, Babiak & Tainsky 2014), and often ending in partnership dissolution (BPI Network 2014; Hynes & Mollenkopf 2008; Inkpen & Ross 2001). Only recently have scholars attempted to address consumer behaviour in a social alliance setting, but more within a cause-related marketing (CRM) context. Further understanding consumer reactions to social alliances is critical, as it often underlies both patronage actions and NPO support (Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015).
This study expands on current social alliance and CSR research by providing greater insight into how consumers react to social alliances within the sporting context. This includes drawing on social alliance communication methods and subsequent reactions from consumer networks aligned with each social alliance organisation. Sports team–NPO relationships are the focus of this study for three principal reasons. First, sports teams are ‘major players’ when it comes to social responsibility due to their strong ties to the community (Walters & Chadwick 2009). Second, professional sports teams and NPOs forming relationships to address social issues is prominent (Kihl, Babiak & Tainsky 2014). Third, there was a general lack of understanding among sports management and academia around the effectiveness of these alliances (Heinze, Soderstrom & Zdroik 2014).

1.2 Purpose and Motivation for Research

A report by global CSR consulting firm Cone Communications (2015) has shown positive consumer reactions globally to CSR, with 93% holding positive views, 90% more likely to trust, and 88% more loyal to companies that engage in such efforts. If managed appropriately, social responsibility initiatives can have favourable market outcomes for firms, including brand equity (Hoeffler & Keller 2002), consumer loyalty (Bhattacharya & Sen 2003; Lee et al. 2012), competitive advantage (Porter & Kramer 2011), goodwill and positive consumer product evaluations (Chernev & Blair 2015), brand differentiation (McWilliams & Siegel 2001), favourable brand attitudes (Li & Lee 2012), and purchase intentions (Rahman & Norman 2016). CSR can also positively impact on social issues such as labour standards including wages, health and safety, and extended working hours (Lindgreen & Swaen 2010; Park-Poaps & Rees 2010), human rights (Mena et al. 2010), health, poverty, energy, education (Wang et al. 2016), social/cultural inclusion (Hall & Matos 2010; Walker & Parent 2010), and ease of compliance with new regulations and laws around societal issues (Yawar & Suering 2017). For many firms across various sectors, CSR is therefore important both commercially and socially.

Despite its importance to firms, measuring the effectiveness of CSR has proven difficult (Servaes & Tamayo 2013; Wang et al. 2016). A number of authors have developed measurement dimensions, including financial performance (Arya & Zhang 2009), employee relations (Jones, Willness & Madey 2014; Turker 2009), product quality (Johnson & Greening 1999; Zavyalova et al. 2012), environmental impact (Diestre & Rajagopalan 2014), competitive advantage (Greening & Turban 2000), management practices (Breitbart, Hovemann & Walzel 2011; Waddock &
Graves 1997), demographic influences (Tian, Wang & Yang 2011) and CSR communication (Kim & Ferguson 2016). However, while such measures have evolved, measuring the impact of CSR still has room for improvement, especially individual and consumer reactions to CSR (Aguinis & Glavas 2012; Wang et al. 2016).

This research gap is especially pertinent in relation to social alliances, where most existing literature has only captured individual responses on one side of the dyad, generally concerning corporate-related outcomes (e.g. Simmons & Becker-Olsen 2006). Studies analysing CSR outcomes at the NPO level are scarce (Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004), and only a few have analysed the outcomes at both the corporation and NPO level (e.g. Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015; Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004). Another paucity in existing literature is that measures of CSR effectiveness have never incorporated the perspective of two consumer groups towards two organisations within a social alliance setting. With this in mind, the research problem this study aims to address is:

**The effectiveness of social alliances between professional sports teams and NPOs in achieving organisational outcomes is not yet known.**

In line with this, Singh (2016) posited that consumers will react to both parent and partner brands in a social co-branding scenario, providing an opportunity to reach new and existing stakeholders (Meenaghan, McLoughlin & McCormack 2013). Based on the assumption that each organisation has a respective consumer network, reaction towards both firms within a social alliance by each consumer group is expected. In a CSR communication setting, Burton et al. (2017) opined a similar line of thinking where in a social alliance, a mutual promotion of each organisation to associated networks can reap reciprocal benefits for the respective firms. Despite such opinions, current CSR and social alliance research has not adequately captured these interrelated consumer reactions. A diagrammatical representation of this social alliance relationship is presented below in Figure 1.1.
As depicted in Figure 1.1, each firm has an associated consumer network; labelled as ‘associated consumers’. In most social alliance settings, the parent firm communicates CSR activities and outcomes with its associated consumers, to obtain reactions towards the firm (Burton et al. 2017). Correspondingly, it also expected that associated consumers of the parent firm will react to its partner organisation in some capacity (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Inoue, Mahan & Kent 2013; Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015; Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004); thereby becoming ‘partial consumers’ of the other firm. Capturing this bilateral reaction presents a more accurate measure of how effective such CSR efforts are.

As focused on in this study, one of the most prominent social alliances in Australian sport is that between the Australian Cricket Team and the McGrath Foundation, based on an official partnership they formed in 2009. In 2003, the McGrath Foundation was founded by former Australian cricketer Glenn McGrath and his then wife Jane McGrath who was battling breast cancer. The purpose of the organisation is to raise funds to provide breast cancer nurses in communities around Australia (McGrath Foundation 2017). Since the inception of its social alliance with the Australian Cricket Team, the two organisations have engaged in various marketing activities to draw attention to the alliance. This includes the centrepiece Pink Test match, which involves supporters, players and officials dressing in pink, the official colour of
McGrath Foundation, to raise awareness and funds. In 2018, this activity singularly raised AU$1,345,610 for the McGrath Foundation (McGrath Foundation 2018).

Using the explanation regarding the shift from associated consumer of the parent organisation to partial consumer of the partnering firm, the Australian Cricket Team has an associated consumer base (fans) that reacts to both it and the McGrath Foundation based on their social alliance. Associated Australian Cricket Team consumers therefore become partial consumers of the McGrath Foundation; with a ‘vice versa’ scenario among the McGrath Foundation’s associated consumers (donors, funders and volunteers). Each of these organisations subsequently receives a reaction from each consumer group. These two entities and their social alliance have provided the focal point for the quantitative phase of this study, with further explanation on their selection discussed in Section 7.1.

In addition, while previous research has highlighted a two-way consumer reaction to social alliances (e.g. Lee & Ferreira 2013; Singh 2016), this study captures a more reflective four-way consumer reaction. Considering the four-way consumer reaction to social alliances has yielded specific benefits for both CSR-related theory and management, as discussed further in sections 1.5 and 1.6 below.

1.3 Research Gaps

As noted above, there has been minimal academic attention on the effectiveness of social alliances within a sporting context, even though professional sports teams commonly use partnerships with NPOs to achieve marketing objectives. Therefore, there is a gap where managerial problems have not been solved by academic studies. This study specifically aimed to address this broader knowledge gap via analysis of management practices and consumer behaviours from the perspective of professional sports teams and NPOs involved in social alliances. Other subsidiary gaps also emerged and were addressed in this study, as detailed in the following subsections.

Collaborative consumer behaviour focus

In current literature, there is paucity in measuring market outcomes at a collaborative level. For example, empirically tested marketing outcomes for NPOs involved in social alliances is scarce (Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015; van Tulder et al. 2016), with corporate or sports team
outcomes receiving most attention. Even in cases where the focus has been on NPO-related outcomes (e.g. Herlin 2015), this has rarely factored in both the firm and NPO perspectives within the social alliance (Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015). Furthermore, a general understanding of consumer reactions towards such alliances is limited, with only a portion of this behaviour studied (e.g. consumer attitudes to purchase behaviour). This study therefore aims to address these two knowledge gaps by examining the associated to partial consumer relationships for both organisations within a social alliance. A hierarchy-of-effects (HOE) theoretical framework was used, which includes the cognitive, affective and conative stages of consumer behaviour generated from various attitudinal and behavioural antecedents to awareness; thereby capturing a more holistic consumer behaviour process.

Antecedents to awareness

Bergkvist and Taylor (2016) specified knowledge on the influences on brand awareness within a marketing alliance setting as one of the largest literature gaps. Aguinis and Glavas (2012) also suggested that the antecedents influencing individual reactions to CSR are limited. That is, while businesses use various mechanisms to communicate their CSR involvement, their effectiveness is relatively unknown, with two core reasons underlying this. First, existing literature rarely measures CSR awareness generated from the practical mechanisms organisations use to communicate such efforts, particularly in social-alliance-based research. Second, when communicating CSR, firms generally use a multi-channel approach; yet broader CSR and CRM literature fails to capture this strategy. This study addresses these gaps by identifying both attitudinal and behavioural antecedents affecting social alliance awareness.

CSR communication

Extending on the above, this study also aimed to address more knowledge gaps concerning CSR communication. For example, while academic attention has been paid to CSR communication via social media channels, there has been more emphasis on empirical research addressing outgoing organisation CSR message content and structure (e.g. Lee, Oh & Kim 2013) rather than consumer interpretation of such messages. This is even more prominent in the sporting context despite sports teams frequently using social media to communicate with their fans (Meng, Stavros & Westberg 2015). NPOs also use social media to engage with audiences, yet measuring its effectiveness has mostly extended to NPO outgoing messages, with the exception of measuring consumer ‘likes’ and ‘retweets’ (Lovejoy, Waters & Saxton 2012). This extends to other forms of CSR communication, such as websites where very little research has measured their ability to generate consumer awareness of an organisation’s CSR activities, including NPOs
This study has therefore gathered insights into effectiveness of social media, website use and other communication channels in generating consumer social alliance awareness.

**CSR cognition**

Consumer reactions to CSR is mostly predicated on their awareness of a firm’s relevant activities (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Boulstridge & Carrigan 2000; Brønn & Vrioni 2001; Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2007; Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001; Pomerling & Dolnicar 2009; Sen, Bhattacharya & Korschun 2006; Servaes & Tamayo 2013). There is subsequently a gap in knowledge where generally CSR awareness has been assumed (Pomerling & Dolnicar 2009). While some authors have attempted to empirically address this gap (e.g. Walker & Heere 2011; Walker et al. 2010; Walker & Kent 2013), none have been in a social alliance setting or from the perspective of two interrelated consumer groups. Thus, existing research has very little idea whether associated consumers are aware of social alliance partners and the social alliance itself. Further to this knowledge gap concerning CSR awareness is the gap relating to CSR knowledge (Wigley 2008), which inhibits an understanding of the elements influencing the consumer decision-making process generated from CSR practices. Therefore, this study addressed this gap in CSR cognition through the exploration of consumer social alliance awareness and consumer knowledge of the social alliance partner.

**Industry practice reflectiveness**

The scarcity in addressing antecedents to awareness and consumer responses associated with social alliances, especially among two consumer groups, means that existing research is not generally reflective of industry practice. Most existing research on social alliances has failed to capture the strategic processes that management adopt to achieve marketing-related outcomes. van Tulder et al. (2016) reiterated this point by highlighting the inadequacy of the reporting and evaluation of outcomes associated with social alliances in existing research. This is particularly relevant at a sporting level, where research addressing consumer outcomes related to social alliances does not extend past CRM. Consequently, little is known about how sports teams can adopt a more strategic CSR approach (Breitbarth et al. 2015; Heinze, Soderstrom & Zdroik 2014). This gap has been addressed in this study by gathering comprehensive insight into current industry practice, and by examining sports team and NPO manager perspectives concerning anticipated consumer behaviour outcomes towards the relevant firms. Additionally, this study has measured whether these objectives or outcomes are
met, which will enable deeper insight into the effectiveness of these alliances in achieving organisation objectives.

1.4 Research Objectives and Research Questions

This research consisted of a mixed-methods study, first using exploratory, qualitative interviews to develop appropriate variables for the quantitative component. The following qualitative and quantitative research objectives and questions were therefore developed.

Qualitative research objectives
1. To explore the antecedent variables that lead to consumer reactions to a social alliance between a professional sports team and NPO.

2. To explore consumer behaviour outcomes or objectives related to a social alliance between a professional sports team and NPO.

Quantitative research objectives
1. To measure the antecedents that lead to consumer awareness of a social alliance between a professional sports team and NPO.

2. To measure consumer reactions developed from such a social alliance between a professional sports team and NPO.

3. To create and validate a conceptual framework of associated and partial consumer group reactions developed from a social alliance between a professional sports team and NPO.

4. To explore whether the strength of the relationship between the antecedents to awareness, cognitive, affective and conative elements of the consumer behaviour process vary among the associated consumer groups towards a professional sports team and NPO in a social alliance.

The purpose of this study is to assess the effectiveness of social alliances in a sporting context via management practice and associated and partial consumer reactions towards both firms within the alliance. To appropriately address the research objectives, the following overarching research question (RQ) was developed:
RQ: How effective are social alliances between professional sports teams and NPOs in achieving organisational objectives?

This overarching RQ was informed by the following four research sub-questions:

1. What are the antecedents to awareness managers use to generate consumer reactions from a social alliance between a professional sports team and NPO?

2. What are the consumer behavioural objectives or outcomes management expect to achieve from a social alliance between a professional sports team and NPO?

3. How do consumers respond to the antecedents to awareness and what reactions do they exhibit towards each firm in a social alliance between a professional sports team and NPO?

4. To what capacity does professional sports team consumer behaviour differ to that of NPO consumer behaviour in achieving organisational objectives for a professional sports team and NPO involved in a social alliance?

1.5 Theoretical Contributions

It is anticipated that this research will make a number of theoretical contributions. The most prominent contribution is analysing both sports team and NPO consumer responses to both organisations within a social alliance. Previous research has rarely captured the associated and partial consumer reaction to social alliances, with a general focus on reactions to one organisation only. In cases where consumer reactions to two organisations have been researched, this has never been done from the perspective of two associated consumer groups.

A second contribution addresses the call made by Bergkvist and Taylor (2016) that highlighted a lack of research into the influences on consumer awareness in current marketing-alliance-based literature. Both previous theory and sports team and NPO manager insight was used to develop attitudinal and behavioural antecedents to awareness that were subsequently measured in terms of generating consumer social alliance awareness. Additional theoretical contributions include analysing the effectiveness of mechanisms adopted by sports team and NPO managers to communicate their CSR practices. For example, social media and websites are
two CSR communication channels that were in need of further academic investigation (Gaither & Austin 2016; Shumate & O’Connor 2010). This is even more evident in a social alliance setting (Burton et al. 2017; Meenaghan, McLoughlin & McCormack 2013).

A third contribution concerns current cognition in relation to CSR and social alliances. With the exception of several authors (e.g. Pomering & Dolnicar 2009; Sen, Bhattacharya & Korschun 2006; Walker & Heere 2011; Walker et al. 2010; Walker & Kent 2013), most research has explored CSR awareness artificially or under presumed circumstances (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001; Pomering & Dolnicar 2009). By using more empirical questionnaire research to measure social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO, this study broadens the limited understanding of CSR awareness. According to Bhattacharya, Korschun and Sen (2009), a better understanding of this awareness provides key insights into CSR-related consumer behaviour and overall effectiveness. Further, Bergkvist and Taylor (2016, p. 169) arguably identified the “biggest gap” in literature addressing consumer awareness within a marketing alliance setting, including social alliances. Once again, a contribution has been made here by empirically testing consumer awareness in a social alliance scenario through aided recall and a construct measuring the level of such awareness. The limited research with respect to consumer CSR knowledge has also been addressed in this study by measuring levels of such knowledge within a social alliance context.

Fourth, by focusing on the antecedents to awareness and three key elements relating to consumer behaviour (cognition-affect-conation), this study provides a more holistic perspective of the consumer behaviour process relating to social alliances. This approach was deemed as the most appropriate manner to assess the impact of CSR programs on consumers in relation to an organisation’s strategic objectives. Therefore, this study builds on the seminal work of Murray and Vogel (1997), who argued that a HOE theoretical framework allows “… such a measurement in that it addresses cognitive and affective dimensions as well as behavioral outcomes …” (p. 146). Thus, the HOE is useful in interpreting how consumers form judgements and make decisions towards firms (Murray & Vogel 1997). However, unlike these authors, this study used the HOE to capture consumers’ responses to CSR via a social alliance in a real-world setting. Capturing the antecedents to social alliance awareness, and the subsequent HOE sequence within the sporting context, provides a basis to empirically examine future studies using validated measurement scales.
Lastly, this study has made further theoretical contributions from a methodology perspective. Primarily, multigroup analysis was used to measure the difference in behaviour among two disparate consumer groups. This extends beyond the more common cross-cultural or gender-based multigroup studies in consumer research; only a few authors have used multigroup analysis for two distinct consumer groups (e.g. Delgado-Ballester 2004; Plouffe, Vandenbosch & Hulland 2001; Robertson et al. 2016). This study therefore builds on extant research by examining the difference in behaviour among sports team and NPO consumers in a CSR setting. While both Lin, Lobo and Leckie (2017) and Tian, Wang and Yang (2011) conducted multigroup studies in a CSR setting among consumers of differing product or service categories, no research appears to have examined such reactions among consumer groups associated with two different firms and in relation to two organisations within a social alliance.

Furthermore, as social alliance practice continues to develop (van Tulder et al. 2016), a greater academic understanding of such alliances must coincide. To date, only a few researchers (e.g. Kihl, Babiak & Tainsky 2014) have used mixed-methods research in relation to social alliances. This study therefore makes a methodological contribution by extending on mixed-methods research in relation to social alliances, including gathering exploratory data concerned with industry practice, and confirmatory data relating to subsequent consumer behaviour.

1.6 Managerial Contributions

The findings in this research provide useful information to managers of commercial and sports firms as well as NPOs that use collaborative efforts such as social alliances to achieve marketing objectives. Specifically, through the analysis of the effectiveness of attitudinal and behavioural antecedents to social alliance awareness, managers will be able to better identify how to inform target audiences about their social alliances. From an attitudinal antecedent perspective, understanding the elements that lead to social alliance awareness will help managers develop more effective relationship marketing and segmentation strategies for communicating their CSR and social alliance participation. Behaviourally, by recognising the antecedents that lead to (or do not) social alliance awareness, managers can more effectively engage with consumers regarding their social alliance inputs and outputs. This will also mean greater resource efficacy, as managers will be able to target audiences more effectively.
Furthermore, understanding the consumer behaviour process via cognition-affect-conation further enhances management’s ability to promote their social alliance participation. That is, understanding how the cognitive phase of this process leads to affect can provide management with direction to more effectively communicate; such as using more informative marketing communications to develop knowledge of a social alliance and its social impact. In addition, by understanding the relationship between affect and conation, management can also develop communication strategies that enhance favourable attitudes towards social alliances; leading to positive behavioural outcomes among associated and partial consumers. In summary, this study’s findings will help managers to identify various touchpoints within the cognitive and affective stages of the consumer behaviour process that maximise social alliance outcomes.

In addition, by integrating the sports team and NPO consumer perspectives identified in this study, managers will be able to enhance the marketing outcomes of their social alliance activities across two disparate consumer groups. This will better highlight how marketing outcomes from social alliances can go beyond their direct constituents and transcend into new consumer groups. From a more specific professional sports team and NPO standpoint, managers will better understand the impact of strategic CSR practices on key stakeholders. As pointed out by Heinze, Soderstrom and Zdroik (2014), there have been numerous calls for sports organisations to address CSR more strategically; but little was previously known about how they can effectively do this.

Overall, this study will strongly assist sports team and NPO managers involved in social alliances to understand, develop and utilise the appropriate resources involved in this collaboration process. By determining the effects of the antecedents to awareness and measuring consumer reactions resultant from social alliances, managers will be able to enhance their social alliance and CSR strategies, thus facilitating the adoption of best practice.

1.7 Research Methodology Overview

To answer the RQs listed in Section 1.4, it was deemed appropriate to use a mixed-methods research design in this study. The justification for this stemmed from the paucity in partnership and CSR-based literature concerning social alliance effectiveness. Previous literature has generally focused on a single organisation (e.g. Uhrich, Koenigstorfer & Groeppel-Klein 2014) or single consumer group perspective (e.g. Lee & Ferreira 2013; Plewa et al. 2016). Yet in reality,
most social alliances generate responses from both associated and partial consumers towards both the parent and partner organisations (Burton et al. 2017; Singh 2016). Thus, to gather deeper insight into management practices regarding consumer reach and outcomes generated from social alliances, an exploratory qualitative method was required. Consequently, key insights and concept development emerging from this process required further investigation via a confirmatory quantitative method. This mixed-methods approach ensured that the research problem was examined more comprehensively.

This study used a sequential mixed-methods design for developmental (also known as ‘initiation’) purposes, as shown in Figure 1.2. This approach is often adopted when there is a need for an exploratory investigation, to appropriately identify variables for the development of a quantitative instrument (Creswell & Plano-Clark 2007; Golicic & Davis 2012; Morgan 1998). This study was thereby informed by two phases of research: a qualitative phase involving interviews with both sports team and NPO managers; and a quantitative phase consisting of questionnaire research of sports team and NPO associated consumers. The qualitative phase was a less influential component of this study (as indicated by the lowercase ‘qual’), with the quantitative phase the more predominant component (as indicated by uppercase ‘QUAN’) (Creswell & Plano-Clark 2007). Furthermore, in line with both Bryman (2006) and Robson (2011), this study’s developmental mixed-methods design used the qualitative component to generate hypotheses and the quantitative component to test them within a single project.

Figure 1.2: Sequential mixed-methods design for developmental purposes

![Phase One](qual data collection) → (qual data analysis) → (qual findings) → (Develop instrument) → (QUAN data collection) → (QUAN data analysis) → (Overall results & interpretation)

Source: Creswell & Plano-Clark (2007)
Note: qual = quantitative, QUAN = quantitative

The qualitative component used in Phase One of this research consisted of semi-structured interviews with a convenience sample of both sports team and NPO managers responsible for social alliances, to identify relevant business practices and objectives. These managers’ insights were used to pinpoint two critical components of social alliance practice. First, the mechanisms adopted to generate awareness of social alliances among associated and partial consumers. Second, the marketing objectives incorporated or anticipated regarding these consumer
reactions to social alliances. In conjunction with existing theory, the data from this first phase was analysed and used to develop the hypotheses for Phase Two.

To quantify the variables developed through Phase One, a quantitative study of a well-known social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation was conducted with associated consumers from each participating organisation. Structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to evaluate the measurement and structural models, and multigroup analysis was conducted to determine the varying levels of strength in consumer reactions among the two associated consumer groups towards each organisation within the social alliance.

1.8 Thesis Structure

This thesis consists of nine chapters, and Figure 1.3 presents a roadmap of the structure.

Figure 1.3: Thesis structure roadmap
Further detail on each chapter’s content is summarised below.

Chapter 1 – Background, Overview of Study and Summary of Findings
This first chapter introduces the research topic including the background, purpose and motivation underlying the research, and then highlights the research gaps which this study has aimed to address. Subsequently, it discusses the research objectives underpinning this study, as well as the RQs used to address them. This chapter next provides an overview of the theoretical, methodological and managerial contributions this study expects to make, which is followed by an overview of the mixed-methods research methodology used to address the RQs. Lastly, this chapter provides a summary of the findings from both the qualitative and quantitative components of this study, as presented in Section 1.9.

Chapter 2 – Review of CSR Literature
The literature review in this thesis has been divided into three chapters. Chapter 2 incorporates an extensive review of broader CSR literature related to this research, to provide an overview of the various perspectives and theories that have been applied to CSR. It then examines literature pertaining to strategic CSR, including the commercial benefits associated with such a strategy. It also inspects the literature concerning CSR communication, before critically analysing the literature specifically focused on CSR in sports.

Chapter 3 – Review of Partnership Literature
Chapter 3 is dedicated to reviewing the literature related to partnerships. It adopts a broad review of current partnership theory before focusing on strategic management and social exchange theory. It then analyses the literature specifically referring to social alliances. Lastly, it reviews the literature pertinent to social alliances in a sporting context, providing evidence of the relevance of this study to extant research.

Chapter 4 – Review of Consumer Behaviour Literature and Initial Conceptual Framework
This chapter provides a narrower conceptualisation of CSR and partnership literature by focusing on the consumer behaviour literature related to CSR, CSR in sports and social alliances. The first part of this chapter critically reviews extant literature regarding consumer reactions towards CSR. It then focuses on such reactions to CSR in a sporting context. Proceeding this, the literature concerning consumer reactions to social alliances in general is reviewed. This is followed by a discussion of the HOE theoretical framework underpinning this research. Utilising the HOE and in combination with the previous theory, this study’s initial conceptual model is presented.
Chapter 5 – Research Design

Chapter 5 introduces the research design used to address this study’s RQs. This includes a discussion of the research paradigm with a specific focus on the pragmatism ontology. This chapter then presents an overview of the mixed-methods research methodology, before discussing the mixed-methods procedure that informed this research.

Chapter 6 – Phase One: Qualitative Research Method, Findings and Revised Conceptual Model

Chapter 6 discusses the qualitative component of this study. More specifically, it presents a discussion of the in-depth interview procedure used to gather data from sports team and NPO managers responsible for the management of social alliances. It then provides a description of the recruitment technique used to enlist participants, which is followed by a discussion of the ethics procedure used in this phase. This chapter then addresses the techniques adopted to develop the qualitative interview guide, as well as those used to establish interview rigour. It next discusses the techniques and procedures selected to interview participants, followed by a discussion of the qualitative data analysis technique used to generate findings. Next, these findings are presented where the revised conceptual model, including a detailed presentation of the corresponding hypotheses is introduced.

Chapter 7 – Phase Two: Quantitative Research Method

This chapter presents the data collection and analysis techniques used for the quantitative phase of this study. It first discusses the sampling procedures adopted to recruit respondents, and then presents an overview of the descriptive research design. Following this, it discusses the questionnaire development including the measurement scales, pre-testing techniques and ethical considerations. The next section is focused on the data analysis techniques used, including data preparation, multivariate assumptions, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), SEM, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), reliability and validity, and the structural model. Lastly, this chapter presents the post-hoc multigroup analysis procedure used to compare the reactions to social alliances among the two associated consumer groups.

Chapter 8 – Phase Two Results

Chapter 8 begins with a presentation of the study’s sample, including the descriptive statistics for the two consumer groups under analysis. A summary of the data analysis procedure is then provided, before the chapter moves onto a detailed discussion of results for EFA, CFA and the structural model to test the hypotheses. It concludes with a discussion of the multigroup analysis results.
Chapter 9 – Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter commences with a review of current social alliance practice as found in this study. It then presents the findings stemming from structural model testing and post-hoc multigroup analysis. Consequently, it draws upon extant literature to assist in describing the effects of the various testable relationships, and providing explanations for results regarding consumer reactions to social alliances. This chapter then presents both the theoretical and practical implications generated from the research, followed by a discussion on its limitations, as well as providing some direction for future research. Lastly, this chapter closes with some overall concluding comments.

1.9 Summary of Main Findings

A summary of the key findings developed from this study are presented in this section. This incorporates findings from both the qualitative and quantitative components used to answer the sub-research questions and the subsequent principal RQ.

1.9.1 Main qualitative findings

In Phase One, interviews were conducted with eight professional sports team and nine NPO managers. This was undertaken to gather insight into social alliance practices, with a specific focus on two key components: the behavioural antecedents used to develop social alliance awareness; the consumer-related objectives or outcomes managers expected to achieve from social alliance participation. Key results from this phase included:

- Interview participants typically used four behavioural antecedents to create social alliance awareness: 1) televised match viewership; 2) live match viewership; 3) website visits; and 4) social media engagement. Two additional attitudinal antecedents to social alliance awareness were developed from previous literature: consumer identification; and consumer trust. In combination, these six antecedents to awareness were included in the revised conceptual model.

- Interview participants indicated five key consumer-related outcomes they expect to achieve from social alliances: 1) awareness generation; 2) donations; 3) increasing team association; 4) match attendance; and 5) merchandise purchasing. Two additional consumer outcomes –
word-of-mouth (WOM) for the sports team and WOM for the NPO – were generated from previous literature. With the exception of awareness generation (cognition), the outcomes gathered from this interview process and previous literature formed the conative variables of the revised conceptual model.

- Additional findings revealed that management do not generally use systematic business practices regarding social alliance strategy development and evaluation; thereby inhibiting the effectiveness of their social alliances.

1.9.2 Main quantitative findings

Using the HOE framework, consumer reactions relating to a social alliance by both of this study’s associated consumer groups were tested. This included antecedents to social alliance awareness, social alliance awareness, social alliance partner knowledge, social alliance attitudes, and consumer outcomes. Multigroup analysis was also conducted to test the moderating effect of the associated consumer groups on the social alliance. Accordingly, the main findings from Phase Two included:

- With the exception of website visits, all of the hypothesised antecedents led to awareness of a social alliance, and consumer identification returned the strongest effect.

- Both sports team and NPO consumers proceed through a traditional HOE sequence. That is, once social alliance awareness is established, they proceed to knowledge of social alliance partner, and then to social alliance attitudes. Most consumers then show an intention to donate, increase team association, attend matches, spread sports team WOM, purchase sports team merchandise, and communicate WOM on behalf of the NPO.

- Multigroup testing results showed that among the antecedents to awareness, the moderating effect of the associated consumer group was only relevant for social media engagement. In this case, NPO consumers demonstrated a stronger effect than sports team consumers.

- There was also a significant difference between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes among the two groups, with sports team consumers returning a stronger effect than their NPO consumer counterparts.
• The multigroup analysis also revealed that the associated consumer group moderates the path of social alliance attitudes across all six consumer-related outcomes. In this case, NPO consumers returned a stronger effect across all outcome variables compared to sports team consumers.
“Arsenal has always been deeply involved in charity work and social responsibility. To begin with, we were only involved locally in Islington, but today we are involved worldwide.” (Arsene Wenger, Manager, Arsenal Football Club)
2.0 Introduction

This chapter is the first of three chapters comprising the literature review. Specifically, this chapter critically reviews extant literature pertaining to CSR. Section 2.1 provides a broad review of various CSR theories, while Section 2.2 analyses current strategic CSR literature, to understand why firms adopt such an approach to social responsibility. Section 2.3 then discusses CSR communication and the related mechanisms organisations use to inform stakeholders of their CSR practices. Section 2.4 provides a narrower conceptualisation by reviewing the emerging CSR in sports literature. Lastly, Section 2.5 provides a summary of the chapter. A roadmap of this chapter is presented in Figure 2.0 below.

Figure 2.0: Chapter 2 roadmap
2.1 CSR Theory

Today CSR is a global phenomenon, with stakeholders increasingly voicing their expectations that businesses need to go beyond financial and legal responsibility to incorporate more ethical and philanthropic practices (Becker-Olsen, Cudmore & Hill 2006; Carroll 2015; Pomering & Dolnicar 2009). Many firms are now consciously accommodating such stakeholder concern in their policies and procedures (Carroll 2015; Filatotchev & Stahl 2015; Wang et al. 2016). Despite its prevalence, the term CSR remains nebulosity. As such, much of previous CSR research has focused on the ambiguity concerning the term ‘corporate social responsibility’ (Aguinis & Glavas 2012; Carroll 1979, 1999; Carroll, Primo & Richter 2016; Lee 2008; McWilliams, Siegel & Wright 2006). This is because there is no universally accepted approach or overarching theory on what it means to be socially responsible (Carroll 1999; Garriga & Melé 2004; Waddock 2004). Furthermore, such CSR work expands over a multitude of disciplines (Carroll 1999; Garriga & Melé 2004), including organisational behaviour, human resource management, marketing, industrial and organisational psychology, and information systems (Aguinis & Glavas 2012).

Compounding the lack of understanding is the array of interchangeable and overlapping terminology used to explain CSR (Brønn & Vidaver-Cohen 2009; Carroll 2015). For example, terms such as ‘social obligation’ (Bowen 1953), ‘corporate sustainability’ (Signitzer & Prexl 2008), ‘corporate citizenship’ (Davis 1973), ‘corporate governance’ (Aoki 2000), ‘triple bottom line’ (Dyllick & Hockerts 2002) and ‘socially responsible investment’ (Elkington 1997) have all been used when referring to CSR. ‘Corporate’ social responsibility itself insinuates that responsibility sits exclusively with corporations as opposed to other business types, including small and medium enterprises (SMEs), NPOs and sporting teams. The term ‘organisational social responsibility’ (Acar, Aupperle & Lowy 2001) was subsequently developed to convey incumbency across all types of organisations.

The CSR concept evidently carries much contention and debate; although a number of key theoretical approaches have emerged that have assisted in conceptualising it. The catalyst for CSR theoretical development was first heralded by Bowen (1953) in Social Responsibilities of the Businessman. Bowen (1953, p. 6) defined social responsibility as “… the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of their objectives and values of our society”. Bowen’s contention was that the largest businesses affect the lives of citizens in a multitude of ways, and should
therefore guide business practice in the future (Carroll 2008). Drucker (1959) also recognised the importance of businesses’ association with its stakeholders by including social responsibility as one of the key goals management must address.

As a precursor to the strategic implications driving CSR, Davis (1960) opined that social responsibility should be seen in a managerial context, suggesting that long-term economic gain can be achieved by incorporating it into key management decisions. In contrast, Walton (1967) suggested CSR to be more volunteer-oriented than mandated, and that there may be costs involved where discernible economic returns are most likely immeasurable.

The more commercialised views concerning social responsibility held by Levitt (1958) and Friedman (1962) caused a substantial increase in CSR debate. The former author claimed that the primary responsibility of business was to achieve profit-maximisation, while the latter echoed these claims in his ‘shareholder’ view that the principal function of business is fiduciary. Accordingly, any movement away from profitable returns would negatively impact employee wages and shareholder recompense. Friedman (1972) also later argued that managers lacked the required skill to address society's problems, and suggested that it was the responsibility of the government rather than business to address social demands.

This shareholder view opened the door for further CSR theory development, perhaps most prominently via Carroll’s (1979) three-dimensional model, in answer to the call for a more conceptualised theoretical paradigm concerning CSR (Lee 2008). Carroll (1979, p. 500) defined CSR as follows: “the social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time”. Based on this definition, social responsibility consists of four categories: economic; legal; ethical; and discretionary. The first highlights that economic viability extends beyond the interests of the firm by impacting on society through supply and demand and profit creation to remain in operation; the legal component relates to the expectation that businesses act in accordance with the law; the ethical, which is more ambiguous, suggests that businesses adopt values and norms that people view as fair and just; and the discretionary component refers to the voluntary acts organisations adopt that move beyond ethics, such as philanthropic activities (Carroll 1979). Carroll (1991) later developed a hierarchical ‘pyramid of CSR’ with economic responsibility at the base, followed by legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities; thereby deeming economic and legal responsibilities as more pertinent. However, while many scholars view Carroll’s three-dimensional model as an important theoretical contribution to CSR, a key
criticism relates to its lack of empirical testing. Stakeholder theory of CSR was consequently developed by academics frustrated by the impracticality presented in Carroll’s and other models (Lee 2008).

First introduced by Freeman (1984), stakeholder theory is considered the “dominant paradigm” in CSR (McWilliams & Siegel 2001, p. 118). It challenges the shareholder view, suggesting that shareholders are only one of many stakeholders associated with a business entity. Stakeholder theory contends that managers must fulfil the needs of a variety of constituents including investors, government, workers, customers, communities, suppliers, political groups and trade associations (Donaldson & Preston 1995; Freeman 1984; Freeman & Reed 1983), asserting that the survival of an organisation is reliant on a number of other parties (i.e. stakeholders) associated with the firm. This theory has sought to explain the benefits associated with engaging stakeholders, both financial and non-financial, in business decision-making. Donaldson and Preston (1995) further emphasised the moral and ethical dimensions associated with stakeholder theory. Through their business case, the authors opine that managers should acknowledge the wide range of stakeholder interests and attempt to respond to them with a mutually accommodating support system because it is a moral requirement to do so.

Furthermore, in challenging previous CSR concepts, Wartick and Cochran (1985) developed a corporate social performance (CSP) framework used to measure the impact of CSR on an organisation’s economic and social output. Extending on this, Wood (1991, p. 693) later defined CSP as “a business organization's configuration of principles of social responsibility, processes of social responsiveness, and policies, programs, and observable outcomes as they relate to the firm's societal relationships”. This definition suggests that examining the social performance of an organisation requires various steps. First, analysing the degree that social responsibility motivates organisation action; second, analysing the extent that organisations use socially responsive processes; third, assessing the existence and type of socially responsible policies; fourth, reviewing programs designed to deal with societal relationships and the observable outcomes stemming from these. Essentially, Wood’s (1991, 1994) view of CSP suggests that the actions of business extend to stakeholders, society and the business itself.

Swanson (1995, p. 195) next expanded on this view by proposing three main types of motivation for CSR participation: economic; positive duty; and negative duty. Economic motivation means that CSR participation is used to achieve greater economic returns via additional sales, profit and returns on investment; negative duty is the adoption of socially responsible initiatives to
placate stakeholders, rather than being altruistic; and positive duty, is the self-motivation driving businesses to act responsibly. In both Wood’s (1991) and Swanson’s (1995) models, reference is made to the financial benefit behind a firm’s adoption of CSR initiatives.

More recently, some authors have applied institutional theory to CSR (e.g. Campbell 2007). Institutional theory is viewed as formal or informal rules, regulations, norms and understandings that constrain and enable behaviour (Morgan et al. 2010), where markets are socially embedded within a wider field of social networks, business associations and political rules (Brammer, Jackson & Matten 2012). Principally, these institutions create coercive, mimetic and normative pressures that impel firms into action (Trendafilova, Babiak & Heinze 2013). Coercive forces include formal and informal pressures exerted from mostly authoritative organisations such as government agencies (Slack & Hinings 1994). Mimetic forces derive from imitating successful firm practices (Campbell 2007), especially within uncertain environments (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). Normative forces mostly relate to pressures from professional groups (e.g. associations) or networks (DiMaggio & Powell 1983).

For firms operating in similar environments, institutional theory indicates that it is common to isomorph with one another (DiMaggio & Powell 1991; Scott 2008). Thus, it dictates that firms look to CSR practices because they are considered appropriate or legitimate (Campbell 2006, 2007). Such institutional pressures mean that firms take tangible steps to designate specific resources to stakeholders, are more likely to receive penalties if particular actions are not taken such as fines and lawsuits, and are more concerned with enacting greater CSR behaviour as a consequence of increased regulatory pressure (Stone 2004; Yang & Rivers 2009). In line with this, Campbell (2006, 2007) contended that firms acting in socially responsible ways are institutionally conditioned due to educational, professional and media pressures. Institutional pressures also play a role partnership development where according to Babiak (2007), one of the principal determinants for forming interorganisational partnerships is to meet requirements and mandates embedded by authoritative groups. Arya and Salk (2006) also suggested that the development of social alliances is a means of counteracting the obligation of government regulations.

Various theories and definitions have been attributed to CSR to clarify its meaning. However, much of the existential questions previously attributed to CSR have now shifted to a stronger focus on how firms can use CSR effectively and strategically to demonstrate clear impact on the
company and community (Wang et al. 2016). Consequently, CSR has moved from an altruistic perspective to an instrumental, strategic reality (Aguinis & Glavas 2012; Carroll 2015).

2.2 Strategic CSR

Husted, Allen and Kock (2015) empirically measured firm value creation generated from a strategic CSR approach. These authors concluded that managers perceive value as created through strategic social positioning and social planning, which both positively influence perceptions of corporate ability. Such a strategic CSR approach is aimed at generating firm and societal reward. In contrast, other research has shown the implementation of CSR activities is often underlined by heterogeneous practices (Seitanidi & Crane 2009). However, CSR approached in such an unsystematic manner and unrelated to the function of the firm ultimately results in both ineffective and inefficient solutions in dealing with societal issues (Jamali & Keshishian 2009; Seitanidi & Crane 2009). In line with this, Porter and Kramer (2006) suggested that approaching CSR in an unmethodical way reduces the impact on society and adversely drains scarce resources from the firm. They further argued that most social problems are too big to be addressed fragmentally. Therefore, scholars have contended that the integration of CSR into long-term strategic objectives can enhance business performance while simultaneously tackling a social cause, creating a win-win scenario for stakeholders (Bruch & Walter 2005; Husted, Allen & Kock 2015; Porter & Kramer 2006, 2011; Sen & Bhattacharya 2001).

Much of the literature indicates that to maximise effectiveness and subsequent benefits of socially responsible practices while dealing with institutional pressures from various stakeholders including government regulators, activist groups, customers, industry associations and suppliers, firms should pursue their CSR objectives strategically. Strategic CSR has been defined as “the attempt by companies to link those largely discretionary activities explicitly intended to improve some aspect of society or the natural environment with their strategies and core business activities” (Waddock 2011, p. 13). It relates to the adoption of CSR practices and policies that not only benefit the wider community, but also make business sense (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Burke & Logsdon 1996; Husted, Allen & Kock 2015; Kotler & Lee 2005; McWilliams & Siegel 2001; Meehan, Meehan & Richards 2006; Porter & Kramer 2006, 2011; Waddock 2004). The recent movement by some firms to a more strategic CSR conception is altering how they practice CSR, moving from passive compliance to proactive engagement in CSR activities (Yin & Jamali 2016).
To address CSR strategically, Burke and Logsdon (1996) proposed five key dimensions that firms should enact to benefit both them and society collectively: 1) centrality; 2) specificity; 3) proactivity; 4) voluntarism; and 5) visibility. Centrality is a measure of the congruence between the firm’s CSR policies or programs and its mission and objectives; it is the driving force behind its goals or objectives, providing direction and feedback including corresponding alignment indicators. CSR programs accurately aligned with an organisation’s core mission are likely to have high centrality. Specificity refers to limiting CSR activities to those that achieve a competitive advantage for the firm, such as CRM providing specific financial benefits to the sponsoring firm. Proactivity reflects the degree that organisational behaviour is planned according to external environment trends. For example, in turbulent markets, organisations should anticipate changes that will affect the firm; such proactivity includes strategically planning and appropriately reacting to potential threats. In the CSR context, firms can monitor social or environmental trends to develop an appropriate way of effectively tackling emergent opportunities or threats. Voluntarism describes the scope of discretionary decision-making by the firm and the absence of externally imposed compliance requirements (Burke & Logsdon 1996). Organisations commonly employ voluntary behaviours within their core business functions where normal business activities are considered voluntary if firms exceed basic operational levels. In CSR, firms that exceed minimum standards of quality or safety, for example, exhibit voluntarism. By doing so, firms can receive strategic and social responsibility pay-offs. Visibility relates to the observance of firm activities to obtain sufficient stakeholder recognition. Visibility has both positive and negative connotations. Positive visibility includes favourable media coverage, solid earnings or increased stock prices; negative can relate to government investigations, uncovering of corporate misdeeds or suspected environmental damage.

From a strategic CSR marketing perspective, three corporate branding strategies associated with CSR have been proposed by van de Ven (2008). The first, reputation management, focuses on the basic requirements firms enact to generate approval from society to operate. This can be reactive or implemented at the early stages of CSR practice. The second, building a virtuous corporate brand, goes beyond reputation development into asserting a strong commitment to responsible behaviour and appropriately utilising marketing instruments or corporate tools to communicate CSR content. Here, the firm is holding itself accountable to societal stakeholders and therefore engages in CSR activities and communication with openness and sincerity. The third, product differentiation, is concerned with distinguishing a product or service via environmental or social impacts, for brand preference. However, one key criticism of this
research is that the author did not appear to consider discrete and indiscrete consumer reactions to these strategies; instead focusing on their responses to perceptions of insincere CSR. As most firms are viewing CSR as an opportunity to innovatively and positively reach consumers, understanding deeper consumer reactions to CSR is important to understand its strategic value.

Furthermore, it has been suggested that the interdependence of business and community means CSR needs to shift into deeply rooted organisational policies and practices for both parties to prosper (Carroll 2015). To achieve this, businesses could consider factoring in the concept of shared value. Shared value has been defined as “policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a company while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in the communities in which it operates” (Porter & Kramer 2011, p. 6). To effectively create shared value, leaders and managers need to develop knowledge and skills around what societal issues are and how to appropriately address them (Emerson 2003; Porter & Kramer 2011). Such knowledge also needs to be complemented by organisational self-reflection into productivity mechanisms, as well as the ability to work across commercial and non-profit boundaries (Porter & Kramer 2011).

It should also be noted in this study that strategic CSR is not without its detractors that feel a company should not participate in morally based activities while simultaneously profiting financially; arguing that benevolence should drive the implementation of good deeds (e.g. Banerjee 2008). However, it is the view here that like other elements of organisational practice, for example, technology adoption, CSR should be strategic to achieve the best possible outcomes. That is, from a firm perspective, the associated benefits of strategic CSR such as consumer loyalty, for example, highlight the relevance of adopting socially responsible strategies. In general, previous research has indicated the direct benefit the firm receives develops from an enhanced reputation where a number of associated benefits ensue (Waddock 2011). Some of these are discussed in the following subsection, validating the importance of adopting a strategic CSR perspective.
2.2.1 Benefits of strategic CSR

Enhanced reputation and image

Firm existence generally hinges on effective reputation management, which should be viewed by management as a critical asset linked directly to corporate success (Gray & Balmer 1998). So much so, one can suggest that managing reputation should be as much the focus of firms as managing the bottom-line. Gray and Balmer (1998, p. 697) defined corporate image as “... the immediate mental picture that audiences have of an organisation, while corporate reputation evolve over time as a result of consistent performance, reinforced by effective communication”. As this definition suggests, reputation is gained over the long term, which aligns with effective strategic CSR theory (Murray & Vogel 1997).

The outcomes of a positive firm reputation include improved relations with investors, higher levels of employee morale, and increased loyalty from customers (Siltaoja 2006). Organisations should therefore actively ensure that reputation management is operationalised within their core social responsibility practices; such a reputation can then be enhanced or reduced as a result of the level and type of CSR activities adopted (Branco & Rodrigues 2006). A favourable reputation in the eyes of various stakeholders is often a result of effective CSR engagement (Melo & Garrido-Morgado 2012).

However, the conundrum of active CSR participation versus consumer scepticism can also often impact the reputation of the participating firm. For example, companies in industries with poor reputations such as tobacco and oil sometimes engage in CSR simply to boost their reputational image. Yet many consumers are pessimistic if they feel such corporations are only participating in CSR activities to improve their reputational standing (Yoon, Gürhan-Canli & Schwarz 2006).

Increased competitive advantage

Sustained competitive advantage is another benefit firms can receive via strategic CSR engagement (Branco & Rodrigues 2006; Fombrun & Shanley 1990; Melo & Garrido-Morgado 2012; Orlitzky, Schmidt & Rynes 2003). Through a survey conducted by KPMG, Crawford and Scaletta (2005) found that the top 10 motivators driving organisations to adopt CSR strategies for a competitive advantage are: 1) economic considerations; 2) ethical considerations; 3) innovation and learning; 4) employee motivation; 5) risk management or risk reduction; 6) access to capital or increased shareholder return; 7) reputation or brand management; 8)
market position or market share; 9) strengthened supplier relationships; and 10) cost savings. Therefore, managers believe that business enhancement via CSR practices enables organisations to better compete through the effective control and deployment of their resources (Branco & Rodrigues 2006). Consequently, various benefits can result as highlighted by the European Commission (2008) in their Commission Competitive Report, and summarised below:

- **Cost reduction**: CSR can contribute to cost savings in business functions, such as human resources, risk management and access to finance. However, the report points out that there has been evidence of both increased and decreased costs.

- **Employee attraction and retention**: CSR participation has been shown to decrease employee turnover while increasing their motivation. Additionally, potential employees, also evidenced in extant studies (e.g. Turban & Greening 1997), often view socially responsible organisations favourably.

- **Innovative solutions**: CSR business practices may extend to supplier firms that consequently develop their own social and environmental practices. Other key benefits include more innovative thinking stemming from wider stakeholder engagement, identification of business opportunities via addressing of societal challenges, and workplaces that are more conducive to innovation.

- **Risk management**: CSR can be used to deal with various business risks including legal, environmental and labour by minimising conflicts between companies, societies and the environment.

- **Financial gain**: CSR can assist in improving financial performance through improved customer loyalty and investor attention.

**Improved financial performance**
While related to competitive advantage, improved financial performance is another significant outcome that can result from CSR. However, inconsistent results in the link between CSR and financial improvement in previous research have caused debate among scholars about whether CSR impacts the bottom line. For example, CSR can result in a positive, negative or neutral
relationship with financial performance (Inoue, Kent & Lee 2011). Furthermore, some management perspectives on this issue indicate that despite the potential for short-term financial losses, CSR is viewed as important because it can lead to higher probability of long-term gains (Den Hond & De Bakker 2007).

To test the relationship between CSR and financial performance, Amato and Amato (2007) examined the relationship between profits and charitable giving and found a correlation. Further, their study incorporated firm size where larger organisations tended to adopt more philanthropic practices more SMEs. This research is limited, however, in that it views CSR practice via a philanthropic lens only.

Alternatively, Saeidi et al. (2015) posited that there is no direct relationship between CSR and financial performance. These authors found that such a relationship is generally mediated by company reputation, competitive advantage and customer satisfaction. As such, these authors contended that CSR can be used to indirectly promote firm performance by enhancing the organisation’s reputation and competitive advantage, while stimulating customer satisfaction.

To address such inconsistent findings in other research linking CSR to financial performance, Orlitzky, Schmidt and Rynes (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 52 quantitative studies. Their analysis of 30 years’ of data indicated a positive relationship between social and financial performance. Similarly, van Beurden and Gössling (2008) found in their analysis of 34 previous studies that 68% showed a positive association between CSR and financial performance. Despite ongoing debate on this issue, more consistent positive findings have shown that CSR can lead to better financial performance.

Other studies have also highlighted that investor relations can be linked to CSR. Shareholder investment in social, environmental and economically sustainable organisations has been growing steadily (Brown-Liburd & Zamora 2015; European Commission 2008), which has resulted in both mainstream investors and analysts seeking investments in socially responsible firms. For example, Goldman Sachs has introduced a methodology for integrating social and environmental issues into company evaluations, believing this can strongly assist in predicting returns and/or leadership levels as signalled by a strong score on social and environmental issues (European Commission 2008); thereby making a firm more attractive for investors.
Based on the above discussion and as identified in this study, the three key benefits of adopting a strategic approach to CSR are: 1) enhanced reputation and image; 2) increased competitive advantage; 3) and improved financial performance. As organisations integrate socially responsible behaviours into key objectives, reputational benefits are likely to ensue. This in turn strengthens the competitive advantage of firms, which will feasibly lead to improved financial performance. However, it should be noted that the very notion of CSR is complex, as stated earlier in this chapter in Section 2.1; while such outcomes can occur, enacting strategic CSR to achieve them often involves various challenges and limitations. However, it is posited here, if organisations are reaping economic, social and environmental benefits, the adoption of CSR practices and policies will continue. Yet while this has the potential to positively impact on social issues worldwide, the unsystematic implementation of CSR is undermining potential outcomes associated with it. Thus, to maximise the results of socially responsible activities and to move from rhetoric to reality, it is important for businesses to tackle CSR strategically. In accordance with Baron (2001), it is surmised in this study that firms should adopt a strategic approach towards CSR just as readily as they do profits.

2.3 Communicating CSR

To receive the benefits associated with CSR, communication with stakeholders regarding CSR is critical (Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2010; Etter 2013; Pomering & Dolnicar 2009). Communicating CSR brings together different stakeholder and societal interests related to such practices (Golob et al. 2017). Consequently, it is increasing in importance as firms look to augment stakeholder relations and perceptions (Bhattacharya, Korschun & Sen 2009; Elving et al. 2015; Korschun, Bhattacharya & Sen 2009). In line with this, Podnar (2008, p. 75) defined CSR communication as “a process of anticipating stakeholders’ expectations, articulation of CSR policy and managing of different communication tools designed to provide true and transparent information about a company’s or a brand’s integration of its business operations, social and environmental concerns, and interactions with stakeholders”.

Organisations should subsequently adopt purposeful CSR communication strategies to further interact with various stakeholders (Sen, Bhattacharya & Korschun 2006). Such communication methods include company reports, advertising campaigns on television (TV), billboards, staff members verbally engaging with consumers, and the internet (Pomering & Dolnicar 2009; Wanderley et al. 2008) which may include websites and social media. Research findings
concerning the impact of CSR communication are inconclusive, with some studies suggesting an implicit communication method such as corporate reports and websites (e.g. Morsing, Schultz & Nielsen 2008), while others nominate more explicit communication such as advertising to help consumers determine organisation values (e.g. Lauritsen & Perks 2015; Schmeltz 2012).

Furthermore, in their literature review of CSR communications, Crane and Glozer (2016) categorised the purpose of such activity into six main areas: 1) stakeholder management; 2) image enhancement; 3) legitimacy and accountability; 4) attitude and behavioural change; 5) sense-making; and 6) identity and meaning creation. Stakeholder management is communicating CSR with key stakeholders to achieve firm goals and objectives. Image enhancement refers to building a brand or reputation. Adding to this, legitimacy and accountability is deeper level image enhancement via different stakeholder perceptions, usually presented via social performance reporting. Attitude and behavioural change is usually measured via consumer outcomes including CSR awareness. Sense-making suggests that CSR communication assists managers and stakeholders in making sense of their environment, and is commonly associated with internal CSR communications. Lastly, identity and meaning creation relates to self-organisational identity congruence developed from CSR communications.

How organisations communicate CSR is receiving growing attention, especially through internet applications such as social media and websites (Seele & Lock 2015). Many firms are turning to websites as a principal marketing communication tool regarding their CSR achievements (Bravo, Matute & Pina 2012). For example, in their analysis of Fortune 500 company websites, Smith and Alexander (2013) found that 98% of these companies used this to communicate CSR. In line with this, Moreno and Capriotti (2009) suggested that websites are an essential tool for communicating CSR-related information. However, these authors also noted the inherent limitations associated with websites in that they generally allow one-way communication and often contain biased, first-party information. Others have also argued that organisations often use websites to convey their corporate identity based on social responsibility practices, but this is mainly driven by corporate self-interest or attempting to align with society’s expectations (Bravo, Matute & Pina 2012).

Gomez and Chalmeta (2011) further highlighted the proliferated use of websites to communicate CSR, finding that most companies use them to convey CSR information via text, images, charts and videos. While website content generally consists of CSR goals/objectives and achievements, with most organisations posting CSR annual reports. Although not all companies
effectively use websites to promote CSR activities, with some showing a lack of understanding about using them to communicate CSR to interested audiences (Adams & Frost 2006; Nyahunzvi 2013; Pope & Wæraas 2016). Amaladoss and Manohar (2013) identified similar results in an emerging economy context; firms’ use of websites to communicate CSR activities was less effective due to the exclusion of voluntary information, which prevents greater organisational transparency from those stakeholders who demand it.

As recognised both in business practice and academia, most electronic CSR communications have moved into Web 2.0 applications through platforms such as social media, blogs and wikis (Seele & Lock 2015). Organisational social media communication is becoming increasingly important for firms to share their CSR efforts to increase stakeholder awareness (Colleoni 2013; Lee, Oh & Kim 2013). In research conducted by Lee, Oh and Kim (2013), firms who are identified as socially responsible are more likely to adopt social media as part of their communication strategy where they interact more frequently with users than irresponsible firms, or firms in industries considered ‘dirty’ (Lyon & Montgomery 2013). This means that firms can utilise social media and be perceived as more sincere given their high social responsibility status.

It has been shown that two-way or dialogic communication can positively impact corporate reputation (Eberle, Berens & Li 2013), attributed to social media that enables both persuasive (Theunissen 2015) and relational communication with stakeholders (Taylor & Kent 2014). Based on an empirical study, Etter (2014) classified firms in their case study into three categories according to their social media interaction strategies: 1) broadcasting strategy, mainly consisting of one-way communication; 2) reactive strategy which is responsive two-way communication; and 3) engagement strategy which involves firms proactively and reactively responding to questions and comments, thereby opening the door for dialogue with multiple stakeholders. Etter (2014) uncovered that the engagement strategy is the least commonly used among firms in their analysis.

Despite the interactive nature of social media, Angeles and Capriotti (2009) found that organisations rarely utilise this forum to develop CSR discussions and interact with interested stakeholders. It has been suggested that such limited use of social media is due to CSR often touching on sensitive or contentious issues that impacts a firm’s reputation or legitimacy (Etter 2013). Further, in spite of social media applications enabling firms to reach more stakeholders (Etter 2014), Colleoni (2013) noted that many companies do not extend their CSR messages to the general public but rather target specific audiences, thereby limiting their reach. However,
as potential means of broadening audiences, social media allows the spreading of a firm’s prosocial message from employees and managers alike, providing the opportunity for entire organisations to become crucial actors in communicating CSR involvement (Kjærgaard & Morsing 2012). As such, Schoeneborn and Tritten (2013) recommended that CSR communication should go beyond the select few who send messages on behalf of the firm, instead incorporating a holistic organisational perspective via multiple actors.

An apparent ineptitude of social media for CSR communications was also identified in the findings of Haigh, Brubaker and Whiteside (2013), who analysed corporate use of Facebook postings to communicate CSR. These authors found that most Facebook postings are focused on corporate ability rather than social responsibility. Yet despite the lack of CSR postings on Facebook, they positively linked Facebook with consumer perceptions of CSR; thus leading to purchase intent.

As another component of Web 2.0, blogs can also provide firms with a channel for engaging with stakeholders. Multinational companies like McDonalds already use blogs to interact with those interested in their CSR practices. Blogs encourage dialogic communication and allow firms to undertake discussions with communities that are often difficult to reach (Fieseler, Fleck & Meckel 2010). Despite such advantages, the community of CSR bloggers is relatively small compared to other corporate-related topics; as confirmed by Fieseler, Fleck and Meckel (2010) who identified less than 1% of web traffic on McDonalds’ website going to its CSR blog.

More recently, Gaither and Austin (2016) explored prosocial reporting by Coca Cola via social media applications, and identified a focus on various social issues including women’s issues, water and healthy living. Additionally, in analysing the viral associations with social media, these authors discovered that women’s issues generate the most retweets, followed by health and wellbeing, and then water. The tone of these consumer messages was mixed, with women’s issues receiving positive feedback, and health and wellbeing negative.

From a social alliance perspective, corporate reporting of NPO partners via websites is generally confined to certain social issues (Shumate & O’Connor 2010). Such findings also show that most corporations use a strategic approach when communicating their NPO relationships on their website, only reporting on a select few to avoid diluting the legitimacy of their support of NPO partners (Shumate & O’Connor 2010). However, to date, in a social alliance setting, research regarding CSR communication effectiveness is particularly scarce, especially on the NPO side.
This, despite social alliance participation enabling the opportunity to engage with consumers innovatively as both organisations can promote the brand to their respective networks (Burton et al. 2017).

Despite CSR communication moving into digital channels, Lim and Greenwood (2017) found that print ads offer more in terms of enabling firms to achieve economic-oriented CSR goals, such as improving competitive advantage, revenue and customer attraction. This is similar to Pomering and Dolnicar (2009) who concluded that print media such as newspaper articles as well as TV news and radio announcers elicit more consumer trust of CSR messages.

Research in relation to consumer reactions to CSR communication in general has mostly focused on changing buyer behaviour. For example, the findings from Schmeltz (2012) suggested that CSR communication can assist organisations in achieving brand loyalty and meeting consumer expectations. To aid buyer behaviour, Jahdi and Acikdilli (2009) opined that various marketing communication mechanisms can be used when communicating CSR to simultaneously convey the firm’s message while impacting corporate image and brand equity, including public relations (PR), advertising and sponsorship. However, commonly, researchers have drawn attention to the scepticism gap in relation to firms potentially facing negative consumer perceptions of credibility in their CSR messages (Elving et al. 2015; Seele & Lock 2015). This can perhaps create a difficult balancing act for organisations that want to exhibit their CSR achievements but need to do so in a way where they are not seen as insincere. Despite such challenges, Du, Bhattacharya and Sen (2010) and Crane and Glozer (2016) recommended that responsible companies communicate their CSR efforts and outcomes regularly with stakeholders.

In their research, Du, Bhattacharya and Sen (2010) made specific recommendations regarding the achievement of positive consumer attributions via CSR message content and channels. These authors suggested that companies communicate both social issues and self-interest or ulterior motive information to reduce consumer scepticism; firms could focus on their commitment, impact, motives and fit with a social cause in their messaging content. With regards to CSR channels, these authors identified two that firms should use to effectively communicate their CSR messages: 1) company channels, such as reports, websites, PR, advertising and point of purchase; 2) and independent sources such as media coverage and WOM. However, a limitation of this research is that it does not highlight or measure which mechanisms are more effective in spreading a company’s CSR message. Most of the academic discussion on CSR communication and its impact on consumers is conceptual, focusing more on
theoretical rather than substantive outcomes, such as measuring actual effectiveness of specific communication tools. Schmeltz (2012) concluded that the number of studies investigating consumer responses and perceptions of CSR resulting from such communication is limited.

In line with this, as pointed out by various authors (e.g. Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2010; Lee, Oh & Kim 2013), generating consumer awareness is often a key objective behind CSR communication strategies, as it enables them to reward companies for their CSR efforts (Burton et al. 2017). Yet, very limited empirically based studies measuring this relationship are available in extant research. Consequently, communication mechanisms used to generate awareness of CSR programs are not really known. ter Hoeven and Verhoeven (2013) somewhat addressed this when they measured employee awareness of a company’s CSR activities. However, communication mechanisms were not measured in this research, rather, the authors used subjective perspectives on the adequacy of information flow as the key communication measure rather than focusing on specific communicative tools (e.g. website or email). Alternatively, in their experimental study, Andreu, Casado-Diaz and Mattila (2015) focused on websites as the communication platform used by firms to generate consumer awareness of CSR practices. Yet while these authors found that websites expand CSR awareness, this awareness was dependent on the type of service (hedonic vs. utilitarian), message appeal (rational vs. emotional) and CSR initiative (environment-related vs. employee-based). Overall, the lack of understanding around CSR communication and awareness creation evident in existing research has suggested that this topic required further empirical investigation.

Adding to this research gap which this study aimed to address, is the overtly broad or narrow perspectives that some authors have adopted when discussing or measuring CSR communication effectiveness. For example, Du, Bhattacharya and Sen (2010) and Jahdi and Acikdilli (2009) suggested PR and advertising as effective CSR communication tools. Alternatively, other researchers have taken a narrow perspective, focusing on only one communication channel (e.g. Colleoni 2013; Gaither & Austin 2016). This is despite the fact that firms generally use a multi-channel approach when communicating CSR with stakeholders (Gomez & Chalmeta 2011; Lee & Shin 2010).

Lastly, to elicit consumer reactions about CSR activities, it is important that firms appropriately and consistently communicate with stakeholders. Specifically, the amount, type and tone of CSR information has been found to play an important role in influencing consumer purchase decisions. For example, Öberseder, Schlegelmilch and Gruber (2011) discovered that the more
information about CSR initiatives via positive messaging, the more likely consumers are to factor this into their purchase criteria. Furthermore, according to Castelló, Morsing and Schultz (2013), firms interconnected with social networks need to understand that CSR is constructed via communicative processes. In the context of this research, given the reliance on community stakeholders for both sports teams and NPOs, this is pertinent; both organisations in such a social alliance need to understand how they can appropriately communicate CSR to elicit a positive response.

2.4 CSR in Sport

Despite the growing body of literature addressing CSR in the business management context, the same sense of social, environmental and financial responsibility has been somewhat overlooked in the sporting context. This has been attributed to sport being viewed as a hobby or positioned more within a social rather than professional context (Breitbarth & Harris 2008). Yet examination of extant literature shows that CSR in sports is emerging as an important phenomenon among scholars, sports managers and sports marketers (e.g. Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Bradish & Cronin 2009; Djaballah, Hautbois & Desbordes 2017; Nyadzayo, Leckie & McDonald 2016). Despite this emergence, Slack (2014) and Rowe, Karg and Sherry (2018) suggested a lot more work needs to be done in this space.

Most early CSR in sports literature has focused on CRM, a philanthropic activity that involves partnering with a charitable organisation to address a particular social cause (Bradish & Cronin 2009; Tangari et al. 2010), and is subsumed under CSR (Sheikh & Beise-Zee 2011). CRM has been defined as “… the process of formulating and implementing marketing activities that are characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified amount to a designated cause when customers engage in revenue-providing exchanges that satisfy organizational and individual objectives” (Varadarajan & Menon 1988, p. 60). In the sports context, while it is common to see sports teams donate a portion of ticket sales to a charity, genuine CSR/partnerships generally go beyond CRM to include more integrative practices reflective of strategic development (Austin 2000; Seitanidi & Ryan 2007).

Advancements in the literature concerning CSR in sport include its enactment in a professional sports setting (Sheth & Babiak 2010), the determinants of CSR in sport (Babiak & Wolfe 2009), its impact on sports fans (Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010; Nyadzayo, Leckie & McDonald 2016;
Walker & Kent 2009), fostering community development (Misener & Mason 2009; Sherry, Schulenkorf & Chalip 2015), sports as a means of deploying CSR (Smith & Westerbeek 2007), and CSR sponsorships (Batty, Cuskelly & Toohey 2016; Djaballah, Hautbois & Desbordes 2017). Such previous studies have demonstrated that CSR practices are entering sports management thinking, and like other organisations, sports organisations are becoming increasingly active in addressing their social responsibility obligations.

It is becoming more common for sports entities to participate in various CSR activities to be socially responsible. These encompass externally run activities such as community outreach programs, athlete volunteerism, community development, youth education, environmental programs and philanthropy (Babiak & Wolfe 2006, 2009; Hovemann, Breitbarth & Walzel 2011; Sherry, Schulenkorf & Chalip 2015; Walker & Kent 2009; Walker & Parent 2010). They also incorporate internal programs such as codes of conduct, worker safety and fair business practices (Walker & Parent 2010). Some of these key aspects will be explored in more detail in Section 2.4.2, but the next section first examines the underlying motives driving sports organisations to engage in CSR.

2.4.1 Why sports organisations are engaging in CSR

Previous research has highlighted that various institutional pressures are creating a sense of social and environmental responsibility among sports firms. Babiak and Wolfe (2009) identified both external pressures and internal resources exclusive to sports teams as jointly pushing teams towards a more deliberate CSR approach. For example, pressures from closely related stakeholders including employees, sponsors, athletes, corporate partners and leagues affect sports teams’ CSR decision-making. Furthermore, valuable, rare and inimitable resources such as players and passion towards the team are causing sports teams to adopt a wider perspective regarding their CSR impact. Kolyperas, Morrow and Sparks (2015) also found stakeholder pressure from media and fans a key driver for teams’ CSR participation in the Scottish Premier League. Additionally, Hovemann, Breitbarth and Walzel (2011) found that sports managers are driven into CSR activities due to the influence of political or community decision-makers but also the perspective these managers hold of sports teams being both community educators and role models.
In an environmental context, Trendafilova, Babiak and Heinze (2013) found that institutional forces often drive sports teams’ CSR, including scrutiny and regulation, shifts in normative standards, and mimetic and associative behaviour. From a scrutiny and regulation perspective, these authors noted that pressures from key governing bodies such as the United Nations has led to the development of various groups such as the Global Sports Alliance that monitor how sports organisations deal with the environment. Also, media scrutiny such as the reporting of environmental regulation breaches had added further pressure on sports executives to deliver more environmentally sustainable programs. Their definition of shifts in normative standards refers to increased stakeholder awareness around green issues and solutions, with consumers expecting sports teams to behave in a manner that ensures a reduction in the environmental impact, as with other forms of CSR practices. Lastly, mimetic and associative behaviour suggests that teams engage in environmental CSR practices because other teams are doing so.

Following on from the above forces, Smith and Westerbeek (2007) identified seven points they believe make sports a unique platform for CSR: 1) mass media and communications power; 2) youth appeal; 3) positive health impacts; 4) social interaction; 5) sustainability awareness; 6) cultural understanding and integration; 7) and immediate gratification benefits. In addition, these authors argued that sports can bridge social and economic gaps while providing opportunities to improve quality of life, and that this is why sports teams often look to CSR. However, it should be noted that these authors’ exertions have not been empirically tested.

It has also been suggested that sports organisations adopt CSR practices to negate the consequences of past or potential malfeasance committed by members associated with the firm (Godfrey 2005). In such instances, CSR is viewed as an insurance policy for any on- or off-field indiscretions. In contrast, some authors believe that benevolence is driving CSR in sports firms (e.g. Walters & Chadwick 2009), suggesting that it is used to minimise the gap between the team and community. Previous research has also indicated that sports management executives recognise the financial and non-financial benefits associated with CSR, and often choose to implement it as a means of enhancing their strategic position (Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Djaballah, Hautbois & Desbordes 2017; Heinze, Soderstrom & Zdroik 2014; Sheth & Babiak 2010).

As such inherent pressures from key stakeholders push sports teams towards CSR development, its recognition as an imperative strategic tool by sports managers further drives the need for teams to adopt specific CSR programs as part of their wider business objectives (Anagnostopoulos, Byers & Shilbury 2014; Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Sheth & Babiak 2010). Despite
this clear need, little is known about how sports teams can enact a more strategic CSR approach (Heinze, Soderstrom & Zdroik 2014); a gap this study has aimed to address.

2.4.2 Implementing CSR in sport

There appear to be three main approaches for executing CSR that sports organisations generally use. The first is the foundation (or community sports trust) model, where a professional sports team develops an independent community foundation (Walters & Chadwick 2009); the second is forming partnerships with NPOs (Heinze, Soderstrom & Zdroik 2014; Kihl, Babiak & Tainsky 2014); and the third is sports teams using player ambassadors to partake in CSR or community activities (Babiak et al. 2012). As part of the CSR implementation process, Babiak and Wolfe (2013) identified six key pillars where sports teams commonly concentrate their efforts, as detail below:

**Labour relations:** This relates to a firm’s treatment of its employees (Babiak & Wolfe 2013). It includes internal organisational procedures concerned with worker safety, codes of conduct, fair business practices, equitable wages, harassment prevention, health and retirement benefits, lawful recruitment and promotions, and sufficient training and development for all employees (Perez-Batres et al. 2012; Walker & Parent 2010). The fair and ethical treatment of workers has been increasingly identified as a key element of social responsibility, and in the professional sports industry, many unique aspects relating to labour relations have emerged. For example, in the AFL there has been considerable attention in more recent times on health-related issues stemming from head injuries, where policy changes have occurred at team and league level. Other programs that help players transition into retirement have been created to assist in the development of professional and personal skills (Babiak & Wolfe 2013).

**Environmental management and sustainability:** To appease consumer expectations, environmental management and sustainability has grown in business practice across multiple industries (Ashby, Leat & Hudson-Smith 2012), including professional sports (Trendafilova, Babiak & Heinze 2013). Particular sports such as golf, rowing and soccer are reliant on the environment, and subsequently view environmental responsibility as imperative to their existence (Trendafilova, Babiak & Heinze 2013). In North America, the National Hockey League (NHL) has developed the NHL Green initiative that is dedicated to the implementation of environmentally responsible practices throughout the league. Each of the 30 NHL teams have
appointed a sustainability representative “... as the liaison to coordinate all environmental efforts between the Team, its facility and the League's internal sustainability team” (NHL Green 2016). Many other sports organisations and events across the globe are incorporating environmental initiatives, such as the Olympics, Super Bowl and World Cup soccer tournaments (Trendafilova, Babiak & Heinze 2013). New sports stadiums are also often designed now with ecology themes, incorporating elements such as recycled building materials, solar panels and bicycle parking (Babiak & Wolfe 2013; Trendafilova, Babiak & Heinze 2013).

Community relations: It is important for responsible businesses to improve the communities they operate in (Babiak & Wolfe 2013). This is arguably enhanced in professional sports given the strong ties with community stakeholders, which engenders teams proactively attempting to address local social issues. Programs around education, health, racial integration and gender equality, for example, are often implemented within sports teams’ CSR objectives. While executing these programs varies across teams, leagues, codes and nations, it is commonly implemented via organisational resource support such as financial backing, players, trainers, mascots, logo use and facilities, and/or via partnerships with NPOs and corporate organisations (Babiak & Wolfe 2013).

Philanthropy: In the sporting context philanthropy has been defined as the “... discretionary responsibility involving slack resources to charitable or social service activities not business related” (Walker & Parent 2010, p. 203). Many professional sports teams engage in some sort of philanthropic activity (Babiak & Wolfe 2013), which is becoming central to their social responsibility (Babiak & Wolfe 2009). For example, some sports teams form charitable foundations that are closely aligned with a team and drive philanthropic initiatives, even though they operate as a separate entity. This foundation model offers a number of advantages for sports teams, including access to wider resources, strategic coordination with community outreach efforts, more effective collaboration with different business sectors, and efficacy in CSR cost assignment (Babiak & Wolfe 2013). In Australia, an example of philanthropy is the AFL donating AU$382,000 to an NPO that tackles youth homelessness (AFL 2015).

Diversity and equity: A stronger emphasis on diversity in many industries is paralleled by the global rise in demographic change that alters stakeholder expectations and social influences. Fenwick and Bierema (2008) highlighted that CSR and diversity are linked when a workforce reflects the society it operates in. Some activities relevant businesses are adopting to ensure diversity include anti-sexual and anti-religious discrimination policies, disabled employment,
programs assisting minorities to advance in organisations, providing work-life balance opportunities, and gender equality policies. In sports, various leagues and teams have actively created a more diverse workforce at front office level, such as the National Basketball Association (NBA) in North America which reported that 40.9% of front office employees are women, and that 45 women were serving as vice-presidents in the NBA league office for the 2014-2015 season (Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sports 2016). Such diversity initiatives can also be aimed at the community (Babiak & Wolfe 2013). For example, the NHL has adopted a Hockey is for Everyone program which encourages participation among those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. In Australia, the NRL has various programs targeting social inclusion including among indigenous communities, such as the NRL School 2 Work program which provides support for indigenous children to stay in school (NRL 2016).

**Corporate governance:** Babiak and Wolfe (2013) emphasised this as the broad, top-level management pillar of CSR. Corporate governance describes “… all the influences affecting the institutional processes, including those for appointing the controllers and/or regulators, involved in organizing the production and sale of goods and services” (Turnbull 1997, p. 181). That is, it relates to the decision-making of the board of a company and how it defines its values, emphasising corporate ethics, accountability, risk identification and management, transparency, and all key socially responsible business practices (Babiak & Wolfe 2013). In professional sports, this can also include relationships among key stakeholders such as managers, executives and owners, player associations, commissioners and boards of directors, as well as the creation and implementation of policies for the teams (Babiak & Wolfe 2013). Therefore, sound governance practices assures stakeholders the organisation they are closely aligned with are subject to appropriate internal checks and that the decision-makers (e.g. the board) act in the best interests of the firm (Hoye & Cuskelly 2007). However, achieving appropriate corporate governance in sports can be a challenge in the face of various misdeeds associated with professional sports such as performance enhancing drugs and betting scandals.

Walker and Parent (2010) categorised CSR initiatives at the professional sports league, team and governing body level. These authors suggested sports teams adopt a more localised perspective via the execution of CSR programs including athlete volunteerism, youth initiatives, charitable donations, community economic development, community initiatives, fan appreciation, community-based environmental programs, team-affiliate partner programs, and free or sport-related initiatives for disadvantaged youth (Walker & Parent 2010). They also suggested that sports leagues adopt a more nation-wide focus when delivering CSR efforts while concurrently
mandating specific CSR initiatives teams must participate in. Finally, governing bodies generally target a global consumer base through CSR initiatives aimed at simultaneously addressing social issues and contributing to a sustainable organisation (Walker & Parent 2010). However, one limitation inhibiting Walker and Parent’s (2010) study is the North American focus, which limits the reporting of actual CSR practices by leagues and teams outside of these borders. This includes sports teams like the English Premier League’s Arsenal Football Club, which already has a variety of community programs aimed at global consumers, such as the Arsenal Gap Year program which involves coaches visiting developing nations to teach at soccer schools (Arsenal Football Club 2016).

As shown in the above examples, sports organisations can enact CSR in a variety of ways to touch on a range of social issues. To further investigate how sports organisations incorporate CSR into business practices, exploration into relevant communication is discussed below.

2.4.3 Communicating CSR in sports

Previous research has highlighted the importance of CSR communication in developing consumer reactions (e.g. Golob et al. 2017), however, this has not sufficiently extended to sports organisations. While Plewa and Quester (2011) and Djaballah, Hautbois and Desbordes (2017) have highlighted sports sponsorship as a means of communicating CSR, only a few other studies have explored CSR communication in sports in detail (e.g. Walker, Kent & Vincent 2010).

In their study of outbound, one-way communication between a sports team and their stakeholders via electronic newsletters, Walker, Kent and Vincent (2010) found that sports teams communicate different CSR-related activities, with some prioritised above others. For example, monetary donations were identified as the most frequently communicated social responsibility activity by the sports team, followed by non-monetary donations such as food or toy drives. Social awareness promotion was the least prioritised, which Walker, Kent and Vincent (2010, p. 191) described as “any event that raised awareness about a social, environmental, or health-related cause”. Such findings could be detrimental for NPOs that partner with sports teams, where a key objective is to raise awareness of their social cause. If stakeholders rarely receive relevant CSR communication, then the marketing outcomes for NPOs are likely diminished, as well as for the sports team that could be perceived as not being serious about their community efforts. Despite such potential negative effects, Walker, Kent and
Vincent (2010) opined that most sports teams do not readily communicate CSR and generally adopt an homogenous approach. As such, the authors suggested that team promotions with a focus on a partnership with an NPO can lead to more positive consumer judgments.

More recently, Anagnostopoulos et al. (2017) analysed how sports teams’ community foundations (or trusts) use Twitter to communicate with key stakeholders about CSR. Their findings showed that such foundations often employ an informative communication strategy rather than engaging with stakeholders via Twitter. Further, foundations they deemed as more effective in their CSR communications, employed staff specifically dedicated to CSR communication.

Using CSR-linked sponsorship to communicate CSR in mega sporting events such as the Olympics has been found to be particularly effective when both the sponsor and sponsee communicate about this, which can result in higher persuasion knowledge activation (Flöter, Benkenstein & Uhrich 2016). Furthermore, in cases of low congruency between a sporting event and a sponsor, a stronger CSR message is required to increase positive consumer perceptions (Uhrich, Koenigstorfer & Groeppel-Klein 2014). While these outcomes have been analysed in a CSR-linked sponsorship setting within sports, such studies have focused more on the message content rather than consumer reactions including awareness; thus, the understanding of CSR communication impact in sport has been limited; another gap this study has aimed to address.

2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter has comprehensively reviewed and synthesised extant literature relating to CSR, including strategic CSR, CSR communication and CSR in sports. Initially the chapter began with a review of wider CSR literature to identify the key theories and models that have been applied to CSR practice. This included Carroll’s (1979) three-dimensional model, stakeholder theory, CSP and institutional theory. This enabled the introduction of strategic CSR to demonstrate the accrued benefits for organisations using strategic CSR, including enhanced reputation and image, increased competitive advantage, and improved financial performance. Social alliances were also identified in the literature as an effective way for firms to adopt strategic CSR, which appear to be becoming more common.
CSR communication was then focused on, to explore how organisations strategically communicate such efforts to key stakeholders, with an emphasis in this study on digital applications including websites and social media. Lastly, this chapter explored the increasingly prominent phenomenon of CSR in sports. Literature focused on why sports organisations are more readily engaging in CSR, and how such initiatives are being implemented where social alliances between sports teams and NPOs were touted by various authors as a means of strategically executing CSR (e.g. Heinze, Soderstrom & Zdroik 2014). In the literature review, particular attention was paid to the specific areas where sports firms mostly focus their CSR efforts, including labour relations, environmental management and sustainability, community relations, philanthropy, diversity and equity, and corporate governance. Lastly, a review of the literature concerning CSR communication in sports was conducted whereby a gap in extant literature was identified addressing consumer awareness from CSR communication.
“The sport contributes strongly to the social cohesiveness of our community and provides a safe and healthy sport and social environment for Australians of all ages and abilities.” (Craig Tiley, Director, Tennis Australia)
3.0 Introduction

This chapter consists of the second part of the literature review, critically examining and reviewing extant literature concerned with organisational partnerships. Section 3.1 reviews the literature pertaining to partnership theory, with a specific focus on strategic management and social exchange theory. Section 3.2 then reviews the literature concerning social alliances, with extra attention paid to motives behind social alliance formation, social alliance design, and organisational- and consumer-behaviour-based outcomes. Section 3.3 focuses on the literature specifically addressing social alliances in sport, and the final Section 3.4 provides a summary of the chapter. A roadmap of this chapter is presented in Figure 3.0 below.

Figure 3.0: Chapter 3 roadmap
3.1 Partnership Theory

This section reviews the literature from commercial business-to-business and cross-sectoral partnerships to outline the theoretical underpinnings involved in business collaborative arrangements. It should be noted that within this study, the term ‘partnership’ is used interchangeably with inter-organisation relationships, collaborations, cross-sector relationships, and alliances (both strategic and social).

Various theories have been developed to explain business collaborations including resource dependence (Glaister & Buckley 1996; Pfeffer & Salancik 1978), social exchange (Oliver 1990), strategic behaviour (Kogut 1988), transaction cost (Williamson 1979), relationship marketing (Arndt 1979) and the more recent organisational learning (Todeva & Knoke 2005). However, the complexity for scholars is that such theories do not adequately explain the operationalisation of business collaborations (Austin 2000; Child & Faulkner 1998; Wood & Gray 1991); they generally focus on the determinants of the collaborative process (Austin 2000).

In line with this, Pittz and Intindola (2015) opined that existing theory does not adequately capture inter-organisational relationship complexity, and that a more rigorous view is required. Given this perspective that partnership theory is underdeveloped “... there are still potential synergies to understanding which could come about from combining some of them” (Child & Faulkner 1998, p. 39). As this study is primarily concerned with social partnership outcomes as opposed to motives, it draws on theoretical positions that specifically address such outcomes. These include strategic management theory and social exchange theory. Together, these two theories allow for better examination of the stakeholder outcomes associated with these partnerships.

3.1.1 Strategic management theory

As this study is concerned with the effectiveness of social alliances between sports teams and NPOs, strategic management theory was deemed as important for assessing the outcomes of such interactions. The process of strategic management relates to the development and implementation of strategic decisions that directly impact organisational direction. The mission and vision, goals, resources, structure, external environment, selection of control systems, feedback, and assessment of outcomes are all factored into these strategic choices (Galbraith
Such a strategy can be defined as a plan for integrating an organisation’s goals, policies and action sequences into a collective whole (Quinn 1998); thereby providing firms with direction and processes to achieve organisational objectives.

A large portion of traditional management literature (e.g. Porter 1987) has focused on management strategy as a means of achieving competitive advantage. Alternatively, more cooperative strategies advocate economic efficiency via a reduction in environmental complexity by collaboratively developing a shared vision (Child & Faulkner 1998; Gray & Wood 1991). Like competitive strategies, organisations that enter relationships cooperatively go through similar steps of the strategic management process in formulating goals, developing management boundaries and assessing outcomes, however, this is done through collaborative conditions (Astley 1984). Astley (1984, p. 526) correspondingly defined collective strategy as “...the joint formulation of policy and implementation of action by members of inter-organizational collectives”.

Furthermore, when operating within uncertain environments (e.g. economic downturn, introduction of new technology) organisations often seek collaborative strategies to gain access to vital resources (i.e. labour or financial) or achieve intangible gains such as reputational benefits or legitimacy. Such firms therefore need to consider, forge and employ deliberate strategic plans to achieve beneficial collaborative outcomes (Huxham 1993). Through the collaborative advantage concept (Huxham 1993), organisations use partnerships to achieve individual and collaborative goals.

In the social partnership context, Clarke and Fuller (2010) extended on the collective strategy definition developed by Astley (1984). They renamed collective strategy as collaborative strategy and defined it as “the joint determination of the vision and long-term goals for addressing a given social problem along with the adoption of both organizational and collective courses of action and the allocation of resources to carry out these courses of action” (Clark & Fuller 2010, p. 86). According to their conceptual model (see Figure 3.1), strategic management of social alliance arrangements involves five set stages.
As shown in the above diagram, stage one assesses the context and forming the partnership. Once partners have been selected, stage two is the development of a collaborative strategic plan among partners, which aims to achieve a common vision and mission. Uniquely captured in this conceptual model are stages three and four, which consist of the collective and individual courses of action to achieve particular objectives. The final stage five relates to the outcomes resultant from the collaborative output. Additional model elements include changes in the domain which are external factors that are beyond the actions taken by the organisation, and feedback loops that allow for “corrective action, overlapping activities and cyclical decision-making” (Clark & Fuller 2010, p. 91).

While deemed a useful model in this research, one limitation is the absence of individual organisational objectives motivating the firm to use social alliances to achieve set objectives. This is supported by Child and Faulkner (1998) who highlighted that the establishment of inter-organisational partnerships is often based on the achievement of a firm’s own objectives, but that a synergy between the two partnering firm’s objectives should be established to ensure this. This has been further emphasised via the collaborative advantage concept proposed by Huxham (1993), where it was highlighted that through collaboration, each organisation is better able to achieve its own objectives. A second limitation in the above model is the ongoing monitoring and evaluation in stages three and four. While it is important to deal with emergent issues that arise, evaluation techniques should be used at all levels of the partnership process (Brinkerhoff 2002; Walters & Anagnostopoulos 2012) and it is surmised in this study that it should extend beyond feedback.
3.1.2 Social exchange theory

From a sociological perspective, social exchange theory views the social behaviour of people in terms of resource exchange (Das & Teng 2002). This suggests that social exchange occurs as a result of the scarcity of resources, spurring actors to enlist one another to obtain valuable inputs (Levine & White 1961). Blau (1968, p. 91) correspondingly defined social exchange as the “... voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically in fact bring from others”, where relationships evolve over time into trusting, loyal and mutual commitments (Cropanzano & Mitchell 2005).

Other research suggests that relationships are more beneficial if the perceived rewards are equally distributed among both members of the exchange (Bernerth et al. 2007). Thus, the notion of reciprocity is an important component of social exchange (Dienesch & Liden 1986). Reciprocity has commonly been referred to as an exchange from one entity being returned by the receiver at some point in time (Gouldner 1960). Such returns may not be immediate or in-kind (Pervan, Bove & Johnson 2009), but enable a balance of exchange over time (Homans 1958). In relation to social alliances, such reciprocity suggests that these partnerships can form as a means of pursuing mutually beneficial goals, with organisations bound by cooperation, collaboration and coordination rather than domination, power and control (Oliver 1990). Such alliances are characterised by commensurate value, whereby their advantages exceed their disadvantages such as loss of decision-making ability and the cost of managing the alliance (Oliver 1990).

It is important to highlight here the differences between social exchanges and economic exchanges, given the context of this study is concerned with social alliances as opposed to commercial alliances. First, social exchanges may or may not involve extrinsic benefits with objective economic value (Das & Teng 2002); second, they are based on the notion of trust, in that other members of the social exchange will reciprocate the benefit received. This is despite the fact that contracts may not be explicit or formalised, and that voluntarily enacted reciprocation limits any guarantee of received benefits (Das & Teng 2002). In contrast, economic exchanges are generally more short-term, with the benefits generally paid for before or immediately after the exchange has occurred.
This study subsequently identified that social exchange can occur in a sports-oriented social alliance in five specific ways. The first is between the NPO and the sports team, with the latter providing the NPO with the necessary fan base and resources to promote its cause. This relationship is reciprocated via NPO support that enables the sports team to be perceived as socially responsible. The other four exchanges are associated with the attitudinal and behavioural reactions of associated and partial consumers to each organisation in the alliance. A graphical representation of the various social exchanges and possible benefits, as identified in this study, is presented in Figure 3.2.

Figure 3.2: Predicted social exchange in sports team-NPO social alliances

3.2 Social Alliances

Austin (2000) forecasted that the 21st century would be an era where interdependence among NPOs, corporations and governments would intensify, which has since been confirmed by firms
seeking cross-sector relationships more than ever before (Branzei & Le Ber 2014; van Tulder et al. 2016). Austin (2000, p. 69) suggested five reasons for this shift:

- Government downsizing and privatising because of fiscal pressures on budgets and recognition of the limits of the state to address social services.

- A growing incontinence of functions from central governments to the local level and from the public sector to the private sector, including NPOs and corporations.

- Social problems have grown in magnitude and complexity, and NPOs have increased in number to address these.

- The search for new resources and organisational approaches is bringing NPOs and corporations together.

- Businesses are looking for new ways to engage with their communities that will have greater corporate relevance and social impact.

In line with this prediction, interest in partnerships as a viable strategic solution to a range of economic and social problems is becoming progressively prominent in both business practice and academia (Austin 2000; Branzei & Le Ber 2014; Bryson, Crosby & Stone 2006; Parker & Selsky 2004; Pittz & Intindola 2015; Rethemeyer 2005; Selsky & Parker 2005; van Tulder et al. 2016). Berger, Cunningham and Drumwright (2004) contended that social alliances have two principal characteristics that distinguish them from strategic alliances: 1) they involve at least one NPO partner; and 2) their objectives expand beyond economic gain into addressing societal issues. Such alliances tend to form either reactively due to external pressures, proactively in anticipation of a social problem that arises and adaptively to acclimate to emerging issues (van Tulder et al. 2016).

Such partnerships are generally approached by both organisations with positive expectations (Shaw & Allen 2006); yet despite this enthusiasm to use partnerships to achieve CSR objectives, the process of collaboration is often complex (Bryson, Crosby & Stone 2006; Pappu & Cornwell 2014). For example, these partnerships can be undermined by conflict between the organisations involved, limited strategic direction, poor communication or coordination,
distrust, and power imbalances (Selsky & Parker 2005; Thibault & Harvey 1997; Tsarenko & Simpson 2017). Further, when organisations from different sectors unite to solve a social problem, they often approach the solution from alternative perspectives (Pittz & Intindola 2015). Consequently, challenges inherent in these social partnerships are often far more complex than other forms of CSR, such as simply donating to charities or employee volunteerism (Jamali & Keshishian 2009).

Furthermore, the type of social alliance enacted by organisations can incorporate various characteristics, such as an interaction level, scope of activities, strategic value and importance to the mission (Pedersen & Pedersen 2013). In categorising various social partnership strategies, Rondinelli and London (2003) branded these alliance types as: arms-length relationships, involving activities such as employee volunteering, philanthropy and marketing affiliations; interactive collaborations which are moderately more intensive and involve the integration of NPO-certified business practices and NPO project involvement; and intensive alliance which is more formalised with NPOs helping to alter business practices and processes, involving regular interaction, joint learning and cooperative decision-making. Thus, such alliances often require a deeper, more complex commitment from the actors involved (Bowen, Newenham-Kahindi & Herremans 2010).

In line with this, Austin’s (2000) Collaboration Continuum (see Figure 3.3) shows how social partnerships can move from incidental to tactical to strategic, highlighting their evolutionary path according to various characteristics and functions. This continuum incorporates seven key elements: 1) level of engagement; 2) importance to mission; 3) magnitude of resources; 4) scope of activities; 5) interaction level; 6) managerial complexity; and 7) strategic value. Such a partnership at the philanthropic stage is characterised by lower-level functions, and as it strengthens it moves through to the second and third stages where the partnership is considered more collective (Austin 2000).
In their conceptual study, Seitanidi and Ryan (2007) reviewed the various forms of social partnership interactions using Austin’s (2000) above model. The authors subsequently highlighted philanthropy, benefaction, patronage, sponsorship, CRM and partnerships (partnerships being a more integrative collaboration) as the types of corporate community engagement via commercial organisation-NPO cooperation.

From a marketing perspective, Burton et al. (2017) argued that social partnerships often sit on a continuum relevant to brand awareness. At one end of this scale are partnerships that involve the donation and subsequent promotion of the contribution to improve brand image and awareness, where the two actors have largely independent strategies. At the other end, there is an integrated co-branding strategy that delivers purposeful messages to consumers and stakeholders, to help achieve objectives associated with the alliance.

For social alliances to create the most value for the organisations involved and society, they need to be enacted collectively (Herlin 2015; Koschmann, Kuhn & Pfarrer 2012) and built on trust, commitment, complementarity and compatibility (Tsarenko & Simpson 2017). Most social alliances cross marketing boundaries to achieve their objectives such as improved market share, brand reputation and a competitive advantage (van Tulder et al. 2016). Therefore, they should be viewed as a long-term investment related to business transformation and growth (Berger et al. 2006). Similar to other strategic alliances, they need to be mutually beneficial and involve the sharing of resources, knowledge and capabilities (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright 2004; 2006; Pittz & Intindola 2015).
3.2.1 Social alliance design

The standard structure of social partnerships has often been debated among academics. Various conceptual models have been developed to identify this, which have been broken down into three key steps: 1) formation; 2) implementation; and 3) outcomes (Selsky & Parker 2005). While it is not the position of this study to participate in this debate, an analysis of social alliance design literature is discussed below to highlight the core outcomes and evaluation processes drawn from such partnerships.

Social alliance formation

In the literature, the social alliance formation stage has been referred to as partnership initiation (Jamali & Keshishian 2009), initial conditions (Bryson, Crosby & Stone 2006), coalition building (Waddock 1989), and preconditions for partnership (Waddell & Brown 1997). Some corresponding models indicate that social alliance formation is integrated within the partnership selection process (Gray 1989; McCann 1983; Waddock 1989), while others suggest it is a distinct phase that occurs before the implementation phase (Austin & Seitanidi 2012; Seitanidi, Kouropoulos & Palmer 2010; Waddell & Brown 1997).

The choice of an alliance strategy usually emerges from an organisation’s inability to independently address particular issues or achieve strategic objectives (Austin 2000; Clarke & Fuller 2010). For such a problem to be successfully addressed, potential partners need to help identify the nature of the issue and why it requires a collaborative effort to solve it (Waddell & Brown 1997). This then leads to an analysis of the potential to enter into such collaborations, via an assessment of the existence of potential partners, followed by identification of the most compatible organisations including likelihood of cohesion (Jamali & Keshishian 2009; Seitanidi, Kouropoulos & Palmer 2010; Waddell & Brown 1997). Waddell and Brown (1997) emphasised the importance of collaborative cohesion for a social alliance to be effective in the long term, meaning that organisational representatives (public or private) need to understand each other’s perspectives of the focal issue. However, others have highlighted challenges or issues that can arise at this early stage of the collaborative process, such as developing a good fit between the partners (Cummings & Holmberg 2012; Lafferty 2007), clear problem definition (Gray 1989; Waddock 1986), complementarity of resources (Austin & Seitanidi 2012), motives, and previous experience in engaging in collaborative efforts (Bryson, Crosby & Stone 2006; Hardy, Lawrence & Phillips 2006; Waddell & Brown 1997). Understanding the salient characteristics at the
formation stage of inter-organisational partnerships is therefore critical for achieving deeper insights into potential outcomes (Seitanidi, Koufopoulos & Palmer 2010).

**Social alliance implementation**

Once the challenges associated with the formation stage have been addressed, the social alliance moves into the implementation stage. The first step here is the selection of appropriate partners (Austin & Seitanidi 2012; Seitanidi & Crane 2009; Seitanidi, Koufopoulos & Palmer 2010; Waddell & Brown 1997). This process is critical to the long-term success of the social alliance and will strongly contribute to value creation output (Austin & Seitanidi 2012). Seitanidi and Crane (2009) defined this social alliance selection as a four-step process: 1) deciding whether it is the most appropriate form of community involvement; 2) developing a set of criteria to assess potential partners including industry, scope of operations, cost-effectiveness, timescale availability and resources; 3) discussing partnership arrangements with potential partners; 4) conducting an informal risk assessment addressing both internal and external needs and concerns.

The next step in the social alliance implementation stage is partnership processes and operations (Austin & Seitanidi 2012). Bryson, Crosby and Stone (2006) pointed out that this phase involves the negotiation of formal and informal agreements regarding the intent of the collaboration. This is where elements such as objectives, rules and regulations, roles, structures, responsibilities, a memorandum of understanding, and decision-making authorities are formalised (Seitanidi & Austin 2012; Seitanidi & Crane 2009). However, across the various models developed in the extant research, only Clarke and Fuller (2010) addressed the individual organisation and collaborative-level implementation of the social alliance. Accordingly, these authors found that some aspects of this implementation stage are enacted collaboratively by both organisations while others are executed individually. They further stressed that implementation at the collaborative level takes a macro perspective focusing on strategic objectives around ecological, economic, legal and social aspects of the environment, while the individual level is more narrowly focused.

Few researchers have empirically explored the design and operational aspects of the social alliance implementation process in the context of sport. In their development of a partnership management model in sport, Parent and Harvey (2009) discussed design and operational elements within the alliance planning process, but this is embedded in the antecedents of the partnership process rather than in the implementation stage as in other social alliance literature.
Alternatively, Walters and Anagnostopoulos (2012) opined that the implementation stage is characterised by partnership management, defining roles and responsibilities and formalising the partnership.

Furthermore, Selsky and Parker (2005) acknowledged key issues and challenges for participating organisations during the implementation stage, including building a common culture, addressing distrust, ignorance, scepticism, fear and power imbalances between the social alliance firms. To combat such challenges, Bryson, Crosby and Stone (2006) proposed that conflict resolution strategies be implemented for such partnerships.

In contrast with this, Austin (2000) earlier suggested the use of enablers that assist in making social alliances function more effectively by reducing the likelihood of potential issues occurring. These include leadership involvement where key decision-makers actively involve themselves within the social alliance; effective, efficient and frequent communication; organisational systems that clearly delineate responsibility for the management of the relations; and mutual expectations and accountability which drive performance. In the sports context, a number of enablers assist in the effective management of social alliance implementation. These include, communication, decision-making, trust, organisational identity, organisational learning, mutuality, commitment, coordination, synergy, staffing, quality information sharing and participation (Parent & Harvey 2009; Walters & Anagnostopoulos 2012).

The final step within the social alliance implementation stage is partnership institutionalisation, which is when structures, processes and programs are embedded within the partnering organisations (Austin & Seitanidi 2012; Seitanidi & Crane 2009). However, it should be noted that many partnerships do not get to this level of collaborative unity and instead dissolve the relationship when outcomes are not met.

**Social alliance outcomes**

The final component of the social alliance process is concerned with outcomes, including examining the repercussions of the interaction between the firms involved as well as the impact on broader society. Such outcomes are generally measured across three levels: 1) direct impact on stakeholders and the social issue; 2) impact on the organisations and associated knowledge exchange and reputational benefits; and 3) influence on social policy or institutional change (Selsky & Parker 2005). However, measuring these outcomes is not a straightforward process and one that is not easily conceptualised (Thomson, Perry & Miller 2008; van Tulder et al. 2016).
This could be due to the multidimensional nature of social partnerships, where outcomes are achieved at the business, NPO and societal level. Existing literature has rarely taken this into account, with a distinct focus on commercial business outcomes (Selksy & Parker 2005), which fails to fully encapsulate beneficial outcomes for key constituents both directly and indirectly. Although more recently, a shift in literature addressing social level outcomes is occurring (e.g. Kolk & Lenfant 2015; van Tulder et al. 2016).

It has also been recognised by some scholars that evaluating the achievement of strategic goals across the business, NPO and societal level within a social alliance is a critical component of the collaboration process (Kouwenhoven 1993; van Tulder et al. 2016). Given that many organisations adopt these partnerships as a key strategy for addressing various objectives, it is important that partnership processes between the participating parties are assessed (van Tulder et al. 2016). Furthermore, appraising levels of strategic achievement is integral for understanding whether the partnerships effectively deliver the necessary course of action for targeted constituents. Thus, managers of these partnerships are ideally positioned to outlay collaborative objectives and develop key indicators to ensure goals are being met. This is in accordance with the partnership evaluation tools developed by Brinkerhoff (2002), who recommended evaluation occur at the selection process, partnership exchange, relationship outcomes, partnership performance and efficiency, and strategy. In line with this, Leonard (1998, p. 5) contended that to effectively assess partnerships, the following criteria should be considered: “willingness to share ideas and resolve conflict, improved access to resources, shared responsibilities for decisions and implementation, achievement of mutual outcomes, satisfaction with relationships between organizations, and cost effectiveness”.

However, while this is the ideal scenario, the evaluation process is replete with challenges. The primary challenge is the measuring of social alliance outcomes at the NPO level. For example, the ambiguity in developing outcome measures (Selksy & Parker 2005) is often a consequence of the wide-ranging, complex goals that underpin NPO activities (Herlin 2015; Weisbrod 1997), including outcomes that cannot be measured in terms of financial performance. Some research has suggested that at the individual organisation level, NPOs can adopt certain criteria to measure social alliance effectiveness, including organisation size, realisation of firm goals, management effectiveness, increased public awareness and financial stability (Herman & Renz 1998; Steckel & Simons 1992); but at the collaborative level, this process is more complex (Herlin 2015).
Empirical findings have also revealed the inadequacies in measuring social alliance outcomes. For example, Walters and Anagnostopoulos (2012) showed through their case analysis that the organisation used both qualitative and quantitative evaluation techniques to measure the impact of social alliance project initiatives on recipients, yet these authors believe this was still insufficient. Similarly, Jamali and Keshishian’s (2009) findings showed social alliance evaluation to be mostly absent among participating firms. Yet it has been recognised as vitally important for responsiveness and quality purposes that social alliance evaluations consider all the important factors that can impact outcomes (Brinkerhoff 2002). As such, numerous researchers have developed measurement dimensions to appraise social alliance outcomes.

In assessing such outcomes, Hood, Logsdon and Thompson (1993) adopted four dimensions for collaboration evaluation. The first is effectiveness in meeting goals, which addresses whether the actual social problem has been dealt with. The second is sustainability, which refers to the institutionalisation of the partnership to ensure its ongoing involvement. The third is the agenda expansion dimension, involving an analysis of a new agenda to keep members interested and ensure continuity of the collaboration. The final fourth dimension is personal outcomes, which describes the personal satisfaction members of the collaboration receive from their participation.

Following on from this, Clarke and Fuller’s (2010) realised outcomes stage addresses the results that occur at the individual organisation and collective levels by both social alliance partners, with six types of outcomes proposed. First, plan-centric outcomes relate to appropriately addressing the underlying issue(s) which drive the collaboration into existence, which are documented in the strategic plan. Second, process-centric outcomes are the internal processes with the collaboration, which can involve adaptations of the original design and implementation of the alliance. Third, partner-centric outcomes consider the impact on learning and adjustments to organisational behaviour. Fourth, outside-stakeholder-centric outcomes involve changes in the inter-organisational relationships between the collaboration (including individual partner organisations) and non-participating stakeholders. Fifth, person-centric outcomes are where the impact is on individuals such as employees. Sixth, environmental-centric are unexpected outcomes that impact on the macro environment.

Various authors have also outlined that while ‘anticipated’ benefits have been discussed in previous literature, realised outcomes receive much less attention; highlighting the challenges
of social alliance evaluation in practice and research (e.g. Arya & Lin 2007; van Tulder et al. 2016).

It is therefore expected that through this research, outcomes associated with a social alliance between sports teams and NPOs will be multi-level. At one level, outcomes are expected to be achieved where social alliance action directly influences the behaviour on both associated NPO and sports team consumers. This in turn affects both organisations, as associated consumers become partial consumers of the partner firms within the social alliance. These prospective benefits should enable greater cohesion among partnering firms as objectives are achieved. This is in line with Austin and Seitanidi (2012) who contended that social alliances generate value simultaneously at multiple levels. Further, by adopting a dual constituency perspective, expectations of effectiveness should be met more efficiently (Herman & Renz 1998).

**Beneficial outcomes of social alliances for NPOs and business**

The general rationale in selecting social alliances as part of an organisation’s strategic decision-making is based on the potential benefits for them and associated key stakeholders (Clarke & Fuller 2010). For the participating firms, a number of positive outcomes can ensue. Yet the reality is that many of these benefits are not achieved by firms or their community partners (Bowen, Newenham-Kahindi & Herremans 2010). Given that this study is concerned with consumer reactions towards social alliances, a focus on the direct benefits to the involved partners was explored, under the premise that such benefits will often lead to external value (Austin & Seitanidi 2012).

For NPOs, partnering with a commercial firm can provide legitimacy it may not have previously obtained (Herlin 2015; Polonsky & Wood 2001; Seitanidi 2008), particularly as creditability is augmented. Corporate executive perspectives of the NPO are often enhanced, highlighting the value of the relationship and often leading to better stakeholder relations (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright 2004; Polonsky & Wood 2001). However, it should be noted that in a recent empirical study by Herlin (2015), social alliances were found to reduce the legitimacy of the NPO, as partnering with a commercial firm can be seen as a movement away from NPO ideology.

Furthermore, by aligning with a commercial firm, NPOs are likely to generate higher levels of publicity and awareness of their social mission (Austin 2000; Gourville & Rangan 2004; Seitanidi 2010), enabling them to achieve higher brand equity (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright 2004). Financially, these social alliances can result in increased resources for the NPO including through
donations (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Inoue, Mahan & Kent 2013; Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015; Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004). The financial support generated from partnering with a commercial firm (Herlin 2015) also enables NPOs to improve the assistance given to targeted constituents (Austin 2000) while simultaneously raising their profile (Lyes, Palakshappa & Bulmer 2016; Polonsky & Wood 2001).

Other benefits for NPOs involved in a social alliance include additional volunteer members from the community (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Vock, van Dolen & Kolk 2013) or the partnering organisation (Polonsky & Wood 2001). Wagner and Thompson (1994) also uncovered that in some instances, high-level management may choose to volunteer with the NPO to offer their business acumen. NPO learning opportunities via social alliances has also been identified by other authors (e.g. Googins & Rochlin 2000; Herlin 2015). For example, Osborne and Gaebler (1992) highlighted five key organisational learning tools NPOs can adopt from business: 1) creating incentives for higher performance; 2) meeting the needs of clients more efficiently; 3) focusing on outcomes rather than inputs; 4) generating revenues innovatively; and 5) leveraging change instead of controlling it. Other interactional benefits for NPOs include greater knowledge creation and technical expertise (Porter & Kramer 2011; Vock, van Dolen & Kolk 2013), access to commercial firm networks (Millar, Choi & Chen 2004), improved relationship with the commercial sector (Vock et al. 2011), and commercial firm employees identifying with the NPO, leading to deeper engagement (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright 2006).

In the business context, there are financial and non-financial benefits for commercial firms by entering into social alliances with NPOs. For example, CRM partnerships have been known to increase sales (Barone, Miyazaki & Taylor 2000; Liu & Ko 2012; Vanhamme et al. 2012; Varadarajan & Menon 1988). This is attributed to consumers believing they are contributing to a good cause (Strahilevitz & Myers 1998), which creates differentiation among competing brands (Barone, Miyazaki & Taylor 2000; Webb & Mohr 1998).

Another benefit of partnering with an NPO is improved corporate reputation (Andreasen & Drumwright 2000; Liu & Ko 2012; Strahilevitz & Myers 1998) and legitimacy (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright 2004; Dahan et al. 2010; Vanhamme et al. 2012). Bowen, Newenham-Kahindi and Herremans (2010) found that through social alliances, businesses are often better at communicating with stakeholders and are more willing to be accountable. Adding to this, Mendleson and Polonsky (1995) asserted that the wider publicity a firm receives from a social alliance can enable it to communicate with new and alternative target markets,
including what are known as ‘second-generation consumers’ or recipients of the partnering NPOs’ services.

It has also been suggested that partnering with NPOs can provide knowledge-oriented transfers for businesses (Drucker 1980), such as social-mission-led decision-making rather than purely financial, CEO accountability to board members, and perceptions as an attractive employer. This last point can also relate to current employees, who could be more motivated to increase their performance if they view their firm as caring about social issues (Park & Levy 2014; Turban & Greening 1997). Also similar to NPO outcomes, interactional benefits have been identified for commercial firms. For example, Seitanidi (2010) drew attention to various interactional benefits in her case study, including providing access to networks, improved community and government relationships, organisational culture transfer, greater accountability, NPO sector legitimacy, and employee skill improvements.

Despite such insights, most of the literature on collaborative outcomes has focused on macro benefits or the success components of the partnership (Clarke & Fuller 2010), with specific consumer outcomes largely ignored. Further, the emphasis of extant research has been at the individual organisation rather than the collaborative level. While some researchers (e.g. Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004) have empirically examined consumer-related outcomes at the NPO level, few have studied consumer outcomes at both the business and NPO level. Up until now, little was known about the actual consequences of social alliances, with very few empirical assessments of effectiveness applied (Hansen & Spitzeck 2011; Lucea 2010; Utting & Zammit 2009; van Tulder et al. 2016).

### 3.3 Social Alliances in Sport

Elements unique to sports teams, such as youth appeal and mass media communication, position many of them as potential agents of social change. Sports teams also have access to rare resources, such as ticketing, signage, iconic facilities, events, and vendors and sponsors (Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Yancey et al. 2009). Yet despite these benefits, sports teams are not always able to deliver community programs as an individual organisation, and often attain partnerships with NPOs that provide them with information, knowledge and resources regarding social issues (Kihl, Babiak & Tainsky 2014).
Although some studies have investigated implementing CSR via social alliances (e.g. Jamali & Keshishian 2009), this has rarely been within the context of sports (Kihl et al. 2014). However, a body of literature addressing social alliances in a sports setting is starting to emerge assisting both academics and practitioners in knowledge development. Table 3.0 presents a review of this literature, which will also be discussed in this section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>General focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irwin et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Analysed attitudes, beliefs and purchase intentions towards sponsors of a sporting event associated with an NPO</td>
<td>Fedex and St. Jude Classic</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Attitudes, beliefs and purchase intentions towards sponsors were positive due to the social alliance</td>
<td>CRM (event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy &amp; Graeff (2003)</td>
<td>Examined consumer attitudes towards professional athletes’ and teams’ CRM activities</td>
<td>Generic CRM arrangement between sports team and NPO</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Consumers have high expectations of athletes’ and teams’ involvement in community programs</td>
<td>CRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Examined the relationship among event attendees, sponsorship, community involvement, and the title sponsor’s brand</td>
<td>Tour de Georgia (TDG) cycling event and sponsors</td>
<td>Interviews and Questionnaire</td>
<td>Active, enthusiastic and knowledgeable consumers are more appreciative of a commercial organisation’s community involvement, leading to positive brand perceptions and purchase intentions</td>
<td>Consumer responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw &amp; Allen (2006)</td>
<td>Examined dynamics of sports development partnerships</td>
<td>Partnership among three NPOs, regional charitable trust, regional sports trust, and regional sport organisations</td>
<td>Interviews, observation, document analysis</td>
<td>Partnership management could be formalised, but a more informal approach was the strength of the relationship</td>
<td>Partnership design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower, Jago &amp; Deery (2006)</td>
<td>Identified elements of successful and unsuccessful partnerships</td>
<td>No specific partners mentioned</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Partnership benefits include goals assistance, fostered innovation, sharing knowledge and expertise</td>
<td>Partnership design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year)</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>General focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babiak (2007)</td>
<td>Explored the determinants of partnership formation</td>
<td>Canadian Sport Centre (NPO) and partners including sports organisations, corporate organisations, university associations and government agencies</td>
<td>Interviews, meeting observations and organisational documents</td>
<td>Key determinants for partnering for Each group are: Canadian Sport Centre – necessity, asymmetry, legitimacy, efficiency and stability Founding partner – reciprocity, legitimacy, efficiency Corporate partners – reciprocity, legitimacy Sport partner – necessity, asymmetry, efficiency, stability Network partner – necessity, reciprocity, efficiency</td>
<td>Network partnership motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vail (2007)</td>
<td>Assessed the implementation of a model for community development</td>
<td>Tennis Canada and associated partners</td>
<td>Interviews and Questionnaire</td>
<td>Community partnerships are inconsistent across communities Partnerships important to build community development</td>
<td>Community organisation development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babiak (2009)</td>
<td>Compared the effectiveness criteria in a multiple organisation partnership</td>
<td>Non-profit Canadian sports centre and its public, private and NPO partners</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Measures across partners are: - highly interrelated - shared across partners - reflective of contesting values and ambiguous</td>
<td>Effectiveness measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filo, Funk &amp; O’Brien (2009; 2010)</td>
<td>Examined the factors that contribute to participants’ perceptions of event sponsors</td>
<td>3M participant selected charities</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Recreation and charity motives contribute to event attachment Charity motives and event attachment contribute to sponsor image Sponsor image and event attachment contribute to sponsor product purchase intent and</td>
<td>CRM (event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author &amp; Year</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>General Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent &amp; Harvey (2009)</td>
<td>Developed a partnership base model for sport</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Partnership antecedents: - Project’s purpose - The environment - Nature of organisations’ motives - Complementarity and fit - Partnership planning</td>
<td>Partnership design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>event attachment contributes to future event participation intent, while sponsor image does not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yancey et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Built a model for collaboration</td>
<td>San Diego Padres and Public Health</td>
<td>Case study analysis</td>
<td>Sports teams are well placed to deliver health programs given athlete celebrity status, media attention, large fan base, sports venues</td>
<td>Collaboration opportunities and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, Close &amp; Finney (2010)</td>
<td>Analysed event attendees’ product knowledge, perceptions of CSR and subsequent reactions</td>
<td>TDG cycling event AT&amp;T and Georgia Cancer Coalition</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Attendee knowledge of an event sponsor’s products combined with their perceptions of social responsibility lead to sponsor firm commitment and purchase intent</td>
<td>Consumer responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayhurst &amp; Frisby (2010)</td>
<td>Analysed tensions resulting from partnership between high-performance sports organisations and NPOs that use sport for development</td>
<td>A partnership between Canadian NPOs and high-performance sport organisations, and a partnership between Swiss NPOs and high-performance sport organisations</td>
<td>Content analysis of websites and documents, and interviews</td>
<td>Tensions highlighted include: - Competing values - Gaining legitimacy - Resource dependency</td>
<td>Partnership design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year)</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>General focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walters &amp; Anagnostopoulos (2012)</td>
<td>Examined the partnership process</td>
<td>UEFA and six partnership organisations</td>
<td>Interview and document sources</td>
<td>The stages of partnership include:</td>
<td>Partnership design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Partnership selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Partnership design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Partnership management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Partnership evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role of interpersonal trust very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoue, Mahan &amp; Kent (2013)</td>
<td>Identified the effect of perceived corporate ability associations of professional sport organisations on consumer support of their NPO partners</td>
<td>Baseball team and charity partner, and basketball team and charity partner</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Corporate ability impacts consumer donations to NPO partner, especially among lowly identified fans</td>
<td>Consumer responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication of large donation amounts by the sports team leads to favourable attitudinal evaluation by fans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Ferreira (2013)</td>
<td>Examined team identification and cause organisational identification on consumer attitudes towards CRM</td>
<td>College football team and boys and girls team, American Cancer Society, football little leagues, gay/lesbian rights or abortion, salvation army, PETA</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Respondents show more positive attitudes towards high-fit scenarios</td>
<td>CRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fit has a higher impact in higher team identification fans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fit had no impact when cause organisation identification is positive, but it plays a role when consumers have low identification with the cause organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco &amp; Pessoa (2014)</td>
<td>Determined the role of partnerships in the university sport sector to achieve collaborative entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Portuguese higher education institute-UBI and various partnerships</td>
<td>Direct observation, interviews, and document analysis</td>
<td>Partnerships help the university achieve community and social entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Partnership motives and benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year)</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>General focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinze, Soderstrom &amp; Zdroik (2014)</td>
<td>Developed a framework for successful implementation of CSR</td>
<td>Detroit Lions and 6 NPOs</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Partnership best practice includes: - Respect and humility in partnership engagement enable NPOs to perform - Authentic CSR - Mutually beneficial gains - Brokerage between firms</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kihl, Babiak &amp; Tainsky (2014)</td>
<td>Evaluated the implementation and operational processes of partnerships in professional sports with NPO</td>
<td>A major baseball league team and a partnership with a parks and recreation department (govt. organisation)</td>
<td>Interviews, Questionnaire and organisational documents</td>
<td>There are discrepancies within the partnership about fulfilling responsibilities and service delivery protocol Generally, stakeholders are satisfied with the program, but inconsistency of findings in the satisfaction of marketing and communications of service delivery</td>
<td>Stakeholder reaction (not consumers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walters &amp; Panton (2014)</td>
<td>Examined the managerial aspects of social partnerships</td>
<td>Community sports trust, football teams and other organisations</td>
<td>Interview data</td>
<td>Identification of partnerships as strategic approach for community program implementation Motives for partnerships differ, reasons include: - Social change - Cross-over between self-interest and social change - Self-interest - Institutional pressures</td>
<td>Partnership motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plewa et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Investigated how organisations can use sport sponsorship to build CSR image</td>
<td>Two partnerships between a national sports team and national NPO, and a local sports team and grassroots NPO</td>
<td>Experimental design</td>
<td>A sporting team’s proactive community engagement enhances CSR image for its sponsor, especially when the property operates on the national rather than grassroots level</td>
<td>Consumer responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Oliver’s (1990) inter-organisational collaboration framework, Babiak (2007) explored partnership motives in a Canadian sports group alliance between an NPO and public and private organisations. The findings showed that various motives influence the different sectors, such as necessity, asymmetry, legitimacy, efficiency and stability driving NPOs to select a partnership strategy, while reciprocity and legitimacy motivate the corporate partner. Walters and Panton (2014) similarly identified various motives behind social alliance formation in a foundation model setting, where they are viewed as a strategic approach for implementing community programs. These authors correspondingly highlighted social change, cross-over between self-interest and social change, self-interest, and institutional pressures as key motivating factors to form such alliances.

According to Parent and Harvey’s (2009) proposed management model of partnerships in sports, alliance structures include antecedents, management and evaluation. That is, the drive to participate in these partnerships is predicated on several internally and externally driven factors such as project purpose, the operating environment, organisation type, partnership motives, partnership fit and planning. Once established, the partnership moves to the management phase where partnership components are developed and controlled. Following the antecedents and management phases, the partnership shifts to the evaluation phase where successes and failures throughout the partnership are identified. This is similar to the model proposed by Walters and Anagnostopoulos (2012) that incorporated an empirical investigation into their analysis and subsequently identified a partnership design phase separate to that of the partnership management phase, with interpersonal trust highlighted as a key attribute influencing the entire partnership process. Both studies opined that the evaluation process in social alliances in the sport context is generally complex and is therefore often omitted.

Babiak (2009) later found that despite measuring success in community sport network partnerships at the community level via client output, there are often insufficient evaluation mechanisms and accountability which impact assessment efficacy. At the network level, participants consider various measures of effectiveness such as organisation participation and continuity levels, services provided, and sporting competition success. At the organisational level, measures of success are generally based on motivations for seeking inter-organisational relationships, such as legitimacy, resource access, and efficiency. However, constraints in the form of identifiable roles and responsibilities, strategic objective shifts, and external pressures can disable the implementation of effective measurement systems. Babiak (2009) therefore
concluded that some measures across network partners are highly interrelated and shared, while others reflect contesting values and ambiguity.

Beyond evaluation, there has been some attention on the notion of complexities and barriers preventing the adequate application of social alliances. Such barriers within the managerial structure of the partnership include partnership agreements, formal communication, intensity of partnership management, conflict and competing agendas (Kihl et al. 2014; Shaw & Allen 2006). From an NPO perspective, Hayhurst and Frisby (2010) drew attention to the tensions felt between these organisations and high-performance sports organisations when enacting development through sport. The three main tensions identified are: 1) opposing values that influence the delivery of programs; 2) Failing to achieve legitimacy and program implementation independently; and 3) power imbalances between the NPOs and partners due to resource dependency.

However, in contrast with the complexities highlighted above, other researchers have presented success factors that have led to sustainable community partnerships within the sports context. For example, Heinze, Soderstrom and Zdroik (2014) emphasised respect and humility, where a sports team listens to its community partner and values their expertise; playing an enabler role through engaging in helping rather than self-serving behaviour; authenticity with respect to their social responsibility motives; mutually beneficial gains for the cause, the city and the sports team; and brokerage which serves as a connector between various community partner organisations. The benefits of incorporating these success factors to the community partnership include the achievement of joint and individual organisation goals, fostering of innovation, sharing of knowledge and expertise, development of communities, and a positive brand image (Plewa et al. 2016; Tower, Jago & Deery 2006; Vail 2007).

For NPOs, collaborating with a sports team can be an attractive option for increasing the impact of their social responsibility and perceptions of effective governance (Babiak & Wolfe 2006). Although the success of such collaborations is often contingent on external factors, such as donation intention which Inoue, Mahan and Kent (2013) found to be affected by fan identification levels and the importance of the non-profit domain to fans. In addition, this study further found that on-field team performance can affect a consumer’s intention to donate to the sponsored social cause, especially when fan identification is at a low level.
Given the scant research focus on social alliances in sport, literature addressing consumer reactions to these social alliances is even sparser and rarely explored outside CRM boundaries which have also been considered scarce (Yuksel, McDonald & Joo 2016). Among the limited research, Roy and Graeff (2003) found that consumers expect both professional athletes and sports teams to contribute to various social issues. This finding may in part be attributed to some teams receiving financial support via government funding of stadiums, arenas and training facilities (Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Godfrey 2009; Roy & Graeff 2003). Furthermore, the findings from the limited studies have generally shown a positive response to CRM initiatives in sports, such as improved attitudes, beliefs and purchase intentions towards the firm (Irwin et al. 2003). More recently, Lee and Ferreira (2013) analysed consumer attitudes towards CRM with a focus on congruency between the sport and the social cause, and revealed that positive attitudes are elicited more in high-fit scenarios where this relationship is moderated by team identification.

In a charity sports event context, Filo, Funk and O’Brien (2009; 2010) found that among consumer participants, recreational and charitable motives contribute to their levels of event attachment. In conjunction with stronger charity motives, this attachment subsequently leads to positive sponsor perceptions and purchase intent. However, these authors also discovered that while event participation directs consumers towards future participation intent, the image of the sponsor does not; suggesting that brand loyalty to the sponsoring firm does not necessarily carry over. Close et al. (2006) also explored consumer reactions in a charity event sponsorship context, and found that active, enthusiastic and knowledgeable consumers are more appreciative of the commercial organisation’s community involvement, which extends to positive brand perceptions and purchase intentions. These findings are also echoed by Lacey, Close and Finney (2010) who discovered that attendee knowledge of an event sponsor’s products combined with the attendees’ perceptions of social responsibility can lead to greater sponsor firm commitment and purchase intent.

While generating various benefits for participating organisations and surrounding communities, sports team social alliances can be loaded with complexities. Yet despite this, sports teams are increasingly turning to social alliances with NPOs (Heinze, Soderstrom & Zdroik 2014; Kihl, Babiak & Tainsky 2014), and therefore need to adopt a more efficient approach in their partnership engagement strategies. In a framework developed by Heinze, Soderstrom and Zdroik (2014), it has been proposed that professional sports organisations use a more authentic, strategic CSR approach, including social alliances. These authors highlighted eight key elements to assure this, as summarised below:
1. Focus on specific areas with a narrower, stronger commitment.

2. Ensure that community needs and team capabilities and goals align, and that all parties involved in the partnership benefit.

3. Demonstrate trust and respect within community groups and involve them in key decision-making.

4. Go beyond simple donations and develop true collaborative relationships.

5. Align community programming with broader goals rather than mandating how resources are used.

6. Identify synergies among key partnership stakeholders.

7. Connect with community partners through regular interaction and shared initiatives.

8. Integrate CSR into core business processes and capabilities.

These eight elements define key management decision-making steps that should occur during the active pursuit of strategic CSR for sports teams. This framework also contributes to measuring the effectiveness of partnership programs; although it is limited in its scope here in that the focus is more on the management of partnerships rather than external stakeholder outcomes. In order to better understand the effectiveness of community partnerships in the sports context, it is important to measure the effects on the consumers such CSR arrangements commonly target. Thus, this study has aimed to extend on previous research addressing the effectiveness of CSR in sports by measuring the impact of this commonly used CSR approach on two key stakeholder groups: sports team consumers and NPO consumers.

### 3.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has critically examined the literature relating to partnerships. It has primarily focused on various partnership theories that have been applied to these organisational collaborative arrangements, with specific attention paid to strategic management and social exchange theory. From a strategic management perspective, it examined how firms in a social alliance set objectives and plan and evaluate courses of action to achieve them, but at a collaborative level. Social exchange theory was also applied in the context of this research relating to sports teams and NPOs, with the exchanges between partner organisations and between organisations and both consumer groups examined.
This chapter also analysed the literature relating to social alliances, demonstrating the proliferation of these to address CSR, marketing and social objectives. Particular emphasis was placed on social alliance typologies that firms generally adopt. It has also provided a review of the literature addressing the three critical components of social alliance arrangements: 1) partnership formation; 2) implementation; 3) and outcomes. From an outcomes perspective, it examined the financial and non-financial outcomes for both NPOs and commercial firms as highlighted in extant research.

The final component of this chapter was a more narrowed focus involving a critical review of social alliances in the sports context, which highlighted the scarcity of existing research that has addressed consumer reactions to social alliances within sport.
“Cricket has given me the platform to spread the message and try to make a positive impact ... Tonight will be my last ever game in Australia, and the Melbourne Stars have made it their Playing for Rhinos night. We will be raising awareness and funds. That’s amazing.” (Kevin Pietersen, International Cricketer)
4.0 Introduction

Chapter 4 is the third component of the literature review. This chapter critically reviews and dissects the literature related to consumer behaviour stemming from CSR, including CSR in sports and social alliances, highlighting the gaps in extant research. Respectively, Section 4.1 examines consumer reactions generated from a firm’s CSR practice, while Section 4.2 adopts a narrower perspective by focusing on the consumer reactions elicited through CSR in sports. This is then followed by a review of the literature pertaining to consumer reactions to social alliances in Section 4.3. Proceeding this section, Section 4.4 introduces the hierarchy-of-effects (HOE) theoretical framework underpinning this study and in combination with the previous sections addressing consumer behaviour, the final section, Section 4.5 introduces the initial conceptual model that was first established from this study. Finally, Section 4.6 provides a summary of the chapter. A roadmap of this chapter’s contents is presented in Figure 4.0.

Figure 4.0: Chapter 4 roadmap
4.1 Consumer Reactions to CSR

Belk, Devinney and Eckhardt (2005) studied consumer reactions to CSR across eight countries, with findings that revealed consumers were less concerned about a firm’s social responsibility and more interested in obtaining quality products at a fair price. However, today, consumers are more likely to consider purchasing a company’s product as a result of CSR participation (Sen, Du & Bhattacharya 2016; Vitell 2015). This apparent shift in consumer behaviour indicates that organisations need to be active in how they approach CSR, and conscious of consumer reactions resulting from CSR practices.

In evaluating the impact of a firm’s CSR initiatives, various factors appear to affect consumer appraisals. These include consumer awareness of societal issues (Maignan & Ferrell 2001), perceived trade-offs a company makes to enact CSR initiatives (e.g. price and quality) (Feldman & Vasquez-Parraga 2013; Sen & Bhattacharya 2001; Vitell 2015), CSR communication source trust (Mohr & Webb 2005; Pomerling & Dolnicar 2009), type and extent of CSR activity (Hildebrand et al. 2017; Li & Lee 2012; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya 2016), consumer values and lifestyle (Lee et al. 2012), and moral sensitivity towards social or environmental issues (McEachern 2015). Organisation size can also influence consumer evaluations of a firm’s CSR performance, with small, local firms often better perceived when enacting CSR than large, multinational companies (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Prout 2006).

Generally, consumers hold an interest in CSR and submit that it plays a role in their purchase criterion. Although this is often dependent on the perceived motives for organisations engaging in CSR (Breitbarth, Walzel & Bryson 2013; Chernev & Blair 2015; Ellen, Webb & Mohr 2006), or the type of company, with those operating in industries with a traditionally bad reputation (e.g. tobacco) often cynically viewed when emphasising their CSR achievements (Yoon, Gürhan-Canli & Schwarz 2006). However, a shift in consumer thinking towards CSR seems to be occurring across all circumstances. For example, Cai, Jo and Pan (2012) found that CSR engagement in more controversial industries such as tobacco and alcohol can positively impact consumer perceptions of the firm. Companies can now use CSR to appeal to consumers, and can be rewarded via a consumer willingness to purchase their products (Chernev & Blair 2015; Henderson & Arora 2010; Lee & Shin 2010), to pay a premium price (Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2007), development of trust (Park, Lee & Kim 2014), loyalty (Ailawadi et al. 2014; Bolton & Mattila 2015; Maignan, Ferrell & Hult 1999) and advocacy behaviours such as WOM (Sen, Du &
CSR participation can also lead to affective reward, where consumers feel a sense of emotional, social or functional value developed from socially responsible purchase decisions (Green & Peloza 2011). Particularly in instances where there is a fit between CSR activity and consumer values and lifestyle (Lee et al. 2012).

Yet despite such positive CSR associations, some consumer reactions towards CSR are still inconclusive, due to a number of conflicting findings (Saeidi et al. 2015). For example, some previous research has shown that consumers react more strongly to unethical behaviour by firms rather than proactive CSR (Elliot & Freeman 2001; Folkes & Kamins 1999). For example, in a study conducted by Bhattacharya and Sen (2003), 52% of consumer respondents said they would boycott a brand for irresponsible business practices. Adding to this, Carrigan and Attalla (2001) identified the most influential purchase criteria as price, value, brand image and fashion trends, as opposed to CSR. Other studies have also shown that CSR does not directly result in purchase intentions if consumers view their motives as insincere (Barone, Miyazaki & Taylor 2000; Ellen, Mohr & Webb 2000; Ellen, Webb & Mohr 2006). Furthermore, consumers often consider CSR less if a company makes end product trade-offs such as quality and price (Barone, Miyazaki & Taylor 2000) and diverges from its core business (Sen & Bhattacharya 2001). Even in instances where consumers hold positive attitudes towards a firm’s CSR performance, this does not always equate to consumption behaviour (Auger & Devinney 2007; Belk, Devinney & Eckhardt 2005; Carrigan & Attalla 2001; Carrington, Neville & Whitwell 2010; Inoue, Funk & McDonald 2017; Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001; Shrum, McCarty & Lowrey 1995).

A lack of awareness has also been attributed to the CSR attitude-behaviour gap, where it has been reported that with the exception of a few “CSR mavens”, most consumers are unaware of the CSR initiatives organisations engage in (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004, p. 14). Such deficiency of CSR awareness has often been cited as the key motive for consumer inaction towards CSR (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Boulstridge & Carrigan 2000; Brønn & Vrioni 2001; Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2010, 2011; Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001; Pomerig & Dolnicar 2009; Sen, Bhattacharya & Korschun 2006; Servaes & Tamayo 2013), despite the positive link between awareness and purchase intent (Lee & Shin 2010). Such awareness has been deemed as critical for organisations wanting to use CSR strategically (Sen, Bhattacharya & Korschun 2006), determined as the primary step for developing positive purchase behaviour based on social responsibility initiatives (Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2010; Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001; Murray & Vogel 1997).
Further underlying this gap in consumer responses towards CSR is a lack of academic knowledge related to different brands’ ethical practices (Alvarado-Herrera et al. 2017; Auger et al. 2003; Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Wigley 2008). That is, very few researchers have directly examined consumer knowledge about companies’ CSR activities, and even less have measured such knowledge (Wigley 2008). The general consensus among the few relevant researchers is that like awareness, CSR knowledge is low among consumers (Auger et al. 2003; Carrigan & Attalla 2001; Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001; Schultz & Morsing 2003). For example, Auger et al. (2003) found that while consumers have solid product knowledge of the products they want to buy, their understanding of its ethical features is limited. Specifically, among the Hong Kong consumers they studied, only 10% could name the ethical features of a specific bath soap product, while only 5% knew the ethical attributes of athletic shoes.

Such limited knowledge has been attributed to consumers having difficulty acquiring or storing CSR information from the companies they are engaged with (Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001), or a lack of proper CSR communication on behalf of the firm (Pomering & Dolnicar 2009; Servaes & Tamayo 2013). Consumers who lack sufficient information regarding an organisation’s CSR are unlikely to be influenced by this in their purchase criteria (Öberseder, Schlegelmilch & Gruber 2011). As such, most consumers do not feel knowledgeable enough to make purchases based on a company’s CSR activities (Wigley 2008). Chomvilailuk and Butcher (2013) confirmed the impact of such knowledge on affective reactions towards a firm’s CSR initiatives; although they did so under the pretense that reputation is representative of knowledge, which does not fully encapsulate cognition.

Despite the above findings, research into consumer CSR cognition has been limited, which this study has aimed to address. A better understanding of consumer awareness and knowledge of CSR is beneficial to provide key insights into corresponding consumer behaviour which ultimately relates to CSR effectiveness.

4.2 Consumer Reactions to CSR in Sport

As with commercial firms, most consumers hold the expectation that sports organisations should be socially responsible (Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2016; Lacey, Kennett-Hensel & Manolis 2015). Through their mixed-methods approach, Walker and Kent (2009) determined that a positive relationship exists among consumer attitudes and subsequent intentions resulting from
a sports team’s CSR activities. These authors suggested that CSR has a significant impact on patronage intentions, leading to increased WOM and merchandise consumption. Through their longitudinal study, Lacey and Kennett-Hensel (2010) also demonstrated that a sports team that participates in CSR is more likely to achieve both trusting and committed consumer relationships; whereby purchase behaviour, WOM communication and interest in the team’s performance are all positively impacted. Spurred on by such findings, many sports teams are viewing CSR as a necessary tool to build customer relationships, and are therefore approaching it strategically based on the premise that customers demand and value CSR engagement (Breitbarth et al. 2015; Lacey, Kennett-Hensel & Manolis 2015). Accordingly, when there is congruence between fan expectations and perceived CSR practices by a sports team, this has a positive effect on relationship quality between the fans and the team (Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2016).

Ko et al. (2014) correspondingly highlighted the positive effect of perceived CSR, but from the perspective of collegiate sport donors. These authors found that positive donor perceptions of the sports organisation’s CSR can lead to increased trust and commitment; thus mediating the link between perceived CSR and donations. Furthermore, findings by Chang et al. (2017) showed that in conjunction with team performance, perceived CSR can significantly impact on team pride and subsequent favourable WOM, indicating that consumers are responsive to a sports teams’ CSR practices.

Sports teams will often use CSR as way to reach out to consumers (Nyadzayo, Leckie & McDonald 2016), where fan judgement of such activities dictates the level of response they exhibit and their general perceptions of the team (Blumrodt, Bryson & Flanagan 2012). Thus, sports teams need to assess how they approach their CSR efforts, which can impact sports fan loyalty, especially among those fans less connected to the team (Nyadzayo, Leckie & McDonald 2016). These loyalty outcomes show how CSR impacts consumer judgements regarding a team’s value and commitment, which build the foundations for a more loyal customer base. Although in contrast, a recent study by Inoue, Funk and McDonald (2017) has questioned the robustness of the relationship between CSR activities and fan loyalty towards sports teams due to a significant but moderate effect from perceived CSR to behavioural loyalty.

Much of the research on consumer reactions to CSR in sport has focused on the positive outcomes associated with sports organisations’ CSR participation (e.g. Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010); while some contradictory arguments about consumer reactions to CSR in sports have
been highlighted in extant research. For example, Walker and Kent (2009) suggested that fan bias can influence consumer decision-making regarding CSR. That is, “... highly identified game attendees may look for the socially responsible activities of teams to reinforce their fanship, however, those activities which contradict those positive feelings (e.g. socially irresponsible actions) will be quickly dismissed” (Walker & Kent 2009, p. 759). Another counter-argument about consumer behaviour stemming from CSR in sport is the notion of ‘CSR blowback’ which refers to “... the negative reactions against firms based on their ethical practices or the social outcomes of their business operations” (Godfrey 2009, p. 709). Given the omnipresence of sports organisations and their influence on the global community, they are more susceptible to CSR blowback than commercial organisations, which is also partly due to the strong media scrutiny that most sports teams and athletes are under (Godfrey 2009).

While previous research has explored consumer relationships stemming from sports organisations’ CSR participation, like much of CSR research, it is limited in that it presumes awareness of CSR activities among consumers. This, despite consumer awareness of CSR leading to benefits for society and sports organisations (Inoue, Mahan & Kent 2013). Some studies have attempted to address the CSR awareness gap in sports. For example, Walker and Kent (2009) identified limited awareness among the 11 fans they interviewed about a sports team’s CSR efforts. Furthermore, Walker and Heere (2011) include CSR awareness via their Consumer Attitudes toward Responsible Entities in Sport (CARES) scale development paper, suggesting awareness to be the first step in consumer attitude development towards CSR initiatives. Empirical findings from their study also showed a significant relationship between awareness and affective evaluations.

Further studies have indicated that the consumer response to CSR initiatives in sports is contingent on awareness. For example, Walker et al. (2010) identified that most consumers who are aware of CSR initiatives respond positively to a sports organisation’s social efforts that are judged to be values- and stakeholder-driven; yet such awareness can also lead to negative consumer perceptions if they believe CSR is being implemented strategically. Walker and Kent (2013) further analysed CSR awareness in a social sporting event scenario, and identified that awareness and positive associations such as advocacy and financial sacrifice are often mediated by the credibility of the event organiser.
Despite such findings, the knowledge underpinning consumer awareness of sports-related CSR is still underdeveloped (Walker & Heere 2011), and has therefore been further explored in this study.

4.3 Consumer Reactions to Social Alliances

While traditionally not the primary focus of social alliance research, the impact of such programs on consumers is examined in this section, to identify potential outcomes from such social alliance collaboration. The corresponding extant literature has revealed some key insights into consumer behaviour towards such partnerships, which should be of interest to both parties within social alliances aiming to achieve marketing objectives (Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015).

The research findings have commonly shown positive consumer reactions towards social alliances. For example, Simmons and Becker-Olsen (2006) argued that consumers perceive a firm more favourably if they are aware that they support a social cause. Yet it has also been suggested that these positive reactions are often dependent on consumer perceptions of the firm’s commitment to a cause (L’Etang 1994). For example, time invested in a social cause is often deemed critical in determining a company’s motives for a CSR collaboration, where longer relationships are often viewed as more genuine (Webb & Mohr 1998). Some researchers have identified perceived motives as a key driving force behind consumer action towards social alliances (e.g. Ellen, Webb & Mohr 2006). Consumers hold various views towards firm motives for social alliance participation, ranging from extreme self-centred motives such as tax write-offs to authentically addressing a social issue. As such, consumers tend to react more positively to strategic or genuine motives, and more negatively to those motives they perceive as egotistic (Ellen, Webb & Mohr 2006; Yoon, Gürhan-Canli & Schwarz 2006). Such positive reactions can be attributed to consumers being more understanding of the strategic motives (Burton et al. 2017; Whetten & Mackey 2002).

In addition, the notion of perceived fit between a commercial organisation and an NPO is a strong determinant of consumer reactions towards such social alliances. Firms that engage in socially oriented activities with congruent NPOs are likely to achieve greater effectiveness than those partnerships that are considered incongruent (Ellen, Webb & Mohr 2006; Simmons & Becker-Olsen 2006; Tsarenko & Simpson 2017; Yoon, Gürhan-Canli & Schwarz 2006). Such a high-fit relationship can lead to various positive outcomes, including reinforcement of the firm’s
positioning, favourable attitudes towards firms and the building of firm equity (Simmons & Becker-Olsen 2006). However, one key criticism of Simmons and Becker-Olsen’s (2006) relevant research is that consumer reactions were only measured at the commercial firm level, with no attention paid to consumer reactions toward the NPO. Most research in relation to consumer reactions towards social alliances is heavily focused on commercial firm outcomes, with few analysing the reaction towards both organisations within such a dyad. Thus, little has been known about the impact of CSR alliances on NPOs (Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004).

Two former studies have partly addressed this research gap in relation to the impact of social alliances for NPOs. Lichtenstein, Drumwright and Braig (2004) proposed that CSR participation leads to a number of benefits including increased purchasing and improved evaluations, which also extends to partner NPOs that often receive more donations. These authors found that the benefits of customer-corporate identification can extend beyond the firm and can actually lead to increased support for the NPO. Furthermore, Irmak, Sen and Bhattacharya (2015) concluded that the extent of company involvement with the NPO is a driving force of consumer reactions towards both organisations. The authors revealed that company involvement can translate into positive consumer reactions for companies with traditionally poorer reputations when they increase their involvement with an NPO. Similarly, NPO support is also often improved if they enter into alliances with companies that traditionally have a more positive reputation. However, one criticism of this second study is the manipulation of corporate reputation within the experimental design, where it has been found that reputation within a real-world scenario is difficult to establish unless a company has committed a well-publicised breach of moral or legal code (Yoon, Gürhan-Canli & Schwarz 2006).

Social collaborations via CRM have been found to engender positive consumer responses such as favourable attitude towards the commercial firm (Berger, Cunningham & Kozinets 1996; Chen, Su & He 2014; Holmes & Kilbane 1993; Mohr & Webb 2005; Ross, Patterson & Stutts 1992), positive NPO attitudes (Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004; Ross, Patterson & Stutts 1992), product evaluations (Berger, Cunningham & Kozinets 1996), purchase intent (Bigné-Alcañiz, Currás-Pérez & Aldás-Manzano 2012; Chang & Cheng 2015; Neale, Filo & Funk 2007), willingness to pay a premium price (Lafferty et al. 2016), favourable reputation (Lii, Wu & Ding 2013), brand choice (Chang 2011) and brand advocacy (Lii & Lee 2012).

Various factors can drive such consumer responses to CRM. For example, consumer involvement in the social cause is a strong driver in influencing purchase intentions (Bester & Jere 2012),
where the importance of the social cause to an individual can impact on their perceptions of CRM activity (Lafferty & Goldsmith 2005). Closely related to such involvement is the concept of consumer identification with an entity (Wann & Brascombe 1993), which has also been found to engender consumer responses to CRM campaigns. For example, consumers often donate to charities that are sponsored by the organisation they strongly identify with, as donating to these causes expresses the values they share with the company (Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004). In a sports setting, Lee and Ferreira (2013) suggested that such identification can occur at the sports team and NPO level. Their findings showed that NPO identification can lead to positive attitudes towards the CRM campaign, and that sports team and NPO identification can moderate the relationship between congruency perceptions and attitude towards a CRM campaign, subsequently leading to purchase intent. In line with this, Lachowetz and Gladden (2003) opined that sports entity identification can lead to identification with a social cause via emotional transfer.

Trust has also been acknowledged as a key determinant of CRM consumer response. For example, Youn and Kim (2008) highlighted interpersonal trust as a psychosocial antecedent for CRM attitude development among consumers. Additionally, consumer trust of perceived motives for participating in CRM can also significantly impact on how they view a company’s CRM activities (Till & Nowak 2000). That is, if trust is not established between participating organisations and consumers, the likelihood to express purchase behaviour is extremely limited (Youn & Kim 2008). Alternatively, if trust is established, then positive patronage intentions such as WOM and loyalty can ensue (Vlachos et al. 2009).

Additional elements that stimulate consumer reactions to CRM include demographic factors such as gender and age, with former studies identifying females and younger consumers as more likely to respond positively to CRM efforts (Moosmayer & Fuljahn 2010; Youn & Kim 2008). Although such findings have been determined by other researchers as inconclusive (e.g. Chéron, Kohlbacher & Kusuma 2012). Other factors such as cultural and social norms (Wang 2014), egotistic benefits (Koschate-Fischer, Stefan & Hoyer 2012), and pre-existing attitudes (Gupta & Pirsch 2006) have also been attributed to CRM consumer responses. Furthermore, it has been suggested that perceived congruence between the consumer and the cause and between the commercial firm and the cause also impact consumer responses to CRM (Lafferty, Lueth & McCafferty 2016). In a sporting context, high fit between a sports team and a cause generally lead to positive consumer attitudes (Lee & Ferreira 2013; Roy & Graeff 2003).
Previous research addressing consumer reactions to CRM have also recorded negative responses (e.g. Berger, Cunningham & Kozinets 1996; Lafferty 1996; Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001). For example, Webb and Mohr (1998) found that consumers do not always view firms that participate in CRM favourably, with consumer scepticism towards likely motives for participating in a campaign underlying such attitudes. These authors also contended that consumers can show distrust towards the NPO partner, but will generally view it more favourably than the commercial firm.

When consumers perceive firms to be driven by self-interest, the impact on consumer responses is significant (Ellen, Webb & Mohr 2006; Varadarajan & Menon 1988). This is also true when product trade-offs such as on quality are made (Barone, Miyazaki & Taylor 2000; Webb & Mohr 1998). Furthermore, given the promotional underpinnings of CRM, some consumers have also criticised firms where the advertising costs have exceeded the benefits collected for the preferred cause (Cone, Feldman & DaSilva 2003; Hoeffler & Keller 2002). Overall, much of the negative implications stemming from CRM are associated with consumer scepticism. Pirsch, Gupta and Grau (2007, p. 126) highlighted that consumers are significantly more cynical towards “promotional CSR” such as CRM as opposed to “institutionalised CSR”.

Despite such challenges, Sagawa and Segal (2000) highlighted the vital role that consumers play in the continuation of social alliances, arguing that they have the ability to influence whether cross-sector partnerships remain or dissolve. That is, in their role as consumers, citizens can choose socially responsible products or look at the CSR record of businesses and their interactions with NPOs. Additionally, they can spread the word or voice their support, while speaking against those organisations that are not socially conscious.

4.4 HOE Theoretical Framework

To effectively analyse reactions from both sports team and NPO consumer perspectives, a HOE was used as the theoretical framework for this study. This is in line with Breitbarth et al. (2015) who suggested that using established consumer behaviour models provides a promising avenue to investigate consumer reactions to CSR in sports. The steps within the HOE model consist of cognition-affect-conation, which are not equidistant from one another in that consumers can move through the steps simultaneously (Lavidge & Steiner 1961). These steps outline the three principal functions of consumer behaviour: awareness; attitudes/feelings; and action (Barry
Cognition relates to the mental or rational states; affect refers to feelings or emotional states; and conation is the behavioural state (Lavidge & Steiner 1961). While originally developed to measure advertising reactions, the HOE framework can be used to identify the consumer response towards the organisations’ CSR efforts (Murray & Vogel 1997).

There are inadequacies in practice and academic research addressing the measurement of social alliance effectiveness (e.g. Jamali & Keshishian 2009; van Tulder et al. 2016; Walters & Anagnostopoulos 2012). To address this, the HOE has been selected in this study as an overall arching framework because sports teams and NPOs enter social alliances to achieve multiple marketing objectives. For a sports team, potential motivations underlying a social alliance relationship with NPOs are to improve favourable attitudes (Babiak 2007) and subsequent consumer behavioural outcomes such as purchase intentions and positive WOM (Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010; Walker & Kent 2009). From an NPO perspective, the key motives and objectives behind social alliance formation with sports teams are possibly raising awareness (Austin 2000), increasing consumer donations (Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004) as well as volunteerism towards the cause (Vock, van Dolen & Kolk 2013). In both contexts, the need to understand the consumer response to social alliances is vital for achieving such objectives; thus quantifying and gauging the effectiveness of social alliances. Given that the HOE is a “… series of predictable information processing stages through which stakeholders proceed” (Murray & Vogel, 1997, p. 147), an appropriate measure of CSR program effectiveness is established in this study.

While there is general consensus that the HOE is comprised of three main stages, contention regarding their order has often been debated (Barry & Howard 1990). For example, Krugman (1965) suggested a cognition-conation-affect sequence based on passive and disinterested recipients of multiple advertising messages; while Bem (1972) believed that a conation-affect-cognition model is more suitable suggesting behaviour as the first step to attitude formation, followed by selective learning to support the action. More recently, Beard (2015) argued that within a services advertising context, consumers go through an affect-conation-cognition process when service advertisements use emotional appeals. Other researchers (e.g. Russell-Bennett et al. 2016; Storbeck, Robinson & McCourt 2006) have contended that cognition and affect are not independent from each other and are actually intertwined. Alternatively, Pieters and Wedel (2008) argued there is insufficient evidence which empirically confirms that consumers go through a rigid HOE. This coincides with Vakratsas and Ambler’s (1999) research that also shows little support for a temporal sequence of effects. In the context of sport, the
HOE was used to measure sponsorship effectiveness. Accordingly, Alexandris and Tsiotsou (2012) argued that the affect-cognition-conation model is more appropriate for sports consumers due to the strong role that emotions and feelings play in guiding their behaviour.

Despite the inherent contention associated with the HOE model, this study has used its original adaptation in the form of the cognition-affect-conation paradigm, but has been reworked for a social alliance in sport context. This adaptation extends on the seminal work of Murray and Vogel (1997) who suggested that a HOE model is the most appropriate manner to assess the impact CSR programs have on key stakeholders and how consumers form judgements and make decisions towards the firm (Murray & Vogel 1997). In addition, given the strength of the relationship previously identified between awareness and subsequent action in both CSR and consumer behaviour research (e.g. Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2007; Pomering & Dolnicar 2009), the original HOE model provides an effective means to investigate the complex consumer reactions to social alliances in sports in its entirety.

4.5 Initial Conceptual Model

While consumer awareness or its antecedents have not been measured in a social alliance context, two potential attitudinal antecedents have been established from former CRM literature. First, consumer identification is highlighted as a key determinant of consumer behaviour resulting from CRM, with highly identified consumers more likely to react positively to CRM activities (Lachowetz & Gladden 2003; Lee & Ferreira 2013; Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004). Second, various authors (e.g. Till & Nowak 2000; Vlachos et al. 2009; Youn & Kim 2008) have pointed to trust as a catalyst for consumer behaviour associated with CRM, where higher levels of trust lead to favourable responses. As these two attitudinal elements were emphasised as key determinants of consumer behaviour reflective of a firm’s CRM activities, it was anticipated in this study that both higher levels of consumer identification and trust lead to awareness of social alliances.

Furthermore, according to previous CSR and social alliance literature, firms communicate their CSR activities to increase consumer awareness of their socially responsible activities including websites (Shumate & O’Connor 2010) and social media (Burton et al. 2017; Seele & Lock 2015). Therefore, both website visits and social media are included in this study’s conceptual model as additional behavioural antecedents to consumer awareness. This is in line with previous CSR and
marketing research which has demonstrated a link between websites and consumer CSR awareness (Andreu, Casado-Díaz & Mattila 2015), and social media and consumer brand awareness (Hoffman & Fodor 2010; Hutter et al. 2013). However, it should be noted that in the broader CSR setting and specifically social alliances, research exploring these relationships is scant.

Following the establishment of consumer awareness, the subsequent section of the conceptual model incorporates the relationships developed from the cognition-affect-conation sequence associated with the original adaptation of the HOE. Consequently, in accordance with Lavidge and Steiner’s (1961) consumer reaction sequence, it is anticipated that awareness will lead to greater knowledge of social alliance partners, which will then manifest into attitudinal evaluations. Once such attitudes are formed, conation towards both firms in the social alliance by associated and subsequent partial consumers is likely to occur. While previous literature has not addressed this consumer behaviour relationship, borrowing from CRM and broader CSR literature, several outcomes associated with such activities have ensued and have been tested in this study: advocacy behaviours including positive WOM about both the sports team and NPO (Lii & Lee 2012), NPO donations (Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004), and merchandise purchasing (Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010).

Based on the previous literature as reviewed above, and in conjunction with the HOE theoretical framework, the following initial conceptual model was developed as shown in Figure 4.1 below.
Figure 4.1: Initial conceptual model

Note: SA = social alliance; ST = sports team
While these variables listed in the above diagram form the initial conceptual model, a lack of previous research addressing consumer responses to social alliances, especially in the sporting context, means that this initial conceptual model was deemed an inadequate representation of current industry practice. First, in relation to the antecedents to consumer awareness, existing research has failed to capture the multi-channel approach that many organisations use to communicate with stakeholders (Gomez & Chalmeta 2011; Lee & Shin 2010). It is expected in this study that firms use more than two channels of communication regarding CSR practices to induce consumer awareness.

From an outcomes perspective, the previous literature has highlighted some behavioural components developed from CSR and CRM activities which were incorporated into the initial conceptual model; however, it was unknown whether these fit within the remit of management objectives concerning social alliance participation. Additionally, other outcomes extending beyond WOM, donations and merchandise purchasing as shown in the initial conceptual model are likely incorporated in social alliance strategies for each firm. As such, further exploratory research was required to investigate this phenomenon in greater detail, which will be discussed further in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.

4.6 Chapter Summary

A review of the consumer behaviour literature related to broader CSR, CSR in sports and social alliances was reviewed in this chapter. Further, the HOE theoretical model underpinning this study was introduced, where in combination with previous consumer behaviour literature the initial conceptual model was presented.

Through this literature review, a number of gaps were verified within extant research. Principally the associated to partial consumer relationship was not adequately identified, despite both organisations in a social alliance possessing consumer networks (Burton et al. 2017). Second, while the awareness gap relating to CSR is starting to receive more attention, this had not extended to social alliances, with consumer reactions examined in previous research based on the assumption of awareness. Third, the antecedents to awareness in both broader CSR and CRM literature failed to adequately capture multi-channel strategies that organisations often adopt to communicate with
stakeholders. Additionally, the effectiveness of these channels in generating awareness was not yet known. Fourth, the cognition gap relating to CSR and social alliance practices is further evidence of the lack of research addressing consumer knowledge. Lastly, much of the consumer reactions in CSR and social alliance literature have focused on commercial firm rather than NPO outcomes. Consequentelively, this study has aimed to address these gaps to enable a more holistic picture of consumer reactions to CSR, and specifically to social alliances.
“We must do more to bring women into sports leadership. We have seen what women can do on the field of play. We need their intellect, energy and creativity in the administration and management of sport as well.” (Thomas Bach, President, International Olympic Committee)
5.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research design used to address the RQs in this study. Section 5.1 of this chapter describes the research paradigm underlying the study and the rationale for selecting a pragmatist paradigmatic approach, while Section 5.2 examines the mixed-methods concept, including the advantages and disadvantages associated with such a research design. The next Section 5.3 provides a discussion on the mixed-methods approach used in this study; while there are various ways the RQs could have been addressed; a mixed-methods research design was preferred due to the paucity in existing literature addressing the overall research topic. Thus, this research involved an exploratory study to analyse current industry practice, and a confirmatory study to investigate subsequent consumer behaviour, to provide a more holistic picture of the effectiveness of social alliances in the sporting context. Lastly, Section 5.4 provides a summary of the chapter. A roadmap of these chapter contents is presented in Figure 5.0.

Figure 5.0: Chapter 5 roadmap
5.1 Research Paradigm

Research paradigms refer to the basic orientation to theory and research (Neuman 2011). Table 5.0 outlines the various research paradigms that are most commonly used.

Table 5.0: Different research paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Theoretical perspective</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>• There is a single reality&lt;br&gt;• External&lt;br&gt;• Objective</td>
<td>• Observable phenomena can provide fact&lt;br&gt;• Reality based on valid and reliable tools</td>
<td>• Positivism&lt;br&gt;• Post-positivism</td>
<td>• Quantitative&lt;br&gt;• Quantitative or qualitative (post-positivism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivist/interpretive</td>
<td>• There is no single reality&lt;br&gt;• Socially constructed&lt;br&gt;• Subjective</td>
<td>• Subjective meaning&lt;br&gt;• The reality behind the details&lt;br&gt;• Underlying meanings</td>
<td>• Interpretivism&lt;br&gt;• Critical enquiry&lt;br&gt;• Feminism</td>
<td>• Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>• Multiple reality&lt;br&gt;• External</td>
<td>• The best method to solve the problem&lt;br&gt;• Both observable phenomena and subjective meanings&lt;br&gt;• Focus on applied research</td>
<td>• Research through design</td>
<td>• Quantitative and qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivism</td>
<td>• Reality is what we perceive to be real</td>
<td>• All knowledge a matter of perspective</td>
<td>• Post-modernism&lt;br&gt;• Structuralism&lt;br&gt;• Post-structuralism</td>
<td>• Discourse theory&lt;br&gt;• Archaeology&lt;br&gt;• Genealogy&lt;br&gt;• Deconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>• Reality is socially constructed&lt;br&gt;• Under consistent internal influences</td>
<td>• Identifying contradictions in reality&lt;br&gt;• Influenced underlying power relations</td>
<td>• Marxism&lt;br&gt;• Queer Theory&lt;br&gt;• Feminism</td>
<td>• Philosophical analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: David & Sutton 2011; Patel 2015; Wahyuni 2012.

As depicted in Table 5.0, there are multiple research paradigms that have been commonly used across the literature. Although there appear to be two that are the most dominant paradigms:
positivism and interpretivism (Krauss 2005). Positivism is underlined by the notion of a singular reality, unveiling the objective truth through the elimination of bias and emotional detachment from the study (Feilzer 2010; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004). Interpretivist researchers reject this notion, instead arguing that a multiple constructed reality exists, and that generalisations and bias avoidance are not possible nor desired (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004). Sitting between these two philosophies is the pragmatic ontology which is used to analyse and understand situations in the real-world (Creswell 2003). This study is focused on addressing the effectiveness of social alliances in a sporting context by gathering insight into relevant industry practices, followed by an examination of how associated and partial consumers react to such alliances. Thus, the research enquiry instrument needed to capture those constructs reflective of effectiveness and can subsequently be tested on a sample of associated consumers of a sports team and NPO within a social alliance. This research process is mostly associated with the pragmatic paradigm, as it is selecting the best method to solve a real-world problem.

Pragmatism accepts that there are singular and multiple realities that open it up to empirical enquiry (Feilzer 2010), which means the researcher is afforded flexibility in selecting the most effective means of approaching a research problem. Pragmatism sidesteps the positivist/interpretivist divide by focusing on whether the research has addressed what it is the researcher wants to know (Feilzer 2010; Hanson 2008). This position is summarised by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, p. 17) who argued:

“We agree with others in the mixed-methods research movement that consideration and discussion of pragmatism by research methodologists and empirical researchers will be productive because it offers an immediate and useful middle position philosophically and methodologically; it offers a practical and outcome-oriented method of inquiry that is based on action and leads, iteratively, to further action and the elimination of doubt; and it offers a method for selecting methodological mixes that can help researchers better answer many of their research questions”.

Accordingly, a mixed-methods methodology is closely associated with the pragmatic ontology (Feilzer 2010; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004; Maxcy 2003; Morgan 2007; Teddlie & Tashakkori
Thus, mixed-methods research, which can be considered a combination of both qualitative and quantitative data in a single study (Harrison 2013), was used as the data collection choice for this study to complement the pragmatic ontology.

5.2 Overview of Mixed-Methods Research

Mixed-methods research has its origins in psychological studies in the 1950s, which was further developed as a new research methodology in the 1980s and early 1990s for many fields including education, management, sociology and health sciences (Creswell 2014). There have been several terms used to explain the mixing of research methods, including multiple methods, blended research, multimethod, triangulated studies and mixed research (Harrison 2013). However, ‘mixed-methods research’ has become the most popular term used to combine qualitative and quantitative components in a single study (Bryman 2006; Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner 2007; Teddlie & Tashakkori 2009). Based on an analysis of multiple definitions of mixed-methods research, Johnson, Onwuegbuzie and Turner (2007, p. 123) defined it as follows:

“Mixed-methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g. use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration.”

As the definition suggests, mixed-methods research enables various paths to respond to RQs appropriately. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) described mixed-methods research as an expansive and creative form of research – inclusive, pluralistic, complementary and eclectic – offering the researcher the best chance to gather suitable, useful answers while ensuring that “a fuller understanding of human phenomena is gained” (Rocco, Gallagher & Perez-Prado 2003, p. 21).

According to Creswell (2014), three strategic approaches to mixed-methods research exist: 1) explanatory sequential; 2) convergent parallel; 3) and exploratory sequential. The explanatory sequential approach involves a two-phase process where a research project collects quantitative data and analyses the results that will then be used to plan the qualitative phase (Creswell 2014).
The intent of such a design is for the qualitative data to explain in more detail the results generated from the quantitative study. Using the convergent parallel approach, a researcher collects both quantitative and qualitative data, analyses them separately, and then compares the results to confirm or disconfirm findings (Creswell 2014). By integrating the thematic data from the qualitative research and the statistical data from the quantitative research, a more comprehensive analysis occurs (Creswell 2014; Teddlie & Tashakkori 2009). The exploratory sequential mixed-methods design occurs when the researcher begins with qualitative data analysis and then uses the findings in a second quantitative phase. The motive for using this strategy is to develop better measurements across larger populations (Creswell 2014), and to obtain a richer description and understanding of a phenomenon (Eisenhardt 1989; Grimsely & Meehan 2007; Ho, Ang & Straub 2003).

There are several advantages associated with mixed-methods research including using the strengths from both qualitative and quantitative research; answering a broader, more complete range of RQs; limiting weaknesses inherent in either method; and providing potential for stronger conclusions (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004; Teddlie & Tashakkori 2009). Despite this, the mixed-methods approach does also possess some challenges, particularly that collecting and analysing both quantitative and qualitative data is time-consuming and potentially costly (Creswell 2014; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004). Researchers also need to learn and adapt to mixing research methods appropriately (Creswell 2014; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004; Malina, Nørreklit & Selto 2011).

5.3 Overview of Mixed-Methods Research Procedure

This study has used the exploratory sequential mixed-methods design for developmental purposes, as shown in Figure 5.1 below.

**Figure 5.1: Sequential mixed-methods design for developmental purposes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase One</th>
<th>Phase Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qual data collection</td>
<td>qual data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qual data analysis</td>
<td>qual findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop instrument</td>
<td>QUAN data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAN data analysis</td>
<td>Overall results &amp; interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Creswell & Plano-Clark 2007
The developmental approach is adopted when there is a need for an exploratory investigation of a phenomenon to most appropriately identify variables and constructs to assist in the development of a quantitative instrument (Creswell & Plano-Clark 2007; Golicic & Davis 2012; Morgan 1998). Specifically, this study was informed by two phases of research: a qualitative phase involving interviews with both sports team and NPO management; followed by a quantitative phase, consisting of questionnaire research of associated consumers of both the sports team and NPO.

As an exploratory technique, qualitative research enables deep interpretations of a phenomena (Zikmund et al. 2011). The most common objectives of qualitative research are to gather knowledge, develop themes and contribute to theory (Patton 2015), and are usually gathered from small sample sizes (Malhotra 2010). There are various techniques associated with qualitative research, including interviewing, focus groups and participant observation which are the most common modes of qualitative enquiry (Fossey et al. 2002).

Alternatively, quantitative research focuses on the quantification in data collection and analysis (Bryman 2016). Therefore, quantitative research aims to “explain, predict and control social phenomena” (Wellington & Szczerbinski 2007, p. 19) by allowing the researcher to aggregate, compare and summarise data (Babbie 2010). Quantitative research is commonly conducted on a larger sample representative of the general population (Malhotra & Peterson 2006), and is mainly concerned with measurement reliability, validity, generalisability, and cause and effect predictions (Cassell & Symon 1994). As such, the quantitative researcher formulates hypotheses and empirically tests them on a specific dataset (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias 1992), which is typically collected via experimentation, observation and questionnaires/surveys (Bryman 2016).

The qualitative phase of this study is particularly useful in that provides realistic insight into the research phenomena from the perspective of industry professionals. The reason why this was undertaken is two-fold. First, to build on current social alliance and CSR literature, where constructs and variables are identified or confirmed through interviews with industry experts and incorporated into a conceptual model. This is in line with previous work by Grimsley and Meehan (2007), who developed a conceptual framework – a priori – and then validated and refined it through qualitative and quantitative techniques. Second, as highlighted by both Bryman (2006) and Robson (2011), the qualitative component of this study generated hypotheses, while the quantitative component
tested these within a single project. Becerra-Fernandez and Sabherwal (2001) and Whitla, Walters and Davies (2007) also used such an approach in their studies, where they found literature to be limited concerning their research topic and unreflective of industry practice. These authors similarly used qualitative interviews to develop key hypotheses to be tested in the quantitative phase of their research. In alignment with this previous research, this study also used the qualitative component, in conjunction with previous theory, to develop variables and subsequent hypotheses to be tested in a quantitative phase. Figure 5.1 below outlines the research methodology used in this research.

**Figure 5.2: Research methodology**
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*Phase One:*
- Literature Review
- Development of Initial Conceptual Model
- Qualitative Research
- Qualitative Data Analysis
- Revised Conceptual Model and Hypotheses

*Phase Two:*
- Quantitative Research
- Research Instrument Design
- Pre-Testing Questionnaire Instrument
- Sampling and Respondent Recruitment
- Quantitative Data Analysis
5.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter introduced the research design that was used to address this study’s RQs. That is, it discussed the pragmatic ontology underlying this research, which enables the examination of real-world problems. Closely associated with pragmatism is mixed-methods research, which this chapter highlighted as the methodology used to address this study’s research problem. More specifically, this study adopted the mixed-methods design for developmental purposes, where an exploratory investigation was required to identify variables for the confirmatory component. As such, this chapter also addressed the specific methods comprising the mixed-methods approach including Phase One, qualitative, semi-structured interviews with sports team and NPO managers, and Phase Two, questionnaire research with associated consumers aligned with a sports team and NPO in a social alliance.

Chapters 6 and 7 will next provide more detail on the qualitative and quantitative research procedures undertaken in this study.
“... our front office staff, coaches and players have joined with community organizations, corporate partners, community leaders, fans and friends to help make an even greater impact on the lives of others throughout our region. Together we have accomplished a great deal, and together we can do even more.” (Robert Nutting, Chairman of the Board, Pittsburgh Pirates)
6.0 Introduction

In this chapter, a detailed account of the qualitative Phase One of this study is presented. Specifically, Section 6.1 details the in-depth interviews and associated advantages and disadvantages of this method, while Section 6.2 provides information on participant recruitment techniques and protocols. Section 6.3 then covers the ethical considerations underpinning Phase One of this study, while Section 6.4 discusses the development of the qualitative interview guide, as well as the various techniques used to ensure interview rigour. This is followed by Section 6.5 which details the steps used during the interview process, while Section 6.6 considers the qualitative data analysis techniques adopted following data collection. Section 6.7 next presents the interview findings concerning both antecedents to awareness and consumer behaviour objectives. Following this, Section 6.8 presents the revised conceptual model following sports team and NPO manager input, and the hypotheses that was to be tested in Phase Two of this study. Lastly, Section 6.9 provides a summary of the chapter. A roadmap of the contents of this chapter is presented in Figure 6.0.
The qualitative component of this study incorporated face-to-face, semi-structured, in-depth interviews as the initial phase of the data collection process. In-depth interviews have been defined
as “a qualitative research technique that involves conducting intensive individual interviews with a small number of respondents to explore their perspectives on a particular idea, program, or situation” (Boyce & Neale 2006, p. 3). It is a particularly effective technique in situations where phenomena cannot simply be observed (Salmon 2007). The in-depth interview process incorporates various components including open-ended questioning, a semi-structured format, developing understanding and interpretation, and recording responses (Guion, Diehl & McDonald 2001).

In this study, semi-structured interviews were used over structured interviews as they enabled more conversation where the interviewee’s responses were further probed and explored. This further questioning also enables one’s experiences or perceptions concerning a phenomenon to be discussed (Patton 2015). Previous researchers (e.g. Cohen & Crabtree 2006) have highlighted some of the other benefits of using semi-structured interviews. First, questions in semi-structured interviewing can be developed ahead of time, allowing for greater interview preparation. Second, semi-structured interviews allow participants to express their ideas and views on their own terms. Third, semi-structured interviews not only confirm what is already known, but provide underlying reasons behind particular responses. The primary advantage this interviewing provided in this study is that it allowed for considerable exchange of information, which led to a reconceptualisation of the issues under study as outlined by Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009). Given that the topic under investigation was previously underexplored, this interview process involving management from professional sports teams and NPOs was vital in developing this phenomenon further.

However, while using interviews in general as an initial information-gathering step is advantageous, it is susceptible to particular disadvantages. For example, Creswell (2003) highlighted that as providers of information, research participants cannot be discounted for potentially introducing bias in their responses. In addition, not all interviews provide articulated and perceptive responses. Patton (2015) confirmed that interviews with various participants may not be comparable or accurate, as sequencing and wording are different for each interview.

### 6.2 Participant Recruitment Techniques and Protocol

Multiple purposive sampling was used to recruit respondents for Phase One of this study (Teddlie & Tashakkori 2009), consisting of convenience sampling (Collins, Onwueguzie & Jiao 2006) and the
chain referral sampling method (Biernacki & Waldolf 1981). Given that this research was informed by previous studies, but aware of the lack of empirical research, it was important that industry experts were interviewed to investigate social alliance functions and objectives concerning consumer reactions. The ideal participants consisted of professional sports team managers/coordinates and NPO managers who are directly responsible for the development, implementation, management and evaluation of social alliances in their respective organisations. To locate such participants, a combination of cold-calling and previously established connections of the supervisory team associated with this study was first used. However, while mostly effective on the sports team side, a lack of participants on the NPO side meant that a referral system was also required to further develop this perspective.

Chain referral sampling, commonly referred to as ‘snowball sampling’, is used when a researcher initially makes contact with people relevant to the research topic and then uses them to establish contacts with others (Bryman 2016). In this case, the researcher asked the relevant sports team managers for the contact details of their NPO partners. According to Faugier and Sargeant (1997, p. 792), chain referral sampling is particularly effective when trying to obtain information from “… difficult-to-observe phenomena”. It was therefore deemed an appropriate sampling method in this study due to the initial difficulties in making contact with NPO managers involved in social alliances with professional sports teams.

In total, eight sports team and nine NPO industry professionals participated in Phase One of this study. Tables 6.0 and 6.1 below highlight these participants’ profiles; specific names have been withheld to maintain anonymity. While the majority of sports team managers interviewed were from the AFL, this was not deemed an issue given that Australian sporting teams and leagues tend to operate in a mostly centralised way (Healey 2012). Therefore, there is a consistency across codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Team 1</td>
<td>Head of Community, Diversity &amp; Strategic Projects</td>
<td>Australian Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Team 2</td>
<td>Communications Manager – Community</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Team 3</td>
<td>Community &amp; Fan Engagement Coordinator</td>
<td>Australian Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Team 4</td>
<td>Events and Community Manager</td>
<td>Australian Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Team 5</td>
<td>Community and Outreach Manager</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Team 6</td>
<td>General Manager – Community Engagement</td>
<td>Australian Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Team 7</td>
<td>Head of Community</td>
<td>Australian Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Team 8</td>
<td>General Manager Community</td>
<td>Australian Football</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.1: NPO participant profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Social cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPO 1</td>
<td>General Manager Marketing &amp; Communications</td>
<td>Child violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO 2</td>
<td>Marketing and Partnerships Manager</td>
<td>Health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO 3</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Children with cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO 4</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Disadvantaged youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO 5</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Marketing Coordinator</td>
<td>Child and adult disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO 6</td>
<td>Manager Corporate Partners &amp; Fundraising</td>
<td>Youth mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO 7</td>
<td>Policy and Program Manager – Sports Engagement Program</td>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO 8</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO 9</td>
<td>Empowerment Programs Officer</td>
<td>Wounded service personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Qualitative Interview Ethics Considerations

As a matter of research protocol and to preserve the rights of interviewees, ethics approval was applied for and granted to undertake this study’s face-to-face, semi-structured interviews with the relevant participants. Prior to the interviews, participants who agreed to take part in this phase of the study were sent a research information statement (RIS) which introduced the research topic, provided relevant information concerning the nature and scope of the project, and informed participants what was required of them and the fact that participation was voluntary (also see Appendix 1). Further, the RIS provided contact details of the researcher and the ethics committee. Interviews only occurred upon signed consent by participants.

6.4 Developing the Qualitative Interview Guide and Interview Rigour

The questions developed in the interview guide for the face-to-face, semi-structured interviews emerged from the literature. Given that the interviews were conducted with both sports team and NPO managers concerning their social alliances, two separate interview guides were developed for each group. However, the key topics within each guide were essentially the same, covering subject matter such as current state of play, antecedents to social alliance awareness, implementation and management of social alliances, and consumer-related objectives or outcomes resulting from social alliances.

To develop the interview guide for Phase One of this study, the procedure suggested by Bryman (2016) (see Figure 6.1 below) was adapted for use here. More specifically, reviewing the literature was a critical step in the early stages of developing appropriate questions in the interview guide by
“... delineating areas of interest and relevance that should be covered in the interview” (Barriball & While 1994, p. 333). This subsequently enabled the development of the first draft of the interview guide, which was assessed by experienced academicians (Mann 1985). This resulted in the elimination of potential ambiguities and leading questions (Barriball & While 1994); thus advancing to question refinement (Bryman 2016).

Figure 6.1: Interview guide procedure

Adapted from Bryman (2016)
Following this step, a pilot draft of each interview guide was created to ensure the appropriateness of the questions used in the semi-structured interviews. This pilot draft was evaluated for its content validity to ensure the correctness of the interview guide relative to its purpose (Barriball & While 1994). Elements such as wording, order of questions, and the inclusion or exclusion of particular questions were scrutinised, which ensured that the instrument measures what it sets out to (Patton 2015).

Once developed, a pilot interview was conducted to ensure reliability within the interview process. This occurred with a participant that had a similar position to the interview participants in this study (Turner 2010); that is, a community manager of a professional sports team. This was an important step in ensuring that sought-after research outcomes were appropriate, which aligns with Glesne’s (1998) argument that a pilot study in qualitative research enables several elements within the process to be tested while simultaneously assisting the researcher in familiarising themselves with the topic. This further determined any flaws or limitations in the interview design and allowed the researcher to make the required revisions prior to conducting the study (Kvale 2008). Feedback from the pilot interview confirmed that the questions in the interview guide were deemed appropriate for further use in the data collection process, thus the interview guides were finalised (see Appendix 2 for final interview guides).

6.5 Interviewing Participants

To overcome the discrepancies identified with the semi-structured interviewing technique and ensure quality within Phase One of this study, various steps suggested by Robson (2011) were adopted for each interview, including:

1. **Introduction**: Introducing oneself and the research project, while simultaneously establishing rapport.
2. **Warm-up**: Asking easy, non-threatening questions to settle both parties down.
3. **Main body of interview**: Covering the main purpose of the interview.
4. **Cool-off**: Asking some straightforward questions at the end.
5. **Closure**: Thanking the interviewee for taking the time to participate.
Sufficient time was allowed to establish rapport with participants, for the interview to be conducted, and information clarified and summarised prior to the exit process (Cavana 2001). McNamara (2009) recommended the following key elements within the interview process to ensure a reliable data collection process: occasionally verifying tape recorder is functioning; asking one question at a time; attempting to remain as neutral as possible; encouraging further responses; being conscious of reaction or appearance to responses; providing transition between major topics; and not losing control of the interview (e.g. running over time or interview roles switching).

All 17 interviews in this study were digitally recorded using a voice recorder, and lasted between 45 minutes to 1.5 hours. As one of the most common methods for interviews (Rubin & Rubin 2012), the benefits of recording an interview include establishing a permanent record of the interview, promoting a more relaxed atmosphere due to freeing the interviewer of distractions, and allowing accurate transcription of the interview (Whiting 2008).

6.6 Qualitative Data Analysis Techniques

While there is no specific recipe for qualitative data analysis (Creswell 2007), there are essential components that need to be factored in. Rowley (2012) identified the following three key steps within the interview data analysis process, which were adhered to in this study:

1. Organising the dataset: The first step is to enter transcripts into a database with appropriate structure, which may entail loading data into a qualitative analysis package. In this study, data was prepared and downloaded into qualitative data analysis software Nvivo 11, which is recognised as particularly useful due to a number of benefits. For example, according to Ozkan (2004), Nvivo is user-friendly and helpful for organising and coding different data types and sources. Further, Ozkan (2004) states that it enables the organising and re-organising of codes, and the development of concepts, and is time-efficient and helpful in building a rigorous database. Furthermore, Nvivo has been found to enhance qualitative data validity by allowing analysis to become more transparent (Siccama & Penna 2008; Welsh 2002). These are the reasons why Nvivo was adopted in this study, and was used to organise the dataset appropriately.
2. **Getting acquainted with the data:** This stage involved becoming thoroughly acquainted with the data. As such, data was read and re-read to gain familiarity with the content of the interviews (Kihl et al. 2014). As a further step, it has been suggested that the researcher begins to consider key themes and reflects on the information they want to identify as part of theme generation (Rowley 2012). In this study, the use of the interview questions provided a base for identifying key themes; a technique recognised by Rowley (2012) as effective.

3. **Classifying, coding and interpreting the data:** The initial step in the final component of qualitative data analysis is concerned with devising structure to the data; here themes either emergent from the data or developed beforehand are finalised. Once established, the next step requires coding the text, so that similar themes within and across interviews can be compared. In this study, this enabled sub-themes to emerge and specific quotes to be identified; themes were predominantly identified within the explicit meanings of the data. This means that the researcher is not searching for additional meanings other than what is being said in the interview (Braun & Clarke 2006). In this study, data were initially openly coded to identify community and NPO management perceptions relating to antecedents to social alliance awareness and expected consumer outcomes associated with social alliances. Axial coding was then performed to further establish categorical and sub-categorical data properties concerning participant thoughts regarding the factors that lead to consumer awareness and subsequent consumer objectives relating to social alliances (Corbin & Strauss 2008) (see Appendix 3 for qualitative coding sheet).

6.7 **Qualitative Research Findings**

To understand industry practice and gain sufficient insight into complex social alliance relationships, qualitative semi-structured interviews were conducted with 17 sports team and NPO managers responsible for the formation, implementation and management of social alliances. This was performed to explicitly answer two of the sub-RQs comprising this study:

- What are the antecedents to awareness managers use to generate consumer reactions from a social alliance between a sports team and NPO?
• What are the consumer behavioural objectives or outcomes management expect to achieve from a social alliance between a sports team and NPO?

Findings from these interviews are further explored in the subsections below.

6.7.1 Summary of qualitative results

The data analysis process identified various themes relating to practical mechanisms that sports team and NPO managers use to generate social alliance awareness, as well as a number of consumer-behaviour-related outcomes or objectives among both sports team and NPO consumers. These emergent themes are summarised in Table 6.2 below.

Table 6.2: Summary of emergent themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antecedents to social alliance awareness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teledosed match viewership</td>
<td>Through repeated consumer viewership of televised games and deliberate promotion of the social alliance, it is expected consumers will become aware of the social alliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live match viewership</td>
<td>Live match attendance frequency and dedicated match days highlighting the social alliance relationship should translate to developed awareness of the social alliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website visits</td>
<td>Website visit frequency coinciding with various cross-promotional activities should lead to greater awareness of a social alliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media engagement</td>
<td>Repeated outgoing messages of social alliance activities and/or outcomes through social media channels should enhance social alliance awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness generation</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour reactions from social alliances are predicated on consumer awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match attendance</td>
<td>A sports-team-related outcome where social alliance participation is expected to lead to live match attendance for both associated and partial consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise purchasing</td>
<td>A sports-team-related outcome where social alliance participation is expected to lead to purchasing of sports’ team merchandise by both associated and partial consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased team association</td>
<td>A sports-team-related outcome where social alliance participation is expected to lead to deeper ties with the team by both associated and partial consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>An NPO-related outcome where social alliance participation is expected to lead to increased funding to the NPO by both associated and partial consumers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7.2 Discussion of main findings

This subsection breaks the qualitative findings down into two key themes as shown in Table 6.2: antecedents to social alliance awareness; and anticipated consumer-related marketing objectives or outcomes from the perspective of sports team and NPO managers.

6.7.3 Antecedents to social alliance awareness

Interview participants listed various mechanisms they use to generate social alliance awareness among targeted and broader audiences. Two questions were used to extract this information: asking managers how they think consumers become aware of social alliances; and how social alliances are specifically communicated to constituents. As a result, four practical antecedents to social alliance awareness were identified: 1) televised match viewership; 2) live match viewership; 3) website visits; 4) and social media engagement. These will be discussed in more detail below.

Televised match viewership

Televised match viewership was identified as one of the primary methods of developing social alliance awareness among various audiences; however, this was not unanimously acknowledged by all interviewees, especially on the NPO side. Among the NPO managers who acknowledged its importance, televised matches were seen as an opportunity to leverage the partnership with a sports team to gain access to different broadcasting avenues and reach wider audiences:

Yeah, yeah, so that’s their [sport team] assets, their media assets, and we get to use them – it’s broadcast on a Friday night to an interstate audience as well. So, we then work out what that’s worth to us, and I can’t remember what it was, but it’s a couple of million dollars of value-in-kind advertising that we just can’t afford in prime-time TV on free-to-air TV. It’s worth a lot to us. (NPO 1 – General Manager Marketing & Communications)

NRL were creating this State of Mind campaign and they wanted mental health organisations ... so then the State of Mind advertisements would go out on television during the State of Origin series. (NPO 6 – Manager Corporate Partners & Fundraising)
As indicated above, during televised match coverage, some NPOs leverage media attention given to the sports team to promote their organisation during televised matches or during advertising breaks. The NPO managers interviewed in this study mostly viewed this as simultaneously enabling the NPO to reach out to those that need their services, while promoting their organisation and social cause they address to raise more funds.

Furthermore, for particular sports teams, the broadcasting of matches through public, cable and sports team dedicated channels was recognised as an opportunity to showcase their social alliances:

Personally, for our team I think there’s potential from TV viewership. (Sports Team 2 – Communications Manager – Community).

In the case of televised match viewership, some sports team managers saw this as an opportunity to raise awareness of their NPO partner as well as develop associative networks among fans and the wider community, to better align the two entities:

Channel 7 came down and filmed the game and it went out that night. So looking for opportunities like that as well, which is building awareness obviously for the charity, but also it connects us quite strongly in with that also. (Sports Team 8 – General Manager Community)

As a further awareness-generation mechanism associated with televised match viewership and interlinked with match attendance, a few sports team managers also mentioned match days that are specifically dedicated to NPO partners which are broadcast nationally:

On TV the other week we had a round dedicated to [NPO] with a jumper that had a bit of purple there, which we’ve been doing that for three years now. Whether it’s for awareness, whether that’s a thing around people need to be aware. (Sports Team 7 – Head of Community)

Such matches are generally broadcast through public and cable TV channels, reaching expansive audiences. Further, during these televised NPO- or social-cause-dedicated match days, it is not uncommon for both organisations to use additional promotional tools to draw attention to the
alliance, including banner advertising, donation details (e.g. websites and hotlines) and stories around community impact.

In summary, through the deliberate promotion of the social alliance and subsequent details highlighting the NPO and social cause via various televised broadcasts, managers on both sides of the alliance can use such viewership to develop awareness of social alliance participation across different audiences.

**Live match viewership**

While more of an awareness-generation mechanism at the sports team’s disposal, match days can also be used by NPOs to establish awareness of their organisation and the social cause they address. Of the eight sports team managers interviewed here, seven acknowledged match days as an antecedent to social alliance awareness, as well as six NPO managers. As noted previously, specific match days are dedicated to the NPO and/or social cause where the NPO receives recognition including via announcements, signage, promotion in match day reading materials, electronic scoreboard endorsements, logo-displayed promotional materials such as headbands, and in some instances trophy presentations at the completion of the match.

Dual objectives are generally associated with dedicated match days. First, they are principally viewed as a more direct awareness-generation mechanism to a large audience; for example, some teams average up to 60,000 attendees per match (Warner 2017). Second, they are viewed as a fundraising mechanism where it is expected that some match day attendees will make donations to the NPO. However, it should be noted that on the sports team side, managers generally view match days as more of an awareness-raising channel of social alliances rather than a fundraising tool:

> We sort of tend to think of the match day is to build the partnership and tell the story. (Sports Team 7 – Head of Community)

While a few NPO managers interviewed here held the expectation that match day participation results in additional funding for the NPO, many saw it as an opportunity to draw additional exposure to their organisation:
I spoke over the microphone and whatever. So yes, we've got some exposure in that sense with people there, and a logo went up on the big screen and things like that. (NPO 4 – General Manager)

This sentiment was echoed by another NPO manager who claimed:

Just an example is the rugby union had the [sport team] played the cup in Sydney and Perth last month, and they showed a clip during the game, middle of the game and the end of the game I think. Start, middle and end, and that was to 90,000 people from a cross-section obviously. (NPO 7 – Policy and Program Manager – Sports Engagement Program)

Other stated benefits as indicated by both sports team and NPO managers from match day participation included a vehicle for storytelling, relationship building with corporate sponsors, and NPO clientele interaction with players to boost morale.

In sum, the ability for NPOs to leverage match days is viewed as useful tool to bring exposure to their organisation by highlighting the relationship they have with one or both of the competing sports teams. This enables NPOs to generate awareness and understanding around the social alliance among a different audience. For sports teams, dedicated match days are viewed as a means of promoting the social alliance to what generally constitutes a dedicated, highly involved audience. While there are match days devoted to specific NPOs or causes, some regular match days also make reference to social alliances through various materials such as permanent ground and surrounding signage, posters, and match day reading materials. Under these circumstances, sports team and NPO managers expect that match day attendees will become more aware of the sports team’s social alliances.

**Website visits**

Most participants nominated websites as a principal promotional tool used to generate awareness of their social alliance participation. In this study, both sports team and NPO managers use websites to provide access to news, partnership updates, events and activities, as well as social impacts concerning their social alliance. The general managerial perspective is that websites are capable of reaching large audiences regarding various community initiatives including social alliance activities:
So we have a website which is, you know, looked at, you know, I think it’s a million impressions a month. (Sports Team 1 – Head of Community, Diversity & Strategic Projects)

The expectation for most managers is that a large number of these visitors will navigate the website to look for both non-sport and sport-related information; thus increasing the likelihood of awareness-generation of social alliances. To aid this, one sports team manager advised that on occasion the sports team will ‘theme up’ their website to bring attention to a particular social alliance partner. For example, the website layout might be made blue to demonstrate a partnership with a mental health NPO which matches their brand colour scheme. Cognition stimulation accordingly occurs, encouraging visitors to research the NPO partner further. However, it was noted that there is limited opportunity for some sports teams to do this as they must remain within the guidelines set by the sport’s governing body when it comes to website layout. In contrast, NPOs do not have such restrictions and often look to websites as a key communication mechanism where they push partnership-related messages to various audiences:

Okay, so we kind of have our channels identified and they go from logo on the website to news item on the website ... we look at these channels we have and we push out the messaging. (NPO 6 – Manager Corporate Partners & Fundraising)

We use our website. We like to write nice stories about what’s actually been the outcomes through the partnership. (NPO 5 – Communications & Marketing Coordinator)

To further leverage website effectiveness and as part of the cross-promotional process, logo exchange on each organisation’s website was seen by many of the interviewed managers as central to raising awareness of social alliance partners:

We're trying to build that awareness through the not-for-profit’s websites as well, so that they're linked to ours and sharing logos and pushing out that partnership as well. (Sports Team 8 – General Manager Community)

So I suggest that logos on the websites – they’re mutually beneficial to each other, and there was the, you know, exclusivity to that. (NPO 3 – Chief Executive Officer)
However, while websites were used by all of the NPOs and sports teams to create awareness of their social alliance and associated activities, its effectiveness was questioned by some managers:

So there’s the website which I would say is almost, I don’t know who looks at a website anymore in terms of – unless they’re researching stuff. (Sports Team 2 – Communications Manager – Community)

In such cases, these managers saw websites as secondary to other communication channels, particularly social media which is discussed below. Despite such perspectives, websites are still commonly viewed as an essential CSR communication mechanism, and regularly used as a key marketing mechanism to engage stakeholders.

Social media engagement
Active social media messages were acknowledged in this study as the most critical tool adopted by sports team and NPO managers to generate social alliance awareness among audiences. All 17 managers interviewed listed the various social media applications as the primary component of their promotional strategy regarding social alliances. Sports teams generally have large, highly involved audiences linked to their social media channels, and therefore view this as an ideal platform to communicate with ‘followers’:

We’ve got a large amount of social media, so Facebook we’ve got 250,000 plus likes, Twitter it’s like 70,000 follows, Instagram, LinkedIn, Snapchat, Pinterest, I think there’s a few more. (Sports Team 1 – Head of Community, Diversity & Strategic Projects)

Sports teams would send messages from their primary social media accounts mixing community-related news with on-field commentary, individual player updates, and team news announcements. While social media message content differed across teams, it was suggested by these managers that the sports teams mainly use social media to highlight the positive impact the NPO has on the community and the relationship the two organisations share. As part of this strategy, corresponding social media images are often distributed by each organisation as a catalyst for creating social alliance awareness and positive support from sports team and NPO consumers. This is particularly pertinent for NPOs, as they view this as vital to accessing new audiences that would normally bypass them:
And then, of course, they ... they're very active on social media, we're active on social media. So whenever there's a ward visit, there's a flurry of photos, and followers and people saying how great they think that is. Fans aren’t necessarily going to follow our social media. But when it’s shared ... and the social media of the [sport team] is pretty heavily followed. (NPO 2 – Marketing and Partnerships Manager)

To further develop awareness, this study’s interviewed managers on both the NPO and sports team side reiterated the importance of a repeated communication strategy, signifying that social alliance communications are sent fairly consistently:

Communicating consistently sorry, with purpose and frequency through social media. (Sports Team 6 - General Manager – Community Engagement)

In addition to consistent, purposeful messaging, sports stars were also often recruited as ambassadors for NPO partners, including sending out CSR communication through their own social media accounts. In such instances, players send messages of support regarding NPO activity and social impact to theirs and the NPO’s followers, leveraging the viral nature associated with social media messages:

Yes, just player ambassadors. So whether they post a photo of them at Sleep at the G or send a message out, I think that’s quite a, in the existing membership base, is quite powerful. Especially if you’re a, you know, number one, number two in the team; they have a very ... influential voice, I think. (Sports Team 4 – Events and Community Manager)

As indicated in this study, most NPOs are also heavily reliant on their social media strategy to communicate to constituents and wider audiences. For most of the NPOs under investigation here, informing their supporters through social media channels was viewed as more effective than other means of communication:

I would say our website isn’t something extensive. It’s there but it’s not extensive or something people would turn to, and that repetitive message you get from social media can be so much more prolific. (NPO 7 – Policy and Program Manager – Sports Engagement Program)
To further develop awareness of their social alliance participation, a few of the interviewed managers on both sides of the dyad highlighted cross-promotion as a strong component of their social media strategy. In such instances, a deliberate, joint communication operation to reach new audiences was developed, with each organisation promoting one another:

"We work with them to look at what content we could promote, for example, on their Twitter, or on their email and Facebook and other social channels. (Sports Team 7 – Head of Community)"

The core objective underlying such a strategy is to encourage consumers on each side to become more aware of the social alliance. While NPOs do not have as large a following on social media as sports teams, they can still provide sufficient audience numbers for sports teams to target through their marketing communications strategies. For example, the McGrath Foundation currently has 269,631 followers on its Facebook site. Additionally, the positive public perception generated from involvement in extensive social initiatives has likely enabled some of these sports teams and NPOs to develop new consumers from within the community.

As evidenced in this study, managers have a variety of tools available to forge awareness of their social alliances, with some aimed towards broader audiences such as the general public, and others more targeted such as for their own constituents. Principally, the managers interviewed in this study turned to digital channels including websites and social media to actively construct social alliance awareness among their constituents and those of their social alliance partner. Messages of mutual support were often posted on social media applications such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter, or through cross-promotion logo placement on each other’s website. In addition, through the use of traditional media channels such as televised and live match viewership of games, the NPOs often received what they view as unprecedented public exposure, which they hoped would lead to increased funds or ongoing, established support. Match days were mostly viewed by interviewed managers as an important social alliance awareness-raising mechanism, particularly those dedicated to NPO partners. This was because these match days were viewed by a large number of attendees who were exposed to various marketing messages concerning the social alliance.

Overall, the various promotional tools enabled the managers interviewed here to highlight their
social alliances to both associated and partial audiences. However, in many cases, a deliberate, strategised approach to enhance the effectiveness of these mechanisms was relatively underutilised; thus impacting on the effectiveness of social alliances and their potential consumer outcomes.

The next section will explore the customer-related objectives and outcomes that interview participants expect to achieve regarding their social alliance output.

6.7.4 Consumer-related outcomes or objectives

In this study, managers from both sports teams and NPOs were asked about expectant or developed consumer-related objectives resulting from their social alliance involvement. Various outcomes were identified concerning consumer reactions towards both organisations in a social alliance, as discussed in more detail below.

Awareness generation

One of the key themes that emerged from the interviews with both NPO and sports team managers is awareness creation. The sports teams were mostly driven by instrumental motives, with the opportunity to enhance their social image and subsequent financial benefits primary reasons for forging NPO relationships. Motivations for NPOs were also developed from instrumental orientations, with the need to increase visibility and funding driven by the opportunity to reach out to a passionate fan base and use mass media communications. In both cases, the managers were reliant on the objective of raising awareness of their social alliances:

I think it's about awareness of [sport team] as a brand and what we do. And for, like I said, there's conversation to be happening in the community about what we're doing. (Sports Team 8 – General Manager Community)

You know, if you've got somebody of note coming to your event, it's a lot easier to get papers there and photographers and things like that, and that helps the awareness. Given that it's a donation- driven charity, so it's all about awareness. (NPO 4 – General Manager)
The general consensus among the NPOs was that the primary objective driving them to align with sports teams is the subsequent financial benefit following visibility. That is, NPO managers use these partnerships as a way of generating awareness of their organisation among new audiences, which should consequentially translate to increased funds for them.

In summary, both sets of managers saw social alliance awareness creation as a critical objective to gain support from associated and partial consumers; that is, once awareness is developed, subsequent benefits will ensue. This is in line with the HOE (Lavidge & Steiner 1961), where awareness is the initial point to subsequent consumer reactions.

**Increased team association**

Fan association with a sports team often ranges on a continuum from low to high; from casual fans to fanatics (Tapp & Clowes 2002). Higher fan association with a sports team can also incorporate various behavioural outcomes, such as becoming a season ticket holder (STH). This is why many sports team managers in this study identified increasing one’s association with the sports team as a preferred outcome resulting from social alliance participation:

> Increasing memberships [STH] is definitely a consideration with the [social alliance] partnerships. (Sports Team 7 – Head of Community)

By targeting the differing levels of association via social alliance and community-related marketing messages, it is hoped that fans will reward the sports team through higher association levels. Some of this study’s sports team managers also suggested that more neutral or non-sport fans may develop allegiances with the team based on its CSR programs:

> If we look at a timeline, the way that we view it here is that, you know, grassroots is down here, which is everything basically from schools programs to junior football clubs to everything, and consumer is up here. So to get them from this level here across to consumer, you know, everything that we try and do here has a fan development aspect to it, because obviously the work that we do in the community, whilst we have a social responsibility, another one of our objectives is to sign members [STHs]. (Sports Team 3 – Community & Fan Engagement Coordinator)
Growing or maintaining associated fans is essential to the long-term sustainability of most professional sports teams. Thus, teams often enact a number of strategic marketing initiatives to develop and enhance their relationships with new and existing fans, including to either develop or retain STHs (McDonald 2010). As identified in this study, some sports team managers perceive social alliances as an additional method they can use to achieve these objectives.

Furthermore, some NPO managers also identified increasing one’s team association as a sports-team-related outcome stemming from social alliance participation with their organisations:

I see the Pride Game as a revenue raiser, as well as a marketing raiser, as well as a membership raiser. (NPO 3 – Chief Executive Officer)

There’s definitely a value-add for them with memberships, that they can say they’re partnering with a national organisation and doing this. And it obviously shows that they’re different to the others, so when they go to market themselves they can say you know and this is how true we are. (NPO 7 – Policy and Program Manager – Sports Engagement Program)

In summary, increasing one’s team association among associated consumers and partial consumers was a core outcome-related objective generated from sports teams’ social alliance participation. In this study, managers on both sides of the dyad recognised that consumers are willing to increase their official association with the team due to the social alliance relationship.

**Match attendance**

In this study, some sports team managers suggested that increasing match attendance among both associated and partial consumers as a key objective related to social alliances and other community programs. This can extend from grassroots activities such as health discussions by sports star ambassadors at local primary schools, to broader social alliance initiatives aimed at wider audiences:

People might attend a match, because people might go and have a look at it based on the association or the community work. (Sports Team 3 – Community & Fan Engagement Coordinator)
For us around the Pride game coming up around the LGBTI community [a match day in support of LGBTI equality], who wouldn't normally come to a football game. And I know just speaking to some people that they will come to these games because it’s celebrating Pride. (Sports Team 8 – General Manager Community)

But I guess it [social alliance] does two things, I guess it brings people to the game who wouldn’t ordinarily come to a game, because they have an association with the NPO and not football ... I think, the halo effect, how good are you going with the partnership, people feel good, they want to come to the footy because of that initiative. (Sports Team 4 – Events and Community Manager)

In this study, some of the sports team managers noted two ideal objectives in relation to match attendance, resulting from social alliance participation. First, less involved supporters are impressed with the sports team’s community-focused efforts and may choose to demonstrate this by attending more matches. Second, the impact of social alliance participation may extend beyond current fan bases, to those associated with the NPO or social cause who want to reward and/or develop an interest in the sports team, and exhibit this through increased match attendance.

To sum, social alliances provided sports teams in this study the opportunity to develop match attendance numbers among associated consumers. Additionally, some sports team managers also saw social alliances as an opportunity to develop partial consumer relationships exhibited through match attendance in support of the sports team who are aligned with their NPO. Match attendance specifically, is an important outcome for managers given it is a principal source of revenue for sports teams (Neale & Funk 2006).

**Merchandise purchasing**

A key marketing objective for some sports teams is to increase revenue via merchandise sales. While highlighted as a primary outcome in previous CSR in sports research (e.g. Walker & Kent 2009), only a few sports team managers in this study identified it as an objective associated with their social alliance participation. Similar to match attendance, the premise underlying this outcome is built on the notion that satisfied fans will reward sports teams for their community work by purchasing team-related paraphernalia developed from affective evaluations. Consequently, those sports team managers who identified merchandise purchasing as a social alliance outcome hoped that sports
team and NPO consumers would engage with the team through merchandise purchasing due to its association with the NPO:

I reckon merchandise and products. So what I mean by that is, because of the involvement with [NPO] to get more ‘merch’ out there. (Sports Team 4 – Events and Community Manager)

To better drive this outcome, some sports teams release ‘special edition’ merchandise dedicated to a particular social cause. For example, a sports team allied with a breast cancer support organisation might release a pink jersey that the team wear on particular match days, which is also promoted and sold in the club shop or via online channels. In one case in this study, a CRM campaign was run by a sports team that promoted specialised merchandise with a portion of sales going to the NPO. In such scenarios, sports teams are hoping to simultaneously generate revenue through merchandise sales as well as promote the social alliance. For some sports team managers in this study, reaching out to community members ideally yielded positive reactions towards the team via purchasing both specialised and regular merchandise:

You see that, whether it be the indigenous jumpers, you see it even with the work that (sports team) have just there done there around the (NPO) with their pink and their brown. I’m sure there’s an opportunity for that. (Sports Team 6 – General Manager – Community Engagement)

In addition to sports team managers, one of the NPO managers in this study also recognised merchandise purchasing as a possible outcome for the sports team:

Purchase merchandise; that’s one, sports team merchandise. We’ve also looked at creating more merchandise, but we need a channel. (NPO 1 – General Manager Marketing & Communications)

This NPO manager understood the additional value generated for the sports team by partnering with their organisation; although it should be noted that this was an isolated case. In general, it was predominantly the sports team managers that identified the purchasing of merchandise, whether specialised merchandise representative of a social alliance or general merchandise, as an objective related to their social alliances.
Donations

Increasing funds via donations is a critical objective underlying most NPO participation in a social alliance with a sports team. In this study, all but one NPO manager clarified this as the principal objective associated with their social alliances. In accordance with the HOE framework, some of these managers linked social alliance awareness generation with subsequent donations:

So, from that we want to – it’s acquisition. So, they help us get our brand out there, and you know brand reputation. We hope they complement our brand because that’s always what you want, and enhance it, with any new partner. And then from that the more people know about us the greater the brand awareness; people understand what we do, feel connected with us and want to give. (NPO 1 – General Manager Marketing & Communications)

Some NPO managers felt that once awareness was raised, then donations would likely ensue. A few sports team managers held similar perspectives, where social alliance activities were created to draw awareness to the alliance, which would ideally result in the raising of funds for the NPO:

For the shoot-out, specifically we created co-branded material that went to our database, just to try and get as many people there to raise money. (Sports Team 5 – Community and Outreach Manager)

[NPO] they’re very, it’s very much based on raising money for them, because their number one goal is to provide new equipment in children’s hospitals around Tasmania; and so they obviously need money for that. (Sports Team 3 – Community & Fan Engagement Coordinator)

Some NPO managers emphasised this donation objective as the principal impact resulting from social alliances with sports teams:

Yeah, I mean I guess we’re an organisation, a charity, so always need to have donations and things like that. So yes, to be able to have those, you know, if fans can get on board and support us. (NPO 9 – Empowerment Programs Officer)

Furthermore, one NPO manager saw these social alliances as a way of maintaining their associated consumers as regular donors:
A big part of our work is about retaining donors. Talking to them further about the work that we’re doing and encouraging them to give again or become regular monthly donors, or other types of giving, and it’s not worth us executing an activity within a fundraising team unless we get an action as a result of that. (NPO 8 – Communications Manager)

In summary, managers on both sides identified increased NPO donations as a core objective associated with their social alliance efforts. This perspective was enhanced among NPO managers who essentially viewed social alliances with a sports team as a critical tactic designed to reach sports team consumers, which would ideally manifest into increased funds for the organisation.

Overall, both sports team and NPO managers in this study identified various consumer outcomes and objectives resulting from their social alliance interactions. As evidenced by participant responses, the outcomes for sports teams included increasing team association, match attendance and merchandise purchasing. For NPOs, the principal outcome was donations. However, while these were the main emergent themes, it is important to note that these were not unanimous among all this study’s participants, with some unable to connect social alliance participation with any instrumental outcomes. To help bridge this gap in these managers strategy development, a discussion highlighting the relevance of this research to industry practice will end this subsection.

**6.7.5 Relevance of this study to industry practice**

A key component of the research problem underlying this study is that effectiveness of social alliances between sports teams and NPOs on consumer behaviour is relatively unknown. This was exemplified by this study’s interviews with industry professionals, where little evidence of formalised processes in developing and evaluating objectives were found. Consequently, while these managers acknowledged an impact of social alliances on their organisation’s associated and partial consumer base, the extent of the impact was mostly generalised or assumed. For example, when discussing the effectiveness of marketing communications concerning the social alliance, one manager stated:

We promote the partnership with [NPO] through match days, definitely through the AFL record, and through the exposure on ground, and the ground announcement things. Once again, if anyone’s listening I don’t know. (Sports Team 4 – Events and Community Manager)
This generalised approach to social alliance strategy development extended to the managers’ social alliance marketing objectives where, except for donations, stated objectives were more of an ‘ideal’ scenario rather than a well-planned, strategically executed process:

It is difficult to define some of the objectives that we need to get out of [NPO] or we look to get out of [NPO]. I think a lot of the outcomes are incidental outcomes we may not ever measure, in terms of how many supporters we might get on board, or the money that’s generated through the goodwill that the club is providing to a foundation. (Sports Team 7 – Head of Community)

Furthermore, the interviews and interactions with the NPOs provided some insights into consumer engagement with their own constituents. For example, some NPOs adopted poor business practice regarding consumer database of past and regular donors and volunteers. Consequently, targeted communication with such consumers was limited, with the NPOs generally relying on more widely cast social media messages. This contrasted with the statements above which drew attention to the importance of consumer retention for NPO sustainability.

However, a shift in industry practice from an informal, ad hoc social alliance approach to a more strategically developed line of thinking seems to be occurring. As such, there is an industry imperativeness underlying this research, stemming from the interviews with both sports team and NPO managers, where a social alliance was beginning to be viewed with strategic intent. In this study, a few managers recognised the importance of adopting a planned, decisive social alliance perspective to maximise outcomes for all stakeholders:

So, I suppose like strategically we’re trying to move to shared values ... community effort strengthens the business and the markets in which we operate. (Sports Team 1 – Head of Community, Diversity & Strategic Projects)

I think that’s the space we’re moving towards, that we can be both; we can be contributing to community but still benefitting our business ... So not dilute it to the sense that it was just so random and sporadic. Have a look at people who were going to be investing, how were we doing it, so that it would be achieving some impact longer term in the community. (Sports Team 2 – Communications Manager – Community)
Some NPO managers also identified the associated benefits of an improved social alliance strategy, including efficiency in resource allocation, development of awareness and improved donor retention techniques:

We are seeing a trend where partnerships are becoming more strategic, partnerships across the board and sports partnerships included, yeah. (NPO 6 – Manager Corporate Partners & Fundraising)

Again, it’s about looking at opportunities to encourage people to donate in a way that also encourages them to give us their contact details so that we can talk to them again. (NPO 8 – Communications Manager)

In summary, some sports team and NPO managers of these dyadic social relationships are starting to adopt a more strategic perspective towards social alliance practices, recognising that in order to achieve tangible value for both firms, a more formalised, strategic approach is required. It was important to gain an understanding of the current state of play to provide insight into the relevance of this research to industry practice, and the manner in which the research problem is addressed.

6.8 Revised Conceptual Model and Hypotheses Development

The exploratory, qualitative interview phase of this study uncovered four behavioural mechanisms most managers use to create awareness of their social alliances among associated and partial consumers. In this study, the managers also related five consumer behaviour outcomes or objectives they hoped to achieve through their social alliances. Thus, building on the initial conceptual model stemming from the literature review with the qualitative management interview findings, the revised conceptual model was further developed as shown in Figure 6.2 below.
Figure 6.2: Revised conceptual model (dashed boxes indicate variables developed in initial conceptual model)

Note: SA = social alliance; ST = sports team
As shown in Figure 6.2, the initial conceptual model was expanded to more accurately reflect industry practice; that is, further insight was gathered into the effectiveness of social alliances in the sporting context. From an antecedent to social alliance awareness perspective, the case study managers reported four behavioural components they adopt to influence such awareness. Together with variables identified through previous theory, it is expected in this study that these antecedents will lead to social alliance awareness among sports team and NPO consumer groups. Thus, this study has effectively answered the call for more research investigating the antecedents that impact consumers’ CSR perspectives (Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2010; Plewa et al. 2016; Vanhamme et al. 2012), as well as their awareness in an alliance setting (Bergkvist & Taylor 2016).

According to the HOE theoretical framework, once consumer awareness is established, a sequence of events is likely to occur. That is, consumers are expected to further their cognition effect by developing deeper knowledge of social alliance partners. Subsequently, once this knowledge is obtained, affective evaluations should occur. Based on these affective evaluations, various consumer outcomes will most likely occur at both the associated and partial consumer level towards both organisations in the alliance. In this study, these are the derived objectives or outcomes that management indicated in the qualitative interview process, and those variables developed from previous theory as depicted in Figure 6.2.

With the establishment of a more reflective conceptual model, the next section of this thesis outlines the hypotheses related to the antecedents to social alliance awareness, the HOE sequence, and consumer-related outcomes. As identified in this study, two distinct consumer groups will react to social alliance input, therefore, hypotheses comparing consumer behaviour among the two groups is also discussed.

### 6.8.1 Antecedents to social alliance awareness

The following discussion details the behavioural and attitudinal antecedents to social alliance awareness that led to the hypotheses for Phase Two of this study.
Consumer identification
Developed from social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner 1979), the identification concept relates to individuals drawing on organisations to form part of their identity (Bergami & Bagozzi 2000). This can extend into the milieu of sports where team identification can range from weak (low) to strong (high), and is particularly important for identifying differing cognitive, affective and behavioural outcomes among fans (Wann & Branscombe 1995). Such team identification has been defined as a “…spectators’ perceived connectedness to a team and the experience of the team’s failings and achievements as one’s own” (Gwinner & Swanson 2003, p. 276). It fulfils a consumer’s need to associate with something that is successful or desirable (Branscombe & Wann 1991; Gladden & Funk 2002; Sutton et al. 1997).

According to Sutton et al. (1997), there are three discernible levels of identification within sports fans. This first is low identification (social fans) which refers to a passive relationship with the sport that generally results in low emotion, financial commitment and involvement. That is, fans at this level generally follow the sport as a form of entertainment and do not have an attachment to a particular team. Medium identification (focused fans) relates to an association with a sports team, which is based on socialness, team performance and/or player personality. This is where fans will be more attracted to the team performance and may make significant personal and financial investments for the team; although as such behaviour correlates with team performance, this can be short-term as team performance dips. High identification (vested fans) refers to those who are most loyal and have a long-term relationship with a sports team, which is often characterised by heavy investment and commitment. Fans with higher levels of identification tend to act differently to those with lower level identification, as they have a stronger sense of belonging and attachment to the team (Mitrano 1999). Identification in general can also extend to NPOs where an individual’s support for the NPO reinforces their self-concept (Cornwell & Coote 2005; Stephenson & Yerger 2014; Sundermann 2017).

Traditionally, social-responsibility-based research has shown consumer identification to be a consequence of CSR awareness (Sen, Bhattacharya & Korschun 2006). However, this study has adopted the perspective from previous CRM literature which highlights consumer identification as a catalyst for consumer behaviour, as well as sports sponsorship literature which demonstrates a link between consumer identification and sponsorship awareness. For example, Gwinner and
Swanson (2003) found that consumer identification is a strong predictor of commercial sponsorship recognition. Similarly, Cornwell, Weeks and Roy (2005) identified sponsorship awareness as a key outcome resulting from higher consumer identification. Thus, given this link between consumer identification and awareness, it was hypothesised here that:

\[ H1a: \text{Consumer identification is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.} \]

**Consumer trust**

Adapted from previous relationship marketing and CRM theory, sports team and NPO consumer trust in their aligned organisation was expected to impact on social alliance awareness. Such consumer trust has been defined as “the expectations held by the consumer that the service provider is dependable and can be relied on to deliver on its promises” (Sirdeshmukh, Singh & Sabol 2002, p. 17). Consequently, building trust is an important part of the relational exchange between an organisation and consumer (Neale & Fullerton 2010; Singh & Sirdeshmukh 2000), and is effective in forging strong bonds (Morgan & Hunt 1994).

Traditionally, previous research has shown awareness as an antecedent to consumer trust (e.g. Lowry et al. 2008); although as a proponent of increased loyalty (Berry 1995; Castaldo et al. 2009; Doney & Cannon 1997; Garbarino & Johnson 1999; Martinez & Rodríguez del Bosque 2013; Morgan & Hunt 1994; Sirdeshmukh, Singh & Sabol 2002) and an experience-related variable (Yoon 2002), it is proposed that consumer trust will lead to greater social alliance awareness. That is, consumers who have already established bonds with their associated organisation will be more cognisant of the initiatives and activities in which these firms participate. This is in accord with Ha (2004) who proposes that individuals with high brand trust are more likely to be aware of company information. This has been emphasised in previous NPO research, which has suggested that a constituent who holds higher levels of trust is more likely to interact with the NPO (Thomas, Cunningham & Williams 2002). Further, according to Mayo (2015), trust in an entity can manifest into developed cognitive processing. For example, Loureiro (2013) found a strong effect between consumer trust and brand awareness in an online banking context. Yoon (2002) also suggested in his conceptual model that trust positively impacts consumer awareness of a website.
It has subsequently been forecasted in this study that the strengthened relationship between the firm and consumer will positively affect awareness of the firm’s activities including social alliances. This sentiment was echoed by a sports team community manager in this study, who stated: “I think that takes time, I think that’s built on trust” in relation to social alliance awareness. Thus, the following hypothesis was developed:

H1b: Consumer trust is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

**Televised match viewership**

There has been substantial research addressing the impact of TV viewing on brand awareness in both advertising and sponsorship contexts. For example, Walsh, Kim and Ross (2008) found a high level of recall for brands advertising at a televised National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR) tournament. While Easton and Mackie (1998) discovered that sponsorship recall via TV viewership increased significantly immediately following a major European soccer tournament (Euro ’96). Lardinoit and Derbaix (2001) further emphasised the importance of TV viewership on consumer cognition when they demonstrated that viewers in their study had greater recall of TV billboards (identification of sponsor during a broadcast) than stadium signage. Similarly, in a more recent study, Olson and Thjømøe (2012) identified TV billboards as having an effective impact on consumer brand awareness.

In relation to prosocial behaviour, there is insufficient empirical research linking consumer awareness developed from TV viewership; although Du, Bhattacharya and Sen (2010) proposed that TV advertising is an effective way to generate awareness of social responsibility initiatives. For NPOs, TV alignment advertising – TV advertisements that promote social alliances – is often considered an effective tool for generating NPO awareness, especially if partnered with an established brand (Park, Hitchon & Yun 2004). Despite the paucity in academic research, sports team and NPO managers in this study look to televised match viewership as a contributor to social alliance awareness. Thus, it was hypothesised here that:

H1c: Televised match viewership is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.
Live match viewership

Live match viewership is an important predictor of general sports team partnership awareness. Mostly measured through game attendance frequency, a positive link had been found between recall and/or recognition and awareness in partnerships between a sports team and commercial entity (e.g. Bennett 1999; Biscaia et al. 2013; Turley & Shannon 2000). Specifically, Biscaia et al. (2013) found a significant relationship between game attendance frequency as a component of behavioural loyalty and sponsorship awareness. Similarly, Cornwell et al. (2000) found a significant relationship between game frequency and long-term sponsorship awareness via a recall and recognition measure. Furthermore, Turley and Shannon’s (2000) research revealed a significantly positive relationship between frequency of game attendance and in-stadium advertising recall.

While the game attendance to consumer awareness relationship has commonly been explored in partnerships between commercial organisations and sports teams, this relationship has not received much attention in existing social alliance research. However, as commercial partners are promoted during game days where increased consumer awareness has been recorded, social alliance partners are also referenced during match days. It is therefore anticipated in this study that a similar finding can be applied to social alliances as match attendees are often exposed to multiple marketing messages concerning the social alliance on match days. This is especially prominent during match days that relate specifically to social causes and/or social alliances, as identified in Phase One of this study. Given that previous literature has indicated an association between game attendance and commercial partnership cognition via recall and recognition, and that sports team and NPO managers have highlighted match days as an integral social alliance promotional activity, it was hypothesised here that:

*H1d: Live match viewership is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.*

Website visits

More and more businesses are turning to online communication tools to interact with their consumers. This includes sports organisations who are able to utilise internet applications such as websites to create a more interactive consumer experience regardless of geographical or time restrictions (Scharl, Neale & Murphy 2004). The higher levels of interactivity of websites compared
with traditional marketing mediums are more attractive to many consumers, and make it more likely they will engage with the organisation (Ghose & Dou 1998). Organisations commonly use websites as part of a CSR-focused communication strategy, drawing users’ attention to the good deeds they perform or the causes they contribute towards (Kim & Rader 2010).

For sports teams, websites can enhance their marketing efforts by creating a more direct line of communication with fans (Beech, Chadwick & Tapp 2000). Supporters can use their websites for company information, player profiles, statistics, highlights and community information (Beech, Chadwick & Tapp 2000). Additionally, it has been suggested that in the sports team CSR context, websites better communicate the definition, recognition and appreciation of social or community activities, and their importance to the organisation and wider community (Breitbarth & Harris 2008).

Furthermore, NPO websites provide organisations with access to new audiences, diverse publics and various stakeholders (Ingenhoff & Koelling 2009), allowing them to communicate their message widely (Ingenhoff & Koelling 2009; Wenham, Stephens & Hardy 2003) while stimulating public engagement (Uzunoğlu & Kip 2014). According to Goatman and Lewis (2007), the principal purpose of an NPO website is to generate awareness of the organisation, followed by awareness of the cause. For consumers, accessing an NPO’s website can provide them with company and cause information, volunteer and fundraising opportunities, and maybe even interaction opportunities with each other via online forums (Goatman & Lewis 2007).

In a general partnership context, websites can help both partnering firms generate brand awareness via internet sponsorship networking (Drennan & Cornwell 2004). That is, the partners co-align to create a united online presence, where both firms can promote one another’s organisation. In this study, industry practice suggests that both firms in a social alliance use websites as one of their main communication drivers with constituents and wider stakeholders regarding social alliance activities. It is therefore anticipated in this study that for both sets of consumers associated with organisations in an alliance, the more frequently they navigate the website of the firm they are aligned with, the more likely they will become aware of the various activities these organisations participate in. This aligns with previous advertising literature that has found a link between frequency of exposure and consumer awareness (e.g. Buil, de Chernatony & Martínez 2013). Thus, it was hypothesised in this study that:
**H1e:** Website visits are positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

**Social media engagement**

It is widely recognised within more recent literature that new digital channels such as social networks, blogs and micro-blogging are being implemented by many firms as a primary communication tool (Dutot, Galvez & Versailles 2016). Social media provides a particularly attractive marketing solution for firms, as it enables them to communicate their messages and receive immediate market reactions (Lee, Oh & Kim 2013). One of the key elements of social media is its ability to facilitate dialogic communication. According to dialogic communication theory, dialogue enables two-way interaction between a firm and its stakeholders by allowing firms to understand and respond to external messages (Kent & Taylor 2002). For the stakeholders, this dialogue enhances the firm’s accountability, enables them to opine on organisation operations, and may increase stakeholder satisfaction (Kent & Taylor 2002); thereby increasing consumer involvement one has with a firm. As a newer technology, social media has created a more interactive form of information exchange, and enabled improved relationship building strategies with consumers (Lee, Oh & Kim 2013). As such, various authors have identified a positive link between social media use and consumer awareness (e.g. Ashley & Tuten 2015); although research in a prosocial setting has been scant.

In the context of this study, social media provides an innovative platform for both sports teams and NPOs to reach associated consumers and new audiences. For example, many NPOs use Twitter, the most common social media application in marketing and PR (Waters & Jamal 2011). Sports teams also frequently adopt social media applications to communicate with fans and broader audiences concerning both on- and off-field matters (Abeza et al. 2017; Meng, Stavros & Westberg 2015).

In relation to creating awareness of social alliances, social media was identified in Phase One of this study as the most proficient tool to promote social alliances to respective audiences. This aligns with previous research that has found that social media has created an unprecedented opportunity for firms to increase public awareness (Kaplan & Haenlein 2010), which can be shared via the propagating of messages via social networks (Shirky 2011). Thus, it was hypothesised here that:
H1f: Social media engagement is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

6.8.2 HOE sequence

Once consumer awareness of the social alliance is established, the HOE theoretical framework suggests that further cognitive and affective evaluations occur. This subsection therefore discusses the hypotheses used to test this sequence of relationships within this research context.

Social alliance awareness to knowledge of social alliance partner

Awareness of a product or service and the ability to bring it to mind is considered an important determinant of decision-making (Nedungadi & Hutchinson 1985). According to Keller’s (1993) Associative Network Memory Model, semantic memory (awareness and knowledge) consists of a series of memory nodes and links. These nodes, which are stored information, go through a ‘spreading activation’ process when information is passed, which determines the extent of retrieval in memory (Collins & Loftus 1975; Raaijmakers & Shiffrin 1981; Ratcliff & McKoon 1988; Saunders & Macleod 2006). A node can activate another node through external or internal information retrieval, and activation can spread from this node to others within memory. Once a threshold level is exceeded, the information contained in that node is recalled (Keller 1993).

To operationalise this for the CSR context, when an activity such as CSR becomes imbedded, this spreads to a consumer’s active memory and produces a link between an organisation and its social practices (Walker & Heere 2011). Once such awareness is established, a consumer will move onto the knowledge phase (Lavidge & Steiner 1961), where they start developing a further understanding of the company’s social values and practices (Murray & Vogel 1997). In this study context, this relates to greater knowledge of the social alliance partner organisation among each associated consumer set.

In general, such knowledge relates to an understanding of a domain’s “...basic contents, as well as its goals, rules and/or principles” (Chiesi, Spilich & Voss 1979, p.257). It differs to awareness in that it is a more in-depth understanding of a domain, and is more impactful on subsequent consumer behaviour. Thus, the following hypothesis was tested here:
H2: Consumer awareness of a social alliance between a sports team and NPO is positively related to consumer knowledge of the social alliance partner organisation.

Knowledge of social alliance partner to social alliance attitudes

Lavidge and Steiner (1961) first highlighted the attitude formation step that follows consumer knowledge. This relationship is further demonstrated in the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975), where attitude develops from two factors: a belief one holds about an object; and the valenced evaluations of the belief. This link has been further exhibited in extant CSR research, where, for example, Lacey, Close and Finney (2010) found that consumers with deeper knowledge about a product form attitudes based on product trait information. In another example, Bang et al. (2000) found that consumers with greater knowledge of the advantages of renewable energy hold more positive attitudes towards it.

Furthermore, previous research has suggested that more knowledgeable consumers are increasingly engaged with a company and its community activities (Algesheimer, Dholakia & Herrmann 2005; Murray & Vogel 1997), and that those with more knowledge about an organisation’s CSR activities or NPO partners generally form more positive attitudes towards the firm (Hwang & Kandampully 2015; Lafferty, Goldsmith & Hult 2004; Wigley 2008) or the firm’s products (Brown & Dacin 1997). In the context of this study, this means that associated consumers with knowledge of their aligned organisation’s social alliance partner will generate affective evaluations regarding the social alliance. As such, it was hypothesised here that:

H3: Consumer knowledge of a social alliance partner organisation is positively related to consumer attitudes towards a social alliance between a sports team and NPO.

6.8.3 Social alliance attitudes to conation

The positive associations that consumers hold towards a company as a result of CSR participation has been deemed as influential for building a positive reputation (Brown & Dacin 1997). However, the mixed findings concerning consumer reactions to CSR means that in some cases attitudes towards a firm are affected more by poor ethical performance rather than proactive social behaviour (Folkes & Kamins 1999). Despite this, positive attitudinal responses have been recorded
in some cases, where consumers view firms as proactive rather than reactive in CSR implementation (Becker-Olsen, Cudmore & Hill 2006; Groza, Pronschinske & Walker 2011).

As learned evaluation mechanisms, attitudes often shape the perceptions of consumers, leading to favourable or unfavourable responses and behaviours (Faircloth, Capella & Alford 2001; Fishbein & Azjen 1975; Keller 1993; Madrigal 2001), making attitudes a useful predictor of consumer behaviour (Mitchell & Olson 1981). Following these attitudinal evaluations, the HOE dictates that consumers proceed to the conative stage, which is considered the behavioural dimension, and is underlined by conviction and purchase (Lavidge & Steiner 1961; Palda 1966). That is, conation generally refers to outcomes.

Previous sports marketing, CSR and social alliance research (e.g. Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015; Murray & Vogel 1997; Walker & Kent 2009) has shown various behavioural outcomes associated with CSR following attitude formation. For example, Murray and Vogel (1997) demonstrated via the HOE framework that favourable attitudes can manifest into support for a firm. Further findings relating to sports team CSR initiatives have shown a positive impact on the intention to purchase sports team merchandise, WOM communication and following a team’s performance (Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010; Walker & Kent 2009). For NPOs, reactions from consumers following social alliance formation can include increased visibility and intentions to donate money (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Inoue, Mahan & Kent 2013; Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015; Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004).

Thus, based on the findings from the previous literature and the input from sports team and NPO managers in this study as to the objectives they hope to achieve through social alliance participation, the following hypothesis was put forward:

**H4: Consumer attitudes toward a social alliance between a sports team and NPO are positively related to a) donation intention, b) increasing team association intention, c) match attendance intention, d) sports team WOM intention, e) merchandise purchasing intention, and f) NPO WOM intention.**
6.8.4 Multigroup hypotheses

The execution of a social alliance requires a thorough understanding of consumer behaviour. As an initial step, grasping the underlying antecedents to social alliance awareness within a multigroup setting is critical for developing an effective alliance marketing strategy. Further, understanding the degree that consumer behaviour varies among consumer groups will also enable managers to advance appropriate segmentation and targeting strategies to maximise commercial viability for each organisation (Plouffe, Vandenbosch & Hulland 2001). In the context of this study, this is driven by the likelihood that both sports and NPO consumers value different aspects of the social alliance and will therefore react differently.

Despite these insights, existing research has not provided a sufficient indication of which antecedents are important to each consumer group, and what consumer-related outcomes are more likely to occur for each consumer group in a social alliance scenario. While previous literature has highlighted positive consumer outcomes associated with CSR or CRM, such as WOM, purchase intentions and increased donations (e.g. Lee & Ferreira 2013; Walker & Kent 2009), it has failed to capture the perspective from both associated and partial consumer groups. Thus, our understanding of consumer behaviour regarding social alliances is incomplete. Subsequently, definitive hypotheses direction across the two consumer groups is restricted. This is in line with Laukkanen et al. (2013), who had no hypotheses direction in their cross-country comparative research due to an insufficiency in previous literature addressing the topic.

Thus, by adapting the above-listed hypotheses across a multigroup setting, the following hypotheses were also tested:

**H5:** The relationship between a) consumer identification, b) consumer trust, c) televised match viewership, d) live match viewership, e) website visits, and f) social media engagement and social alliance awareness will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups.

**H5g:** The relationship between social alliance awareness and knowledge of social alliance partner will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups.
H5h: The relationship between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups.

H5: The relationship between social alliance attitudes and i) donation intention, j) increasing team association intention, k) match attendance intention, l) sports team WOM intention, m) merchandise purchasing intention, and n) NPO WOM intention will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups.

6.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the qualitative method used in Phase One, and the subsequent hypotheses that were tested in Phase Two of this study. First, it detailed the face-to-face, semi-structured, in-depth interviews used to gather data from sports team and NPO managers to explore social alliance industry practice in more detail. As such, a multi-purposive sampling technique was used, consisting of convenience sampling and snowball sampling to ensure that managers closely aligned with social alliance execution were recruited. In total, eight sports team and nine NPO managers participated in Phase One of this study.

Further, this chapter has outlined the steps involved in developing the qualitative interview guide and the reliability measures adopted for the interview process; using input from experienced academicians, piloting a draft and conducting a pilot interview. Following this critical step, the discussion on participant interviews included the techniques adopted within each interview to ensure interview efficiency.

Once data collection was addressed, this chapter discussed the data analysis process used in Phase One of this study. Specifically, three major steps were employed to perform this task. First, data was organised through Nvivo 11; second, to get acquainted with the data, interview transcripts were read and re-read; and third, coding and classifying of the data was conducted for interpretation based on antecedents to social alliance awareness and consumer outcomes.

Next, the findings from the manager interviews were presented in this chapter. This consisted of the four antecedent variables that management use to generate awareness of social alliances: 1)
televised match viewership; 2) live match viewership; 3) website visits; 4) and social media. As well as the five consumer-related objectives: 1) awareness generation; 2) match attendance; 3) merchandise purchasing; 4) increasing team association; 5) and donations.

This chapter then presented the revised conceptual model that incorporated variables gathered through previous theory and management practice. It also discussed the associated hypotheses highlighting the antecedents to social alliance awareness, the HOE sequence, and consumer outcomes stemming from social alliance participation between a sports team and NPO. Lastly, the chapter discussed the multigroup hypotheses that were also going to be tested, to investigate the differences in reactions among the two consumer groups towards the two organisations in a social alliance.
“Becoming more diverse and inclusive is a huge priority at NASCAR, and we continue to make long-term investments to boost female and minority participation across every level of our sport, on and off the track.” (Jim Cassidy, Senior Vice President, NASCAR)
7.0 Introduction

This chapter introduces Phase Two, the quantitative component of this study. The core objective of this phase was to examine the consumer response to social alliances, providing insight on whether anticipated management objectives or outcomes are met. Section 7.1 discusses the target population, including the sampling frame, the technique used to develop the sample, and recruitment of the respondents. Section 7.2 provides the descriptive research design focusing on the questionnaire methodology, measures and measurement scales adopted for each variable, and Section 7.3 then examines the pre-testing of the questionnaire employed in this research. Section 7.4 covers the ethical considerations underpinning the quantitative investigation, and Section 7.5 then discusses the data analysis procedure that was adopted in this research including EFA and SEM, consisting of CFA and structural models. Section 7.6 explains the post-hoc multigroup analysis procedure undertaken in this study, to compare the results between the two different consumer groups, while Section 7.7 summarises the chapter. A roadmap of this chapter’s contents is presented in Figure 7.0.
7.1 Target Population

The target population refers to the part of the total population where the study is directed (Churchill, Lacobucci & Isreal 2010), and is the group from which the sample is taken (Tustin 2005). According to Aaker et al. (2011), it is important for the target population to be well-defined to answer the RQ accurately and obtain adequate results. In cases where the target population is large, sampling needs to occur (Hair et al. 2014).
In the context of this study, it was anticipated that the revised conceptual model can be applied to an alliance between any professional sports team and NPO. Therefore, the target population theoretically consists of associated consumers of any professional sports team and NPO in Australia. However, in practice, the data collection from multiple social alliances and their associated consumers was not attainable for this study. Since the Australian Cricket Team and its NPO partner the McGrath Foundation agreed to participate in this current study, they were employed here to represent a social alliance between sports teams and NPOs.

7.1.1 Sampling frame

Zikmund et al. (2011, p. 326) defined a sample frame as “a list of elements from which a sample may be drawn”. For Phase Two of this study, ‘list’ refers to associated consumers from Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation; both maintain a database which comprises their respective associated consumer base. The sample was initially randomly drawn from these databases. This research also sourced a reputable panel data company (Cint) to supplement the McGrath Foundation database due to insufficient consumer responses to the questionnaire. Thus, both these lists were used as the sampling frames.

7.1.2 Sampling method and respondent recruitment

Sampling has been defined as “a subset, or some part of a larger population” (Zikmund et al. 2011, p. 321) where techniques regarding sampling to obtain a portion of a larger population have been established (Proctor 2005). In this study, sampling was based on both associated and partial consumer reaction towards a social alliance. As such, a probability, simple random sample from consumers closely aligned with the Australian Cricket Team and the McGrath Foundation were recruited. A probability sample is where each member of a population has a known probability of selection (Zikmund et al. 2011), while simple random sampling ensures that each element within the population has an equal chance of being selected (Bryman 2016).

To collect quantitative data, a web-based questionnaire was sent by the two participating organisations within the social alliance to consumers listed on their respective databases via a link. In total, the questionnaire link was sent to 15,000 sports team and 4,500 NPO associated consumers.
These numbers were agreed by the participating organisations to try and overcome the high percentage of non-responses that is becoming more prevalent in social research (Bryman 2016). Furthermore, to maximise heterogeneity and generalisability in the sample population (Bryman 2016), the organisations attempted to obtain an even gender split. Additionally, as per ethical considerations, the questionnaire was only sent to respondents who were 18 years or over.

Insufficient response rates on the McGrath Foundation side meant that additional sampling was required through a panel data company. In this case, the questionnaire was sent to 2,155 panel data members with an additional screening question asking participants: “Have you donated, volunteered or fundraised for the McGrath Foundation in the past 12 months?” If the respondent answered positively, they would move to the next phase of the questionnaire.

As a further consideration, sample size was based on the sufficiency to conduct SEM (Hair et al. 2014). Various authors have suggested the minimum sample sizes required for SEM data analysis, although it should be noted that agreement is yet to be achieved. For example, Anderson and Gerbing (1988) recommended 100 to 150 subjects as the minimum requirement, while other authors have argued that five subjects per variable is sufficient (Bentler & Chou 1987). According to Jackson (2003, p. 139), “… basing sample size on minimum value (e.g. 200 or more observations), ensuring indicators are carefully chosen and reliable, and ensuring there is an adequate number of indicators per latent variable seemingly provide more supportable guidelines for sample size than N:q”, where N is sample size and q is the number of parameters to be estimated. In line with this, this study aimed to achieve a sample size aligned with previous sports marketing research (e.g. Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010), and one that is deemed significant for data analyses purposes (Tabachnick & Fidell 2013).

7.2 Descriptive Research Design

The term ‘survey’ has often been used synonymously with questionnaire; yet surveys generally consist of various data collection techniques such as personal interviews, direct observation or self-administered questionnaires (Bryman 2016). As such, the term adopted in this study was ‘questionnaire’ given that it was used as the primary data collection technique. There are various advantages associated with the use of questionnaires in data collection, including reaching a large,
dispersed population, gathering data unobtrusively as respondents can provide inputs in a less tense environment, minimising bias associated with interview response and interpretation, and timeliness (McClelland 1994). Questionnaires can be conducted via telephone, face-to-face, mail or electronically (Bowling 2005), and this study opted for the use of a web-based questionnaire via the Qualtrics platform.

Various advantages have been associated with web-based questionnaires, including a stronger visual appeal (Jansen, Corley & Jansen 2007; Van Selm & Jankowski 2006), an ability to gather more thorough information than mail-based (Monroe & Adams 2012), an ability to obtain large sample sizes in a short time period (Denissen, Neumann & van Zalk 2010), rapidness of responses (Jansen, Corley & Jansen 2007; McDonald & Adam 2003), cost-effectiveness (Denissen, Neumann & van Zalk 2010; McDonald & Adam 2003; Van Selm & Jankowski 2006), maintenance of anonymity (Andrews, Nonnecke & Preece 2003; Denissen, Neumann & van Zalk 2010), reduction of missing data via a forced response mechanism (Qualtrics 2017), and more accurate coding (Lockett & Blackman 2004).

However, some disadvantages with web-based questionnaires have also been identified, such as weak response rates (McDonald & Adam 2003) and high rates of non-delivery of emails due to multiple or redundant email addresses (Bryman 2016). Despite this, Aaker et al. (2011) asserted that any disadvantages associated with web-based questionnaires are far outweighed by the advantages.

In this study, responses were gathered from the associated consumers of the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation (as shown in Figure 7.1 below).
As depicted in Figure 7.1, it was anticipated that each associated consumer group would react to both the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation. To capture this and the additional partial consumer relationship, two questionnaires were developed to measure the antecedents to social alliance awareness, cognition, affect and conation for each group. These were the same across the two groups, except wording was slightly adjusted to suit the context (e.g. ‘I feel the Australian Cricket team is trustworthy’ compared to ‘I feel the McGrath Foundation is trustworthy’). This was in line with previous research by Plouffe, Vandenbosch and Hulland (2001) who effectively compared the antecedents to the intention to adopt an innovation among consumers and merchant retailers using two separate yet similarly worded questionnaires.

7.2.1 Development of questionnaire instrument

According to Sekaran (2003), there are three critical considerations in the development of questionnaires: 1) wording; 2) appearance and categorisation; and 3) coding of the variables. The wording used in the questionnaires was mostly developed from previous similar studies (e.g. Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010), but adapted to suit the context. The wording was checked by an external
panel as well as staff members of the sports team and NPO organisations participating in the research (managers, legal team and research team). Furthermore, the appearance used was an attractive, simplistic layout that was easy on the eye to maximise response rates (Dillman 2014). Variable categorisation was also performed both \textit{a priori} and following qualitative interviews in Phase One, to align with the RQs.

On unobservable variables, this study adopted measurements that consisted of multiple items. Kline (2010) highlighted the importance of adopting constructs composed of multiple items in that the various facets of the construct are included and comprehensively assessed. This technique tends to return more reliable results than single-item scales (Sass & Smith 2006). In this study, while most of these items were adapted from established items found in existing research (e.g. Walker & Heere 2011), some were newly developed following the qualitative component of this study, particularly where there was a dearth of measurements available in extant literature (Hair et al. 2014). This will be discussed in more detail in the next subsection.

\textbf{7.2.2 Measurement scales}

This subsection examines the variables and latent constructs adopted in Phase Two of this study. Specifically, in accordance with the HOE theoretical framework, the revised conceptual framework consisted of antecedents to social alliance awareness, knowledge, attitude and consumer outcomes associated with social alliances. Scale adoption decisions were based on obtaining measurements that had proven high construct reliability (CR), as indicated by CR value and/or Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) coefficients (Hair et al. 2014). It should be noted that the order of items within each construct was randomised, and the order of the outcome variables was also altered to ensure that similar questions (e.g. word-of-mouth for the sports team and word-of-mouth for the NPO) were not sequential. As listed in the following subsections, all questions adopted a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree, unless stated otherwise. A full copy of each questionnaire is available in Appendices 4a and 4b.

\textbf{Social alliance awareness}

Social alliance awareness was the first question in the questionnaire and was measured in two parts. The first part was a developed screening question to determine the level of consumer recognition
regarding social alliance partners, where respondents were asked: “Please select the name of the [sports team/NPO] associated with [the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team]”. Respondents could select from five options, where an incorrect response would end their questionnaire participation. Thus, only respondents who had a base awareness of these social alliance partners could proceed due to successive cognitive-and affective-based questions.

The second part determined varying degrees of social alliance awareness. Walker and Heere (2011) developed such an awareness level measure as part of broader cognition in their CSR in sports research. However, this multiple-item scale included a knowledge component and an affective component, moving beyond first-level cognition (Lavidge & Steiner 1961). Therefore, this full scale was deemed inappropriate for this study. To develop a more appropriate awareness level measure, four items adapted from existing empirically derived marketing- and CSR-related scales were used, with wording slightly modified for contextual relevance and based on feedback from the managers of the participating organisations. This consisted of Sen, Bhattacharya and Korschun’s (2006) single-item company awareness measure, two items from Beidenbach, Bengtsson and Marell’s (2015) brand equity scale, which exhibited a high $\alpha$ coefficient (0.87) and CR (0.88), and one item from Walker and Heere’s (2011) CARES scale which also indicated evidence of high reliability $\alpha = 0.92$. Table 7 shows the items comprising the social alliance awareness measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Alliance Awareness (Recall)</td>
<td>Developed for this study</td>
<td>Please select the name of the [sports team/NPO] associated with [McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Alliance Awareness (Level)</td>
<td>Walker &amp; Heere (2011)</td>
<td>I am aware of the alliance between the McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sen, Bhattacharya &amp; Korschun (2006)</td>
<td>I am familiar with the alliance between the McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beidenbach, Bengtsson &amp; Marell (2015)</td>
<td>I can recognise this social alliance between the McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team among other social alliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beidenbach, Bengtsson &amp; Marell (2015)</td>
<td>I can quickly recall the logo of the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consumer identification

Various researchers have demonstrated that stakeholders can strongly identify with organisations (e.g. Ashforth & Mael 1989). To measure such consumer identification in this study, a 6-item scale originally developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) was adapted to suit this study, as used in many previous studies (e.g. Bhattacharya, Rao & Glynn 1995; Cornwell & Coote 2005; Ngan, Prendergast & Tsang 2011), and which showed a high $\alpha$ coefficient of 0.87. Table 7.1 depicts the items used to measure consumer identification in this study.

Table 7.1: Consumer identification measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer identification</td>
<td>Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>When someone criticises the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team, it feels like a personal insult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>I am very interested in what others think about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>The McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team successes are my successes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>When someone praises the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team, it feels like a personal compliment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mael &amp; Ashforth (1992)</td>
<td>If a story in the media criticised the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team, I would feel embarrassed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consumer trust

While consisting of both cognitive and affective components (Johnson & Grayson 2005; McAllister 1995; Swan, Bowers & Richardson 1999), in this study consumer trust was an attitudinal antecedent hypothesised to lead to social alliance awareness. Therefore, consumer trust was measured by five relevant items, with four adopted from Sirdeshmukh, Singh and Sabol (2002) who recorded a high reliability $\alpha = 0.96$, and one item from Wu, Tsai and Hung (2012). These are shown in Table 7.2 below.
Table 7.2: Consumer trust measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer trust</td>
<td>Sirdeshmukh, Singh &amp; Sabol (2002)</td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is very dependable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirdeshmukh, Singh &amp; Sabol (2002)</td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is very competent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirdeshmukh, Singh &amp; Sabol (2002)</td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is of high integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirdeshmukh, Singh &amp; Sabol (2002)</td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is very responsive to its supporters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wu, Tsai &amp; Hung (2012)</td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is trustworthy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Television match viewership

Television match viewership of sports matches can be considered traditional sports-related consumption behaviour. Identified by sports team and NPO managers as a key marketing communications tool to highlight social alliances, television match viewership was measured in this study using a single-item, open-ended question adapted from Karg and McDonald (2011) who asked: “For the season, how many games involving your supported team did you watch on TV [maximum 22]?”. The wording here was slightly altered based on feedback from the pre-testing panel, and the maximum number of matches was adapted for this context where the participating sports team stipulated a maximum of 30 televised games per season. As such, the question measuring this variable is shown in Table 7.3 below.

Table 7.3: Televised match viewership measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Televised match</td>
<td>Karg &amp; McDonald</td>
<td>For last season, how many games involving the Australian Cricket Team did you watch on TV [0-30 games]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viewership</td>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Live match viewership

Live match viewership is a behavioural antecedent identified by sports team and NPO managers in this study as a mechanism used to generate social alliance awareness among associated and partial consumers. The expectation is that those who attend games will be more aware of social alliances. To select an appropriate measure of game attendance as an antecedent variable for this study, a single-item measure was adapted from Karg and McDonald (2011) who asked respondents: “For the
season (not including finals), how many games involving your supported team did you attend live [maximum 22]?”. Here the wording was slightly altered based on feedback from the pre-testing panel, and a single-item measure was used. That is because single-item measures of simple and straightforward constructs are suited to field research (Bergkvist & Rossiter 2007). As such, the live match viewership measure is shown in Table 7.4 below.

Table 7.4: Live match viewership measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live match viewership</td>
<td>Karg &amp; McDonald (2011)</td>
<td>How many Australian Cricket Team games did you attend last season?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Website visits**

Websites have been deemed the iconic representation of professional organisations, providing multiple sections that target different audiences (Esrock & Leichty 1998; Maignan & Ralston 2002; Pollach 2005). To measure website visits as an antecedent variable to social alliance awareness in this study, a single-item question was used asking respondents “How often do you visit the McGrath Foundation’s/Australian Cricket Team’s website per week on average?” ranging from 0-15 visits per week. The rationale for this is based on the contention that the frequency of a particular activity leads to greater impact on judgements (Hornik 1984) and awareness (Buil, Chernatony & Martínez 2013; Walliser 2003). Additionally, given the disparity in content on sports teams and NPO’s websites, (e.g. sports teams have match highlights, player statistics, match fixture information, whereas NPOs have advice, social cause and donation information), website visit frequency enabled the variable to be suitably measured across groups. Therefore, the website visits measure is shown in Table 7.5 below.

Table 7.5: Website visits measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website visits</td>
<td>Developed for this study</td>
<td>How often do you visit the McGrath Foundation’s/Australian Cricket Team’s website per week on average?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social media engagement

All 17 managers interviewed in Phase One of this study agreed that social media is the primary awareness-generating mechanism for social alliances. This study’s social media engagement construct incorporated items from Rapp’s et al. (2013) study addressing social media usage across business suppliers, retailers and consumers. Given that this research is specifically interested in consumer social media use and subsequent reactions, eight of the ten items from Rapp’s et al. (2013) social media usage scale developed for the consumer component of their research, which recorded a high reliability coefficient $\alpha = 0.95$, were adopted. The eight items were selected based on relevance to this study, with some wording slightly altered to fit. For example, the item “I use social media to follow sales and promotions” was deemed inappropriate. An additional item was developed from Phase One – “I use social media to follow Australian Cricket Team players” – due to player ambassadors communicating messages of social alliance support. The social media engagement measures are shown in Table 7.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapated from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media engagement</td>
<td>Rapp et al. (2013)</td>
<td>I use social media to follow the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapp et al. (2013)</td>
<td>I use social media to monitor events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapp et al. (2013)</td>
<td>I use social media to improve my relationship with the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapp et al. (2013)</td>
<td>I use social media to communicate with the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapp et al. (2013)</td>
<td>My relationship with the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is enhanced by social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapp et al. (2013)</td>
<td>I use social media to keep current on events of charities/sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapp et al. (2013)</td>
<td>People use social media to reach me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed for this study</td>
<td>I use social media to follow Australian Cricket Team players.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge of social alliance partner

Consumer knowledge differs to awareness in that it relates more to a deeper understanding of a phenomenon (Wigley 2008). Knowledge has been operationalised as both objective (Brucks 1985) and subjective (Monroe 1976), where subjective measures are said to be better for evaluating motivation to conduct various behaviours (Flynn & Goldsmith 1999; Selnes & Grønhaug 1986). Thus, to measure knowledge of the social alliance partner in this study, a five-item scale was adapted from research conducted by Flynn and Goldsmith (1999) who developed a subjective knowledge scale. After undergoing rigorous testing in their study, the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was recorded at 0.92. Wording was altered here to suit this research context. Table 7.7 shows the items used to measure knowledge of social alliance partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of social alliance partner</td>
<td>Flynn &amp; Goldsmith (1999)</td>
<td>I pretty much know about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flynn &amp; Goldsmith (1999)</td>
<td>I feel very knowledgeable about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flynn &amp; Goldsmith (1999)</td>
<td>Among my circle of friends, I’m one of the ‘experts’ on the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flynn &amp; Goldsmith (1999)</td>
<td>Compared to most other people, I know more about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flynn &amp; Goldsmith (1999)</td>
<td>When it comes to the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team, I really know a lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social alliance attitudes

Attitude is an affective construct and often acts as the medium between cognition and conation (Peterson, Hoyer & Wilson 1986). It is also a standard unidimensional construct regularly used in social research (Ajzen 1987), and is particularly prominent in the consumer behaviour literature. For this study, consumer attitude towards the social alliance was measured on five, 7-point semantic differential scales adapted from Groza, Pronschinske and Walker (2011) CSR-related study and Rifon et al.’s (2004) social alliance study. All four items were used from Groza, Pronschinske and Walker’s (2011) study which recorded high reliability ($\alpha = 0.95$), while one additional item was adopted from
Rifon et al.’s (2004) study which also received high reliability ($\alpha = 0.90$). The main question associated with the semantic differential scale was: “What is your attitude towards the social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation?” Table 7.8 outlines the semantic differential scales used in this social alliance attitudes measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Alliance</td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Dislike/like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Unfavourable/favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Negative/positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rifon et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Pleasant/unpleasant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, conative consumer reactions to the organisations in the social alliance were measured as intent to act. While measuring intention does not necessarily predict actual behaviour, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) suggested it is the easiest and most efficient way that one can actually predict behaviour. More recently, Morwitz, Steckel and Gupta (2007) demonstrated the positive correlation between intent and actual behaviour. Thus, measuring the intention to act as representative of conation was deemed appropriate for this study.

**Donation intention**

In this study, the intention to donate is a behaviourally based objective derived for the NPO. Donation intention was directly adapted from Ranganathan and Henley’s (2008) scale, which achieved a high reliability ($\alpha=0.89$). All three items were adopted for this study and anchored by a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = extremely unlikely to 7 = extremely Likely. The guiding question asked: “Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation ...”. The items used to measure intention to donate are depicted in Table 7.9 below.
Table 7.9: Donation intention measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to donate</td>
<td>Ranganathan &amp; Henley (2008)</td>
<td>I am likely to donate money to McGrath Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranganathan &amp; Henley (2008)</td>
<td>I will donate money next time to McGrath Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranganathan &amp; Henley (2008)</td>
<td>I will definitely donate money to McGrath Foundation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasing team association intention

The intention to increase team association construct was measured as a behavioural objective. This item was adapted from Madrigal’s (1995) Basking in Reflected Glory (BIRGing) measure. Accordingly, BIRGing refers to one’s tendency to "share in the glory of a successful other with whom they are in some way associated” (Cialdini et al. 1976, p. 366). One of the key tenets to BIRGing is an individual’s inclination to increase an association with “a successful other, such as a sports team” (Madrigal 1995, p. 206). To measure intention to increase team association in this study, a single item was adapted from Madrigal (1995) which asked respondents: “Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of increasing your association with the Australian Cricket Team in the future?” This was measured using Groza, Pronschinske and Walker’s (2011) behavioural intention construct which included four items on a 7-point semantic differential scale and recorded a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.93. Table 7.10 outlines the items used to measure increasing team association intention in this study.

Table 7.10: Increasing team association intention measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to increase team association</td>
<td>Madrigal (1995)</td>
<td>Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of increasing your association with the Australian Cricket Team in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Unlikely/likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Improbable/probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Impossible/possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Uncertain/certain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Match attendance intention

This is a behavioural construct measuring a consumer’s intention to attend the team’s matches in the future due to social alliance participation. In this study, this construct asked: “Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of attending Australian Cricket Team games in the future?” This was adapted from Trail, Fink and Anderson’s (2003) research that measured match attendance as part of a wider behavioural intention measure among sport spectators, and Groza, Pronschinske and Walker’s (2011) consumer behavioural intention measure relating to organisation CSR. A 7-point semantic differential scale consisting of four intention items was used to address this question. Table 7.11 shows the items used to measure match attendance intention.

Table 7.11: Match attendance intention measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to attend</td>
<td>Trail, Fink &amp; Anderson (2003)</td>
<td>Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matches</td>
<td></td>
<td>McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of attending Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker</td>
<td>Cricket Team games in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td>Unlikely/likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker</td>
<td>Improbable/probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td>Impossible/possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Pronschinske &amp; Walker</td>
<td>Uncertain/certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WOM intention

WOM often plays an important role in new consumer acquisition (Anderson 1998; Zeithaml, Berry & Parasuraman 1996). Positive WOM illustrates the favourable spreading of communication about a firm by a satisfied customer (Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010); in contrast, unfavourable WOM depicts a dissatisfied customer. Thus, it is an important outcome associated with social alliance participation. In this study, WOM was measured at the sports team and NPO level, incorporating two items each from Lacey and Kennett-Hensel (2010) (CR = 0.79) and Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1996) ($\alpha = 0.93$). As intention to spread positive WOM about each organisation needed to be captured, item wording was altered to suit the representative organisation. The base
question was: “Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation ...” which was anchored by a 7-point Likert-scale from 1 = extremely unlikely to 7 = extremely likely. Tables 7.12 and 7.13 below highlight the items used to capture WOM intention for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation respectively.

Table 7.12: WOM intention measure (Australian Cricket Team Consumers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOM intention – sports team</td>
<td>Lacey &amp; Kennett-Hensel (2010)</td>
<td>I am willing to encourage others to attend Australian Cricket Team games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacey &amp; Kennett-Hensel (2010)</td>
<td>When the topic of sports comes up in conversation, I will be willing to go out of my way to recommend attending Australian Cricket Team games to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeithaml, Berry &amp; Parasuraman (1996)</td>
<td>I will encourage friends and relatives to support Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeithaml, Berry &amp; Parasuraman (1996)</td>
<td>I will say positive things about the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.13: WOM intention measure (McGrath Foundation Consumers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOM intention – NPO</td>
<td>Lacey &amp; Kennett-Hensel (2010)</td>
<td>I am willing to encourage others to donate to the McGrath Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacey &amp; Kennett-Hensel (2010)</td>
<td>When the topic of charities comes up in conversation, I will be willing to go out of my way to recommend donating to the McGrath Foundation to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeithaml, Berry &amp; Parasuraman (1996)</td>
<td>I will encourage friends and relatives to support the McGrath Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeithaml, Berry &amp; Parasuraman (1996)</td>
<td>I will say positive things about the McGrath Foundation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Merchandise purchasing intention**

This construct is behavioural and has been measured in this study as a consumer-related outcome directed towards the sports team. The intention to purchase merchandise construct was borrowed and adapted from Trail, Fink and Anderson’s (2003) spectator behaviour measure, and from Groza, Pronschinske and Walker’s (2011) behavioural intention constructs. The guiding question asked, “Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of purchasing Australian Cricket Team merchandise in the future?” where a 7-point
semantic differential scale was used on four corresponding items. Table 7.14 below shows the items used to measure sports team merchandise purchasing intention.

Table 7.14: Merchandise purchasing intention measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Adapted from</th>
<th>Final item in questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to purchase merchandise – sports team</td>
<td>Trail, Fink &amp; Anderson (2003)</td>
<td>Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of purchasing Australian Cricket Team merchandise in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Prongschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Unlikely/likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Prongschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Improbable/probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Prongschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Impossible/possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groza, Prongschinske &amp; Walker (2011)</td>
<td>Uncertain/certain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Pre-testing the Questionnaire

In this study, steps to pre-test the questionnaire were taken to determine any flaws or limitations in the questionnaire design, which allowed the researcher to make the required revisions prior to conducting the study. Pre-testing the questionnaire involved a panel consisting of the researcher, supervisory team, other academics, and sports team and NPO managers and staff members, to ensure the quality of the measures, wording, length and format (Kihl et al. 2014). There were 14 participants in the pre-testing stage, where slight improvements were made according to their feedback; thus ensuring face validity. Following this, the questionnaire underwent rigorous psychometric testing to ensure its reliability and validity, which will be discussed further in Section 7.5.8.
7.4 Ethical Considerations

Similar to Phase One of this study, ethical considerations were at the forefront of the data collection process. Thus, all ethical considerations adhered to Swinburne University’s Human Research Ethics Committee (S UhREC) code of conduct for human research. An ethics application for Phase Two was lodged with SUHREC in November 2016, where ethics approval was granted until August 2017. For full details of the ethics approval, see Appendix 5.

7.5 Quantitative Data Analysis Techniques

In total, 7,314 Australian Cricket Team consumers completed the questionnaire, with a response rate of 48.76%. Conversely, only 45 NPO consumers on the McGrath Foundation database (1.00%) responded. However, 492 panel data respondents indicated an association with the McGrath Foundation in the screening question, with a response rate of 22.83%.

Three steps were employed to analyse the questionnaire data collected from both sports team and NPO consumers. First, data was coded according to the responses provided by both sets of respondents; second, descriptive statistics were computed to explain the demographic characteristics of the sample; and third, to determine the antecedents to social alliance awareness and subsequent cognition, affect and conation, multivariate data analysis was used. More specifically, SEM was adopted which enabled measurement property testing and the ability to test key theoretical relationships simultaneously (Hair et al. 2014). The subsections below will review the strategies and other actions taken to analyse this research data, while a more detailed review of the analysis results will be provided in Chapter 8.

7.5.1 Data preparation

Initially, the data collection occurred via Qualtrics. Once uploaded into Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), the first step involved data cleansing (Creswell 2012). The Qualtrics program provided two benefits to the data cleansing process. First, all questions were programmed as ‘forced response’ to ensure responses were entered before moving to the next question; thus reducing the likelihood of missing data. Second, the timing associated with completing a questionnaire was
monitored. That is, if respondents took considerably less time to complete the questionnaire than expected, these responses could be deleted. Pre-testing showed that the questionnaire would take approximately 8-15 minutes to complete; therefore, any that was completed in less than eight minutes was deleted from analysis to ensure greater robustness in the results. Additionally, questionnaires that were incomplete were also removed from further analysis. For sports team consumers, 3,324 responses were removed; while 157 responses were removed from NPO consumers. Further, acquiescence response bias (Podsakoff et al. 2003), where respondents answer questions without any significant variation (e.g. continually selecting ‘strongly disagree’ for every response), was also factored in the data cleansing process. As such, 23 responses from NPO consumers and 153 responses from sports team consumers were subsequently removed from the data analysis (Menictas, Wang & Fine 2011).

**Missing data**

Due to the forced response mechanism implemented via the Qualtrics platform, where respondents had to complete a question before moving to the next one, missing data was not an issue in this study.

**Univariate and multivariate outliers**

Outliers can be defined as “observations with a unique combination of characteristics identifiable as distinctly different from the other observations” (Hair et al. 2006, p. 73). As such, the presence of outliers can potentially distort values, and render results meaningless (Peña & Prieto 2001). Outliers are characterised by unusually high or low values on a variable, or a unique combination of values over various variables that make an observation stand out from others (Hair et al. 2006). When an unusual score is detected on a single variable, this is considered a univariate outlier; whereas across variables, this is determined as a multivariate outlier (Field 2009).

To detect univariate outliers in this study, the Z-scores were calculated where the statistic was divided by the standard error. If values were greater than ±3.29, they were marked as outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell 2013). To detect multivariate outliers, the Mahalanobis D² measure was used. As contended by Hair et al. (2006, p. 75), this “… measures each observation’s distance in multidimensional space from the mean centre of all observations, providing a single value for each observation no matter how many variables are considered”. Accordingly, for large sample sizes,
scores that are 3 or 4 can be considered as possible outliers. Within this study, the standard score was set at ±3, where any values greater than this were considered outliers. In combination, there were 23 cases of outliers detected here, which were subsequently deleted.

7.5.2 Multivariate assumptions

The majority of statistical tests are reliant on particular assumptions (Meyers, Gamst & Guarino 2006). If these assumptions are violated, results may be untrustworthy, biased or corrupt (Osborne & Waters 2002; Tabachnick & Fidell 2013). These assumptions are discussed further below.

Normality of data

Hair et al. (2006) suggested that normality is an important assumption in multivariate analysis, and that if the variation from the normal distribution is too large, then all proceeding statistical tests will become invalid. However, these authors also noted that this can be dependent on the sample size, with samples of greater than 200 reducing the detrimental effect of non-normality.

In this study, normality of the data was checked through skewness and kurtosis tests. Skewness is the degree of asymmetry in a distribution (Hopkins & Weeks 1990), where positive skewness represents a distribution to the left and negative skewness reflects a distribution to the right (Hair et al. 2006). Kurtosis is often referred to as the ‘peakedness’ or ‘flatness’ of the distribution relative to normal distribution (Hair et al. 2006). Although this has been disputed by some, with another definition proposed that kurtosis “… reflects the extent to which density of observations differs from the probability densities of the normal curve” (Hopkins & Weeks 1990, p. 723).

To analyse skewness and kurtosis in this study, an initial graphical analysis of normality was conducted via SPSS using histograms and normal probability plots (Hair et al. 2006). This examination revealed normality in most constructs; although some exhibited a certain level of skewness and kurtosis. Upon further examination, the vast majority of constructs fell between the acceptable value of -2 to +2 (Field 2009; Gravetter & Wallnau 2014; Trochim & Donnelly 2006). Across the Australian Cricket Team consumer sample, the McGrath Foundation consumer sample and a combined sample consisting of both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, there were two variables where kurtosis values exceeded ±2 (see Appendix 7). While
these values fell beyond the recommended limit, it can be affirmed that using the maximum likelihood (ML) estimation method for further analysis remains acceptable in cases of slight or moderate departures from normality (Reisinger & Mavondo 2007). Therefore, in this study, these instances of departure from normality were not considered problematic.

**Linearity**
Within many multivariate data analysis techniques, there is an assumption that variables in the analysis are linearly related (Meyers, Gamst & Guarino 2006). As stipulated by Hair et al. (2006), because correlations are representative of linear relationships, nonlinear variables will not represent correlation value. That is, if the association between the independent variable and dependent variable is not linear, the true relationship could be underestimated (Osborne & Waters 2002). To assess linearity in this study, scatterplots were examined to identify nonlinear patterns in the data using SPSS. No nonlinear relationships were detected via this technique.

**7.5.3 Structural equation modelling (SEM)**

To offset the limitations associated with particular multivariate techniques, namely the inability to examine more than one single variable at a time, this study used SEM as the principal data analysis approach. This is because SEM enables the researcher to test an “... entire theory with a technique that considers all possible information” (Hair et al. 2006, p. 705). Of particular note is SEM’s ability to test the conceptual model that contains dependence relationships, where a dependent variable can become an independent variable (Hair et al. 2006). Additionally, SEM tests validity of measures and theory plausibility simultaneously (Chin 1998). This is significant, as separating theory and measurement can result in incorrect measurement, explanations and predictions (Lowry & Gaskin 2014). Lastly, SEM has the ability to take random and systematic error into account (Mackenzie 2001).

However, there are limitations that have also been attributed to SEM. These include susceptibility to incorrect researcher interpretation (Jeon 2015), potential confirmation bias (MacCallum & Austin 2000), and a reliance on sufficient sample size (Jeon 2015). Yet despite such limitations, SEM was deemed as well-suited for data analysis in this study, given the sequence of events associated with the conceptual model where complex variable relationships were examined.
7.5.4 Two-step SEM approach

To conduct SEM, this study adopted the two-step approach recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), which incorporates both the measurement and structural latent variable models. The measurement model indicates the relationship of the observed variables to their underlying constructs, while the structural model interprets causal inferences of the constructs to each other (Anderson & Gerbing 1988). Further, as stipulated by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), the measurement model assesses convergent and discriminant validity, while the structural model assesses predictive validity. To perform the two-step SEM approach, data were analysed using the statistical software package Mplus (Version 8).

7.5.5 Model evaluation – assessing model fit

As part of SEM, various fit indices are often produced. When model fit indices are considered acceptable, the hypothesised measurement model has been supported by the sample data (Schumacker & Lomax 2010). There are various categories of model fit indices including absolute, relative, parsimony and noncentrality (Maruyama 1998). Absolute, relative and noncentrality fit indices will be presented next, as they account for those used in this study.

Absolute fit indices demonstrate the extent that the whole model provides an acceptable fit to the data, and exclude comparisons between an alternative and original model. Absolute model fit indices include chi-square ($\chi^2$) index, goodness of fit index (GFI) and standardised root mean square residual (SRMR) (Reisinger & Mavondo 2007). In contrast, relative fit indices compare the incremental fit of the model tested to a null model, and can include Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and normed fit index (NFI). Noncentrality fit indices test the extent of rejection of an incorrect model (Reisinger & Mavondo 2007), and can incorporate comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), relative noncentrality index (RNI) and McDonald's centrality index (MCI).

Mplus produced various fit indices, including absolute fit indices ($\chi^2$ and SRMR), relative fit indices (TLI) and noncentrality fit indices (CFI and RMSEA); these therefore provided the different model evaluation for this study and are detailed below.
Absolute fit indices
According to Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger and Müller (2003), the probability value of $\chi^2$ should be between 0.05 and 1.00. However, a $\chi^2$ index is sensitive to large sample sizes (Bagozzi 1981; Bentler & Bonett 1980). As such, the normed $\chi^2$ is often used, which is determined by dividing the $\chi^2$ value by degrees of freedom (d.f.) (Bentler & Bonnet 1980). According to Byrne (2012), a well-fitting model should have a $\chi^2$/d.f. between 1.0 and 2.0; although Byrne (2012) contended that a value between 2.0 and 3.0 indicates a reasonable fit.

In relation to the second absolute fit index used in this study, SRMR values for an appropriately fitting model should be less than 0.05 (Byrne 2012), although values up to 0.08 are also considered acceptable (Hu & Bentler 1999).

Relative fit indices
TLI values of close to or greater than 0.90 (Hair et al. 2006) are considered a good fit; although a value greater or equal to 0.95 is often considered a more suitable fit (Byrne 2012).

Noncentrality fit indices
An RMSEA value of less than 0.05 is considered a good fit, but this can extend up to 0.08 to be considered a more reasonable fit (Hair et al. 2006; Kline 2010). CFI values of close to or greater than 0.90 (Hair et al. 2006) are considered a good fit; although a value greater or equal to 0.95 is considered a more suitable fit (Byrne 2012).

Summary of model fit indices used in this study
There is no agreement on what fit indices should be used for model evaluation (Reisinger & Mavondo 2007). Thus, evidence of model fit in this study was developed through the triangulated findings from the various model fit output produced by Mplus (Hu & Bentler 1999). Table 7.15 below summarises the model fit indices criteria used in this study.
### Table 7.15: Model fit indices criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Acceptance criterion</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>Probability level (p) &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger &amp; Müller (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Chi-square ($\chi^2$/d.f.)</td>
<td>Between 1.00-2.00 good fit; Between 2.00-3.00 reasonable fit</td>
<td>Byrne (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised root mean square residual (SRMR)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05 up to 0.08</td>
<td>Byrne (2012); Hu &amp; Bentler (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>&lt;0.05 good fit; up to &lt;0.08 reasonable fit</td>
<td>Hair et al. (2006); Kline (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative fit index (CFI)</td>
<td>Close to or &gt; 0.90 good fit; ≥ 0.95 better fit</td>
<td>Hair et al. (2006); Byrne (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker-Lewis index (TLI)</td>
<td>Close to or &gt; 0.90 good fit; ≥ 0.95 better fit</td>
<td>Hair et al. (2006); Byrne (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.5.6 Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)

Given the nature of this study where relevant theory did not sufficiently capture consumer behaviour in relation to social alliances, and the fact that there were some newly developed items gathered from Phase One, it was necessary to conduct EFA. The role of EFA is to reduce those items that do not represent the factor, to develop a smaller, more meaningful set (Hair et al. 2006). In cases where theory inadequately details the relationship of indicators to an underlying construct, EFA is particularly pertinent (Gerbing & Anderson 1988). Hurley et al. (1997) highlighted that conducting an EFA prior to CFA is useful in scale evaluation. Further, EFA enables item analysis by evaluating how they relate to the construct and associated constructs, where the ideal result is the items measuring the construct are scored together to constitute that construct (Gorsuch 1997).

Within this study, EFA was conducted using SPSS, with factor interpretation determined via the direct oblimin rotation method. This is a type of oblique factor rotation that allows a certain correlation between factors, and identifies the extent that each factor is correlated (Hair et al. 2006). The orthogonal rotation method is more commonly used for this purpose; although it has been suggested that producing uncorrelated factors this way does not adequately represent the complexity in human behaviour. The alternative oblique factor rotation method enables a more accurate solution (Costello & Osborne 2005). In this study, the correlations in the correlation matrix...
were set at 0.30. If any factor loadings fell below this figure, then the item was deleted. This aligns
with Hair et al. (2006) who suggested that ±0.3 is minimally acceptable, and is representative of
approximately 10% of the variable’s total variance accounted for by the factor. In this research, no
factor loadings fell below ±0.3.

To analyse the factor structure in this study, as is commonly practised in marketing research (e.g.
Braunstein & Ross 2010), and in accordance with Bollen (1989) and Byrne (2012), the sample for
each consumer group was randomly split into two equal halves, with the first half used to conduct
EFA and the second for CFA. The justification for splitting each sample for EFA and CFA testing was
to ensure that the findings from one did not influence the other; thereby preventing any data
interference (Bollen 1989). The samples were split using the SPSS random sample function.

7.5.7 Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

There are two reasons for validating the measurement model via CFA. First, it examines the items
measuring each construct; and second, it evaluates the measurement properties including reliability
and validity of each construct via factor analysis (Hair et al. 2006; Schumacker & Lomax 2012).
Measurement models are tested as a means of gauging whether insufficient fit can be attributed to
measurement alone. In this study, the measurement model indicated that the latent variables were
“measured well” (Shumacker & Lomax 2012, p. 83). To estimate this model, the ML method was
adopted, which is widely used (Tabachnick & Fidell 2013) and is more efficient when the normality
assumption is met (Hair et al. 2014).

Measurement model testing via CFA is generally adopted to statistically confirm a pre-determined
relationship and to test whether data fits a theoretically proposed model (Hair et al. 2014). CFA
involves a postulated relationship between the observed measures and underlying factors
developed a priori, and then the hypothesised structure is statistically tested (Byrne 2012).

Given that this study analysed the reactions of two different consumer groups towards both
organisations in a social alliance, a number of steps were employed to confirm the unidimensionality
of the constructs, and to account for reliability and fit of the measurement model (Schumacker &
Lomax 2010). First, using the second-half split sample for each group after randomly splitting the
sample into two equal halves, one-factor congeneric model testing was conducted on each construct that comprised of combined and/or newly developed scales. Second, one-factor congeneric model testing was conducted on constructs that consisted only of previously established scales for each sample. Third, one-factor congeneric model testing was conducted on all factors using a combined sample of Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers. Lastly, a full CFA was conducted on a whole dataset for each consumer group separately, and then on a combined sample of Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers.

To assess the measurement models, the various model fit indices mentioned earlier in Table 7.15 and widely used in previous research were adopted, to check whether the data collected fit the measurement model.

7.5.8 Reliability and validity

Strong psychometric measures such as well-scoring reliability and validity are essential to SEM (Kline 2010). In SEM, reliability refers to the extent that latent construct indicators are free from error (Peter 1979) and consistent in their measurements (Hair et al. 2006; Schumacker & Lomax 2012). Thus, the more a scale represents the true score of a variable, the less it reflects other extraneous factors; thereby proving the reliability of the scale (DeVellis 2012). Hence, as reliability scores decrease, their indicators are less consistent and they become a poor representation of the construct (Hair et al. 2006). Importantly, reliability measures are necessary for validity (Peter 1979), which refers to whether a set of indicators accurately measures the concept it is supposed to measure (Bryman 2016). Various tests were conducted in this study to measure both the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, and these processes are discussed further below.

Cronbach’s alpha (α)

Coefficient alpha was developed by Cronbach (1951) as a measure of internal consistency of multiple-itemed scales (Peterson 1994). Cronbach’s α coefficient is measured between 0 and 1 (Hair et al. 2006), where a scale’s variance can be attributed to a true score of a latent variable (DeVellis 2012). That is, α “… takes into account variance attributable to subjects and variance attributable to the interaction between subjects and items” (Cortina 1993, p. 98). However, there is contention surrounding the adequate level of Cronbach’s α (Schmitt 1996). For example, Hair et al. (2006)
stated that a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ value of 0.60 to 0.70 is considered at the lower level of acceptability, while DeVellis (2012) defined an $\alpha$ score between 0.65 and 0.70 as minimally acceptable, between 0.70 and 0.80 as respectable, and between 0.80 and 0.90 as very good. While Cronbach’s $\alpha$ has been widely used (Peter 1979; Peterson 1994), perceiving it as the only measure of reliability has been deemed insufficient (Schmitt 1996); thus leading to the inclusion of CR.

**Construct reliability (CR)**

This second reliability measure was adopted in this study to offset the limitation of Cronbach’s $\alpha$. When reliability is estimated through SEM, this is referred to as ‘construct reliability’ (Peterson & Kim 2013). Consequently, it has been considered a truer reliability score because the construct loadings are able to vary (Peterson & Kim 2013). A CR threshold value of 0.60 was recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981), while Hair et al. (2014) suggested a value for each construct should be 0.70 or higher. Furthermore, CR must be established before construct validity can be measured.

**Content validity**

According to Bryman (2016), content validity (also known as ‘face validity’) is the most basic requirement of validity. Essentially, content validity is an intuitive process where the content of a question accurately reflects the concept it is meant to measure (Bryman 2016). Thus, content validity is based on expert opinion rather than statistical analysis (Kline 2010). In this study, content validity tests occurred during the pre-testing phase, where 14 respondents including industry professionals provided feedback on the accuracy of measures.

**Construct validity**

Construct validity has been defined as “... the extent to which a set of measured items actually reflects the theoretical latent construct those items are designed to measure” (Hair et al. 2006, p. 776). To assess construct validity, convergent and discriminant validity have been recommended (Fornell & Larcker 1981). Convergent validity is “the degree to which two or more attempts to measure the same concept though maximally dissimilar methods are in agreement” (Bagozzi & Phillips 1982, p. 468). That is, measures that theoretically should be related are actually related. In this study, convergent validity was achieved via CFA where items loaded significantly on their corresponding constructs. In contrast, discriminant validity is the extent that measures do not correlate highly with other measures where they should differ (Peter 1981). To assess discriminant
validity in this study, an average variance extracted (AVE) measure was used. This involved summing all squared standardised factor loadings and dividing them by the number of items (Hair et al. 2014). Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggested that discriminate validity is achieved if the recorded AVE of a construct is higher than the highest squared correlation with any other construct.

In this study, CR measures were considered acceptable if they exceeded 0.70 as suggested by Hair et al. (2014), and if AVE values were greater than 0.50 as suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

7.5.9 Structural model

The second step in SEM involves analysing the structural model (Anderson & Gerbing 1988). According to Hair et al. (2006, p. 583), the structural model is “the set of one or more dependence relationships linking the hypothesised model’s constructs”. That is, it determines the relationship between the latent variables, and provides indication of the extent that theoretically hypothesised relationships are supported by the sample data (Shumacker & Lomax 2010). In this study, structural model testing was conducted using the ML estimation method on a whole dataset with the two samples combined.

7.6 Post-hoc Multigroup Analysis Procedure

A critical component of this study was to analyse the moderating effect of the associated consumer groups, which is why multigroup analysis was conducted. Multigroup analysis consists of two principal elements: measurement invariance (Vandenbussche & Lance 2000); and multigroup testing (Byrne 2012; Wang & Wang 2012). When comparing such groups, the psychometric properties of a research instrument need to translate and be administered across these groups (Milfont & Fischer 2010; Sass & Schmitt 2013). Measurement invariance is therefore the first component of multigroup analysis, followed by multigroup testing which examines the hypothesised relationship between variables.

To test for measurement invariance in this study, a multigroup CFA was used (Steenkamp & Baumgartner 1998) where the theoretical model was compared with the observed structure across the two samples (Milfont & Fischer 2010). This strategy typically involves the development of
sequential nested models by adding parameter constraints on each model (Milfont & Fischer 2010) and by analysing model fit indices on these restrictive models (Byrne 2012; Steenkamp & Baumgartner 1998; Vandenberg & Lance 2000), with a specific focus on the $\chi^2$ difference. This study followed the commonly used approach of testing individual group models: configural invariance, metric invariance and scalar invariance in testing for measurement invariance. Configural invariance, which incorporates the baseline model for further testing, examines whether factors consist of the same items across groups (Byrne 2012; Wang & Wang 2012). If invariance is not achieved at this stage, this indicates that the constructs are measured by different items across the groups (Wang & Wang 2012). Metric invariance tests whether factor loadings are interpreted the same way across groups (Milfont & Fischer 2010). If invariance is achieved, this indicates that latent variables are interpreted the same way (Wang & Wang 2012). Scalar invariance tests the invariance of latent means; that is, whether observed scores are related to latent scores across groups (Milfont & Fisher 2010). If there is variance across the groups, this indicates that respondents either respond systematically higher or lower to the items in one group.

Following this, multigroup testing estimates a structural model with measurement invariance across groups. To achieve this, the first step is to develop a baseline or unconstrained model where structural coefficients are not constrained to be equal across the groups (Sass & Schmitt 2013); where fit indices also dictate the appropriateness of the model. Once a baseline model is established, adding constraints on all the structural weights enables an assessment of change-in-model fit (Lin, Lobo & Leckie 2017). Using the $\chi^2$ difference test, one can conclude whether structural coefficients are equal across groups (Sass & Schmitt 2013).

To conduct the various stages of the post-hoc multigroup analysis outlined above, including the different components comprising measurement and multigroup testing, Mplus (Version 8) was used in this study.
7.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the methodology used to answer sub-RQ three and four. Specifically, it used the web-based questionnaire program Qualtrics to collect data from McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team consumers, with both organisations sending an email link containing the questionnaire to consumers on their respective databases. This was deemed the most appropriate way to reach associated consumers from each organisation.

In the two questionnaires that were developed, each contained similar wording to ensure comparability among the groups. The different variables used in the questionnaires were developed _a priori_ and following qualitative interviews of industry professionals in Phase One of this study. As such, most items were adapted from established scales in the extant literature, while some were newly developed. Scale adoption was based on measurements that had proven reliability (Hair et al. 2014).

This chapter also discussed the various quality control steps that were taken to ensure that any flaws in the questionnaire were minimised. This included 14 participants in the pre-testing panel that previewed the questionnaire and provided feedback, with revisions then made prior to sending the questionnaire to respondents.

To send the questionnaire link, a probability, simple random sample of associated consumers from each organisation were recruited for participation, as this portion of the study examined consumer behaviour related to an established social alliance. In total, the questionnaire was sent to 15,000 Australian Cricket Team consumers, 4,500 McGrath Foundation consumers, and 2,155 panel data members.

The data analysis discussion in this chapter highlighted the process used to analyse the data, including the statistical tools adopted to ensure research rigour. SEM was used as the principal data analysis technique, as it allows both measurement property and theoretical relationship testing simultaneously. Although as a first step EFA was conducted using SPSS, as some measures were previously untested, where factor interpretation was determined via the direct oblimin rotation method. To conduct SEM, this study adopted the two-step approach recommended by Anderson.
and Gerbing (1988), where a measurement model and structural model were tested. Measurement model testing was performed through one-factor congeneric testing and full CFA across the two samples and on a combined sample. The discussion on the structural model testing highlighted the procedure used to test the hypotheses. Strong psychometric testing including Cronbach’s α, CR, content validity and construct validity via convergent and discriminant validity were also discussed, which were performed using Mplus.

Lastly, this chapter discussed the multigroup procedure used in this study to compare the reactions to a social alliance among the two different associated consumer groups. This included a discussion on measurement invariance testing via a multigroup CFA and subsequent multigroup testing to test the multigroup hypotheses. Other topics covered in this chapter included data preparation processes, multivariate assumptions and model fit indices.
“Contrary to certain economists who preached that the business of business was business, we came to believe that the obligation of businesses was social responsibility for their employees, their stakeholders, their shareholders, their local community and the greater community.” (David Stern, Commission, NBA Commissioner)
8.0 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results for Phase Two of this study. The chapter begins by presenting the descriptive statistics and sample size in Section 8.1. Next, Section 8.2 presents a summary of the primary data analysis procedure. Section 8.3 then discusses the results relating to social alliance partner recognition as a component of social alliance awareness. Section 8.4 next discusses the results of the EFA, while Section 8.5 presents the results of the CFA. Following this, Section 8.6 presents the results of the overall CFA for each consumer group as well as a combined sample. Section 8.7 presents the measurement invariance results for the initial phase of the multigroup analysis. The next Section 8.8 provides the results of the structural model testing, which is followed by Section 8.9 which presents the results of the post-hoc multigroup analysis. Lastly, a summary of the chapter is provided in Section 8.10. Figure 8.0 depicts a roadmap of the contents of this chapter.
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8.1 Sample Size and Descriptive Statistics

Overall response rates to the questionnaire varied considerably among the two consumer groups. A total of 7,314 Australian Cricket Team consumers responded to the questionnaire with a response rate of 48.76%, while only 45 McGrath Foundation consumers responded. Panel data was subsequently used to substitute the McGrath Foundation consumer sample, where 492 (22.83%) panel data respondents indicated an association with the McGrath Foundation. Following the various steps in the data cleansing process, it was determined that 3,832 questionnaires from Australian Cricket Team consumers and 355 from McGrath Foundation consumers were deemed acceptable for further analyses. However, the disproportionate sample sizes were still considered problematic for additional quantitative comparative data analysis. Therefore, a reduction in the Australian Cricket Team consumer sample size was required for further multigroup analysis.

Multigroup analysis was used to determine the differences in reactions among the two consumer groups towards the two organisations in the social alliance. While unequal sample sizes for multigroup analysis is not uncommon (Robertson et al. 2016), nor an issue (Byrne 1989), ratio of sample size has been found to impact fit indices at the various levels of invariance testing (Chen 2007). Hence, with such disparity in usable responses across the two groups, the number of Australian Cricket Team consumer responses was reduced to appropriately compare responses. This procedure involved randomly selecting cases matched on age and gender, to ensure there was no significant difference (p>0.05) among the two consumer groups for each age and gender category (Robertson et al. 2016). Following this process, 504 Australian Cricket Team and 355 McGrath Foundation consumer responses were used for further analysis, and the descriptive statistics for each group is summarised in Table 8.0.
Table 8.0: Sample size and descriptive statistics for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ACT consumer original sample</th>
<th>ACT consumer revised sample</th>
<th>MF consumer original sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>76.40</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under $30,000</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$59,999</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$69,999</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$79,999</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000-$89,999</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000-$99,999</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 +</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: n=3,832, n=504, n=355

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation
8.2 Summary of Quantitative Data Analysis Procedure

Various steps were employed to analyse the data for the quantitative phase of this study, as detailed in Chapter 7 and summarised in Figure 8.1 below.

**Figure 8.1: Summary of quantitative data analysis procedure**

![Diagram](image)

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

As depicted in Figure 8.1, the data analysis process incorporated multiple steps to ensure measurement rigour. As a first step, an EFA was conducted on a split sample of each group as a preliminary examination of scale construction. To test for unidimensionality of the factors following EFA, one-factor congeneric model testing was conducted on factors that consisted of combined
scales from previous research and/or newly developed scales using the second-half split sample. The purpose of splitting the sample was to ensure non-interference of findings through the EFA and subsequent CFA process (Bollen 1989). As a second step of unidimensionality, one-factor congeneric model testing was performed only on factors that incorporated previously established scales on a full sample of each group. As an additional step in ensuring adequate measurement properties, one-factor congeneric model testing was conducted on all factors using a combined sample. In accordance with Hair et al. (2014), problematic items identified through each stage of this process were removed based on statistical and theoretical justification.

Following the three phases of one-factor congeneric model testing, an overall CFA incorporating all factors was conducted for each consumer group separately, and then on a combined sample of both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers to depict whether the model fitted the sample data sufficiently. This thereby ensured the achievement of construct validity.

Following the overall CFA process, the consumer behaviour comparison for McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team consumer groups incorporated three steps of measurement invariance as a means of analysing the adequacy of the psychometric properties across the two groups: 1) configural invariance; 2) metric invariance; and 3) scalar invariance.

Lastly, to test the various hypotheses as outlined in chapter six, a structural model was conducted on a combined sample as an initial step for testing the consumer reaction to social alliances in this study. Further, multigroup testing was subsequently performed to address the multigroup hypotheses comparing the reaction to social alliances of the two associated consumer groups.

To conduct EFA and subsequent CFA, constructs and items were accordingly coded for analysis using SPSS and Mplus. Table 8.1 displays the construct and item codes, as well as their corresponding questionnaire item number.
The results of the various steps included in the data analysis process will be presented in the sections below, but first a discussion of the recognition results via aided recall is presented.

### 8.3 Social Alliance Partner Recognition Results

Recalling that the first question in the questionnaire was an awareness-recognition-based question asking respondents to select the social alliance partner associated with their aligned organisation, respondents had five options to choose from. For Australian Cricket Team consumers, recognition of the social alliance partner was high, with 95.15% of respondents recognising the McGrath Foundation. The McGrath Foundation consumers also had relatively high recognition of its sporting social alliance partner, with 68.92% of respondents highlighting Australian Cricket Team.

### 8.4 EFA Results

As part of the scale evaluation process, EFA was run on all constructs across the two consumer groups. Following research convention, samples were randomly split into approximately equal size for each group, with EFA run on one dataset and CFA on the alternate dataset. EFA was therefore conducted on an Australian Cricket Team consumer sample of n=252 respondents and a McGrath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct name</th>
<th>Construct code</th>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Questionnaire item number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antecedents to awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer identification</td>
<td>IDT</td>
<td>IDT_1 to 6</td>
<td>11-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer trust</td>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>TRU_1 to 5</td>
<td>17-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media engagement</td>
<td>SocM</td>
<td>SocM_1 to 8</td>
<td>25-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hierarchy-of-Effects sequence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social alliance awareness</td>
<td>AWA</td>
<td>AWA_1 to 4</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of social alliance partner</td>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td>KNOW_1 to 5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social alliance attitudes</td>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>ATT_1 to 5</td>
<td>33-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation intention</td>
<td>DON</td>
<td>DON_1 to 3</td>
<td>38-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase team association intention</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>TAS_1 to 4</td>
<td>41-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match attendance intention</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>MAT_1 to 4</td>
<td>45-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth sports team intention</td>
<td>WOMST</td>
<td>WOMST_1 to 4</td>
<td>49-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise purchasing intention</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>MP_1 to 4</td>
<td>53-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth not-for-profit</td>
<td>WOMNPO</td>
<td>WOMNPO_1 to 4</td>
<td>57-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisation intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foundation consumer sample of n=178 respondents. In both instances, EFA was performed using SPSS, where factor interpretation was determined through the direct oblimin rotation method, and item correlations were expected to be >0.300.

As an initial step to EFA to test factor analysis suitability, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity and Kaiser Meyer-Olkin (KMO) scores were calculated. A KMO score above 0.6 is considered the minimum acceptable score (Hair et al. 2014), while the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity should be significant ($p < 0.05$) (Tabachnick & Fidell 2013). Results of the EFA are presented in Appendix 6.

### 8.5 CFA Results

Various steps were employed in this study as part of the CFA process to further ensure measurement rigour. The first step was to confirm the factor structure of the constructs containing a combination of established scales and/or newly developed scales using the second-half split sample (ACT n=252; MF n=177). These factors were: TRU, SocM, AWA, ATT, TAS, MAT, WOMST, MP, and WOMNPO.

The second step consisted of one-factor congeneric model testing on factors that consisted only of original measures using the full dataset from each group (ACT n=504; MF n=355). These were: 1) IDT, which was solely adapted from Mael and Ashforth (1992); 2) KNOW, which comprised of Flynn and Goldsmith’s (1999) subjective knowledge measure; and 3) DON, which was borrowed from the intention to donate scale developed by Ranganathan and Henley (2008). The rationale for this was to further identify unidimensionality and construct validity (Hair et al. 2014) of already established constructs within the datasets across the two groups.

The third step incorporated one-factor congeneric model testing on all factors using a combined sample (n=859) to test for construct unidimensionality and validity as a precursor for measuring and comparing consumer reactions to the social alliance among the two consumer groups.

Model fit indices $\chi^2$, $\chi^2$/d.f., RMSEA, CFI, TLI and SRMR, as described in Chapter 7 and summarised below in Table 8.2, were used to indicate whether the data appropriately fit the measurement
model. Additionally, standardised regression weights, modification indices (MI) and the content of the items were used to provide justification of item removal, if required.

Table 8.2: Model fit indices criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Acceptance criterion</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>Probability level ($p$) &gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger &amp; Müller (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Chi-square ($\chi^2$/d.f.)</td>
<td>Between 1.00 and 2.00 good fit;</td>
<td>Byrne (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between 2.00 and 3.00 reasonable fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised root mean square residual (SRMR)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05 up to 0.08</td>
<td>Byrne (2012); Hu &amp; Bentler (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>&lt;0.05 good fit; up to &lt;0.08 reasonable fit</td>
<td>Hair et al. (2006); Kline (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative fit index (CFI)</td>
<td>Close to or &gt; 0.90 good fit; ≥ 0.95 better fit</td>
<td>Hair et al. (2006); Byrne (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker-Lewis index (TLI)</td>
<td>Close to or &gt; 0.90 good fit; ≥ 0.95 better fit</td>
<td>Hair et al. (2006); Byrne (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the outcomes across each stage of the one-factor congeneric model testing is provided in the subsection below. See Appendix 8 for the full results and corresponding data analysis procedures across the three stages of this testing.

8.5.1 One-factor congeneric model testing – summary of outcomes

Following the first stage of one-factor congeneric model testing using the second-half split sample (ACT $n=252$; MF $n=177$), nine items in total were removed from further analysis. The deletion of these items were based on both how the deletion impacted the operationalisation and meaning of the construct and statistical modification (Hair et al. 2014). These items were TRU_3, SocM_3, SocM_4, SocM_6, SocM_8, ATT_4, TAS_4, MAT_4 and MP_4. To ensure the remaining items were common across the two groups, these problematic items were dropped from further analysis for both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumer datasets.
The second stage of the one-factor congeneric model testing resulted in the removal of three additional items from further analysis. These were IDT_4, IDT_5 and KNOW_3. These items were removed for both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumer datasets.

After conducting the final one-factor congeneric model testing on all constructs across the combined sample, one additional item, AWA_1 was dropped from further analysis for both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumer datasets.

### 8.5.2 Common method variance

When measuring the relationship between variables using the same method, it is possible that the research is susceptible to common method variance (CMV) (Spector 2006). Accordingly, CMV relates more to the method of measurement than the constructs the measures represent, and can be one of the principal causes of measurement error (Podsakoff et al. 2003). There are primarily four sources of CMV as identified by Podsakoff et al. (2003): 1) common rater effects which is caused by the respondent, as the same person, providing the measure between relationship variables; 2) item characteristic effects which relates to the interpretation by a respondent of an item due to the properties of that item; 3) item context effects which refers to the interpretation of an item due to its relation to other items making up the instrument; and 4) measurement context effects which includes spurious covariance caused by the context in which the measures were obtained.

Various techniques were use in this study to reduce CMV. First, items measuring the constructs were worded appropriately to reduce ambiguity (Podsakoff et al. 2003; Spector 2006). Second, when administering the questionnaire, respondents were informed of their anonymity and the confidentiality of their responses in the RIS that was provided (Robertson et al. 2016). The RIS also informed respondents that there were no correct or incorrect responses and to answer as honestly as they could (Robertson et al. 2016). Third, the most common statistical test, Harman’s single-factor test (Malhotra, Kim & Patil 2006), was used where CMV was calculated in SPSS. Results from this test showed that the single factor explained less than 50% of the total variance (Podsakoff & Organ 1986). Thus, it can be concluded that the association between variables was not affected by CMV in this study.
8.6 Overall CFA

The previous section discussed the steps used to refine the measurement of the multi-item constructs, where unidimensionality was tested via three stages of one-factor congeneric model testing. Following this portion of data analysis, an overall CFA was conducted on all multi-item latent constructs for each consumer group’s dataset and on a combined sample. As done previously, this was performed using Mplus data analysis software with ML estimation. Table 8.3 below demonstrates that adequate model fit for the data across the two consumer groups and combined sample was achieved.

Table 8.3: Model fit indices – overall CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/d.f.</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>1371.738</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1329.402</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>1589.904</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>2.002</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation; ACT n=504; MF n=355; combined n=859

Table 8.4 next depicts the correlation matrix for Australian Cricket Team consumers, as well as the means of each multi-item latent construct, standard deviation (SD) and square root of the AVE to indicate discriminant validity. Table 8.5 then presents the correlation matrix for McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the mean, SD and square root AVE. Lastly, Table 8.6 provides the correlation matrix for the combined sample, as well as the mean, SD and square root AVE.
Table 8.4: Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix – Australian Cricket Team consumers (n=504)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AWA</td>
<td>5.773</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. KNOW</td>
<td>4.365</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>0.457**</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IDT</td>
<td>3.878</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>0.165**</td>
<td>0.341**</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TRU</td>
<td>5.097</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>0.217**</td>
<td>0.233**</td>
<td>0.451**</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SocM</td>
<td>3.904</td>
<td>1.886</td>
<td>0.153**</td>
<td>0.168**</td>
<td>0.302**</td>
<td>0.234**</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ATT</td>
<td>6.390</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.342**</td>
<td>0.266**</td>
<td>0.152**</td>
<td>0.322**</td>
<td>0.123**</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DON</td>
<td>4.959</td>
<td>1.536</td>
<td>0.342**</td>
<td>0.321**</td>
<td>0.208**</td>
<td>0.238**</td>
<td>0.185**</td>
<td>0.396**</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TAS</td>
<td>4.843</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>0.252**</td>
<td>0.294**</td>
<td>0.357**</td>
<td>0.368**</td>
<td>0.285**</td>
<td>0.467**</td>
<td>0.467**</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MAT</td>
<td>5.169</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>0.198**</td>
<td>0.251**</td>
<td>0.269**</td>
<td>0.320**</td>
<td>0.187**</td>
<td>0.342**</td>
<td>0.398**</td>
<td>0.540**</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WOMST</td>
<td>4.914</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>0.290**</td>
<td>0.303**</td>
<td>0.453**</td>
<td>0.475**</td>
<td>0.318**</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>0.397**</td>
<td>0.521**</td>
<td>0.591**</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MP</td>
<td>4.212</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>0.206**</td>
<td>0.248**</td>
<td>0.363**</td>
<td>0.328**</td>
<td>0.270**</td>
<td>0.264**</td>
<td>0.417**</td>
<td>0.562**</td>
<td>0.493**</td>
<td>0.489**</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. WOMNPO</td>
<td>4.705</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>0.303**</td>
<td>0.405**</td>
<td>0.380**</td>
<td>0.308**</td>
<td>0.323**</td>
<td>0.432**</td>
<td>0.593**</td>
<td>0.493**</td>
<td>0.502**</td>
<td>0.642**</td>
<td>0.424**</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations are significant at **p<0.010 (two-tailed), *p<0.050 (two-tailed), ns not significant. Diagonal elements are square root of AVE (bolded).
Table 8.5: Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix – McGrath Foundation consumers (n=355)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AWA</td>
<td>5.763</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. KNOW</td>
<td>5.059</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.530**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IDT</td>
<td>5.021</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.401**</td>
<td>0.594**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TRU</td>
<td>6.028</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.554**</td>
<td>0.273**</td>
<td>0.381**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SocM</td>
<td>4.747</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.414**</td>
<td>0.568**</td>
<td>0.683**</td>
<td>0.252**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ATT</td>
<td>6.158</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.311**</td>
<td>0.380**</td>
<td>0.101**</td>
<td>0.479**</td>
<td>0.010**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DON</td>
<td>5.662</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.415**</td>
<td>0.380**</td>
<td>0.426**</td>
<td>0.464**</td>
<td>0.384**</td>
<td>0.317**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TAS</td>
<td>5.353</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.298**</td>
<td>0.556**</td>
<td>0.493**</td>
<td>0.282**</td>
<td>0.545**</td>
<td>0.394**</td>
<td>0.457**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MAT</td>
<td>5.192</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.346**</td>
<td>0.593**</td>
<td>0.494**</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.610**</td>
<td>0.289**</td>
<td>0.406**</td>
<td>0.760**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WOMST</td>
<td>5.316</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.419**</td>
<td>0.602**</td>
<td>0.689**</td>
<td>0.361**</td>
<td>0.676**</td>
<td>0.203**</td>
<td>0.491**</td>
<td>0.620**</td>
<td>0.656**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MP</td>
<td>5.015</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.275**</td>
<td>0.559**</td>
<td>0.579**</td>
<td>0.183**</td>
<td>0.621**</td>
<td>0.217**</td>
<td>0.428**</td>
<td>0.724**</td>
<td>0.769**</td>
<td>0.666**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. WOMNPO</td>
<td>5.525</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.457**</td>
<td>0.431**</td>
<td>0.676**</td>
<td>0.522**</td>
<td>0.591**</td>
<td>0.293**</td>
<td>0.550**</td>
<td>0.503**</td>
<td>0.475**</td>
<td>0.674**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations are significant at **p<0.010 (two-tailed), *p<0.050 (two-tailed), ns not significant. Diagonal elements are square root of AVE (bolded).
Table 8.6: Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix – combined sample (n=859)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AWA</td>
<td>5.769</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. KNOW</td>
<td>4.652</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>0.465*</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IDT</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>0.234**</td>
<td>0.506**</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TRU</td>
<td>5.482</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.293**</td>
<td>0.316**</td>
<td>0.515**</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SocM</td>
<td>4.252</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>0.240**</td>
<td>0.378**</td>
<td>0.496**</td>
<td>0.304**</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ATT</td>
<td>6.293</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.326**</td>
<td>0.121**</td>
<td>0.072*</td>
<td>0.289**</td>
<td>0.047*</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DON</td>
<td>5.246</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>0.351**</td>
<td>0.373**</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>0.367**</td>
<td>0.287**</td>
<td>0.319**</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TAS</td>
<td>5.054</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>0.265**</td>
<td>0.430**</td>
<td>0.437**</td>
<td>0.369**</td>
<td>0.406**</td>
<td>0.408**</td>
<td>0.479**</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MAT</td>
<td>5.179</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>0.255**</td>
<td>0.400**</td>
<td>0.340**</td>
<td>0.271**</td>
<td>0.351**</td>
<td>0.316**</td>
<td>0.382**</td>
<td>0.623**</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WOMST</td>
<td>5.080</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>0.330**</td>
<td>0.443**</td>
<td>0.551**</td>
<td>0.454**</td>
<td>0.464**</td>
<td>0.280**</td>
<td>0.442**</td>
<td>0.567**</td>
<td>0.608**</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MP</td>
<td>4.544</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>0.226**</td>
<td>0.429**</td>
<td>0.498**</td>
<td>0.332**</td>
<td>0.443**</td>
<td>0.208**</td>
<td>0.445**</td>
<td>0.641**</td>
<td>0.612**</td>
<td>0.569**</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. WOMNPO</td>
<td>5.044</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>0.335**</td>
<td>0.449**</td>
<td>0.541**</td>
<td>0.447**</td>
<td>0.450**</td>
<td>0.320**</td>
<td>0.610**</td>
<td>0.513**</td>
<td>0.467**</td>
<td>0.658**</td>
<td>0.586**</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations are significant at **p<0.010 (two-tailed), *p<0.050 (two-tailed), ns not significant. Diagonal elements are square root of AVE (bolded).
Analysis of the correlation matrices across Australian Cricket Team, McGrath Foundation and the combined consumer samples revealed that in all three cases, the correlation coefficients of the focal constructs were lower than the square root AVE value across all constructs; thus indicating discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker 1981).

As a further step, the descriptive statistics were calculated on the means of those items pertaining to each construct that were confirmed in CFA testing to indicate normality. These results are presented in tables 8.7, 8.8 and 8.9 below for Australian Cricket Team, McGrath Foundation and combined consumer groups respectively.

Table 8.7: Descriptive statistics – Australian Cricket Team consumers (n=504)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWA</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>5.773</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>-1.278</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.365</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>3.878</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>5.097</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>-0.592</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>3.904</td>
<td>1.886</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>6.389</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>-1.621</td>
<td>2.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.959</td>
<td>1.536</td>
<td>-0.811</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.843</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>5.169</td>
<td>1.629</td>
<td>-0.744</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.914</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>-0.768</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.212</td>
<td>1.690</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>4.705</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>-0.741</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Min. = minimum statistic; Max. = maximum statistic, SD = standard deviation, stat. = statistic, std. error = standard error.
As shown across tables 8.7, 8.8 and 8.9, all constructs have a negatively skewed distribution that indicates variance in responses (Lin, Lobo & Leckie 2017). Further, the majority of skewness and kurtosis values fell within the acceptable +2 to -2 range. There are exceptions for the ATT construct across the three groups, and the DON construct among McGrath Foundation consumers. However, given this slight deviation from normality is not consistent across most constructs and the sample size is in excess of 200 in all three cases, it was deemed appropriate to continue using these constructs for further analysis, as the impact of non-normality was negligible (Hair et al. 2014).
The results of the overall CFA for the three groups are presented in Table 8.10 below. The standardised factor loadings of all multi-item latent constructs, as well as the Cronbach’s $\alpha$, CR and AVE are shown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
<th>Combined sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. FL</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA</td>
<td>I am familiar with the alliance between the McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can recognise this social alliance between the McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team among other social alliances.</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can quickly recall the logo of the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td>I pretty much know about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel very knowledgeable about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to most other people, I know more about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When it comes to the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team, I really know a lot.</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT</td>
<td>When someone criticises the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team, it feels like a personal insult.</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am very interested in what others think about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When I talk about the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team, I usually say ‘we’ rather than ‘they’.</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>ACT consumers</td>
<td>MF consumers</td>
<td>Combined sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. FL</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If a story in the media criticised the McGrath Foundation/Australian</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket Team, I would feel embarrassed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is very</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dependable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is very</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>competent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is very</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsive to its supporters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trustworthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM</td>
<td>I use social media to follow the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I use social media to monitor events.</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My relationship the McGrath Foundation/Australian Cricket Team is</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enhanced by social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I use social media to follow Australian Cricket Team players.</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>What is your attitude toward the alliance between the Australian</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation? Dislike: Like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is your attitude toward the alliance between the Australian</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation? Unfavourable: Favourable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>ACT consumers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. FL  α    CR  AVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. FL  α    CR  AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is your attitude toward the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation? Negative: Positive</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON</td>
<td>I am likely to donate money to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will donate money next time to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will definitely donate money to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of increasing your association with the Australian Cricket Team in the future? Unlikely: Likely</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of increasing your association with the Australian Cricket Team in the future? Improbable: Probable</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>ACT consumers</td>
<td>MF consumers</td>
<td>Combined sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. FL</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST</td>
<td>I am willing to encourage others to attend Australian Cricket Team games.</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When the topic of sports comes up in conversation, I will be willing to go out of my way to recommend attending Australian Cricket Team games to others.</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will encourage friends and relatives to support Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will say positive things about Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of purchasing Australian Cricket Team merchandise in the future? Unlikely: Likely</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of purchasing Australian Cricket Team merchandise in the future? Unlikely: Likely</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>ACT consumers</td>
<td>MF consumers</td>
<td>Combined sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. FL</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchasing Australian Cricket Team merchandise in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundation, what is the likelihood of purchasing Australian Cricket Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>merchandise in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impossible: Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO</td>
<td>I am willing to encourage others to donate to the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When the topic of charities comes up in conversation, I will be willing to</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>go out of my way to recommend donating to the McGrath Foundation to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will encourage friends and relatives to support the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will say positive things about the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation
The standardised factor loadings for the constructs across each group including the combined sample were presented in Table 8.10. As evidenced, all were above the 0.500 threshold suggested by Hair et al. (2014). Furthermore, with the exception of four items (AWA_4 across the three datasets, and KNOW_1 for Australian Cricket Team consumers), all standardised factor loading values were above the ideal 0.70 value (Hair et al. 2014). Thus, convergent validity was achieved.

In addition, as depicted in Table 8.10, all CR values exceeded the 0.70 minimum as suggested by Hair et al. (2014), with several values exceeding 0.90; indicating that the measures consistently represent the same construct. As a further measure of reliability, Cronbach’s α scores were calculated. These values ranging from 0.761 to 0.965 (lowest to highest) across the three datasets showed internal consistency of the constructs. As further highlighted in Table 8.10, all AVE values were above the 0.500 as suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981); thus indicating discriminant validity.

Given that all multi-item latent constructs exceeded the minimum CR and AVE values, construct validity was achieved. With this mind, it was deemed appropriate to move forward with the next stage of the data analysis procedure, and results derived from this are discussed below.

8.7 Measurement Invariance Results

To test the moderating effect of associated consumer group, a multigroup post-hoc test was conducted consisting of measurement invariance as a first step, including configural, metric and scalar invariance. The model fit results for configural invariance are presented in Table 8.11 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.11: Configural model fit indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2745.836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the model fit indices, the configural invariance returned adequate model fit. As a result, the next metric invariance measurement stage was conducted. Table 8.12 shows these model fit results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.12: Metric model fit indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2828.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As depicted in Table 8.12, the disparity in $\Delta \chi^2$ was significant ($p<0.001$). Consequently, as suggested by Byrne (2012), MI were used to analyse why this occurred. High MI values showed the presence of a residual covariance between two items (MP_3 and TAS_3), and as a result, these items were freed to achieve partial metric invariance as indicated by the insignificant $p$-value ($p=0.309$) depicted in Table 8.13 below which also includes additional model fit results for partial metric invariance.

Table 8.13: Partial metric model fit indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/d.f.</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2778.094</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>32.258</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this step, the analysis involved testing for scalar invariance. Scalar invariance consists of two components: intercepts and latent means (Byrne 2012). The first intercept invariance component was executed by constraining the intercepts of the items to be equal across the two consumer groups (Milfont & Fischer 2010). In this study, a large discrepancy in the comparison of intercepts between Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers was identified. Thus, scalar invariance could not fully be achieved in this case. This outcome is not uncommon, as highlighted by Marsh et al. (2017, p. 2) who suggested that scalar invariance is an “unachievable ideal that in practice can only be approximated”. These authors also highlighted that where scalar invariance is achieved, this is most often in small-scale studies with a limited number of constructs. Therefore, to test the invariance simply across latent means, intercepts were subsequently fixed. The results then showed that latent mean invariance across the two consumer groups was acceptable, as shown in Table 8.14 below.

Table 8.14: Latent mean invariance model fit indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/d.f.</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2798.560</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>20.466</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-significant worsening of fit between the latent mean invariance testing and partial metric invariance dictates that in this study, partial measurement invariance was achieved. The other fit indices also demonstrated an acceptable fit to the data. Thus, the measurement model in this study showed appropriate measurement invariance across the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumer groups to continue onto multigroup testing.
8.8 Structural Model Testing Results

Following the analysis of one-factor congeneric models and overall CFA estimation, the next step involved structural model testing of the combined sample (n=859). This was performed to investigate consumer reactions towards both organisations involved in the social alliance, thereby testing the various hypotheses. Mplus with ML estimation was used for this purpose as recommended by Hair et al. (2014).

In this portion of the data analysis, the following hypotheses were tested:

H1a: Consumer identification levels are positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

H1b: Consumer trust is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

H1c: Televised match viewership is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

H1d: Live match viewership is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

H1e: Website visits are positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

H1f: Social media engagement is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

H2: Consumer awareness of a social alliance between a sports team and NPO is positively related to consumer knowledge of the social alliance partner organisation.

H3: Consumer knowledge of a social alliance partner organisation is positively related to consumer attitudes towards a social alliance between a sports team and NPO.
H4: Consumer attitudes towards a social alliance between a sports team and NPO are positively related to a) donation intention, b) increasing team association intention, c) match attendance intention, d) sports team WOM intention, e) merchandise purchasing intention, and f) NPO WOM intention.

As depicted in the revised conceptual model, there were six independent variables hypothesised to influence the AWA dependent variable. The subsequent consumer behaviour sequence meant that the AWA dependent variable became an independent variable. This was also the case with the KNOW and ATT constructs. As an independent variable, ATT was hypothesised to lead to various outcomes for the sports team and NPO. In this study, the SEM specifies cause from one direction without any reciprocal effects or feedback loops, and can therefore be considered recursive (Byrne 2012).

This study’s model fit indices as shown in Table 8.15 indicate adequate model fit. While the p-value is significant, the normed Chi-square value ($\chi^2$/d.f.) is 2.321, which according to Byrne (2012) is considered sufficient. All other fit indices show good model fit with the combined sample data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/d.f.</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2182.229</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.321</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.16 depicts the hypotheses testing results of the combined sample of Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers. As highlighted, with the exception of one hypothesised relationship (H1e), the other hypotheses were supported. The final structural model depicting these results for the combined sample is next shown in Figure 8.2.
Table 8.16: Hypotheses testing results – combined sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. errors</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a: IDT → AWA</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>8.137</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: TRU → AWA</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>4.089</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c: TV viewership → AWA</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>3.112</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1d: Live games → AWA</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>4.440</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1e: Website visits → AWA</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1f: SocM → AWA</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>5.781</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: AWA → KNOW</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>9.770</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: KNOW → ATT</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>6.107</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: ATT → DON</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>6.389</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: ATT → TAS</td>
<td>2.503</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>6.482</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c: ATT → MAT</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>6.310</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4d: ATT → WOMST</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>6.286</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4e: ATT → MP</td>
<td>2.596</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>6.075</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4f: ATT → WOMNPO</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>6.297</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.17 shows the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) on the combined sample of Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers. As depicted, 23% of total variation of the AWA construct is explained by the antecedents to awareness. This indicates that there are other drivers of social alliance awareness that are not included in this model. The values for the other dependent variables are highlighted in Table 8.17.

Table 8.17: $R^2$ Values – combined sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWA</th>
<th>KNOW</th>
<th>ATT</th>
<th>DON</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>MAT</th>
<th>WOMST</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>WOMNPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.2: Final structural model – combined sample

Note: SA = social alliance; ST = sports team. **P<0.001, *P<0.05, ns non-significant (unfilled box denotes a non-significant relationship).
8.8.1 Hypotheses results interpretation

In this subsection, a detailed interpretation of the above results is provided based on the hypotheses testing. Using the guidelines suggested by Kline (2010), the standardised path coefficients assisted in interpreting effect size of the relationship between variables, where values less than 0.10 are considered a ‘small’ effect, values around 0.30 detect a ‘medium’ effect, and values close to or greater than 0.50 return a ‘large’ effect.

**Hypothesis H1a: Consumer identification as an antecedent to social alliance awareness**
Previous research indicates that sports consumers who highly identify with an organisation are more likely to be aware of this organisation’s sponsors (Cornwell, Weeks & Roy 2005; Gwinner & Swanson 2003). It was posited in this study that this link extends to socially based relationships between a sports team and an NPO. Thus, associated consumers who possess high identification levels with either the sports team or NPO are more likely to have greater awareness of their associated organisation’s social alliances. In this study, a positive and significant relationship between consumer identification ($\beta = 0.203$, $p<0.001$) and social alliance awareness was recorded. This effect can be considered medium given that the standardised path coefficient score was above 0.10. Therefore, as hypothesised, consumer identification is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

**Hypothesis H1b: Consumer trust as an antecedent to social alliance awareness**
As the second attitudinal antecedent to awareness, consumer trust has been found to be a catalyst for consumer attitude formation and subsequent behaviour in CRM relationships (Youn & Kim 2008). In this study, it was proposed that higher consumer trust among associated consumers is likely to lead to social alliance awareness. The corresponding results indicate this to be the case, with a positive and significant relationship found between consumer trust and awareness ($\beta = 0.075$, $p=0.001$). The standardised path coefficient score also indicates a small effect, based on a value of less than 0.10. Therefore, as was hypothesised, consumer trust is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports teams and NPO.

**Hypothesis H1c: Televised game viewership as an antecedent to social alliance awareness**
Televised game viewership has often been linked with awareness in a commercial sports sponsorship setting (e.g. Lardinoit & Derbaix 2001). On occasion, televised matches, specifically those dedicated to particular social issues and/or NPO partners, enable both sports teams and NPOs to promote social alliances to broader audiences. Most managers in this study...
correspondingly viewed televised matches as a good opportunity to generate awareness of their social alliances among constituents. Thus, it was posited in this study that the more matches a consumer watches on TV, the more likely they are to be aware of their aligned organisation’s social alliances. This is based on the positive and significant relationship between televised game viewership and social alliance awareness identified in this study ($\beta = 0.042$, $p<0.050$). Despite being significant, in accordance with Kline (2010), this relationship can be considered small, as depicted by the standardised path coefficient value of less than 0.10. Nonetheless, as hypothesised, televised match viewership is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

**Hypothesis H1d: Live game viewership as an antecedent to social alliance awareness**

In Phase One of this study’s data collection, some managers highlighted live game viewership as an antecedent to social alliance awareness. Accordingly, these sports team and NPO managers suggested that live games provide an opportunity to showcase their social alliances to interested audiences, where special attention is drawn to NPO partners and social alliance outcomes. It was therefore posited here that the more games consumers attend live, the more likely they are to be aware of their aligned organisation’s social alliance. However, while the results ($\beta = 0.061$, $p<0.001$) indicate that this is the case, the strength of the effect is considered small given the standardised path coefficient score. Nonetheless, as hypothesised, live match viewership is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and an NPO.

**Hypothesis H1e: Website visits as an antecedent to social alliance awareness**

As indicated in previous theory, organisations often use websites to convey their CSR activities to various audiences (Gomez & Chalmeta 2011). This was confirmed in this study’s findings stemming from interviews with sports team and NPO managers responsible for social alliances, who all used websites to varying degrees to develop awareness of social alliance participation. Furthermore, as websites across sectors offer different information, frequency of website visits was considered the ideal way to capture reactions in two consumer groups simultaneously. This was reaffirmed based on the positive link between frequency of exposure and awareness found in previous marketing research (e.g. Buil, de Chernatony & Martínez 2013). Yet despite these common indicators, this study’s results suggest that website visits do not lead to social alliance awareness ($\beta = 0.015$, $p>0.050$), as indicated by a $p$-value greater than 0.050. Thus, contrary to the hypothesised relationship, website visits are not positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO among associated consumer groups.
**Hypothesis H1f: Social media engagement as an antecedent to social alliance awareness**
As the final behavioural antecedent to social alliance awareness, social media was unanimously highlighted in Phase One of this study as the principal tool sports team and NPO managers use to create awareness of their social alliances. While previous research on this relationship is relatively scant, Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) opined that social media provides organisations with an opportunity to increase public awareness. It is therefore posited in this study that social media engagement with associated consumers leads to awareness of their aligned firm’s social alliances. Accordingly, the results indicated a positive and significant relationship between social media engagement and such awareness ($\beta = 0.098, p<0.001$); even though the standardised path coefficient score of less than 0.10 demonstrates a small effect. Thus, as hypothesised, social media is positively related to social alliance awareness between a sports team and NPO.

**Hypothesis 2: Social alliance awareness influencing knowledge of social alliance partner**
According to the traditional HOE sequence, once awareness is established, knowledge follows to complete the cognitive stage (Lavidge & Steiner 1961). It was therefore posited in this study that the same sequence would occur, with associated consumers that show awareness of their aligned organisation’s social alliances exhibiting knowledge of the social alliance partner firm. The results correspondingly show a positive and significant relationship between social alliance awareness and knowledge of social alliance partner ($\beta = 1.833, p<0.001$), and the high standardised path coefficient value of above 0.50 further indicates a strong effect between these two variables. Thus, as hypothesised, consumer awareness of a social alliance between a sports team and an NPO is positively related to knowledge of the social alliance partner organisation.

**Hypothesis 3: Consumer knowledge of social alliance partner influencing social alliance attitudes**
Both the HOE (Lavidge & Steiner 1961) and theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975) have pointed to the relationship between cognition and affect. It was therefore proposed in this study that consumers with greater knowledge of their aligned organisation’s social alliance partner hold affective evaluations regarding the social alliance. Furthermore, according to the results, there is a significant and positive relationship between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes ($\beta = 0.338, p<0.001$), and the effect of this relationship can be considered medium given the standardised path coefficient score is around 0.30. Therefore, as was hypothesised, consumer knowledge of a social alliance partner organisation is positively related to social alliance attitudes between a sports team and NPO among associated consumer groups.
Hypothesis 4a: Social alliance attitudes influencing donation intention
Both previous theory (e.g. Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004) and sports team and NPO manager insights from this study have referred to donations as a critical social alliance outcome. It was therefore expected here that social alliance attitudes would lead to donation intention to the NPO across both consumer groups. A positive and significant relationship between social alliance attitudes and donation intention subsequently reaffirms this position ($\beta = 2.168$, $p<0.001$), while the high standardised path coefficient score indicates a large effect. Thus, as hypothesised, social alliance attitudes regarding a social alliance between a sports team and NPO is positively related to donation intention.

Hypothesis 4b: Social alliance attitudes influencing increasing team association intention
In this study, sports team managers highlighted increasing one’s team association as an objective associated with social alliance participation. Accordingly, these managers viewed this as an outcome that could affect both associated sports team consumers and subsequent partial consumers associated with the NPO. It was therefore presupposed here that attitudinal evaluations regarding the social alliance would lead to the intention to increase one’s association with the sports team. As shown in the corresponding results, there is a positive and significant relationship between social alliance attitudes and increasing team association intention ($\beta = 2.503$, $p<0.001$), where the effect can be considered large as depicted in the high standardised path coefficient value. As such, the hypothesis that social alliance attitudes between a sports team and NPO is positively related to increasing team association intention can be confirmed.

Hypothesis 4c: Social alliance attitudes influencing match attendance intention
As a sports-team-related outcome, match attendance was highlighted by the sports team managers in this study as a possible objective related to social alliance participation. It was therefore postulated here that consumer attitudes regarding a social alliance would lead to match attendance among both associated and partial consumers. As subsequently demonstrated in the results, there is a positive and significant relationship between social alliance attitudes and match attendance intention ($\beta = 2.222$, $p<0.001$), and the effect of this relationship can be considered large as evidenced in the standardised path coefficient score. Thus, as hypothesised, consumer attitudes towards a social alliance between a sports team and NPO is positively related to match attendance intention.
Hypothesis 4d: Social alliance attitudes influencing sports team WOM intention
Spreading positive WOM for the sports team is a significant consumer outcome that has been found in previous CSR research (Lacey & Kennet-Hensel 2010; Walker & Kent 2009). Despite not being identified in this study by sports team and NPO managers, it is still determined here as holding significant value for organisations choosing to participate in social alliances. It was therefore posited that there would be a significant relationship between social alliance attitudes and WOM on behalf of the sports team resulting from social alliance participation. The results correspondingly indicated a positive and significant relationship between social alliance attitudes and WOM intention for the sports team ($\beta = 2.919, p<0.001$), and the effect of this relationship is large according to the high standardised path coefficient value. Thus, as hypothesised, consumer attitudes towards a social alliance between a sports team and NPO is positively related to sports team WOM intention.

Hypothesis 4e: Social alliance attitudes influencing merchandise purchasing intention
Merchandise purchasing has been highlighted in previous research as a consumer outcome stemming from positive attitudinal evaluations associated with CSR in sports (Walker & Kent 2009). Most sports team managers and one NPO manager interviewed in Phase One of this study also suggested that merchandise purchasing of both specialised social-alliance-related and regular merchandise is a potential outcome of social alliance participation. It was therefore posited in this study that attitudinal evaluations of the social alliance between a sports team and NPO would lead to sports team merchandise purchasing intention among both associated and partial consumers. The results showed a positive and significant relationship between social alliance attitudes and merchandise purchasing intention ($\beta = 2.596, p<0.001$), with large effect as indicated via the path coefficient value. Thus, the hypothesis that consumer attitudes towards a social alliance between a sports team and NPO is positively related to the intention to purchase sports team merchandise is confirmed.

Hypothesis 4f: Social alliance attitudes influencing NPO WOM intention
The final consumer-related outcome associated with social alliance participation is NPO WOM intention. As a second NPO-related outcome in this study, positive advocacy concerning NPOs has also been found in previous CRM research (e.g. Lii & Lee 2012). Hence, it was expected in this study that the same outcome would occur in a social alliance setting. As such, it was posited here that social alliance attitudes would lead to positive WOM intent on behalf of the NPO. According to the results, there is a positive and significant relationship between social alliance attitudes and NPO WOM intention ($\beta = 3.007, p<0.001$), and there is a large effect in this relationship as depicted in the standardised path coefficient value which exceeded 0.500. Thus,
as hypothesised, consumer attitudes towards a social alliance between a sports team and NPO is positively related to NPO WOM intention.

8.9 Multigroup Testing

To test the multigroup hypotheses, multigroup testing on a full sample for each group was conducted (ACT n=504; MF n=355). This involved testing a structural model with measurement invariance across the groups. To achieve this, the first step was to develop a baseline or unconstrained model where structural coefficients were not constrained equal across the groups (Sass & Schmitt 2013). Fit indices dictated the appropriateness of the model. Once established, adding constraints on all the structural weights enabled an assessment of change in model fit (Lin, Lobo & Leckie 2017). Using the $\chi^2$ difference test, one can conclude whether structural coefficients are equal across groups (Sass & Schmitt 2013). Given the structural relationships tested previously on a combined sample of sports team and NPO consumers returned an insignificant relationship between website visits and social alliance awareness, website visits was subsequently dropped from the multigroup testing.

To test the remaining hypotheses, Mplus with ML estimation was used on the following hypotheses:

H5: The relationship between a) consumer identification, b) consumer trust, c) televised match viewership, d) live match viewership, and f) social media engagement and social alliance awareness will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups.

H5g: The relationship between social alliance awareness and knowledge of social alliance partner will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups.

H5h: The relationship between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups.

H5: The relationship between social alliance attitudes and i) donation intention, j) increasing team association intention, k) match attendance intention, l) sports team WOM intention, m) merchandise purchasing intention n) NPO WMO intention will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups.
Table 8.18 below shows the fit indices for the unconstrained structural model, while Table 8.19 then highlights the fit indices for the constrained model.

Table 8.18: Unconstrained structural model fit indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/d.f.</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3740.700</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.19: Constrained structural model fit indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/d.f.</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3803.511</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>62.811</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $\Delta \chi^2_{12}$ as evidenced in Table 8.19, shows there is a significant difference between the two groups in relation to social alliance consumer reaction. Subsequently, multigroup hypotheses results are presented in Table 8.20. The final structural relationships for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers are presented in Figure 8.3 and Figure 8.4 respectively.

Table 8.20: Multigroup hypotheses testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$d.f.</th>
<th>$\beta_{\text{ACT}}$</th>
<th>$\beta_{\text{MF}}$</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H5a: IDT $\rightarrow$ AWA</td>
<td>3743.776</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.141**</td>
<td>0.268**</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b: TRU $\rightarrow$ AWA</td>
<td>3743.360</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.108**</td>
<td>0.165**</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5c: TV viewership $\rightarrow$ AWA</td>
<td>3741.988</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.055*</td>
<td>0.086**</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5d: Live games $\rightarrow$ AWA</td>
<td>3741.225</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.037*</td>
<td>0.043**</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5f: SocM $\rightarrow$ AWA</td>
<td>3760.866</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>20.166**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.064*</td>
<td>0.274**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5g AWA $\rightarrow$ KNOW</td>
<td>3741.454</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.829**</td>
<td>1.100**</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5h: KNOW $\rightarrow$ ATT</td>
<td>3758.764</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>18.064**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.729**</td>
<td>0.285**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5i: ATT $\rightarrow$ DON</td>
<td>3746.105</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>5.405*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.020**</td>
<td>2.832**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5j: ATT $\rightarrow$ TAS</td>
<td>3754.663</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>13.963**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.187**</td>
<td>3.306**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5k: ATT $\rightarrow$ MAT</td>
<td>3763.815</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>23.115**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.001**</td>
<td>3.460**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5l: ATT $\rightarrow$ WOMST</td>
<td>3751.144</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>10.444*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.479**</td>
<td>4.084**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5m: ATT $\rightarrow$ MP</td>
<td>3760.088</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>19.308**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.086**</td>
<td>3.427**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5n: ATT $\rightarrow$ WOMNPO</td>
<td>3750.861</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>10.161*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.299**</td>
<td>3.813**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation, $\beta$ = Standardised estimate

**$p<0.001$, *$p<0.05$, ns non-significant

As shown in Table 8.21, for Australian Cricket Team consumers ($R^2=0.114$), the influence of the antecedents on social alliance awareness were much lower than their McGrath Foundation ($R^2=0.618$) counterparts. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that the McGrath Foundation is less well-known among the associated consumers of the Australian Cricket Team. Social alliance awareness’ influence on knowledge of social alliance partner was moderated differently across groups ($R^2_{\text{ACT}}=0.282$; $R^2_{\text{MF}}=0.408$) with a higher influence amongst McGrath Foundation consumers. The influence of knowledge of social alliance partner on social alliance attitude also differed across groups with the influence stronger amongst Australian Cricket Team consumers.
(R^2_{ACT}=0.097; R^2_{MF}=0.009). Social alliance attitudes’ influence on the outcome variables were all higher in Australian Cricket Team consumers as depicted in Table 8.21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWA</th>
<th>KNOW</th>
<th>ATT</th>
<th>DON</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>MAT</th>
<th>WOMST</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>WOMNPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation
Figure 8.3: Structural relationships – Australian Cricket Team consumers

Note: SA = social alliance; ST = sports team; **p<0.001, *p<0.05, ns non-significant.
Figure 8.4: Structural relationships – McGrath Foundation consumers

Note: SA = social alliance; ST = sports team; **p<0.001, *p<0.05, ns non-significant (unfilled box denotes a non-significant relationship).
8.9.1 Interpretation of multigroup hypotheses results

In this subsection, interpretation of the multigroup hypotheses results is presented. This incorporates testing for the moderating effect of the associated consumer group across the antecedents to social alliance awareness, the HOE and consumer outcomes relating to a social alliance between a sports team and NPO. Based on the results, the differences in effect size across the two consumer groups indicate a comparatively stronger reaction in one group. This is important given that existing research has not provided sufficient indication of the antecedents to awareness and subsequent consumer reactions across different groups in a social alliance setting. Thus, the findings presented here provide an indication of social alliance effectiveness.

**Hypothesis H5a: The relationship between consumer identification and social alliance awareness will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups**

For both consumer groups, a positive and significant relationship between consumer identification and social alliance awareness was found. However, contrary to the hypothesised relationship where a significant difference in reactions among the two groups was expected, the moderating effect of the associated consumer group on the relationship between consumer identification and social alliance awareness was not significantly different ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 0.141; \beta_{\text{MF}} = 0.268, p=0.079$). Hypothesis H5a was therefore unsupported.

**Hypothesis H5b: The relationship between consumer trust and social alliance awareness will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups**

Consumer trust was found to positively impact on social alliance awareness in both associated consumer groups. However, the difference in this relationship among the two consumer groups was insignificant, which indicates that the moderating effect of the associated consumer group had minimal influence on the relationship between consumer trust and social alliance awareness ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 0.108; \beta_{\text{MF}} = 0.165, p=0.103$). As such, hypothesis H5b was unsupported.

**Hypothesis H5c: The relationship between televised match viewership and social alliance awareness will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups**

It was hypothesised that the moderating effect of the associated consumer group would impact on the relationship between televised match viewership and social alliance awareness. However, the estimate values indicate no significant difference between sports team and NPO consumers when it comes to televised match viewership and its impact on social alliance awareness.
Hypothesis H5c: The relationship between live match viewership and social alliance awareness will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups
Live match viewership was hypothesised to lead to social alliance awareness. However, while there was a significant relationship between live match viewership and social alliance awareness in the Australian Cricket Team consumer group, an insignificant result was returned for McGrath Foundation consumers. Despite this, the strength of the relationship among the two groups was insignificant ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 0.037; \beta_{\text{MF}} = 0.043, p=0.469$). Thus, hypothesis H5c was unsupported.

Hypothesis H5d: The relationship between social media engagement and social alliance awareness will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups
It was anticipated that the moderating effect of the associated consumer group would significantly impact the relationship between social media engagement and social alliance awareness. In line with this, the results indicated a significant difference among the two consumer groups in the relationship between social media engagement and social alliance awareness ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 0.064; \beta_{\text{MF}} = 0.274, p<0.001$). Thus, hypothesis H5d was supported. Further analysis showed a stronger effect for NPO associated consumers, as depicted via the higher $\beta$ value. Interpretation of these results indicates that the relationship between social media engagement and social alliance awareness is stronger among NPO than sports team consumers.

Hypothesis H5g: The relationship between social alliance awareness and knowledge of social alliance partner will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups
In both consumer groups, a positive relationship between social alliance awareness and knowledge of the social alliance partner was evident. However, there was an insignificant difference in this relationship between the two consumer groups ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 1.829; \beta_{\text{MF}} = 1.100, p=0.385$). Consequently, hypothesis H5g was unsupported, in that the associated consumer group does not play a moderating role between social alliance awareness and knowledge of social alliance partner.

Hypothesis H5h: The relationship between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups
It was hypothesised that the moderating effect of the associated consumer group would play a significant role in creating a difference in the relationship between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes among the two consumer groups. As evidenced, there was a significant difference between NPO and sports team consumers in the relationship between knowledge of a social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 0.729; \beta_{\text{MF}} = 0.285$, \(p=0.256\)). Hypothesis H5c was therefore also unsupported.
Hypothesis H5i: The relationship between social alliance attitudes and donation intention will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups

It was hypothesised that the moderating effect of the associated consumer group would play a role in the relationship between social alliance attitudinal evaluations and donation intention. As expected, there was a difference in the strength of the relationship of these two variables for each consumer group. Accordingly, the relationship between social alliance attitudes and intention to donate was stronger among NPO than sports team consumers ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 1.020$; $\beta_{\text{MF}} = 2.832$, $p<0.05$). Thus, hypothesis H5i was supported.

Hypothesis H5j: The relationship between social alliance attitudes and increasing team association intention will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups

Increasing team association intention was an expected outcome relating to social alliance participation for a sports team. For both consumer groups, increasing team association intention returned a positive and significant result, even though there was a significant difference in the strength of the relationship among the two consumer groups ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 1.187$; $\beta_{\text{MF}} = 3.306$, $p<0.001$). Hypothesis H5j was therefore supported. Specifically, the path from social alliance attitudes to increasing team association intention was stronger among NPO than sports team consumers.

Hypothesis H5k: The relationship between social alliance attitudes and match attendance intention will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups

For both consumer groups, a significant and positive relationship between attitudinal evaluations and intention to attend matches were found. Further, the results indicate a moderating effect of the associated consumer plays a role in the strength of the relationship between social alliance attitudinal evaluations and match attendance intention ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 1.001$; $\beta_{\text{MF}} = 3.460$, $p<0.001$). The impact of social alliance attitudes on the intention to attend matches was stronger in the NPO than the sports team consumer group. Hypothesis H5k was therefore supported.

Hypothesis H5l: The relationship between social alliance attitudes and sports team WOM intention will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups

Both sports team and NPO consumers demonstrated a significant and positive relationship between social alliance attitudes and sports team WOM intention. Additionally, the moderating effect of the associated consumer group played a significant role, with a difference in the
strength of the relationship between social alliance attitudes and sports team WOM intention found among the two consumer groups ($\beta_{(ACT)} = 1.479; \beta_{(MF)} = 4.084, p<0.05$). Thus, hypothesis H5I was supported. As also shown, the greater $\beta$ value for NPO consumers indicates that the path from social alliance attitudes to intention to spread favourable WOM on behalf of the sports team was stronger among NPO than sports team consumers.

**Hypothesis H5m:** The relationship between social alliance attitudes and merchandise purchasing intention will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups

As a sports-team-related outcome, both sport team and NPO consumers demonstrated a significant and positive link between social alliance attitudes and merchandise purchasing intention. In relation to the moderating effect of the associated consumer group, the relationship between social alliance attitudes and merchandise purchasing intention was stronger among NPO than sports team consumers. As a consequence, there was a significant difference between the two groups ($\beta_{(ACT)} = 1.086; \beta_{(MF)} = 3.427, p<0.001$), which supports hypothesis H5m.

**Hypothesis H5n:** The relationship between social alliance attitudes and NPO WOM intention will vary across sports team and NPO consumer groups

Consumers on both sides of the dyad returned a significant and positive result for the relationship between social alliance attitudes and NPO WOM intention. Furthermore, the moderating effect of the associated consumer group was also significant, with a difference in the strength of the relationship found ($\beta_{(ACT)} = 1.299; \beta_{(MF)} = 3.813, p<0.05$). H5n was therefore supported. Specifically, the impact of social alliance attitudes on the intention to spread favourable WOM on behalf of the NPO was stronger in the NPO than the sports team consumer group.

**8.10 Chapter Summary**

This chapter has presented the results of Phase Two of this study, which quantitatively analysed the consumer reaction developed from a social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation.

Using a sample of 504 Australian Cricket Team consumers and 355 McGrath Foundation consumers, EFA and CFA results on all multi-item latent constructs were presented. Specifically, EFA results showed that unidimensionality was achieved, as the same factors were recorded across the groups. Following this, three phases of one-factor congeneric testing were conducted.
to ensure construct validity and reliability. Consequently, 13 items were removed from the analysis to obtain adequate model fit. This chapter then presented the next-stage results concerned with the overall CFA to obtain further reliability and validity. This was conducted across the two groups and on a combined sample.

This chapter next discussed the results of the model testing where, except for website visits, all the hypothesised antecedents led to social alliance awareness. Further testing revealed that in combination, Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers go through a traditional HOE sequence. Consequently, these consumers demonstrated an intention to donate, increase team association, attend matches, spread sports team WOM, purchase sports team merchandise, and communicate NPO WOM as a result of the social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and the McGrath Foundation.

The final section of this chapter has presented the results of the multigroup post-hoc analysis, used to test the moderating effect of the associated consumer group. These results associated with the antecedents to social alliance awareness demonstrated that the path from social media engagement to social alliance awareness was significantly different, with the relationship stronger for NPO than sports team consumers. There was also a significant difference between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes, where the impact was stronger among the sports team than the NPO consumer group. Lastly, the post-hoc multigroup analysis revealed that the associated consumer group moderates the path from social alliance attitudes to all six consumer-related outcomes proposed in the revised conceptual model, where the relationships were stronger among NPO than sports team consumers.
“We are particularly proud that 2015 marked a tremendous milestone in our partnership with The Salvation Army. Since our association began on Thanksgiving Day in 1997, we have now helped the Army raise more than two billion dollars, bringing food, clothing, shelter, rehabilitation and countless other services to millions of people, in the most need, around the world.” (Jerry Jones, Owner, President & General Manager, Dallas Cowboys)
9.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a final discussion of the findings, implications and conclusion from this study. Section 9.1 reviews current social alliance practice as evidenced from this study. Next, Section 9.2 presents results concerned with generating social alliance awareness, while Section 9.3 discusses the results relating to what happens once social alliance awareness is established. Following this, Section 9.4 addresses the consumer outcomes that stem from the formation of social alliance attitudes. Section 9.5 compares the reaction of the associated consumer groups in relation to the antecedents to social alliance awareness. The next Section 9.6 reviews the differences of the associated consumer groups concerned with the HOE sequence, while Section 9.7 discusses the differences in consumer outcomes between sports team and NPO consumers. Section 9.8 provides a summary of findings from Phase One and Two of this study. Section 9.9 then discusses the theoretical implications developed from the research findings, while Section 9.10 focuses on the managerial implications derived from the findings. Section 9.11 then provides a discussion on the limitations associated with this study, while Section 9.12 presents avenues for future research. Lastly, this chapter presents concluding comments in Section 9.13. A roadmap of this chapter is depicted in Figure 9.0.
9.1 Review of Current Social Alliance Practice From this Study

This study set out to examine how social alliances between sports teams and NPOs work in practice. This was necessary because the effectiveness of social alliances in achieving organisational outcomes was not yet known. This was especially prominent in relation to consumer reactions to such alliances where previous theory failed to adequately capture the complete consumer response to sports teams and NPOs in a social alliance. Going into this from past studies addressing effective CSR and social alliance practice, it was expected that managers involved in a social alliance would have systemised processes and procedures in place concerning social alliance development, implementation and evaluation.

Specifically, previous theory highlighted that to maximise effectiveness and subsequent commercial and social benefits stemming from CSR and social alliances, organisations should develop strategic objectives (Breitbarth, Hovemann & Walzel 2011; Bruch & Walter 2005; Husted, Allen & Kock 2015; Porter & Kramer 2006, 2011; Sen & Bhattacharya 2001). Burke and Logsdon (1996) suggested that CSR objectives can provide both direction and feedback indicators to ensure objectives are met. By specifically defining objectives, a reduction in the variation of performance may occur as ambiguity surrounding tasks are reduced (Locke et al. 1989). Critically, objectives need to be purposeful, specific, demanding and sufficient to those who are attempting to achieve them (Locke 1968; Rossiter & Percy 1997). In a partnership context, goal and objective-setting is a more complex process as organisations deal with conflicting goals or missions (Babiak & Thibault 2009; Iyer 2002; Parker & Selsky 2004; Thomson & Perry 2006). Despite this, it was expected that similarly to other marketing functions, sports teams and NPOs in a social alliance would have specific objectives regarding social alliance promotion and consumer reactions (Astley 1984; Clarke & Fuller 2010; Huxham 1993). Furthermore, to measure the achievement of objectives, it was also anticipated that firms would use evaluative mechanisms. As highlighted in previous work, objectives provide a foundation for measuring level of performance (e.g. Breitbarth, Hovemann & Walzel 2011; Solomon & Young 2007). Therefore, evaluating the achievement of social alliance objectives is a critical component of the collaboration process in order to measure social alliance performance (Kouwenhoven 1993; van Tulder et al. 2016).

However, the finding in this study showed that in practice sports team and NPO managers rarely developed a specific social alliance strategy. For example, consumer responses to social alliances
were viewed as an ideal scenario rather than stated in formalised objectives. Furthermore, these managers rarely indicated the use of evaluation mechanisms to measure such outcomes. In spite of this, several sports team and NPO managers in this study showed a propensity to develop a more strategic approach to social alliance practice. Accordingly, these managers viewed social alliances through the lens of shared value where both the organisation and society may benefit (Porter & Kramer 2011). With this in mind, the findings of this study are particularly relevant for sports team and NPO managers wanting to use social alliances to achieve organisational outcomes. Therefore, the following discussion will highlight key components of social alliances between a sports team and NPO for the attainment of best practice.

9.2 How is Social Alliance Awareness Built?

Both sports team and NPO managers in a social alliance viewed an increase in social alliance awareness as an important component of their social alliance participation. This is because awareness is seen as a first step to develop consumer responses to each organisation (Burton et al. 2017). To initially assess social alliance awareness, a recognition question was used through aided recall on associated consumers aligned with the Australian Cricket Team and the McGrath Foundation. Accordingly, the high recognition rates via aided recall recorded in this study indicated that consumers closely align the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation. This contrasts previous research where CSR awareness has traditionally been depicted as minimal (e.g. Pomering & Dolnicar 2009; Servaes & Tamayo 2013).

This result is plausible given the length of the relationship between the two organisations. McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team officially joined forces in 2009, meaning this social alliance has been in operation close to 10 years. According to previous CRM research, the longer the commitment a firm shows their NPO partner, the greater the opportunity for consumers to learn of the relationship (Ellen, Webb & Mohr 2006; Varadarajan & Menon 1988). More recently, McDonald and Karg (2015) similarly found that the length of the relationship between a commercial sponsor and a sports team is a prominent contributing factor in developing consumer sponsorship awareness. This same finding can be extended to social alliances where the relationship may be attributed to the relatedness or familiarity of the two organisations in the mind of consumers which is then recalled via memory networks (Till & Nowak 2000; Wakefield, Becker-Olsen & Cornwell 2007). Therefore, it is reasonable to postulate that length of relationship can assist social alliance awareness.
In order to further develop social alliance awareness, both sports team and NPO managers incorporated a multi-channel approach to promote social alliances to associated consumers and general audiences. Specifically, these managers employed four major communication mechanisms including, televised match viewership, live match viewership, website visits and social media engagement. As a further contributor to social alliance awareness, two attitudinal antecedents were developed from previous theory. In combination with the four mechanisms indicated by sports team and NPO managers in Phase One, the understanding of how to build social alliance awareness was further developed. Results generated from the SEM will discuss these in more detail below.

9.2.1 How does consumer identification lead to social alliance awareness?

Previous researchers have shown that in a social alliance setting, consumer identification with a commercial firm or sports team can lead to favourable outcomes such as positive attitudes (Lee & Ferreira 2013), increased NPO donations (Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004) and social cause identification transfer (Lachowetz & Gladden 2003). However, consumer identification has not previously been measured as an antecedent to awareness in a social alliance context. An examination of previous sports marketing literature demonstrates that in a commercial-sports team sponsorship scenario, highly identified fans are more likely to be aware of sponsors than fans with low identification levels (Cornwell & Coote 2005; Gwinner & Swanson 2003). Similarly, results in this study have shown that high consumer identification with a sports team or NPO by each associated consumer group, led to social alliance awareness.

According to Bhattacharya, Rao and Glynn (1995), the congruence between consumer objectives and company objectives enables the identification process. It is plausible that in the context of this study, consumers who identify with each firm are more likely to possess social alliance awareness as the organisation’s socially oriented objectives align with their own (Bigné-Alcañiz et al. 2010; Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004). Thus, as associated McGrath Foundation and Australian Cricket Team consumers identify with their respective organisations, cognitive transfer occurs where associated consumers develop greater awareness of the social alliance.

Furthermore, the effect size of identification to social alliance awareness was the largest, indicating that consumer identification is the most influential antecedent to social alliance
awareness. This is a logical finding given that company-consumer identification develops strong consumer relationships (Bhattacharya, Rao & Glynn 1995; Bhattacharya & Sen 2003) that go beyond simple transactions into powerful cognitive connections (Bigné-Alcañiz et al. 2010). Here, consumers psychologically accept the organisation as forming part of their self-identity (Scott & Lane 2000). In this study, as associated consumers classify the organisation as a part of their identity, it is understandable that consumer identification with the firm is the most salient antecedent to social alliance awareness.

9.2.2 How does consumer trust lead to social alliance awareness?

This study’s results have shown a positive direct effect between consumer trust and social alliance awareness. According to Youn and Kim (2008), trust acts as a catalyst to consumer attitude formation in relation to CRM alliances. The finding of this study extends on that by highlighting the wider role consumer trust can play in the consumer behaviour process. Accordingly, in this study, trust was found to positively link to social alliance awareness; thus, consumer trust contributed to social alliance awareness as a precursor to affective evaluations.

According to relationship marketing theory, the multiple activities that organisations undertake to develop and maintain relational exchanges such as customer relationship management can contribute to trust between a consumer and organisation (Gruen, Summers & Acito 2000; Morgan & Hunt 1994; Neale & Fullerton 2010). As associated consumers develop such trusting and loyal relationships with their aligned organisations (Martinez & Rodriguez del Bosque 2013), it has been surmised here that they are more cognisant of the various activities these organisations participate in, including social alliances. This is in line with previous social psychology literature, which has indicated that trust in an entity can lead to developed awareness and that distrust can prevent further awareness from occurring (Mayo 2015).

9.2.3 How does televised match viewership lead to social alliance awareness?

Televised match viewership was the first behavioural antecedent sports team and NPO managers identified in this study as a mechanism used to generate social alliance awareness among various audiences. Results have shown a positive direct relationship between televised match viewership and social alliance awareness.
Such significant relationships between TV viewership and brand awareness have been captured in previous advertising research (e.g. Peters & Bijmolt 1997). This extends into sports marketing where the promotion of commercial products during televised sports has been found to significantly impact on awareness of such products (Walsh, Kim & Ross 2008). In alliance-based research, the impact of TV viewership on brand awareness has predominantly been recorded in sponsorship relationships. For example, findings by Lardinoit and Derbaix (2001) and Olson and Thjømøe (2012) have shown that TV billboards significantly lead to awareness of a commercial sponsor.

The results in this study have demonstrated the significant effect of TV viewership on awareness in a social alliance context. This is somewhat analogous to Park, Hitchon and Yun’s (2004) finding, that through social alliance advertisements on TV, awareness of the commercial brand is high. However, this study is unique in that it has recorded awareness of the social alliance rather than exclusively focusing on one organisation in an alliance, and has done so across two consumer groups. This therefore extends on previous research by incorporating social alliance awareness at the associated and partial consumer level as well as capturing awareness of the partnership itself.

A plausible explanation for the finding in this study concerning the relationship between televised match viewership and social alliance awareness is that televised match viewership was measured in terms of exposure through frequency. In this context, it was expected that consumers who watch more televised games are increasingly exposed to the multiple marketing messages concerning the social alliance. Sports team and NPO managers in Phase One indicated that various references are made to NPO partners and the alliance during televised matches such as donation information and social impacts (e.g. how a breast cancer nurse assisted a family). This aligns with previous commercial sponsorship research where levels of exposure have been determined as important in influencing awareness of the sponsor (Johar, Pham & Wakefield 2006; Wakefield, Becker-Olsen & Cornwell 2007). That is, the more one is exposed to the relationship between a sponsor and sponsee, the more this partnership is encoded in memory (Johar, Pham & Wakefield 2006).

Furthermore, it is plausible that both consumer groups in this study are actively engaged in televised matches and are therefore drawn to the various social alliance and non-social-alliance messages they are exposed to. This is in accordance with the program involvement concept,
which can be defined as “an active, motivated state, signifying interest and arousal induced by a television program” (Moorman, Neijens & Smit 2007, p. 131).

Overall, based on this study’s findings in combination with previous research that has identified a relationship between televised match viewership and sponsorship awareness, it can be supported that the more matches a consumer watches on TV, the more likely they are to be aware of that team’s social alliances. This also indicates that promoting CSR via TV is effective in generating awareness of CSR activities.

9.2.4 How does live match viewership lead to social alliance awareness?

Like televised match viewership, the premise of live match viewership leading to social alliance awareness was based on frequency of exposure, where high exposure positively leads to awareness (Buil, de Chernatony & Martínez 2013; Walliser 2003). Consequently, this study’s results have shown a significant and positive relationship between live match viewership and social alliance awareness. This is akin to findings regarding commercial partnerships in sports. For example, Bennett (1999) found a significant relationship between frequency of game attendance in the English Premier League and sponsor recall across three teams under analysis. According to this author, the greater the frequency of visiting a sports team’s home ground, the higher the probability of sponsor awareness due to repeated exposure. As part of a consumer experience measure, Cornwell et al. (2000) also linked live game attendance with sponsor awareness via repeated exposure, where spectators with higher game attendance are more likely to recall a commercial sponsor.

As with commercial sponsorship relationships, the link between game attendance and social alliance awareness as identified in this study can be explained by frequency of exposure. That is, on game days, various marketing messages concerning social alliances are presented to attendees, including via match day programs, perimeter stadium signage and banners. With such promotional materials displayed around the ground on match days, spectators are exposed to them throughout the matches they attend and often absorb them subconsciously (Bennett 1999; Wakefield, Becker-Olsen & Cornwell 2007). This is in accordance with the ‘mere exposure’ concept where repeated exposure to stimuli enhances familiarity and subsequent affective evaluations of the stimuli (Zajonc 1968). Furthermore, McDonald’s (2010) study concerned with STH churn identified that live game attendance can be used by sports teams as an effective tool
for building connections with fans. Therefore, it can be postulated that as these connections are established, awareness of extra-curricular activities such as social alliances may develop.

**9.2.5 How do website visits (not) lead to social alliance awareness?**

As a key communication channel for companies, websites provide the opportunity to promote their social-oriented activities to various audiences (Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2010). Thus, firms commonly use their websites for advertising and marketing CSR information (Andreu, Casado-Díaz & Mattila 2015). Yet, there has been a lack of research empirically addressing website effectiveness in generating awareness of CSR and more specifically, social alliances. However, according to results in this study used to address this gap, there is an insignificant relationship between website visits and social alliance awareness. Website visits were the only antecedent sports team and NPO managers identified in this study that did not lead to social alliance awareness. The insignificant relationship between website visits and social alliance awareness contrasts with the previous limited research. Specifically, Andreu, Casado-Díaz and Mattila (2015) detected a significant relationship between website viewership and CSR awareness among consumers based on message appeal and service type. It also counteracts Du, Bhattacharya and Sen’s (2010) proposal that CSR reporting on company websites is effective in generating awareness of its CSR initiatives.

This contrast in findings extends into a commercial sponsorship setting, where according to Drennan and Cornwell (2004), website sponsorship leads to brand awareness. These authors opined that partnership firms can utilise websites to jointly promote one another’s organisation. This was also highlighted by both sports team and NPO managers interviewed in Phase One of this study who pointed to websites as one of the principal tools for creating social alliance awareness, citing joint promotion as an adopted strategy. Yet this contradicts the results of Phase Two, which have indicated that this online approach is ineffective in achieving social alliance awareness.

The insignificant relationship between website visits and social alliance awareness identified in this study is more comparable with Pope and Waaraas’s (2016) contention that CSR awareness generated via company websites is low. In addition, according to similar empirical findings by Nyahunzvi (2013), corporate websites are the least effective medium that organisations use to report CSR practices.
The apparent breakdown in the relationship between website visits and social alliance awareness identified in this study can be explained by various factors. First, it is plausible that sports team and NPO associated consumers do not take the time to read about social alliance agendas on their aligned organisation’s website. For example, according to a survey conducted by consulting firm Penn Schoen Berland (2010), only 13% of respondents claimed to have read about CSR efforts on corporate websites. Fieseler, Fleck and Meckel (2010) also uncovered less than 1% of web traffic on the McDonalds’ website goes to the company-run CSR blog page. Thus, while consumers often hold the expectation of a company being socially responsible (Cone Communications 2015), they may not proactively engage with company websites to obtain this information (Pope & Wæraas 2016).

Second, while some associated consumers are interested in pursuing CSR information on a company website, the presentation of the content can prevent them from easily accessing this information. For example, Bhattacharya, Sen and Korschun (2008) claimed that CSR advertisements might be ‘tucked away’ within remote pages when investigating employee CSR awareness. This likely extends to publicly available websites where CSR-related information might be difficult to locate.

Third, NPOs and sports teams may use a simplistic approach to present CSR information on their websites which can be unappealing for consumers to attempt to navigate. This is in accordance with findings by Amaladoss and Manohar (2013) who uncovered that the presentation of CSR reporting on websites is often fairly standard. For example, companies generally use static PDF reports and images rather than interactive, multimedia tools to enhance engagement with stakeholders. This may be driven by insufficient financial investment in innovative or creative websites that attracts consumers (Amaladoss & Manohar 2013). Adams and Frost (2006) concluded with a similar outcome in their cross-cultural study of CSR web reporting across Australia, Germany and UK, citing financial resource inefficiency as inhibiting website effectiveness. Thus, associated consumers might be disinterested in investigating social alliance information further.

Lastly, it is possible that when reporting CSR or social alliance information on a company’s website, message content is not customised for each stakeholder segment. For example, audiences who access websites to obtain CSR information can include customers, clients, employees, management and media (Pomering & Dolnicar 2009; Pope & Wæraas 2016). Thus, disseminating the relevant information could prove challenging for associated consumers.
The mixed results in existing research concerning the relationship between consumer website visits and awareness of CSR activities makes it difficult to draw any definitive conclusions regarding website effectiveness in generating CSR or social alliance awareness. However, the findings of this study indicate that both sports team and NPO managers are not effectively leveraging websites to maximise marketing outcomes associated with their social alliances.

9.2.6 How does social media engagement lead to social alliance awareness?

In this study, all sports team and NPO managers claimed social media to be their principal communication tool used to generate social alliance awareness. This is somewhat in line with Tiago and Verissimo’s (2014) finding that commercial organisation managers identify brand awareness as a key perceived benefit associated with social media. In the NPO context, Briones et al. (2011) also observed that managers often turned to social media to generate awareness of their organisation, using it to transfer unaware publics into active consumers (Paek et al. 2013).

Results of this study demonstrate a positive direct effect between social media engagement and social alliance awareness. This finding is in accordance with Colleoni’s (2013) and Lee, Oh and Kim’s (2013) arguments that social media communications offer organisations the ability to increase awareness regarding their CSR efforts. Lee, Oh and Kim (2013, p. 804) correspondingly referred to social media as “...a social awareness engine”, indicating that social media facilitates CSR awareness. Yet, as also mentioned in this study’s literature review, there is a lack of empirical investigation measuring this relationship.

Drawing on other marketing literature beyond CSR, most findings have generally demonstrated a positive relationship between social media engagement and consumer awareness (e.g. Ashley & Tuten 2015; Naylor, Lamberton & West 2012; Tsimonis & Dimitriadis 2014). For example, according to Hutter et al. (2013), consumer interaction with Facebook positively affects brand awareness. Kim and Ko (2012) similarly found that social media interaction leads to consumer awareness of a luxury brand as a proponent of brand equity. This study’s results are consistent with these findings and extend on CSR research by showing that social media engagement can lead to social alliance awareness.
An explanation for this strengthening relationship might be due to the proliferated growth of social media use by sports teams (Meng, Stavros & Westberg 2015; Newman et al. 2017), which includes community-related information such as social alliances with NPOs (Abeza et al. 2017). Consequently, social media enables these organisations to actively communicate marketing messages to consumers (Kim & Ko 2012) through repeated exchanges (Burton et al. 2017; Tsimonis & Dimitriadis 2014) which stimulates growth in consumer awareness (Yan 2011).

This relationship could also be plausibly explained via the numerous messages both organisations within a social alliance can send to related constituents and wider audiences on their social media networks. That is, through repeated messaging, social alliance information is received by different networks, subsequently generating awareness of the partnering brand (Burton et al. 2017; Tsimonis & Dimitriadis 2014; Yan 2011). For example, in the context of this study, if the Australian Cricket Team ‘retweets’ or ‘likes’ a message sent by the McGrath Foundation, this message is received by associated consumers of both organisations and can spread through each consumer’s social media network. This would be enhanced in cases where organisations have a large social media following, as is the case for the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation.

In conclusion, Bergkvist and Taylor (2016) first identified influences on alliance awareness and subsequent awareness as the largest gaps in marketing-alliance-based research, including social alliances. As depicted in the above discussion, there were both attitudinal and behavioural antecedents that generated social alliance awareness. In this study, results indicated that consumer identification, consumer trust, televised match viewership, live match viewership and social media engagement all led to consumer social alliance awareness. Specifically, from a behavioural perspective, these findings aligned with the contention that one of the underlying motives for communicating CSR is to develop relevant awareness (Burton et al. 2017; Crane & Glozer 2016).

9.3 What Happens Once Social Alliance Awareness is Established?

The importance of consumer awareness cannot be understated particularly as it often dictates the consumer decision-making process (Huang & Sarigöllü 2012; Keller 2008) and is a prerequisite to the subsequent stages of the HOE sequence (Lavidge & Steiner 1961; Murray & Vogel 1997). For sports teams, CSR awareness is important based on the benefits it provides the
community through donations and the sports team such as increased loyalty (Inoue, Mahan & Kent 2013). For NPOs, establishing awareness of their organisation and the social cause they address is critical to their existence and one of the principal reasons why many of them select an alliance-based strategy (Austin 2000; Gourville & Rangan 2004; Seitanidi 2010).

Once consumer awareness is established, the HOE dictates that knowledge will follow. In this study, consumer knowledge of the social alliance partner for each associated consumer group was measured as the subsequent step following social alliance awareness. The result in this study showed a significant and positive relationship between social alliance awareness and knowledge of the social alliance partner among sports team and NPO consumers. This finding is similarly aligned to Murray and Vogel’s (1997) proposal that CSR awareness develops into greater knowledge of a firm’s social values.

There are three likely causes for this CSR connection. First, the relationship can be explained by the HOE sequence. In advertising, once consumer awareness is initially established, stronger cognition develops where consumers form knowledge of a company’s offerings (Lavidge & Steiner 1961). Comparably, in the context of this study, once a consumer becomes aware of the social alliance, it is reasonable to assume they would then become knowledgeable of the social alliance partner organisation as cognition develops.

Second, the continued promotion of the social alliance by each organisation may have featured the partner firm; thus, it may assist associated consumers in developing their knowledge of the partner organisation. For example, as the two social alliance organisations highlight the partnership, the social impact, funds raised and upcoming events to their constituents, this could lead to the development of further knowledge as consumers receive information concerning the social alliance partner and related activities or outcomes. Additionally, communication of the social alliance can extend past direct constituents to alternative target markets (Burton et al. 2017; Mendleson & Polonsky 1995), meaning that it is possible that associated consumers may receive messages from the partner firm (e.g. Australian Cricket Team consumers receiving McGrath Foundation messages), thereby developing knowledge of this firm.

Third, in measuring knowledge of the social alliance partner, a subjective knowledge measure was used in this study. Therefore, associated consumers may have believed they possess certain knowledge concerning the social alliance partner organisation than if an objective measure was
used. Section 9.11 and 9.12 discusses this further as a limitation of this study and a subsequent area of future research.

Consistent with the HOE theoretical framework, this study has shown that once knowledge is generated, consumers move to the affect stage of the consumer behaviour process. Accordingly, these findings demonstrate a causal sequence where a direct positive effect between knowledge of a social alliance partner and attitudinal evaluations has been found which aligns with previous CSR research. For example, Murray and Vogel (1997) also recorded positive attitudinal evaluations in relation to knowledge of a firm’s prosocial behaviour in their HOE model. Further, Wigley (2008) showed a direct link between CSR knowledge and favourable attitudes generated from the firm’s CSR programs in her study.

In a social alliance context, this relationship between knowledge and attitudes was also highlighted in previous research. For example, Lacey, Close and Finney (2010) found that in a CRM event sponsorship scenario, consumers with developed product knowledge are more likely to form positive affective evaluations towards the sponsoring firm. Furthermore, according to findings by Lafferty, Goldsmith and Hult (2004), higher cause familiarity led to more favourable attitudinal reactions towards a social alliance. With these previous findings in mind and those established in this study, it can be supported that there is a relationship between knowledge and attitude formation resulting from prosocial behaviour, including social alliances.

The HOE sequence provides further support for this finding within the social alliance context. As stipulated by Lavidge and Steiner (1961), following the development of product knowledge, most consumers proceed to evaluative affect where attitudes are formed. This can be attributed to consumer learning and understanding of a firm’s prosocial activities and positive social contributions (Hwang & Kandampully 2015; Lacey, Close & Finney 2010). In the context of this study, as associated consumers from the sports team and NPO develop greater social alliance awareness and knowledge of the social alliance partner the more likely it is they form positive attitudes toward the alliance itself.

**9.4 How Do Social Alliance Attitudes Influence Consumer Reactions Towards Organisations in a Social Alliance?**

This section will discuss the impact of social alliance attitudes on the consumer outcomes among sport team and NPO consumers.
For NPOs in this study, one of the principal objectives for forming a social alliance with a sports team was to raise funds via donations. Given the imperativeness of donations to an NPO’s existence, most marketing activities are geared toward achieving this objective. The results in this study have shown a significant and positive relationship between social alliance attitudes and the intention to donate to the NPO. This is consistent with numerous studies indicating that social alliance participation leads to increased donations for an NPO partner (e.g. Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015; Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004). This extends into a sporting social alliance with Inoue, Mahan and Kent (2013) finding that consumers are more willing to donate to the NPO partner of their favourite sports team, although this was dependent on fan identification and corporate ability (on-field performance). Nevertheless, there are similarities between the findings expressed in previous research and this study.

This finding concerning the relationship between social alliance attitudes and donation intention can likely be explained by the donation conditions stipulated by Bhattacharya and Sen (2004) and Irmak, Sen and Bhattacharya (2015) in the context of a social alliance. Accordingly, these studies found that reputable and involved organisations generate a stronger likelihood of consumer donations to the NPO partner firm. From a reputation perspective, as a sports team the Australian Cricket Team is most likely held in higher stead by consumers compared with commercial firms (Babiak & Wolfe 2009). This arguably could be further enhanced by their standing as a national sports team as opposed to an individual club team.

Furthermore, the involvement between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, driven by relationship length, likely encourages consumers to view the social alliance positively, which may manifest into increased donations for the McGrath Foundation. According to previous CRM research, the length of the relationship among partners often demonstrates higher commitment (Drumwright 1996) and is considered more effective than short-term sporadic partnerships (Till & Nowak 2000).

Corporate ability also provides another explanation for this particular relationship. For example, Inoue, Mahan and Kent (2013) stated that consumer donations to a sports team’s NPO partner are driven by on-field success. In this study, the Australian Cricket Team is a highly successful team and has been listed by ESPN (2018) as the most successful cricket team in history. Perhaps persistent positive sporting results have drawn favourable reactions from associated Australian Cricket Team consumers to donate to McGrath Foundation.
It is also plausible that the generalised mechanisms for donating to charities also underlie the relevant findings in this study. Bekkers and Weipking (2007) identified eight mechanisms through a review of previous literature, some of which can be applied to this study. The first, awareness of need, is usually triggered by an external stimulus that develops awareness of a need to support a charity NPO. In this case, the stimulus could be the social alliance with Australian Cricket Team and subsequent promotion mechanisms that stimulate a consumer’s awareness that McGrath Foundation requires public financial support.

The second mechanism is solicitation. Previous research has shown that 85% of donor giving occurs following solicitation (Bryant et al. 2003). In social alliances within sport, the various communication mechanisms identified in Phase One of this study are also possibly used to solicit NPO financial support via donations from spectators, including televised matches, dedicated match days, websites and social media.

The third mechanism relevant to this study is altruism which has been found to act as a strong motivator to donate to charity NPOs (Bekkers & Ottoni-Wilhelm 2016). In the case of this study, altruistic motivation among both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers could likely drive them to donate to the McGrath Foundation. This stems from concern for the organisation (Bekkers & Weipking 2007) or from the associated affection of donating to charities, such as ‘warm glow’ (Andreoni 1990).

Reputation is the next mechanism associated with NPO donations, where individuals that donate are viewed positively by their peers (Muehleman, Bruker & Ingram 1976). In this instance, one may donate to McGrath Foundation in order to garner peer recognition and wear pink (McGrath Foundation official colour) to promote their donation activities to others (Grace & Griffin 2006).

Other stated psychological benefits such as the joy of giving, self-image and mood have also been highlighted as mechanisms for charitable donations. In the case of joy of giving in the context of this study, it is likely that Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers receive positive psychological states for donating to the McGrath Foundation. For example, Harbaugh, Mayr and Burghart (2007) showed evidence of positive neural activity associated with the donation process. In terms of self-image in this study, associated Australian Cricket Team or McGrath Foundation consumers might view themselves as generous (Schlegelmilch, Diamantopoulos & Love 1997), altruistic or soft-hearted (Bekkers 2006), which
then translates to donation intent. The final psychological benefit of mood relates to unconscious mood states on giving (Bekkers & Weipking 2007). In this instance, it is plausible that the association between Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation triggered a positive mood among both associated consumer groups, consequently inspiring them to consider a donation.

Efficacy is the last relevant mechanism identified by Bekkers and Weipking (2007) which relates to the perception that donors are making a positive contribution through their donations. In the context of this study, this could be a strong driving force in the case of associated Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers who intend to donate to McGrath Foundation because they genuinely believe they are making a difference to the social cause.

In addition to donation intention, the social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation led to the intention to increase team association. Specifically, the findings from this study have demonstrated a significant and positive relationship between social alliance attitudes and increasing team association intention on a combined sample of both NPO and sports team consumers. It has been recognised that professional sports teams have varying levels of fan support ranging from casual fans to fanatics (Tapp & Clowes 2002). As such, these teams generally offer variant packages aimed at fans with differing levels of commitment (McDonald 2010). For example, a sports team can offer a ‘bronze’ package that requires low financial commitment in exchange for limited benefits such as access to all home games only. Further, they may also offer a ‘platinum’ package requiring high-level financial commitment but with the offer of multiple benefits such as access to all home and away games, hospitality functions, exclusive access to events, and reserved seating. The results in this study correspondingly indicate that consumers are willing to commit greater financial investment in the team by increasing their official level of association due to the sports team’s social alliance. This finding supports similar research observations where CSR activities by sports teams have been found to result in increased loyalty (e.g. Chang et al. 2017; Inoue, Mahan & Kent 2013; Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010; Nyadzayo, Leckie & McDonald 2016). For example, Nyadzayo, Leckie and McDonald (2016) uncovered that sports team CSR can impact fan loyalty, often expressed through the intention to purchase a season ticket, which is even more evident among those less connected to the team. Lacey and Kennett-Hensel (2010) similarly found that a team that participates in CSR activities receive both trusted and committed fan relationships which ultimately lead to a consumer willingness to increase purchase behaviour via ticket holder level.
In a social alliance setting, Inoue, Mahan and Kent (2013) contended that an alliance between a professional sports team and NPO reinforces one’s connection to the team.

However, none of these studies have captured this relationship from both the sports team and NPO consumer perspective. While previous CSR research has shown that current fans are willing to support the team, the findings in this study extend on this by demonstrating that NPO consumers are also willing to officially support the team. Mendleson and Polonsky (1995) earlier stated that social alliances can enable firms to reach ‘second generation consumers’ or those that are recipients of the NPOs services; yet, this study has shown that it can go beyond this potential consumer group to associated consumer networks of the NPO, which is presumably a more significant market size.

In this study, the results highlighting the relationship between social alliance attitudes and intention to increase team association amongst Australian Cricket Team consumers may be explained via relationship marketing theory. That is, social alliance activity can stimulate the consumer need to maintain relations with the sports team as a result of their social contributions. This manifests into relational benefits for the team such as consumers wanting to increase their level of support (Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010). A further explanation for this particular finding in the two associated groups is that the social alliance acts as an education mechanism. This means that consumers are provided with information concerning the values and commitment that the organisation shows towards other external stakeholders (Nyadzayo, Leckie & McDonald 2016). This may then prompt consumers to reward the team via behavioural commitment, such as increasing their team association.

It was hypothesised in this study that social alliance attitudes would lead to match attendance intention for both sports team and NPO consumers. Results of this study supported this hypothesis by demonstrating a significant and positive relationship between social alliance attitudes and match attendance intention. This reflects a recent study by Kim et al. (2017) who found a positive link between sports team CSR and consumer intentions to attend future matches. Although according to their research, this relationship is mediated by perceived sincerity of CSR activities. While the finding in this study broadly supports that by Kim et al. (2017), it does contrast other research which has found no evidence of the intention to attend matches as a result of team CSR. For example, in their examination of two regional amateur football teams in France, Blumrodt, Bryson and Flanagan (2012) found that sports fan perceptions of ethicality do not translate to favourable sport spectator behaviour, including
match attendance. Inoue, Kent and Lee (2011) also found an insignificant relationship between CSR as measured through sports team’s philanthropy and match attendance when examining whether CSR impacts the financial performance of sports teams. More recently, Inoue, Funk and McDonald (2017) concluded that the relationship between sports team CSR and fan behavioural loyalty, as measured through game attendance frequency, is weak as shown in their significant but small effect between perceived CSR and loyalty in sports fans. Such findings differ to those in this study which have shown that CSR as implemented via social alliances, generates a strong effect in terms of match attendance ($\beta = 2.222$).

The variation in findings between this study and former studies likely relates to the manner which CSR has been interpreted. For example, Inoue, Funk and McDonald’s (2017) study adopted a general measure of CSR, while this study measured CSR as implemented through social alliances. This perhaps indicates that consumers respond more positively to CSR via social alliances than generalised CSR activities implemented by the professional sports team.

In sum, results from past sports marketing research have drawn mixed responses when determining whether CSR activities lead to an increase in match attendance among consumers. Although until now, this has never been measured using social alliances as the overriding CSR activity. Significantly, as both consumer groups are willing to attend a sports team’s matches based on their social alliances holds a positive outlook for sports team managers given the impact of match attendance on a sports team’s revenue (Neale & Funk 2006).

In addition to social alliance attitudes leading to match attendance intention, in this study, social alliance attitudes were found to lead to favourable word-of-mouth (WOM) intention. This indicates that social alliances can act as a mechanism for consumers to advocate on behalf of both organisations within a social alliance. These are favourable results as positive WOM is one of the most effective marketing outcomes for firms operating in any given industry (Trusov, Bucklin & Pauwels 2009). The results in this study align with previous research that has suggested that CSR leads to favourable WOM (Bhattacharya & Sen 2004; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya 2016; Vlachos et al. 2009; Walsh & Bartikowski 2015; Xie, Bagozzi & Grønhaug 2015), including the sporting context, with Walker and Kent’s (2009) study showing that CSR participation can lead to WOM for the sports team. Similarly, Lacey and Kennett-Hensel (2010) found that the committed relationships that consumers and sports teams elicit through CSR, often transfers into favourable WOM. More recently, Chang et al. (2017) uncovered that once team pride increases as a result of sports team CSR participation, favourable WOM from fans increase. More
relatedly, this research extends on Lii and Lee (2012) who discovered a positive link between CRM and WOM for both the commercial firm and NPO. Thus, based on the findings of this study and previous work in CSR, it can be supported that CSR often leads to positive WOM.

This is particularly important for sports teams as many of them actively encourage consumers to spread positive WOM on their behalf especially among more committed consumers (Kunkel, Hill & Funk 2013). Furthermore, it has been argued that WOM is very important for NPOs given that donors commonly assess them through the advice of existing donors (Arnett, German & Hunt 2003; Sundermann 2017). This is despite the fact that sports team and NPO managers in this study did not highlight WOM as an outcome related to their social alliance participation in Phase One.

Further to WOM intention for both the sports team and NPO, social alliance attitudes were found to have influenced merchandise purchasing intention. Extant research drawing a link between CSR and purchase intention is inconclusive. Some authors have stipulated that CSR will only lead to positive purchasing when it is seen as sincere (e.g. Ellen, Webb & Mohr 2006), while others have found that CSR is not seen as an important factor as much as price and quality when consumers assess purchase criteria (e.g. Belk, Devinney & Eckhardt 2005). In contrast to these findings, previous studies have drawn a positive link between CSR and purchase behaviour (e.g. Auger et al. 2003; Creyer & Ross 1997; Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2010; Mohr, Webb & Harris 2001; Murray & Vogel 1997; Sen, Du & Bhattacharya 2016; Vitell 2015), demonstrating beneficial commercial outcomes for firms stemming from CSR. According to Sen, Du and Bhattacharya (2016), after much debate around CSR leading to consumer purchasing, it can be concluded that consumers are still more likely to make purchase decisions resulting from CSR. This view is supported in this study where results have shown that attitudes generated from a social alliance appears to influence the intention to purchase sports team merchandise among both associated consumer groups.

More specifically, this research bolsters literature in relation to CSR in sports and CRM. This includes the finding that consumer attitudes resulting from such initiatives lead to merchandise consumption among existing fans from a CSR in sports perspective (Walker & Kent 2009). Within the extant CRM literature, this study supports Bigné-Alcañiz et al. (2012) in particular, who demonstrated a positive link between favourable brand attitudes and brand purchase intention. Furthermore, according to Lee and Ferreira’s (2013) study of a CRM relationship in sport, there is a positive link between favourable CRM attitudes and sports team merchandise purchase.
intent. It also builds on previous research where the findings of this study have shown that both sports team and NPO consumer groups are willing to purchase sports team merchandise due to the team’s social alliance.

These favourable consumer reactions by both consumer groups towards both organisations in a social alliance can likely be explained by social exchange theory. Specifically, as stated in the literature review in subsection 3.1.2, it was expected that various social exchanges between the two associated consumer groups and the two organisations in the social alliance would prompt affective and conative consumer reactions.

Social exchange has been conceptualised as “a joint activity of two or more actors in which each actor has something the other values” (Lawler 2001, p. 322). Such exchange is based on the benefit for each actor via the exchange of behaviours or goods (Emerson 1976; Homans 1961). Within the context of this study, the developed social alliance attitudes may prompt the Australian Cricket Team consumer to subsequently provide financial support for McGrath Foundation through donations. Thus, an exchange of goods from one actor to the other has occurred. In reciprocation, the Australian Cricket Team consumer likely feels satisfaction, or altruism for their donation behaviour. Subsequently, a balance of exchange has occurred as each actor receives value from the other. At the same time, McGrath Foundation consumers might follow a similar path where the McGrath Foundation receives consumer loyalty (as indicated via donation intention) in exchange for feelings of pride and/or satisfaction resultant from assisting a social cause of relevance to the consumer. The above example is in accordance with McGrath (1997) who suggested that repeated donations to an NPO is often a result of the satisfaction a donor feels following the initial donation. The same path can be postulated for the NPO WOM intention where through the affect generated from the social alliance, the Australian Cricket Team consumer spreads positive WOM on behalf of the McGrath Foundation and in exchange is rewarded with feelings of pride, satisfaction or altruism. For McGrath Foundation consumers, the emotional exchange they receive is reciprocated for the NPO in the form of loyalty via WOM. This finding is in line with Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) who suggested that social exchange theory presupposes that relationships evolve into loyal and mutual commitments.

Similarly, other outcomes shown in this study (e.g. merchandise purchasing, increasing team association) can be explained by a comparable social exchange link where the consumer shows an intent towards behaviour directed at both organisations in a social alliance in exchange for emotions or affect (Lawler 2001). For example, the findings in this study have demonstrated a
positive consumer reaction towards the Australian Cricket Team which can plausibly be explained by the derived feelings of pride or satisfaction an associated consumer feels towards the team due to its community contributions. Consequently, the Australian Cricket Team consumer wants to reward the team by increasing their official level of support, attending more matches, purchasing team-related merchandise or spreading favourable sports team WOM. For the McGrath Foundation consumer, the impact that the Australian Cricket Team has on the McGrath Foundation might generate feelings of legitimacy or satisfaction, which could then manifest into various behavioural exchanges including increasing team association, attending matches, purchasing team merchandise and spreading positive WOM on behalf of the team. With this in mind, the results in this study confirmed the contention that associated consumers of each parent organisation may become the partial consumer of the partner organisation in a social alliance.

9.5 How Do the Antecedents to Social Alliance Awareness Differ Among Sports Team and NPO Consumers?

This portion of the thesis presents a concluding discussion of results concerning the multigroup hypotheses which compared the antecedents to social alliance awareness among NPO and sports team consumers.

With regard to consumer identification, a positive direct effect was found between consumer identification and social alliance awareness in both consumer groups. While there is a difference between the two groups, with NPO consumers ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 0.268, p<0.001$) showing a stronger effect between consumer identification and social alliance awareness than sports team consumers ($\beta_{\text{MF}} = 0.141, P<0.001$), the difference is insignificant. Thus, the moderating role of the associated consumer group had no influence on the relationship between consumer identification and social alliance awareness. Although generally anticipated that a sports team would garner greater identification due to its passionate fan base (Babiak & Wolfe 2009; Smith & Westerbeek 2007; Tapp & Clowes 2002), many NPOs have consumer networks that also highly identify with them (Burton et al. 2017; Stephenson & Yerger 2014; Sundermann 2017). This indicates that sports team and NPO identification are not necessarily disparate. Therefore, it can be concluded that consumer identification is a key contributing factor to social alliance awareness regardless of the differences between the consumer groups.
In addition to consumer identification, consumer trust was measured as an attitudinal antecedent to awareness. According to results in this study, there is a direct effect between consumer trust and social alliance awareness among both associated consumer groups. The findings suggest that consumers with an established bond with their aligned organisation as developed through relational trust are more aware of social alliance business practices and activities they participate in. The insignificant difference in effect sizes between the two groups ($\beta_{ACT} = 0.108, p<0.001; \beta_{MF} = 0.165, p<0.001$) indicates no moderating effect of the associated consumer group on the link between consumer trust and social alliance awareness. Therefore, it can be postulated that both the sports team and NPO have developed trust among their associated consumer networks.

Following consumer trust, televised match viewership was measured as an antecedent to social alliance awareness. While results in this study have shown a positive and significant effect from televised match viewership to social alliance awareness in each consumer group ($\beta_{ACT} = 0.055, p<0.05; \beta_{MF} = 0.086, p<0.001$), the difference between them was insignificant. This result is surprising given that televised match viewership is normally associated with typical sports fan behaviour. This could be attributed to the sports team consumer paying closer attention to what is happening on-field rather than other marketing messages during televised matches. This aligns with selective perception theory where consumers only process a limited number of marketing stimuli while ignoring others (Taylor, Franke & Bang 2006). Alternatively, the finding could be explained by the specific team under analysis in this study. As a national team, it is likely the Australian Cricket Team draw more supporters and subsequent viewers than a professional club team. Therefore, a broader audience incorporating McGrath Foundation consumers may likely be tuning into matches.

In regard to live match viewership, the results here have shown a positive direct effect between live match viewership and social alliance awareness in the sports team consumer group. In contrast, the relationship between live game viewership and social alliance awareness is insignificant for NPO consumers. Yet, despite this disparity in results, the multigroup testing showed no significant difference between the two consumer groups ($\beta_{ACT} = 0.037, p<0.05; \beta_{MF} = 0.043, p>0.05$). Thus, the moderating effect of the associated consumer group plays little role in influencing the relationship between live match viewership and social alliance awareness. There are two plausible explanations for this result. First, sports team matches are played in multiple stadiums both nationally and internationally, therefore, it is logistically challenging for particular consumers to attend all matches. Second, it is possible that during live matches, the social
alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation is not adequately promoted. Whilst the centrepiece activity, the Pink Test, is dedicated to the social alliance, little attention may be paid to promoting the social alliance during other home and away matches; thus impacting on both associated consumer group’s social alliance awareness.

Following on from live game viewership, social media engagement was the next antecedent to social alliance awareness that underwent multigroup testing in this study. This relationship returned a positive direct effect for both consumer groups. Further, the results showed that the effect is moderated by the associated consumer group with McGrath Foundation consumers relying more on social media to develop awareness of their aligned organisation’s social alliance ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 0.064$, $p<0.05$; $\beta_{\text{MF}} = 0.274$, $p<0.001$). Therefore, of all antecedents to awareness, social media engagement is an isolated case where the associated consumer group moderated the effect of social alliance awareness. The difference in the strength of relationship between social media engagement and social alliance awareness among the two consumer groups can plausibly be explained by the diversity of social media messages sent by each organisation to targeted constituents. For example, the sports teams commonly use social media to provide information on players, match activity, teams, results, highlights, commercial relationships, statistics, promotions, fan interactions, entertainment and achievements (Wang & Zhou 2015; Witkemper, Lim & Waldburger 2012). In contrast NPOs mostly use social media for basic communication of information such as activities, donation and volunteer requests, and advocacy (Lovejoy, Waters & Saxton 2012). It is possible that for sports team consumers, these messages are getting lost among the plethora of sports-related content which means they are less focused on off-field content.

9.6 How Does the HOE Sequence Differ Among Sports Team and NPO Consumers?

The theoretical stance taken in this study is that the associated consumer group would moderate the relationship between social alliance awareness and knowledge of the social alliance partner. While a direct effect was evident here between social alliance awareness and knowledge of social alliance partner for each consumer group, the insignificant difference indicates the absence of the moderating effect of associated consumer group ($\beta_{\text{ACT}} = 1.829$, $p<0.001$; $\beta_{\text{MF}} = 1.100$, $p<0.001$). As indicated in the slightly stronger effect size, perhaps sports team consumers feel slightly more confident in their knowledge of the social alliance partner than their NPO counterparts which can be explained by the subjective knowledge measure. However, the insignificant difference in results is unsurprising given that knowledge is a
cognitive extension of awareness (Lavidge & Steiner 1961). That is, consumers with high-level awareness of a particular object can progress to deeper knowledge of that object via further learning (Smith, Chen & Yang 2008).

With regard to the relationship between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes, the results of this study have shown a positive direct effect for both consumer groups. Furthermore, results have indicated that the relationship is moderated by the associated consumer group with a significant difference in the strength of the relationship between the two constructs recorded for each consumer group ($\beta_{ACT} = 0.729, p<0.001; \beta_{MF} = 0.285, p<0.001$). As evidenced, Australian Cricket Team consumers showed a higher effect than McGrath Foundation consumers in their attitudinal evaluations of the social alliance. It is feasible that this result can be explained by how the organisations position social alliances according to core objectives. That is, social alliances are arguably more closely aligned to an NPO’s core objective as a medium to generate funds. From the sports team perspective, social alliances could instead be considered extra-curricular given that the core objectives are more oriented towards on-field performance and related activities such as coaching, youth development, and player contracts. Thus, the stronger affective reaction is driven by sports team consumers’ appreciation of the extra-curricular activities geared towards assisting community stakeholders, as opposed to NPO consumers, who might consider a social alliance as another fundraising activity.

9.7 How Does the Influence of Social Alliance Attitudes on Consumer Reactions Differ Among Sports Team and NPO Consumers?

It was hypothesised that the moderating effect of the associated consumer group would influence the strength of the relationship between attitudinal evaluations and donation intention. As expected, there was a significant difference in the strength of the relationship among these two variables for each consumer group. Specifically, NPO consumers exhibited a stronger effect of social alliance attitudes on donation intention than sports team consumers as a result of the social alliance ($\beta_{ACT} = 1.020, p<0.001; \beta_{MF} = 2.832, p<0.001$). This finding is reasonably surprising given that NPO consumers are largely made up of already established donors, volunteers and fundraisers. It is expected that as a loyal consumer base, the social alliance would have less bearing on their donation behaviour than sports team consumers. Although, it could be argued that as a loyal consumer base, NPO consumers are more likely to want to support the organisation via regular donations (McGrath 1997; Sargeant & Woodliffe 2007), and the social alliance merely acts as one of many triggers to stimulate this.
The intention to increase team association was an outcome in this study relating to social alliance participation for the sports team. For both of the consumer groups, increasing team association intention returned a positive and significant result. The moderating effect of the associated consumer group played a significant role on this outcome, with NPO consumers demonstrating a stronger effect between social alliance attitudinal evaluations and increasing team association intention ($\beta_{ACT} = 1.187, p<0.001; \beta_{MF} = 3.306, p<0.001$). This aligns with Lacey, Close and Finney (2010) who opined that social alliance event attendees are more likely to demonstrate a commitment to the sponsoring firm. In this study’s context, NPO consumers appear to be more likely to show a behavioural commitment to the partner firm by showing intent to officially increase their level of support for the sports team.

The stronger effect for NPO consumers in their intention to increase team association is significant for sports teams who look to social alliances to build their season ticket holder (STH) base. By NPO consumers expressing such an interest in supporting the team due to their social alliance participation, it is possible that a new market segment emerged. This also indicates sports team consumers are not as willing as NPO consumers to reward the sports team for their off-field activities which could be due to the latter already indicating a strong commitment to the team.

Following the interviews with sports team and NPO managers, it was theorised here that social alliance participation leads to sports team match attendance intention. In line with this, a direct effect between social alliance attitudinal evaluations and match attendance intention was evident in both consumer groups. The results also showed the moderating effect of the associated consumer group on the strength of the relationship between attitudinal evaluations and intention to attend matches ($\beta_{ACT} = 1.001, p<0.001; \beta_{MF} = 3.460, p<0.001$). More precisely, NPO consumers demonstrated a stronger likelihood to attend matches than their sports team counterparts as a result of the social alliance.

Such findings again provide interesting insight for sports team managers looking to social alliances to achieve multiple marketing objectives. That is, while both of the consumer groups appeared willing to attend more matches based on social alliance participation, the stronger effect for NPO consumers suggests a deeper enthusiasm to engage in typical fan behaviour as a result. A similar yet reverse outcome is found in a sponsorship setting where sports fans attend the stores of the commercial sponsor aligned with their team due to this firm’s support of the sponsored entity (Herrmann, Kacha & Derbaix 2016). This can plausibly translate to findings in
this study where NPO consumers see the sports team as the ‘sponsoring firm’ and want to attend matches as a result of the association between the two organisations.

The relationship between attitudinal evaluations and sports team WOM intention has demonstrated a positive direct effect for both associated consumer groups. The moderating effect of the associated consumer group plays a role where a significant difference in the strength of relationship between social alliance attitudes and sports team WOM intent ($\beta_{ACT} = 1.479, p<0.001; \beta_{MF} = 4.084, p<0.001$) was found. More specifically, NPO consumers indicated a stronger intention to spread positive WOM on behalf of the sports team than their counterparts as a result of social alliance participation. This is an interesting finding as sports team WOM has typically been associated with fan loyalty and commitment (Bauer, Stokburger-Sauer & Exler 2008; Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010). In this study’s context, one would expect sports team consumers to be more active in spreading sports team WOM than NPO consumers.

Similarly to spreading sports team WOM, the associated consumers on both sides of the dyad returned a positive direct effect from social alliance attitudes to NPO WOM intention. The moderating effect of the associated consumer group was evident, based on the significant difference in the strength of this relationship ($\beta_{ACT} = 1.299, p<0.001; \beta_{MF} = 3.813, p<0.001$). The results showed a stronger relationship among NPO consumers than sports team consumers concerning NPO WOM intent resulting from a social alliance. This finding is less surprising than for sports team WOM intention, given that NPO WOM is generally indicative of committed NPO consumer behaviour (Sundermann 2017).

These findings concerning stronger WOM intent for the sports team and NPO on behalf of the NPO consumer may partly be explained by the inherent altruism normally associated with these consumers (Phillips & Phillips 2011; Piferi, Jobe & Jones 2006). Previous research has indicated that consumers who possess high altruism often engage in positive WOM and generally hold the expectation that they should engage in such behaviour (Romani, Grappi & Bagozzi 2013). Therefore, if an NPO consumer is more altruistic than a sport team consumer, they are more likely to engage in advocacy behaviours. In saying that, the findings of this study are positive for both sport team and NPO managers, as both consumer groups indicate a willingness to spread favourable WOM.

From the perspective of engaging in sports team merchandise purchasing, the theoretical position in this study was that the associated consumer group moderates the relationship
between attitudinal evaluations and intention to purchase merchandise. Both sports team and NPO consumers indicated a positive and significant link between social alliance attitudes and merchandise purchasing intent. Yet, NPO consumers showed a stronger relationship between these attitudinal evaluations and merchandise purchasing intention compared to sports team consumers ($\beta_{ACT} = 1.086, p<0.001; \beta_{MF} = 3.427, p<0.001$).

This finding also contradicts general expectations, with sports team merchandise purchasing typically aligned with committed and loyal fan behaviour (Trail, Anderson & Fink 2005) as well as positive fan behaviour towards CSR and CRM alliances (Lee & Ferreira 2013; Walker & Kent 2009). It is plausible that the NPO consumers in this study either wanted to invest in the sports team including via merchandise as a result of social alliance participation, or felt a sense of affiliation with the sports team and wanted to openly display this relationship through officially branded merchandise (Kwon & Armstrong 2002). This is in line with the similarity-attraction theory which stipulates that individuals are attracted to and support those individuals or groups that are similar to their own (Smith 1998).

### 9.8 Summary of Findings

To briefly summarise the findings from the qualitative and quantitative components of this study, sports team and NPO managers did not incorporate systematic business practices regarding social alliance strategy development and evaluation, thus inhibiting their social alliance effectiveness. Despite such underdeveloped business practice, some of these managers listed four key mechanisms they use to stimulate social alliance awareness: 1) televised match viewership; 2) live match viewership; 3) website visits; and 4) social media engagement. Two additional attitudinal antecedents to social alliance awareness were developed from previous theory: consumer identification; and consumer trust. Through the interview process, managers also identified various consumer-related outcomes they expected or hoped to achieve from their social alliance participation: 1) awareness generation; 2) donations; 3) increasing team association; 4) match attendance; and 5) merchandise purchasing. Two additional consumer-related outcomes: WOM for the sports team and NPO, were generated from previous theory.

Quantitative results showed that on a combined sample, except for website visits, all the hypothesised antecedents led to social alliance awareness. Of all antecedents to awareness, consumer identification returned the strongest effect. Further, both sports team and NPO
consumers proceeded through a traditional HOE sequence. Specifically, once social alliance awareness was established, consumers advanced to knowledge of social alliance partner, then to social alliance attitudes. Following the development of social alliance attitudes, most consumers demonstrated an intent to donate, increase team association, attend matches, spread sports team and NPO WOM and purchase sports team merchandise as a result of the social alliance.

Multigroup testing in this study showed that among the antecedents to awareness, the moderating effect of the associated consumer group was only relevant for social media engagement. In this context, NPO consumers demonstrated a stronger effect than sports team consumers. There was also a significant difference between knowledge of social alliance partner and social alliance attitudes amongst the two groups with sports team consumers returning a stronger effect. Finally, multigroup testing showed that the associated consumer group moderated the path of social alliance attitudes on all six consumer-related outcomes. In this case, NPO consumers returned a stronger effect across all outcome variables, including donation intention, increasing team association intention, match attendance intention, sports team and NPO WOM intention, and purchasing merchandise intention.

9.9 Theoretical Implications

Five theoretical implications have emerged from the research undertaken here. These include 1) a more comprehensive social alliance process; 2) dual consumer perspectives; 3) influences on awareness; 4) CSR and social alliance cognition; and 5) HOE confirmation. These are discussed in detail below.

9.9.1 A more comprehensive social alliance process has been achieved

Existing research concerning social alliance practice is limited (van Tulder et al. 2016), which is partly due to such research taking a narrow business practice perspective with very little empirically investigating the holistic process of management input into social alliances to generate consumer output. This study therefore has implications for current social alliance theory, as it has used a combination of qualitative research to capture social alliance management practice and quantitative research to investigate social alliance consumer reactions. A more comprehensive social alliance process has consequently been achieved.
One of the overall aims of the qualitative component of this study was to develop an understanding of social alliance practice in an area where current theory has been scant, namely antecedents to awareness (Bergkvist & Taylor 2016; Burton et al. 2017). Furthermore, existing research addressing social alliances has tended to adopt a partnership design perspective where the analysis is based on internal partnership functions or outcomes (e.g. Jamali & Keshishian 2009; Seitanidi & Ryan 2007; Selsky & Parker 2005) rather than externally related stakeholder outcomes. As such, a second objective of the qualitative component of this study was to investigate the anticipated consumer behaviour outcomes that sports team and NPO managers expect to achieve from their social alliance participation. The core purpose of the quantitative component was to capture whether these management objectives or anticipated outcomes regarding consumer behaviour were met. While consumer behaviour has been captured in extant alliance literature, this has predominantly been in relation to CRM.

In combination, both the qualitative and quantitative components of this study build on current theory addressing social alliances where the perspectives of managers and consumers are simultaneously captured.

9.9.2 A dual consumer perspective has provided a more insightful picture

The principal theoretical implication of this study is the capturing of a dual consumer perspective towards both organisations in a social alliance. While it has previously been postulated that both participating organisations in social alliance relationships have consumer networks (Burton et al. 2017), these joint reactions have never been captured empirically. Thus, the findings here have significant implications for CSR and alliance-based theory. Existing CSR research including CRM, has measured the consumer reaction to one or to both organisations in an alliance but always from the perspective of one consumer group. The findings of this study extend on existing research by empirically demonstrating that organisations that enter a social alliance generally have their own associated consumer group that react differently to each organisation in the alliance. Furthermore, the stronger reactions from this study’s NPO consumers compared with that of sports team consumers indicates that this consumer group is more prevalent and active than has previously been theorised. Therefore, the reaction by both consumer groups towards both organisations in a social alliance postulates a four-way consumer reaction, as the associated consumers of each organisation transition to partial consumers of the partner firm.
Up until now, existing theory concerning consumer reactions to social alliances appears to have been underdeveloped.

9.9.3 There are many influences on awareness

This study’s findings concerned with the effectiveness of the antecedents that lead to social alliance awareness provide significant insights for current CSR, CSR in sport and alliance-based theory. Most literature has assumed the mechanisms that cause awareness of CSR (Schmeltz 2012), with very few researchers empirically measuring the effectiveness of antecedents to CSR awareness among consumers (see exception Andreu, Casado-Díaz & Mattila 2015). Thus, extant research on how to generate CSR awareness within the consumer stakeholder group is limited. In evaluating the antecedents to social alliance awareness, this study found that consumer identification, consumer trust, televised match viewership, live match viewership and social media engagement are influential constructs that impact awareness, whereas website visits are not. While two of these factors uniquely relate to the sporting context only, the others have permutations for CSR and social alliance theory by demonstrating that they influence consumer awareness.

Furthermore, as indicated in the literature review in chapter two, current theory addressing CSR communication has either adopted a very narrow perspective, focusing on only one communication channel (e.g. Gaither & Austin 2016) or taken a very broad conceptual perspective such as PR or advertising (e.g. Du, Bhattacharya & Sen 2010; Jahdi & Acikdilli 2009). The extant CSR theory does not capture a multi-channel perspective where firms use various channels of communication to generate CSR awareness. Thus, the empirical findings in this study provide a new understanding of CSR communication, and therefore make a substantial theoretical contribution by examining the effectiveness of a multi-channel approach to develop CSR awareness.

From a marketing alliance perspective, including social alliances, Bergkvist and Taylor (2016) indicated that the influences on awareness in subsequent research are virtually non-existent and worthy of further exploration. While Gwinner and Swanson (2003) demonstrated that fan identification is a contributing factor to commercial sponsorship awareness in a sporting context, current literature has not sufficiently explained both attitudinal and behavioural determinants of alliance awareness. The findings in this study therefore provide critical insight
to the mechanisms that contribute to alliance-based awareness. Furthermore, capturing the impact of these mechanisms among two disparate yet connected consumer groups, each of which is affected by the alliance, further enriches the knowledge of the influences that cause alliance awareness.

9.9.4 CSR and alliance-based awareness and knowledge is better captured

Previously, very few researchers have empirically examined consumer CSR awareness (Pomering & Dolnicar 2009; Servaes & Tamayo 2013). However, this understanding is starting to develop momentum in extant research as more empirical examinations of CSR awareness occur (e.g. Walker & Kent 2013; Servaes & Tamayo 2013). The findings of this study contribute to this momentum by adopting a CSR awareness perspective from two disparate consumer groups, demonstrating that both consumer groups have a similar awareness of CSR via social alliances. Further, the high level of social partner awareness as depicted through an aided recall measure in this study contradicts existing research that has implied CSR awareness is low (Pomering & Dolnicar 2009; Sen, Bhattacharya and Korschun 2006; Servaes & Tamayo 2013; Walker & Heere 2011; Walker et al. 2010; Walker & Kent 2013). Thus, the evidence from this study indicates that in some instances, CSR awareness among consumers is stronger than initially thought.

With regard to alliance-based theory, another implication from this study’s findings emerged. That is, in measuring consumer awareness of social alliance partners via aided recall and social alliances via a multi-item construct measure, this study has answered the call from Bergkvist and Taylor (2016) opining that awareness of marketing alliances, including social alliances is a large gap in extant research. By demonstrating here that consumers are aware of social alliance partners and social alliances themselves, these findings have significant implications for understanding such awareness. This is an important first step for current social and commercial partnership theory development concerned with consumer awareness.

A further step to CSR and partnership theory development is the understanding concerning knowledge of CSR implemented via social alliances. While research addressing consumer knowledge of CSR is scant (Wigley 2008), it has been measured here as a further cognitive function relating to social alliances. The findings show that both associated consumer groups
possess sufficient knowledge of their aligned organisation’s social alliance partner. Thus, a broader understanding and perspective of CSR knowledge is presented in this study.

9.9.5 A typical hierarchy-of-effects sequence is sound in a social alliance context

The implications drawn from this study also have an impact on current consumer behaviour theory. Specifically, this study adopted the HOE as the theoretical framework in order to measure consumer reactions to social alliances. Findings showed that consumers undergo a rigid consumer behaviour process when reacting to each organisation in a social alliance. Therefore, it was evidenced that the HOE sequence is theoretically sound. As such, this study contributes to the seminal work of Murray and Vogel (1997) who used a HOE theoretical framework to capture such reactions to CSR. Building on this work, results in this study further demonstrate that various antecedents stimulate awareness of a social alliance which leads to a cognitive-affective-conative consumer behaviour process, and it has done so across two consumer groups.

Additionally, with regard to consumer behaviour outcomes developed from CSR or social alliances, most research has captured consumer reactions to one organisation and has mostly been related to purchase behaviour (e.g. Chernev & Blair 2015). In cases where consumer reactions have been towards both firms in a social alliance (e.g. Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004), this has never been from the perspective of two consumer groups that are closely aligned with each organisation. Furthermore, past studies have only focused on purchase behaviour and donations (e.g. Irmak, Sen & Bhattacharya 2015; Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig 2004). While not in a social alliance setting, Murray and Vogel (1997) suggested that behaviour relating to CSR extends beyond purchase behaviour. The findings in this study compound this, with consumer outcomes relating to the NPO consisting of both donation and WOM intentions, and consumer outcomes for the sports team consisting of increasing team association, match attendance, purchasing sports team merchandise and WOM intentions. These findings demonstrate that consumer behaviour relating to CSR is more extensive than has been shown in previous work.

9.10 Managerial Implications

This research has enabled the further development and understanding of social alliance partnerships within professional sports, including their impact on consumer behaviour.
Understanding the associated consumer reaction to each organisation in a social alliance provides management with significant insight on how social alliances can achieve multiple marketing objectives. These managerial implications are relevant for both sports team and NPO marketers and managers. This subsection subsequently provides the critical implications drawn from this study for various industry practitioners, which have been broken down into five main components. These include 1) social alliance strategy; 2) NPO business practice; 3) antecedents to social alliance awareness; 4) evaluation and touchpoints; and 5) favourable marketing outcomes from social alliances. While these findings have been developed from one well-known social alliance, it is suggested that the implications of these results can extend to lesser-known or newly formed social alliances to facilitate best practice.

9.10.1 A strategised social alliance approach is required

The results concerning consumer behaviour towards both firms in the social alliance present pragmatic guidelines for selecting a strategised approach to such alliances. As highlighted in the qualitative component of this study, managers generally adopt an ad hoc approach to their social alliance strategy development. For example, formalised objectives were virtually absent for both sports team and NPO managers; managers instead mentioned idealised outcomes incorporated into the revised conceptual model that were not necessarily purposefully pursued. In addition, managers also showed little by way of evaluative mechanisms used to measure external successes or failures regarding social alliance output. In line with previous strategic management theory, it is valuable for organisations to integrate goals, policies and action sequences to achieve objectives at both an individual and collaborative level (Clarke & Fuller 2010; Huxham 1993; Quinn 1998), and to evaluate the attainment of objectives (Kouwenhoven 1993; van Tulder et al. 2016).

Lacey and Kennett-Hensel (2010) contended that like other business functions, CSR is an investment, and that like most investments, time is required to be rewarded with associated benefits. While manager responses in Phase One of this study indicated this line of thinking is starting to develop in their social alliance approach, many were unable to see the marketing benefits associated with it. These findings therefore show that managers need to alter their presumptions that their social alliance programs are a peripheral activity designed to satisfy the select few, and begin to realise that sincere, well-developed social alliances can manifest into critical marketing outcomes for both organisations. This means moving from what Austin (2000)
referred to as ‘philanthropic partnerships’ to more integrative partnerships designed to maximise benefits to various stakeholders. CSR initiatives rarely reach their potential in maximising outcomes because managers commonly overlook the range of benefits it can provide (Docherty & Hibbert 2003; Lacey & Kennett-Hensel 2010).

9.10.2 NPO business practice is sub-optimal versus theory

NPO business practice was shown to be sub-optimal in comparison to existing theory. Namely, the theoretical position underlying developed business practice is the use of strengthened consumer relationship management (Chen & Hu 2013; Fullerton 2005; Zeithaml, Bitner & Gremler 2013) and engagement strategies (Pansari & Kumar 2017). However, in the case of NPOs, this was shown to be especially underdeveloped with multiple NPOs in this study not adopting such tools or procedures. Consequently, two of these critical implications for managers were developed not from the research findings, but rather the research process undertaken in this study. These are also highlighted as limitations of the study presented in Section 9.11.

First, the inclusion of only one social alliance in this study was primarily due to poor consumer database management by other targeted NPOs, which resulted in the exclusion of another two social alliances. These additional NPOs were unable to participate in the research as they had little or no personal details of previous donors, funders and volunteers on their database. They were subsequently unable to send emails or sufficiently communicate with consumer networks. While this was not the focus of this study, this is an important finding for sports team managers wishing to align with an NPO to enact CSR. To achieve the potential marketing outcomes associated with social alliances as discovered in this study, it is critical that during the formation stage they ensure potential NPO partners keep up-to-date, detailed information on current and past consumers. Database management is a critical part of consumer relationship management, allowing firms to understand and develop relationships with different consumer groups (Dwyer et al. 2009). It is therefore imperative for sports team managers to form social alliances with NPOs that adopt sound consumer management practices.

Second, while other NPO managers agreed to participate in this research, poor engagement from their consumer base meant that insufficient questionnaire responses were received. As a result, two additional social alliances to the organisations mentioned previously were excluded from examination. This was also evident among McGrath Foundation consumers, where only
1% participated in the questionnaire despite 4,500 consumers receiving it via email. However, this was overcome with panel data given the popularity of the organisation. Consequently, both NPO and sports team managers need to be considerate of possible implications of poor associated NPO consumer engagement. From an NPO perspective, management need to implement various relationship marketing tools such as storytelling to increase consumer engagement (Kim, Lloyd & Cervellon 2016). Sports team managers correspondingly need to ensure that potential NPO partners are adopting consumer engagement strategies to provide a platform for consumers willing to communicate with the NPO and sports team. This could mean developing and implementing joint engagement strategies as the social alliance relationship progresses to stimulate engagement with key stakeholders (Holmes & Smart 2009). This can also be an important step assisting NPO consumer retention given the relationship between effective consumer engagement and consumer loyalty (Pansari & Kumar 2017).

9.10.3 Attitudinal and behavioural antecedents to awareness need to be considered

The findings here relating to the various antecedents to social alliance awareness provide management with insight into the different determinants that influence awareness of social alliance participation. In particular, given that consumer identification has been identified as the strongest contributing factor to social alliance awareness, consumers should be segmented based on their varying degrees of identification. This may be effective in developing alternative social alliance promotion strategies targeted at each segment, and further enhancing awareness among consumers (Herrmann, Kacha & Derbaix 2016). Managers could also focus their direct communication efforts on those consumers that already highly identify with the organisation, or alternatively focus on those with low identification to stimulate stronger identification and strengthen social alliance awareness (Gwinner & Swanson 2003; Sutton et al. 1997). It is therefore advocated here that managers from both sides of the dyad identify and segment associated consumers by identification levels, and develop outreach strategies targeting both consumer groups.

Consumer trust was the second attitudinal antecedent identified in this study as leading to social alliance awareness in both associated consumer groups. This suggests that managers should adopt differing strategies to develop consumer trust. In the context of this study, both sports teams and NPOs can provide consumers with consistent and competent performances, which have been highlighted as a precursor to consumer trust (Sichtmann 2007; Sirdeshmukh, Singh
& Sabol 2002). This does not necessarily have to extend to on-field performances for sports teams, but as service providers, both organisations must demonstrate competency at frontline employee and management practice level. This could include demonstrating that the organisation is both competent and credible (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman 1995; Sichtmann 2007). For example, actively communicating achievements at leadership and community level, such organisation successes including designation of funds to CSR programs could demonstrate competency. Other trust building tactics such as relationship development strategies or delivering on promises could also influence consumer trust (Hess & Story 2005; Sichtmann 2007). Once trust is established between the firm and consumer, it has been uncovered here that awareness of their social alliances and subsequent benefits can ensue.

Furthermore, as indicated by the behavioural antecedents to awareness within this study, with the exception of website visits, a multi-channel approach to communicating social alliances is an effective way for firms to develop social alliance awareness across both targeted and broader audiences. It is therefore also recommended that managers on both sides of the dyad adopt a deliberate multi-channel communication strategy concerning social alliances.

The insufficiency of website visits leading to social alliance awareness provides an implication of import for managers. Websites have often been cited as the iconic representation of an organisation (Cebi 2013; Esrock & Leichty 1998; Maignan & Ralston 2002; Pollach 2005) and are important as they communicate CSR activities to key stakeholders (Angeles & Capriotti 2009; Breitbarth & Harris 2008). Thus, it is suggested here that management redevelop their website communication of social alliance initiatives. By providing consumers with a more creative and transparent website experience, there is a stronger likelihood this channel will yield effective results for CSR awareness (Tagesson et al. 2009). For example, creating more innovative websites (e.g. embedding videos, sounds and virtual tours) will enable more active interaction and engagement with the website to develop further understanding of the social alliance. Further, websites should allow both consumers and employees to exchange and discuss CSR information, including social alliances (Nyahunzvi 2013). This is enhanced in the sports setting where sports teams have significant 'star power' that can be used to engage with interested stakeholders (Schoenborn & Tritten 2013). Such a strategy is also likely to reduce perceived bias, as the information source is more trusted (Walker & Kent 2009).

It is also strongly advocated here that management consider developing a joint website highlighting their integration within the social alliance. Cross-promotional strategies such as
logo placement on each other’s website do not appear to achieve positive CSR awareness responses; firms should therefore consider changing tact on their website strategy. They are then more likely to achieve a range of associated outcomes in addition to highlighting their social alliances. For example, using a joint website, consumers on both sides of a social alliance can participate in normal patronage behaviours such as donating to the NPO, finding socially relevant information, purchasing sports team merchandise and tickets to an upcoming match all on the one site. In addition, the perception of an integrated, genuine partnership can be established. For many firms, this will convert the view of simply adopting a philanthropic relationship to a more dedicated and integrated social alliance that is sincere about the achievement of both marketing and social objectives (Jamali & Keshishian 2009; Seitanidi & Crane 2009).

The additional findings here that have demonstrated a significant but weak effect between live game viewership and social alliance awareness on the combined sample as well as the insignificant effect among NPO consumers suggest that managers are not doing enough during live games to promote the social alliance. It is therefore recommended that managers ensure social alliance relationships are continuously and innovatively promoted via live matches. For example, NPO partners could employ various in-stadium activities such as spectator interaction or uniquely developed on-field initiatives highlighting the social cause (Biscaia et al. 2013).

From a televised game viewership perspective, the significant but weak effect between this and social alliance awareness indicates that managers need to further develop their current promotional strategy via televised matches. For example, using TV billboards during televised matches should enhance social alliance awareness, as these have previously been shown to lead to increased recall (Lardinoit & Derbaix 2001; Olson & Thjømøe 2012). Thus, lesser-known social alliances than the one focused on in this study could use TV billboards to further develop social alliance awareness. It is also suggested here that managers increase the frequency of TV channels to promote their social alliances. This is particularly important in the context of this study, because NPO partners are often competing with commercial firms that sponsor sports teams for a share of the consumer’s mind. Both social alliance partners therefore need to integrate efforts to enhance consumer awareness in an oversaturated market (Wakefield, Becker-Olsen & Cornwell 2007).

Social media has also been identified in this study as an influence on social alliance awareness. This is a positive outcome for both the sports team and NPO managers who stated social media
as their principal communication tool concerning social alliances. However, the significant yet weak effect between social media engagement and social alliance awareness indicates that management need to further develop their social media strategy to be more effective in generating social alliance awareness. It is therefore recommended here that organisations adopt all major forms of social media and use them regularly to communicate with both associated and partial consumers. Burton et al. (2017) suggested something similar, emphasising that firms in CSR partnerships are afforded the opportunity to reciprocally promote each other. This could take the form of repeated messages and/or utilise the two-way or dialogical function of social media where organisations can communicate with interested stakeholders or use targeted advertising. Organisations may consequently stimulate cognitive functions across the consumer groups, which will influence the HOE sequence. Similar to websites, it is recommended that managers consider a joint social media profile to exhibit the integration of their social alliance efforts, and that this profile is actively promoted.

9.10.4 Understanding the consumer behaviour process enables evaluation and touchpoints

This study’s findings demonstrate a hierarchical sequence to the consumer behaviour process resultant from a social alliance, which has various management implications. In particular, management understanding that a HOE sequence occurs could help to evaluate prosocial consumer behaviour generated from social alliance output (Murray & Vogel 1997). Managers can therefore view whether social alliance programs and activities achieve strategic advantage and provide long-term benefits to the organisation and key stakeholders (Murray & Vogel 1997). This should guide management decision-making concerning social alliances in relation to the other functions of the firm.

Further, the rigid HOE process highlights the different touchpoints management can use to reach consumers at the various stages of the consumer behaviour sequence. Managers can consequently adapt their communication methods to stimulate certain stages of the sequence. For example, in their communication of the social alliance, they could use an advertisement consisting of a mix of divergence and relevance to stimulate brand awareness (Smith, Chen & Yang 2008). Then to increase subsequent consumer knowledge of the social alliance partner and/or the social alliance among constituents, management can use informative advertising strategies. Furthermore, if management want to create favourable attitudes among both
associated and partial consumers to stimulate the patronage process, they could use positive emotional appeals for instance (Moore & Harris 1996).

Another implication for managers regarding the consumer behaviour process relates to the stronger effect for sports team consumers regarding attitudinal evaluations. Sports team managers could subsequently highlight social alliance and related impacts to associated consumers to further enhance these positive evaluations towards the social alliance. This also indicates that NPO managers can comfortably reach out to sports team consumers with the knowledge that they should react favourably. However, as stated previously in Section 9.10.1, if social alliances are more integrative, then both sets of associated consumers should be equal recipients of marketing messages regarding the social alliance. This means engaging in co-branding and co-promotion strategies (Burton et al. 2017), and aligning those responsible for CSR with those responsible for marketing functions (Nyadzayo, Leckie & McDonald 2016) across firms.

9.10.5 Favourable consumer outcomes are generated from social alliances

As indicated in this study, the positive consumer outcomes stemming from the social alliance provide a number of implications for management. Primarily, the results show the transition for each associated consumer group of the parent organisation to partial consumers of the partner organisation. This means for management, there are tangible marketing objectives that can be achieved via social alliance participation and that a new market segment for each organisation has emerged. The positive reaction to each organisation by the two consumer groups provides sports team and NPO managers with incentive to further prioritise social alliances relative to other marketing activities.

Furthermore, managers need to recognise that associated consumers of their social alliance partner can transition to partial consumers of their own firm, and subsequently need to adopt appropriate segmentation and targeting strategies to effectively reach each consumer group. This is perhaps more pertinent for sports team managers as one of the most critical findings impacting management practice is the strength of NPO consumer reactions across all related outcomes generated from the social alliance. These reactions enable sport team managers to view NPO consumers as a legitimate target market that is willing to partake in various patronage behaviours that benefit the sports team. It is therefore advocated that sports team managers...
actively recognise and reach out to NPO consumers concerning social alliance programs, to develop similar relationships with these consumers as they have with those associated with the team.

As an additional implication, the results also indicate that social alliances can be used as a mechanism to enable loyalty among associated consumer groups. For example, by demonstrating a willingness to donate and spread positive NPO WOM, NPO consumers exhibit loyalty behaviours toward the NPO because of the social alliance. Consequentially, it is feasible that NPO managers look to social alliances as a donor retention strategy, where donor retention has often been cited in both theory and practice as one of the greatest challenges facing NPOs (Sargeant 2001). The loyalty concept is also applicable to sports teams where associated consumers exhibit an intent to partake in various loyalty behaviours such as increasing team association because of social alliance participation. Nyadzayo, Leckie and McDonald (2016) identified increasing STH levels as a behavioural component of loyalty generated from a sports team’s CSR initiatives. These authors subsequently suggested that sports teams use CSR when trying to re-patron current STHs or lower-level fans. This extends to social alliances that could also be used as a component of team CSR to increase fan behavioural loyalty.

9.11 Research Limitations

Typical of all research, there are a number of limitations in this study that impact both the theoretical and managerial implications. It is important to acknowledge these, as they provide various avenues for future research as explored in Section 9.12.

The first limitation is the generalisability of Phase Two of this study, attributed to the collection of data from one social alliance. In particular, the data collected might not be applicable across all social alliances in sports. There are a few reasons underlying this generalisability limitation. First, the social alliance under analysis is well-established, operating as an official social alliance for close to ten years. While every effort was made to incorporate other social alliances, inadequate database management and consumer engagement on behalf of the NPOs prevented their inclusion in this study. Consequently, these findings might not be indicative of social alliances that have been in operation for shorter periods and are less established. Second, the sports team in the social alliance under analysis involved a national sporting team as opposed to a professional club team. While no research exists identifying whether national teams garner
more support than club teams in professional sports, it can be assumed that national teams most likely draw a wider supporter base. Thus, it is possible that the consumer reactions to the social alliance would be more exaggerated than those involving a professional club team, given the greater supporter numbers. Third, the data was collected from a social alliance in only one professional sport, cricket. It is therefore feasible that these results could not be applied to social alliances in different sports. Yet, despite the inherent limitation of the generalisability of these results, the revised conceptual model was developed based on interviews with 17 sports team and NPO managers in social alliances across three different professional sports, including club and national teams. This limitation is therefore partially overcome, as it is likely that this conceptual model can be applied across various social alliance types within the sporting context. It should be noted that six of the eight interviews conducted with sports team managers were from the same league which may potentially bias results.

The second limitation is concerned with the collection of the data. Specifically, the data were collected via online questionnaires, which means only those with access to a computer and the internet were able to participate; although, one could reasonably suggest that this method is more reflective of the general population. In addition, as there were insufficient questionnaire responses collected from McGrath Foundation consumers in the initial stage of Phase Two, respondents were subsequently recruited from a research panel company (Cint). While a screening question was used asking respondents their relationship with McGrath Foundation, it is possible that they were not all ‘associated’ McGrath Foundation consumers but rather consumers that have had one interaction with the NPO.

The final limitation relates to some measures used in the questionnaire that could have potentially impacted research results. The initial awareness question was measured using aided recall where Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation respondents were provided with five options to select the social alliance partner. Aided recall has been recognised as a less rigorous measure than unaided recall, as stimulation is provided for respondents to identify the social alliance partner (McDonald & Karg 2015). Thus, unaided recall is potentially a more reflective measure of awareness than aided recall. In addition, a subjective knowledge measure was used in this study. While this has been shown to be more influential on consumer reactions (Flynn & Goldsmith 1999; Selnes & Grønhaug 1986), it can also indicate that consumers do not know as much about the social alliance partner as they thought. Therefore, an objective measure would likely capture a more accurate picture of social alliance partner knowledge. Lastly, the consumer outcomes associated with social alliance participation were all measured
using intentions to act as opposed to studying actual behaviour. While other research has shown this to still be a strong reflection of consumer behaviour (e.g. Morwitz, Steckel and Gupta 2007), it does not always comprehensively capture genuine consumer conation.

9.12 Future Research

Previous research exploring consumer reactions to social alliances is underdeveloped. That is, this study is the first to capture the reactions from such relationships by both associated consumers of a parent organisation and the partial consumers of the partner organisation across two consumer groups. In combination with the limitations underpinning this study, this opens various avenues for future research.

For example, the lack of generalisability in this study presents various opportunities for future research. First, less established social alliances than the one examined here are worthy of further exploration. Through analysis of a newly formed or lesser known social alliance, consumer reactions to social alliances in professional sports will be further developed, enabling deeper insight into whether they achieve marketing objectives. Second, given that the social alliance under investigation here incorporated a national sporting team which likely holds wider and more favourable support than a club team, replicating the research in a professional club team setting would yield some interesting results, particularly as competition for cognition, affect and conative support is likely more intense. Third, as only one sport was analysed within the Australian setting, examining consumer reactions to social alliances across different sports and in different countries would provide some critical insights into social alliance phenomena. This could further extend into relationships between sporting bodies and NPOs. For example, the Tennis Australia Foundation has recently developed a social alliance with the NPO, Fight MND (Tennis Australia 2018), which could provide a more diversified view of the effectiveness of social alliances within professional sports.

Another area of future research which would further contribute to knowledge concerning consumer cognition of social alliances stems from the limitations in the measures used here to capture initial social alliance partner awareness and knowledge. Instead using unaided recall to measure social alliance partner awareness may provide a more accurate account, and could deliver additional insight for both social alliance practice and theory, which has only previously been measured here via an aided recall measure. Previous literature has shown that commercial
sponsorship awareness in sports as measured via unaided recall is low (e.g. Karg & McDonald 2015), which perhaps could also be applied to a social alliance relationship. Furthermore, from the knowledge of social alliance partner perspective, using an objective measure could yield a more appropriate account of actual consumer knowledge concerning social alliance partners. Another area of future research, specifically in the sporting context, could measure consumer reactions to social alliances in comparison with the other CSR initiatives implemented by professional sporting teams. For example, investigating if consumers react more favourably to social alliances than grassroots community programs. This would provide greater insight into resource allocation and efficacy for managers.

An additional area of future research should involve qualitative research to consider the motives amongst sports team and NPO managers in forming a social alliance in professional sports. This could possibly consider whether the motives driving these organisations to develop such alliances are normative or instrumental. This could also extend to the perspective of other stakeholders such as employees and consumers. This would enable both academics and managers to gather insight into the consistency of their motives related to other stakeholders associated with their organisations.

Future research could also focus on the marketing and communication of social alliances. In Phase One of this study, managers critically highlighted the proliferated use of social media to promote social alliances, which led to social media engagement in generating social alliance awareness being measured here. This has opened the door to a more comprehensive analysis of social media use to promote social alliances in professional sports. In this study, social media was measured at the general level without drawing a distinction between the various social media platforms consumers and organisations commonly use (e.g. Facebook, Twitter Instagram). By drawing such a distinction in future research, further understanding of the effectiveness of each social media platform in generating social alliance awareness will develop. Additionally, analysis of social media content concerning social alliances in sports, including analysis of two-way and dialogic communication and consumer reactions in terms of ‘likes’ and ‘retweets’, for example, could enhance the assessment of social media communication effectiveness.

Lastly, as highlighted in this study’s results, NPO consumers react more strongly than their sports team counterparts when it comes to the behavioural component of the HOE, with a stronger effect identified across all six behavioural outcomes. While some reasons have been postulated
here via various theories such as social exchange theory, these results are worthy of further exploration. There is an opportunity for exploratory research of both sports team and NPO consumers, to uncover why NPO consumers demonstrate a stronger behavioural reaction than sports team consumers. It is subsequently recommended that face-to-face interviews or focus groups be conducted with these groups, which will also further aid in the development of segmentation and targeting strategies for both firms within an alliance.

9.13 Concluding Comments

Commonly, professional sports teams and NPOs form an alliance to achieve a variety of marketing objectives. While previous research has postulated effective social alliances, little is known about whether these alliances actually achieve what it is they set out. Thus, this formed a gap between current consumer behaviour theory and practice. This is especially evident in relation to consumer reactions to social alliances. While previous work has examined consumer reactions to such alliances to some extent, particularly in CRM, never has this been from the perspective of two consumer groups associated with each organisation participating in a social alliance. Therefore, up until now both sports team and NPO managers were unsure of their social alliance effectiveness. These two consumer groups are considered the first targeted group of consumers to evaluate the effectiveness of social alliances due to their interactions with their associated organisations in the social alliance. They represent the initial groups of customers who potentially become aware of the social alliance, leading to favourable attitudes and taking actions in favour of the social alliance’s objectives.

To address the above gap, this study utilised a mixed-methods approach consisting of a qualitative component followed by a quantitative component. The qualitative component incorporated interviews with both sports team and NPO managers to gather insight into social alliance practice. One of the critical findings from this phase of the study highlighted the unsystematic approach underpinning social alliance business practice. In this instance, such practice contradicted theory where managers rarely adopted formalised objectives or evaluation mechanisms. This subsequently eroded the effectiveness of these social alliances in achieving organisational outcomes. Further findings from this portion of the study showed that sports team and NPO managers used various promotional tools to create social alliance awareness. Additional findings highlighted some consumer-related outcomes managers expected or hoped to achieve from their social alliance participation.
To test consumer reactions to social alliances, a questionnaire was used to capture how associated consumers of the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation respond to each organisation in the social alliance. From a social alliance awareness perspective, in combination, consumers from both sides of the dyad were influenced by behavioural (televised game viewership, live game viewership and social media engagement) and attitudinal antecedents (consumer identification and consumer trust). Once social alliance awareness was established, consumers followed a traditional HOE (cognition-affect-conation). The conative component included favourable outcomes for both the sports team and NPO. For the sports team, consumers associated with both organisations in the social alliance showed an intent to increase team association, attend matches, spread WOM and purchase merchandise. For the NPO, these consumers exhibited an intention to donate and spread WOM. Therefore, the postulated movement from associated consumer of the parent organisation to partial consumer of the partner organisation was supported.

To test the difference in reactions among each associated consumer group, a moderation analysis was conducted. Results gathered from this highlighted that the moderating effect of the associated consumer group was particularly influential regarding consumer outcomes. Specifically, NPO consumers demonstrated a stronger effect than sports team consumers in their intent to donate, increase team association, attend matches, spread sports team WOM, purchase sports team merchandise and spread NPO WOM. Because of the findings generated from this study, it is recommended that:

- Sports team and NPO managers develop joint, formalised objectives concerning consumer outcomes, and integrate goals, policies and action sequences to achieve objectives at both an individual and collaborative organisation level and to evaluate the attainment of these objectives

- Sports team managers form social alliances with NPOs who adopt sound consumer database management practices and implement various consumer engagement strategies

- Sports team and NPO managers adopt appropriate segmentation and targeting strategies to reach associated and partial consumer groups more effectively
• Sports team and NPO managers utilise a deliberate multi-channel communication strategy concerning social alliances

• Sports team and NPO managers further prioritise social alliances relative to other marketing activities given the favourable organisational outcomes social alliances produce
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Appendix 2: Qualitative Interview Guide

Sports Team:

About community manager role
1. How long have you been in your role?
2. What was the state of play in terms of community programs and social alliances when you started the job?
3. What is the current state of play like now?
4. What changes did you bring to the role?
5. What are the difficulties or challenges you have in the role?
6. How many staff members do you have that deal with social alliances?

Picking partners
1. Why did you pick the NPO partner(s) you have a social alliance with?
2. What is the process of picking partners?
3. Generally, who approaches who in developing a social alliance?
4. How were they picked previously?
5. If an NPO approaches you, what criteria do you use to move forward with a social alliance?

Management, objectives & formalisation of partnership
1. Who do you deal with if there is a problem or a discussion is needed? What level does communication take place? (e.g. CEO to CEO or Community Manager to CEO)
2. How do you develop your social alliance objectives? Are objectives created formally or informally? Why?
3. What are some collaborative objectives you develop?
4. How is the social alliance implemented?
5. How is the social alliance managed?
6. Can you tell me about whether the team have an input into what the social alliance is trying to achieve? In your view is it mainly/partly about association/leverage? How so?
7. How are your objectives measured?
8. How do you measure success?
9. Does the NPO partner have any input into how they reach your fans? If so, how?
10. What best practice tools do you adopt to make the partnership work?
Impact on consumers/audiences

1. How do you think fans and NPO consumers become aware of your social alliances, through what means?
2. How do you communicate the partnership to fans and/or NPO consumers (different audiences) or what tools do you use to bring awareness to audiences?
3. Do you think your social alliances influence consumers? If so, how?
4. Can you tell about the outcomes/objectives you develop regarding fan reactions?
5. What outcomes do you expect to see from NPO partner consumers (funders/donors/volunteers)?
6. What outcomes do you expect to see from fans?
7. How do you measure consumer reactions to your social alliances?
8. How do you define success in terms of social alliance outcomes?
NPO:

About Role
1. How long have you been in your role?
2. What was the state of play in terms of social alliances with sports team when you started the job?
3. What is the current state of play like now?
4. What changes did you bring to the role?
5. What are the difficulties or challenges you have in the role?
6. How many staff members do you have that deal with social alliances?

Picking Partners
1. Why did you choose to have a social alliance with a sports team? Why that sports team?
2. What is the process of picking partners?
3. Generally, who approaches who in developing a social alliance?
4. How were partners picked previously?
5. Has a professional sports team ever approached you? If so, what criteria do you use to move forward with a social alliance? If not, how do you approach the sports team?

Management, Objectives & Formalisation of Partnership
1. Who do you deal with if there is a problem or a discussion is needed? What level does communication take place? (e.g. CEO to CEO or Community Manager to CEO?)
2. How do you develop your social alliance objectives? Are objectives created formally or informally? Why?
3. What are some collaborative objectives you develop?
4. How is the social alliance implemented?
5. How is the social alliance managed?
6. Can you tell me about whether the sports team have an input into what the social alliance is trying to achieve? In your view is it mainly/partly about association/leverage? How so?
7. How are your objectives measured?
8. How do you measure success?
9. Does your organisation have any input into how they reach your fans? If so, how?
10. What best practice tools do you adopt to make the partnership work?
11. How do you react if the sports team or a player does something controversial or illegal?
Impact on consumers/audiences
1. How do you think your consumers and fans become aware of your social alliances, through what means?
2. How do you communicate the partnership to your consumers and/or fans (different audiences) or what tools do you use to bring awareness to audiences?
3. Do you think your social alliances influence consumers? If so, how?
4. Can you tell about the outcomes/objectives you develop regarding consumer reactions?
5. What outcomes do you expect to see from sports team fans?
6. What outcomes do you expect to see from your consumers?
7. How do you measure consumer reactions to your social alliances?
8. How do you define success in terms of social alliance outcomes?
### Appendix 3: Qualitative Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Codes</th>
<th>Axial Code</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td>Social Media Engagement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinterest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Star tweets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts/repetitive posts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital channels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo posts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went viral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook messaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website impressions/hits</td>
<td>Website Visits</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logo on website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website reports/annual reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theming website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on website of partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing logos on website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News story posted on website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground signage</td>
<td>Live Game Viewership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match records/magazine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large audience attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The big game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use matches to raise awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play games there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match day activations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated match days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen it at the game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity/Social cause round</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live clips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showed stuff at games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion during games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated messaging at games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast on television</td>
<td>Televised Game Viewership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match days broadcast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching games on television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmed on TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shown on TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated viewing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV advertisements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-to-air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated round on TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Codes</td>
<td>Axial Code</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly recognised campaign</td>
<td>Awareness Generation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fans naming community partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalling partners/Member recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness is there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be aware of what we are doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps raise awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise the partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly aware of the club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is about awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing awareness of our organisation/team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting that awareness out there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding and awareness activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend matches</td>
<td>Match Attendance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing people to the game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come to the game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who support the NPO to come to the game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who don’t come to the game will come to the game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sign members</td>
<td>Increasing Team Association</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO supporter to team membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing fan support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships to increase memberships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships as an outcome of partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They’ve joined us because of the cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special guernsey</td>
<td>Merchandise Purchasing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise and products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get merch out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guernsey sold in store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See them buying merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing team merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable donations</td>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctioning to raise funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising funds for NPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropping money into a tin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get message out to raise money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People want to give</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect us to them and then donate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Codes</td>
<td>Axial Code</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater brand awareness to donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring in money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to get funds out of that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy to have donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4a: Research Information Statement and Questionnaire Copies Australian Cricket Team consumers

INFORMATION STATEMENT

PROJECT TITLE: From Awareness to Action: Exploring the impact of social alliances on consumer behaviour in the sporting context.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dr. Civilai Leckie, Lecturer in Marketing Swinburne University

CO-INVESTIGATORS: Professor Heath McDonald, Associate Dean (Research and Engagement) Swinburne University

STUDENT INVESTIGATORS: Daniel Rayne (PhD Business) Swinburne University

WHAT THIS PROJECT IS ABOUT AND WHY IT IS IMPORTANT?

We are conducting research on how fans respond to social alliances between the Australian Cricket Team and Not-for-Profit organisations (NPOs). This research project is carried out independently by the researchers and does not receive any financial funding from any company. We are particularly interested in factors that create awareness of these alliances and the subsequent feelings and actions associated with these alliances. The knowledge gained from this study will assist both sports teams and NPOs to develop strategies that can improve performance outcomes and further improve social issues.

WHAT DOES THE STUDY INVOLVE AND WHAT IS THE TIME COMMITMENT?

We ask you to participate in the anonymous questionnaire survey. It is anticipated that it will take about 15 minutes of your time. The questionnaire asks about your awareness of an alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and a charitable organisation, as well as the interaction with the Australian Cricket Team, the identification, trust and actions towards both organisations involved in the alliance. Please answer all questions unless the instructions indicate otherwise. If you are unsure about an answer, please provide your best estimate. You are free to participate or not in this study as you wish. Thus, the participation in the questionnaire survey is completely voluntary. You are free to cease or terminate the questionnaire anytime. By clicking the link, you are consenting to participate in this study.

WILL ALL DATA PROVIDED BE PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL?

You will not be required to give your name or to provide any identifying information. Accordingly, the questionnaire is anonymous and thus data cannot be traced to any individual. No information about any participant will be given to Swinburne University, or to any other individual or organisation. All data will be stored electronically with password protection. Only the researchers whose names appear here will have access to the data.

HOW WILL THE DATA BE USED?

It is expected that this project will result in publications for academic journal articles and presentations at conference. Data will be analysed at an aggregate level. At no stage will the potential respondents be identified or mentioned in the manuscripts.

HOW DO I TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

If you would like to participate in this research project, please click the 'Next' button at the bottom of the page. If you have any questions regarding the project at any stage, please contact Daniel Rayne via phone at 03 9214-5891 or email at drayne@swin.edu.au.

This project has been approved by or on behalf of Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of this project, you can contact:

Research Ethics Officer, Swinburne Research (H68),
1. Please select the name of a not-for-profit organisation associated with the Australian Cricket Team.

- Breast Cancer Network Australia
- Beyond Blue
- White Ribbon
- McGrath Foundation
- Lifeline

2. Social Alliance Awareness

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognise this social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation among other alliances.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can quickly recall the logo of McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Knowledge of Not-for-Profit Partner

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I pretty much know about the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very knowledgeable about the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among my circle of friends, I’m one of the “experts” on the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to most other people, I know more about the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to the McGrath Foundation, I really know a lot.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Identification

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When someone criticises the Australian Cricket Team, it feels like a personal insult.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very interested in what others think about the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I talk about the Australian Cricket Team, I usually say “we” rather than “they”.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian Cricket Team’s successes are my successes.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone praises the Australian Cricket Team, it feels like a personal compliment.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a story in the media criticised the Australian Cricket Team, I would feel embarrassed.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Trust
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel that the Australian Cricket Team is very dependable.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the Australian Cricket Team is very competent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the Australian Cricket Team is of high integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the Australian Cricket Team is very responsive to its supporters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the Australian Cricket Team is trustworthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. TV Viewership
For last season, how many games involving the Australian Cricket Team did you watch on TV (from 0-30 games)? (Please only nominate games where you would have watched more than half of the match)

7. Live Games
How many the Australian Cricket Team games did you attend last season? Please put in a numbered response (e.g. 6).
8. Website Frequency
How often do you visit the Australian Cricket Team’s website per week on average? (the Australian Cricket Team’s website refers to cricket.com.au only)

- 0 times
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 times
- 4 times
- 5 times
- 6 times
- 7 times
- 8 times
- 9 times
- 10 times
- 11 times
- 12 times
- 13 times
- 14 times
- 15 times
9. Social Media
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to follow the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to monitor events.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to improve my relationship with the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to communicate with the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with the Australian Cricket Team is enhanced by social media.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to keep current on events in the sport.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to follow the Australian Cricket Team players.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People use social media to reach me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Attitude Towards Alliance
What is your attitude towards the social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Unpleasant</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Donate
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>Moderately unlikely</th>
<th>Slightly unlikely</th>
<th>Neither likely nor unlikely</th>
<th>Slightly likely</th>
<th>Moderately likely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am likely to donate money to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will donate money next time to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will definitely donate money to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Increasing Team Association
Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of increasing your association with the Australian Cricket Team in the future?

- Unlikely
- Improbable
- Impossible
- Uncertain
- Likely
- Probable
- Possible
- Certainly

13. Match Attendance
Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of attending the Australian Cricket Team games in the future?

- Unlikely
- Improbable
- Impossible
- Uncertain
- Likely
- Probable
- Possible
- Certainly
14. *Word-of-Mouth Communication Sports Team*

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

**Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to encourage others to attend the Australian Cricket Team games.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the topic of sports comes up in conversation, I will be willing to go out of my way to recommend attending the Australian Cricket Team games to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will encourage friends and relatives to support the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will say positive things about the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. *Intention to Purchase Merchandise*

Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of purchasing the Australian Cricket Team merchandise in the future?

| Likelihood          | Unlikely | Improbable | Impossible | Uncertainly | Likely | Probable | Possible | Certainly |
|---------------------|----------|------------|------------|-------------|--------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
16. Word-of-Mouth Communication NPO

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to encourage others to donate to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the topic of charities comes up in conversation, I will be willing to go out of my way to recommend donating to McGrath Foundation to others.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will encourage friends and relatives to support McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will say positive things about McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

What is your age (years)?

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 and above
- Prefer not to answer
What was your level of income (per annum)?

- under $30,000
- $30,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$49,999
- $50,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$69,999
- $70,000-$79,999
- $80,000-$89,999
- $90,000-$99,999
- $100,000 and above
- Prefer not to answer

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unconfident</th>
<th>Moderately unconfident</th>
<th>Slightly unconfident</th>
<th>Neither unconfident nor confident</th>
<th>Slightly confident</th>
<th>Moderately confident</th>
<th>Extremely confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How confident are you that you have sufficient knowledge to complete the questions in this survey?
Appendix 4b: Research Information Statement and Questionnaire Copies McGrath Foundation consumers

INFORMATION STATEMENT

PROJECT TITLE: From Awareness to Action: Exploring the impact of social alliances on consumer behaviour in the sporting context.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dr. Civilai Leckie, Lecturer in Marketing Swinburne University
CO-INVESTIGATORS: Professor Heath McDonald, Associate Dean (Research and Engagement) Swinburne University
STUDENT INVESTIGATORS: Daniel Rayne (PhD Business) Swinburne University

WHAT THIS PROJECT IS ABOUT AND WHY IT IS IMPORTANT?

We are conducting research on how fans and donors respond to social alliances between the McGrath Foundation and a sports team. This research project is carried out independently by the researchers and does not receive any financial funding from any company. We are particularly interested in factors that create awareness of these alliances and the subsequent feelings and actions associated with these alliances. The knowledge gained from this study will assist both sports teams and not-for-profit organisations to develop strategies that can improve performance outcomes and further improve social issues.

WHAT DOES THE STUDY INVOLVE AND WHAT IS THE TIME COMMITMENT?

We ask you to participate in the anonymous questionnaire survey. It is anticipated that it will take about 15 minutes of your time. The questionnaire asks about your awareness of an alliance between the McGrath Foundation and a sports team, as well as the interaction with the McGrath Foundation, the identification, trust and actions towards both organisations involved in the alliance. Please answer all questions unless the instructions indicate otherwise. If you are unsure about an answer, please provide your best estimate. You are free to participate or not in this study as you wish. Thus, the participation in the questionnaire survey is completely voluntary. You are free to cease or terminate the questionnaire anytime. By clicking the link, you are consenting to participate in this study.

WILL ALL DATA PROVIDED BE PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL?

You will not be required to give your name or to provide any identifying information. Accordingly, the questionnaire is anonymous and thus data cannot be traced to any individual. No information about any participant will be given to Swinburne University, or to any other individual or organisation. All data will be stored electronically with password protection. Only the researchers whose names appear here will have access to the data.

HOW WILL THE DATA BE USED?

It is expected that this project will result in publications for academic journal articles and presentations at conferences. Data will be analysed at an aggregate level. At no stage will the potential respondents be identified or mentioned in the manuscripts.

HOW DO I TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

If you would like to participate in this research project, please the 'Next' button on the bottom of the page. If you have any questions regarding the project at any stage, please contact Daniel Rayne via phone at 03 9214-5891 or email at drayne@swin.edu.au.
This project has been approved by or on behalf of Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of this project, you can contact:

Research Ethics Officer, Swinburne Research (H68),
Swinburne University of Technology, PO Box 218, HAWTHORN VIC 3122.
Tel (03) 9214 5218 or +61 3 9214 5218 or resethics@swin.edu.au

Screening question for panel respondents only:

Have you donated, volunteered or fundraised for the McGrath Foundation in the past 12 months?

- Yes
- No

1. Please select the sports team associated with the McGrath Foundation.

- Hawthorn Football Club
- Victoria Bushrangers
- Australian Netball Diamonds
- Australian Cricket Team
- Australian Hockey Kookaburras

2. Social Alliance Awareness
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognise this social alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation among other alliances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can quickly recall the logo of the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Knowledge of Sports Team Partner

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

| I pretty much know about the Australian Cricket Team. | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
| I feel very knowledgeable about the Australian Cricket Team. | | | | | | |
| Among my circle of friends, I'm one of the "experts" on the Australian Cricket Team. | | | | | | |
| Compared to most other people, I know more about the Australian Cricket Team. | | | | | | |
| When it comes to the Australian Cricket Team, I really know a lot. | | | | | | |

### 4. Identification

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

| When someone criticises the McGrath Foundation, it feels like a personal insult. | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
| I am very interested in what others think about the McGrath Foundation. | | | | | | |
| When I talk about the McGrath Foundation, I usually say "we" rather than "they". | | | | | | |
| The McGrath Foundation successes are my successes. | | | | | | |
| When someone praises the McGrath Foundation, it feels like a personal compliment. | | | | | | |
| If a story in the media criticised the McGrath Foundation, I would feel embarrassed. | | | | | | |
5. Trust
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation is very dependable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation is very competent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation is of high integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation is very responsive to its donors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the McGrath Foundation is trustworthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. TV Viewership
For last season, how many games involving the Australian Cricket Team did you watch on TV (from 0-30 games)? (Please only nominate games where you would have watched more than half of the match)

7. Live Games
How many Australian Cricket Team games did you attend last season? Please put in a numbered response (e.g. 6).
8. Website Frequency
How often do you visit the McGrath Foundation's website per week on average?

- 0 times
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 times
- 4 times
- 5 times
- 6 times
- 7 times
- 8 times
- 9 times
- 10 times
- 11 times
- 12 times
- 13 times
- 14 times
- 15 times
9. Social Media
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to follow the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to monitor events.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to improve my relationship with the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to communicate with the McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with the McGrath Foundation is enhanced by social media.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to keep current on events of charities.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use social media to follow Australian Cricket Team players.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People use social media to reach me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Attitude Towards Alliance
What is your attitude toward the alliance between the McGrath Foundation and the Australian Cricket Team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Unpleasant</th>
<th>Liku</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Donate
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>Moderately unlikely</th>
<th>Slightly unlikely</th>
<th>Neither likely nor unlikely</th>
<th>Slightly likely</th>
<th>Moderately likely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am likely to donate money to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will donate money next time to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will definitely donate money to McGrath Foundation.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Increasing Team Association
Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of increasing your association with the Australian Cricket Team in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improbable</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainly</td>
<td>Certainly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Match Attendance
Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of attending the Australian Cricket Team games in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improbable</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainly</td>
<td>Certainly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Word-of-Mouth Communication Sports Team
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to encourage others to attend the Australian Cricket Team games.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the topic of sports comes up in conversation, I will be willing to go out of my way to recommend attending the Australian Cricket Team games to others.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will encourage friends and relatives to support the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will say positive things about the Australian Cricket Team.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Intention to Purchase Merchandise

Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation, what is the likelihood of purchasing the Australian Cricket Team merchandise in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Improbable</th>
<th>Impossible</th>
<th>Uncertainly</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Probable</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Certainly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Word-of-Mouth Communication NPO
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you.

**Because of the alliance between the Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am willing to encourage others to donate to McGrath Foundation.

When the topic of charities comes up in conversation, I will be willing to go out of my way to recommend donating to McGrath Foundation to others.

I will encourage friends and relatives to support McGrath Foundation.

I will say positive things about McGrath Foundation.

---

**What is your gender?**

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Prefer not to answer

**What is your age (years)?**

- [ ] 18-24
- [ ] 25-34
- [ ] 35-44
- [ ] 45-54
- [ ] 55-64
- [ ] 65 and above
- [ ] Prefer not to answer
What was your level of income (per annum)?

- under $30,000
- $30,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$49,999
- $50,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$69,999
- $70,000-$79,999
- $80,000-$89,999
- $90,000-$99,999
- $100,000 and above
- Prefer not to answer

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by selecting the number that is right for you:

| How confident are you that you have sufficient knowledge to complete the questions in this survey? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely unconfident | Moderately unconfident | Slightly unconfident | Neither unconfident nor confident | Slightly confident | Moderately confident | Extremely confident |
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Appendix 6: EFA Results

Consumer identification (IDT)

IDT was tested as a hypothesised antecedent to social alliance awareness. Consequently, five items measuring IDT underwent EFA to determine the unidimensionality of the construct. All item correlations were above 0.300, illustrating sufficient inter-correlation among the items. A KMO score of 0.901 was achieved for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 0.899 for McGrath Foundation consumers, and in both instances the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant ($p=0.000$); thus indicating EFA sufficiency.

One initial eigenvalue greater than 1 was recorded in both consumer groups, accounting for 67.658% of the item’s variance for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 71.700% for McGrath Foundation consumers. Thus, for each consumer group, unidimensionality was achieved for the IDT construct. Table A6.1 below depicts the factor loadings of the IDT items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

Table A6.1: EFA of IDT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDT 1</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT 2</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT 3</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT 4</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT 5</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT 6</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.060</td>
<td>4.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>67.658</td>
<td>71.700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Consumer trust (TRU)

TRU was hypothesised to influence social alliance awareness. EFA was conducted on five items comprising the construct, to ascertain unidimensionality. All item correlations returned a score greater than 0.300, indicating adequate inter-correlation among items. KMO scores of 0.907 and 0.862 for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers respectively, and a significant Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($p=0.000$) across the groups highlighted the suitability of EFA.
For both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, one initial eigenvalue greater than 1 was recorded, where the percentage of total variance explained was 81.309% for Australian Cricket Team and 74.106% for McGrath Foundation consumers. Thus, unidimensionality was achieved for TRU. Table A6.2 below depicts the factor loadings of the TRU items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

Table A6.2: EFA of TRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRU 1</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU 2</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU 3</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU 4</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU 5</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.065</td>
<td>3.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>81.309</td>
<td>74.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Social media engagement (SocM)

Like the two previous constructs, SocM was measured as one of the antecedents to social alliance awareness. Eight items comprising the construct underwent EFA to test for unidimensionality. KMO scores of 0.933 for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 0.946 for McGrath Foundation consumers was recorded, with Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity returning a significant result across the two groups (p=0.000). All item correlations were above 0.300, indicating adequate inter-correlations among the items.

For Australian Cricket Team consumers, one initial eigenvalue exceeding 1 was returned with 74.603% accounting for item variance. Similarly, for McGrath Foundation consumers, one initial eigenvalue greater than 1 was recorded with 81.753% accounting for item variance. Consequently, unidimensionality for SocM was achieved. Table A6.3 below depicts the factor loadings of the SocM items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.
Table A6.3: EFA of SocM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SocM 1</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM 2</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM 3</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM 4</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM 5</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM 6</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM 7</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM 8</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>5.968</td>
<td>6.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>74.603</td>
<td>81.753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Social alliance awareness (AWA)

The first HOE factor to be extracted represents the level of social alliance awareness for each associated consumer group. Four items were subject to EFA here, to test the unidimensionality of the construct. Correlations among the items measuring AWA were above 0.300, indicating sufficient inter-correlations across all. For Australian Cricket Team consumers, a KMO score of 0.762 was achieved and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity value was significant \((p=0.000)\). For McGrath Foundation consumers, a KMO score of 0.759 was recorded and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant \((p=0.000)\).

For each group, only one of the initial eigenvalues exceeded 1, accounting for 69.393% of the item’s variance-covariance matrix for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 65.666% for McGrath Foundation consumers; thus indicating unidimensionality. Table A6.4 depicts the factor loadings of the AWA items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

Table A6.4: EFA of AWA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWA 1</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA 2</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA 3</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA 4</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>2.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>69.393</td>
<td>65.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation
Knowledge of social alliance partner (KNOW)

Following social alliance awareness, it was expected that the associated consumers would develop greater knowledge of their aligned organisation’s social alliance partner. The correlations among the items measuring KNOW were above 0.300, indicating sufficient inter-correlations. KMO scores of 0.890 for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 0.861 for McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as a significant score for Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (p=0.000) indicated appropriateness of EFA.

Furthermore, one item recorded an initial eigenvalue greater than 1 for each group, explaining 72.297% of item variance among Australian Cricket Team consumers and 85.979% among McGrath Foundation consumers; thus indicating unidimensionality. Table A6.5 below depicts the factor loadings of the KNOW items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

Social alliance attitudes (ATT)

In accordance with HOE, ATT is an affective construct that generally leads to behavioural outcomes. To test for unidimensionality, EFA was conducted on five items that constituted this construct. The correlations among these items were all above 0.300, demonstrating adequate inter-correlations. KMO scores of 0.890 and 0.861 for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers respectively, as well as a significant Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity for each group (p=0.000) highlighted suitability of the data for EFA.

One item returned an initial eigenvalue greater than 1 in each group. Consequently, a one-factor solution was found for the ATT construct, with percentage of total variance explained as
91.451% for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 69.925% for McGrath Foundation consumers; therefore achieving unidimensionality. Table A6.6 below depicts the factor loadings of the ATT items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

Table A6.6: EFA of ATT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT 1</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 2</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 3</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 4</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 5</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.573</td>
<td>3.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>91.451</td>
<td>69.925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Donation intention (DON)

DON is an NPO-oriented outcome and was measured using three items. To test for unidimensionality, EFA was conducted on the DON construct. Inter-item correlations were adequate, as correlations for all items were above 0.300. The KMO for Australian Cricket Team consumers was 0.781, and for McGrath Foundation consumers 0.745. In addition, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant for both consumer groups ($p=0.000$). Thus, the data was well-suited for EFA.

For each group, only one of the initial eigenvalues exceeded 1, accounting for 94.333% of the item’s variance-covariance matrix for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 81.255% for McGrath Foundation consumers; thus indicating unidimensionality. Table A6.7 below depicts the factor loadings of the DON items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

Table A6.7: EFA of DON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DON 1</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON 2</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON 3</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>2.830</td>
<td>2.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>94.333</td>
<td>81.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation
Increasing team association intention (TAS)

TAS is a sports-team-related outcome associated with social alliance participation. Four items measuring TAS underwent EFA, to determine the unidimensionality of the construct. All item correlations were above 0.300, illustrating sufficient inter-correlation among these items. A KMO score of 0.849 was achieved for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 0.859 for McGrath Foundation consumers, while in both instances the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant ($p=0.000$); thus indicating sufficiency for EFA.

One initial eigenvalue greater than 1 was recorded in both consumer groups, accounting for 90.971% of the item’s variance for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 84.054% for McGrath Foundation consumers. Unidimensionality was therefore achieved on the TAS construct. Table A6.8 below depicts the factor loadings of the TAS items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAS 1</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS 2</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS 3</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS 4</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td>3.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>90.971</td>
<td>84.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Match attendance intention (MAT)

MAT was hypothesised as a sports-team-related outcome resulting from social alliance participation. EFA was conducted on four items that comprised the construct, to ascertain unidimensionality. All item correlations returned a score greater than 0.300, indicating adequate inter-correlation. KMO scores of 0.869 and 0.866 for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers respectively highlighted the suitability of the data for EFA. Further, a Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant ($p=0.000$), also demonstrating EFA suitability.

For both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, one initial eigenvalue greater than 1 was recorded, where the percentage of total variance explained was 95.224% for
Australian Cricket Team and 88.307% for McGrath Foundation consumers. Thus, unidimensionality was achieved for MAT. Table A6.9 below depicts the factor loadings of the MAT items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

Table A6.9: EFA of MAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAT 1</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 2</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 3</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 4</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.809</td>
<td>3.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>95.224</td>
<td>88.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Word-of-mouth sports team intention (WOMST)

WOMST relates to positive advocacy on behalf of the sports team, where it was hypothesised that associated consumers of both organisations involved in the social alliance will spread positive WOM on behalf of the sports team. To measure WOMST, four items were used which underwent EFA to test the unidimensionality of the construct. A KMO score of 0.865 for Australian Cricket Team consumers and of 0.854 for McGrath Foundation consumers was recorded, with Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity returning a significant result ($p=0.000$) for both groups of consumers. Additionally, the correlations among the items measuring WOMST were all above 0.300, indicating sufficient inter-correlations among the items.

For Australian Cricket Team consumers one initial eigenvalue exceeding 1 was returned, with 86.611% accounting for item variance. Similarly, for McGrath Foundation consumers one initial eigenvalue greater than 1 was recorded, with 80.769% accounting for item variance. Consequently, a single-factor solution for WOMST was identified; thus, unidimensionality was achieved. Table A6.10 below depicts the factor loadings of the WOMST items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.
Table A6.10: EFA of WOMST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMST 1</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST 2</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST 3</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST 4</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>3.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>86.611</td>
<td>80.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Merchandise purchasing intention (MP)

It was expected that both sets of associated consumers will purchase sports team merchandise as a consequence of social alliance participation. MP, which consisted of four items, was the next to undergo EFA to determine construct unidimensionality. The correlations among the items measuring MP were all above 0.300, indicating adequate inter-correlations. KMO scores of 0.867 for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 0.873 for McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as a significant score for Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity across the two groups ($p=0.000$) indicated appropriateness of the data for EFA.

Furthermore, one item recorded an initial eigenvalue greater than 1 for each group, explaining 91.780% of item variance among Australian Cricket Team consumers and 90.103% among McGrath Foundation consumers; thus indicating unidimensionality. Table A6.11 below depicts the factor loadings of the MP items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

Table A6.11: EFA of MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP 1</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 2</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 3</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 4</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.671</td>
<td>3.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>91.780</td>
<td>90.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Word-of-mouth not-for-profit organisation intention (WOMNPO)

WOMNPO is an NPO outcome stemming from social alliance participation, where associated consumers on both sides of the social alliance were expected to positively advocate on behalf
of the NPO. WOMNPO consisted of four items that underwent EFA to test the unidimensionality of the construct. KMO scores of 0.866 for Australian Cricket Team consumers and 0.852 for McGrath Foundation consumers were recorded, with a Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity returning a significant result for each group ($p=0.000$). Additionally, the correlations among the items measuring WOMNPO were above 0.300, indicating adequate inter-correlations.

For Australian Cricket Team consumers, one initial eigenvalue exceeding 1 was returned, with 86.350% accounting for item variance. Similarly, one initial eigenvalue greater than 1 was recorded for McGrath Foundation consumers, with 80.519% accounting for item variance. Consequently, unidimensionality for WOMNPO was achieved. Table A6.12 below depicts the factor loadings of the WOMNPO items for Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers, as well as the eigenvalue and total variance explained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACT consumers</th>
<th>MF consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO 1</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO 2</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO 3</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO 4</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.454</td>
<td>3.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total variance explained</td>
<td>86.350</td>
<td>80.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

One of the most critical components of this study was to conduct quantitative comparative research among the two consumer groups. Parity in dimensional invariance between these groups was therefore required for subsequent analysis (Gregorich 2006). As shown in the above analysis, EFA results across both consumer groups returned the same factors, meaning that dimensional invariance was achieved. As a second element of psychometric testing, CFA testing followed EFA, which is presented in the next section below.
### Appendix 7: Skewness and Kurtosis Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWA</td>
<td>-1.551</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-2.900</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.271</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.004</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.331</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.583</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>-0.613</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-1.119</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.726</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>-1.639</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.479</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON</td>
<td>-0.811</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.549</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>-0.457</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.132</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>-0.749</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.062</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST</td>
<td>-0.768</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.168</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>-0.370</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.669</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.933</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO</td>
<td>-0.741</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.920</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Stat = Statistic, Std. Error = Standard Error, ACT = Australian Cricket Team, MF = McGrath Foundation
Appendix 8: Results for Three Stages of One-Factor Congeneric Model Testing

One-factor congeneric model testing stage one

The results for the first stage of one-factor congeneric model testing are presented in this subsection demonstrating the achievement of construct validity.

Consumer trust (TRU)

TRU was measured on items adopted from two different scales developed by Sirdeshmukh, Singh and Sabol (2002) and Wu, Tsai and Hung (2012). Consequently, one-factor congeneric model testing was conducted on the second-half split sample of both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers. Model fit indices for Australian Cricket Team consumers returned adequate model fit as shown in Table A8.1. However, for McGrath Foundation consumers, model fit on all five items used to measure TRU was poor.

Table A8.1: Original model fit indices TRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>3.742</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>16.577</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

An analysis of factor loadings on McGrath Foundation consumers did not reveal any values below the minimum standard (0.500). Therefore, as per Jöreskog (1971) suggestion for one-factor congeneric model testing, MI were analysed to diagnose problematic items. A large MI value highlighted a residual covariance between TRU_3 and TRU_1. Therefore, the best course of action was to remove item TRU_3. This was further justified because this item was repetitive with the other items conceptually. Given the comparative nature of this research within this study, this item was also removed for Australian Cricket Team consumers. Respecified model fit indices are presented in A8.2.

Table A8.2: Respecified Model Fit Indices TRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>2.831</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>4.425</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

While the RMSEA for McGrath Foundation consumers returned a result slightly higher than 0.080, the suggested minimum, it was determined to be sufficient for this measurement model
given its proximity to the minimum recommended value and the fact that other model fit indices returned adequate model fit. The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of TRU are shown in the Table A8.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRU_1</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU_2</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU_4</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU_5</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Social media engagement (SocM)

As a critical antecedent to social alliance awareness, SocM was measured using Rapp et al.’s (2013) consumer social media use scale and a question developed following interviews with sports team and NPO managers in Phase One incorporating sports star ambassadors as key communicators of social alliances. Model fit indices returned inadequate fit on the eight-items used to measure SocM as shown in Table A8.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>137.329</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>107.350</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

To diagnose the problematic items, MI were used as standardised regression weights were all above the minimum 0.500 value. The first stage of diagnoses demonstrated an issue with SocM_4 showing a residual covariance with SocM_3 in both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumers. As such, SocM_4 was dropped from the analysis. Following this, model testing was re-run which once again resulted in inadequate model fit. This process was repeated iteratively until adequate model fit was achieved in both consumer groups and following a review of the conceptual nature of the items. Therefore, items SocM_3, SocM_6, and SocM_8 were also dropped from further analysis. Respecified model fit indices are presented in Table A8.5.
Table A8.5: Respecified model fit indices SocM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of SocM are shown in the Table A8.6.

Table A8.6: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of respecified SocM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SocM_1</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM_2</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM_5</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM_7</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Social alliance awareness (AWA)

As stipulated in Chapter 7, AWA was measured using a combination of items from three different scales (Beidenbach, Bengtsson & Marell 2015; Sen, Bhattacharya & Korschun 2006; Walker & Heere 2011). One-factor congeneric model testing was run on the AWA construct for each consumer group separately.

As shown in Table A8.7, model fit indices demonstrated sound fit in both consumer groups.

Table A8.7: Model fit indices AWA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>5.277</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of AWA are shown in Table A8.8.

Table A8.8: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of respecified AWA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWA_1</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA_2</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA_4</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA_5</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All factor loadings returned values above the minimum recommended figure of 0.500 and adequate model fit indices indicated construct validity.

**Social alliance attitudes (ATT)**

The ATT measure incorporated five semantic differential items. Three items were adopted from Groza, Pronschinske and Walker (2011) and two from Rifon et al. (2004). Of the five items used to measure ATT, model fit indices returned the following results highlighted in Table A8.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A8.9: Original model fit indices ATT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

As demonstrated, model fit indices were inconsistent across groups in that Australian Cricket Team consumers returned inadequate model fit while McGrath Foundation consumers returned adequate model fit. An analysis of MI was conducted on Australian Cricket Team consumer results following a review of factor loading scores which all returned acceptable results above 0.500. A problem was identified with ATT_4 which showed a residual covariance with ATT_5. This item was subsequently dropped from analysis across both consumer groups to maintain group comparison consistency. This was further justified because this item was repetitive with the other items conceptually. Table A8.10 shows the respecified results of model fit for both consumer groups following the dropping of item ATT_4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A8.10: Respecified model fit indices ATT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

As depicted in Table A8.10, adequate model fit was achieved on the ATT construct. The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of ATT are shown in Table A8.11.
Table A8.11: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of respecified ATT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_1</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_2</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_3</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_5</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Increase team association intention (TAS)

Using a combination of Madrigal’s (1995) BIRGing scale and Groza, Pronschinske and Walker’s (2011) intention scale, the TAS construct was measured with four items. Model fit indices for Australian Cricket Team consumers returned positive results on all four items, however, for McGrath Foundation consumers, initial model fit indices proved inadequate as shown in Table A8.12.

Table A8.12: Original model fit indices TAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>18.679</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Consequently, an analysis of the MI revealed a high MI value with item TAS_4 in the case of McGrath Foundation consumers. As such, this item was removed from further analysis and was deemed conceptually repetitive with other items. A subsequent CFA was run for both sets of consumers to maintain comparative consistency. As this construct originally consisted of four items, dropping one item meant that the measurement model was a just identified model in that it consisted of only three items. Kline (2010) contends that model fit assessment requires at least one degree of freedom, however, in a three-item model the d.f. is zero. To remedy this, one item was fixed to another to obtain at least one d.f. in re-running the model. Respecified model fit results for the TAS construct are presented in Table A8.13 where adequate model fit was achieved across the two consumer groups.

Table A8.13: Respecified model fit indices TAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation
The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of TAS are shown in Table A8.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS_1</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS_2</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS_3</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

**Match attendance intention (MAT)**

MAT used a combination of Trail et al.’s (2003) match attendance measure and Groza, Pronschinske and Walker’s (2011) intention measure. One-factor congeneric model testing was conducted on the construct consisting of four items to test for unidimensionality. Model fit indices on this factor showed inconsistent results amongst the two consumer groups with McGrath Foundation consumer data returning adequate model fit on all four items while Australian Cricket Team consumer data demonstrating poor model fit as depicted in Table A8.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>9.698</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Further analysis of Australian Cricket Team consumer data highlighted an issue between item MAT_4 showing a residual covariance with MAT_3 as indicated by a high MI. Hence, MAT_4 was removed from further analysis where model respecification was then performed using the remaining three items. The repetitive nature of this item with other items conceptually further justified its removal. As mentioned previously, in order to ensure at least one d.f., one item was fixed to another. Model fit indices of the respecified measurement model is presented in A8.16, demonstrating adequate model fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation
The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of MAT are shown in the Table A8.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT_1</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT_2</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT_3</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

**Word-of-mouth sports team intention (WOMST)**

To measure WOMST, two items were adopted from Lacey and Kennett-Hensel’s (2010) and two additional items from Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman’s (1996) WOM scale. After running CFA, measurement model results returned adequate model fit for both consumer groups as depicted in Table A8.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of WOMST are shown in Table A8.19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST_1</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST_2</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST_3</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST_4</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

All factor loadings returned values above the minimum recommended figure of 0.500 and model fit indices were adequate.
Merchandise purchasing intention (MP)

As an outcome variable, MP was measured using four-items adopted from a combination of Trail et al.’s (2003) fan spectator behaviour scale and Groza, Pronschinske and Walker’s (2011) intention scale. Again, model fit indices returned inconsistent results with Australian Cricket Team consumer data results showing inadequate model fit and McGrath Foundation consumer data returning appropriate model fit as shown in Table A8.20.

Table A8.20: Original model fit indices MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>14.062</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Given that all factor loadings were above the minimum recommended value (0.500), MI were used to diagnose potential problematic items. Item MP_4 had a high MI value indicating a residual covariance with MP_2. Therefore, MP_4 was removed from further analysis and a respecified measurement model was run. This item was also removed because it was deemed repetitive with other items conceptually. As there were only three items representing the construct, an item was fixed to another to generate at least one d.f. Results highlighted adequate model fit as shown in Table A8.21.

Table A8.21: Respecified model fit indices MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of MP are shown in Table A8.22.

Table A8.22: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of respecified MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP_1</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP_2</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP_3</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation
Word-of-Mouth NPO intention (WOMNPO)

The final construct to undergo one-factor congeneric model testing on the second-half split sample was WOMNPO. To measure WOMNPO in both consumer groups, two items were adapted from Lacey and Kennett-Hensel’s (2010) and an additional two items from Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman’s (1996) WOM scale. Model fit indices, as shown in Table A8.23, revealed sufficient unidimensionality of the construct in both consumer groups with all indices falling within the required criteria.

Table A8.23: Model fit indices WOMNPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>4.432</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of WOMNPO are shown in the Table A8.24.

Table A8.24: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of WOMNPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28_1</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28_2</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28_3</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28_4</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

All factor loadings returned values above the minimum recommended figure of 0.500.

One-factor congeneric model testing stage two

The results for the second stage of one-factor congeneric model testing are presented in this subsection.

Consumer identification (IDT)

IDT was the first established scale that underwent one-factor congeneric model testing. Mael and Ashforth (1992) originally measured identification using a 6-item scale. After conducting congeneric model testing on this construct separately for each data set, model fit indices returned unacceptable fit as highlighted in Table A8.25.
Table A8.25: Original model fit indices IDT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>24.053</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>41.312</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Standardised regression weights showed that all items were above the minimum standard of 0.500.

Consequently, MI and the conceptual nature of the items were then analysed to diagnose problematic items. For Australian Cricket Team consumer data, large MI scores showed a residual covariance between IDT_3 with IDT_4. For McGrath Foundation consumer data, residual covariances were found between IDT_5 and IDT_4 and IDT_4 with IDT_3.

To ensure that both consumer groups shared the same items given the quantitative comparative research underlying this study, IDT_4 and IDT_5 were dropped for both data sets. Subsequent analysis returned acceptable model fit for each group which is shown in Table A8.26.

Table A8.26: Respecified model fit indices IDT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>5.590</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of this factor are shown in Table A8.27.

Table A8.27: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of respecified IDT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standard regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT_1</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT_2</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT_3</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT_6</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

The squared multiple correlations for Australian Cricket Team consumers is below 0.500 which indicates that variance extracted on each item may be low as a result of measurement error. However, according to Hair et al. (2014), squared multiple correlations are indicative of the rules related to factor loadings and were therefore considered acceptable for further testing in this
case given that factor loadings were above the 0.500 minimum. Further CR and AVE testing presented in Section 8.6 confirmed the appropriateness of the items measuring IDT.

**Knowledge of social alliance partner (KNOW)**

KNOW was adapted from the original 5-item subjective knowledge scale developed by Flynn and Goldsmith (1999). One-factor congeneric model testing on this construct for each data set returned inappropriate model fit, although this was more prominent in Australian Cricket Team consumer data as shown in Table A8.28.

**Table A8.28: Original model fit indices KNOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>35.699</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>11.076</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Arguably, model fit for McGrath Foundation consumers was sufficient, however, in keeping with comparative consistency in having the same items across groups, it was deemed acceptable to diagnose problematic items in both data sets for the KNOW construct. After using the standardised regression weights as an initial diagnostic tool, which revealed sufficient factor loading scores, MI were used. In each associated consumer group, large MI signified a residual covariance between KNOW_3 and KNOW_4. Subsequently, KNOW_3 was dropped from analysis where model fit indices returned adequate model fit on the respecified model as shown in Table A8.29. Additionally, this item was removed because it was deemed repetitive with other items conceptually.

**Table A8.29: Respecified model fit indices KNOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

The standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of this factor are shown in Table A8.30.
Table A8.30: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of respecified KNOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised Regression Weights ACT</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlations ACT</th>
<th>Standardised Regression Weights MF</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlations MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOW_1</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW_2</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW_4</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW_5</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Donation intention (DON)

The final construct subject to one-factor congeneric model testing that consisted only of an established scale was DON which was measured using three items, making it a just-identified model. Therefore, one item was fixed to another to obtain at least one d.f.

Subsequently, congeneric model testing showed adequate model fit for both Australian Cricket Team and McGrath Foundation consumer data as depicted in Table A8.31.

Table A8.31: Model fit indices DON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

Table A8.32 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of DON.

Table A8.32: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of DON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights ACT</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations ACT</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights MF</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DON_1</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON_2</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON_3</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACT = Australian Cricket Team; MF = McGrath Foundation

One-factor congeneric model testing stage three

The results for the third stage of one-factor congeneric model testing are presented in this subsection.
Consumer identification (IDT)

IDT was the first factor to undergo congeneric model testing using a combined sample to determine construct validity, and consisted of four items after two items were dropped at the first stage of congeneric model testing on the split sample. Model fit indices showed adequate model fit as highlighted in Table A8.33. Thus, construct validity was achieved for the IDT construct.

Table A8.33: Model fit indices IDT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDT</td>
<td>4.095</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.34 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of IDT on a combined sample. As depicted, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.34: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of IDT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDT_1</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT_2</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT_3</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT_6</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA on the combined sample for IDT is shown in Figure A8.1

Figure A8.1: CFA outcome IDT - combined sample
Consumer trust (TRU)

To test for construct validity, TRU underwent one-factor congeneric model testing using a combined sample. The construct consisted of four items after one item was removed during the first stage of one-factor congeneric model testing. Model fit indices as indicated in Table A8.35 returned favourable model fit to the sample data. This showed sufficient unidimensionality of the TRU construct.

Table A8.35: Model fit indices TRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.36 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of TRU on a combined sample. As evidenced, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.36: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of TRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRU_1</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU_2</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU_4</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU_5</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA on the combined sample for TRU is shown in Figure A8.2.

Figure A8.2: CFA outcome TRU - combined sample
Social media engagement (SocM)

SocM originally consisted of eight items, however, four problematic items were dropped in stage one of one-factor congeneric model testing. Therefore, using a combined sample, SocM underwent one-factor congeneric model testing using the remaining four items. As shown in Table A8.37, the measurement model fit the sample data appropriately as depicted through adequate model fit indices.

Table A8.37: Original model fit indices SocM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SocM</td>
<td>2.419</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.38 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of SocM on a combined sample. As highlighted, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.38: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of modified SocM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SocM_1</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM_2</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM_5</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocM_7</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA on the combined sample for SocM is shown in Figure A8.3.

Figure A8.3: CFA outcome SocM - combined sample
Social alliance awareness (AWA)

Following testing for construct validity on the four items comprising the AWA construct, original model fit indices returned poor model fit on a combined sample as shown in Table A8.39.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A8.39: Original model fit indices AWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of MI occurred as the standardised regression weights were all above the minimum recommended value of 0.500. MI showed an issue with item AWA_1, returning a high MI score and showing evidence of residual correlation with AWA_2. As such, AWA_1 was removed from analysis. Given that this construct consisted of four items, the removal of one item rendered AWA as a just identified model. Therefore, as previously stated, one item was fixed with another as to develop a sufficient d.f. value. Following this, model fit indices showed good model fit as depicted in Table A8.40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A8.40: Respecified model fit indices AWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.41 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of AWA. As demonstrated, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A8.41: Standardised regression weights &amp; squared multiple correlations of modified AWA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWA_4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA for AWA is shown in Figure A8.4 for the combined sample.
Knowledge of social alliance partner (KNOW)

To test for construct validity, one-factor congeneric model testing using a combined sample was conducted on the KNOW construct. The construct consisted of four items after one item was removed during the first stage of one-factor congeneric model testing. Model fit indices returned adequate model fit to the sample data as highlighted in Table A8.42.

Table A8.42: Model fit indices KNOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.43 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of KNOW. As depicted, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.43: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of KNOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOW_1</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW_2</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW_4</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOW_5</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA on the combined sample for KNOW is shown in Figure A8.5.
Social alliance attitudes (ATT)

The ATT construct consists of four items following the removal of one problematic item during stage one of one-factor congeneric model testing. Model fit indices in Table A8.44 shows adequate model fit for ATT.

Table A8.44: Model fit indices ATT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.45 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of ATT. As depicted, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.45: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of ATT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT_1</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_2</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_3</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_5</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA for ATT is shown in Figure A8.6 for the combined sample.
Figure A8.6: CFA outcome ATT - combined sample

Donation intention (DON)
Table A8.46 demonstrates that construct validity for DON was achieved as evidenced through adequate model fit indices. Given that this construct consisted of three items, one item was fixed with another to develop a sufficient d.f. value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DON_1</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON_2</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON_3</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.47 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of DON. As demonstrated, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

The outcome of the CFA on the combined sample for DON is shown in Figure A8.7.
Increasing team association intention (TAS)

To test for construct validity, CFA was performed on the three items that constituted the TAS construct. As a just identified model, one item needed to be fixed with another to develop a sufficient d.f. value. As shown in Table A8.48 the model fit indices demonstrated adequate model fit for TAS.

Table A8.48: Model fit indices TAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.49 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of TAS. As highlighted, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.49: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of TAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAS_1</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS_2</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS_3</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA for TAS is shown in Figure A8.8 for the combined sample.
One-factor congeneric model testing was performed on the MAT construct which consisted of three items after one item was dropped during the initial stage of one-factor congeneric model testing. As a just identified model, one item needed to be fixed with another to ascertain a minimum d.f. value. Model fit indices shown in Table A8.50 highlights the achievement of adequate model fit for MAT.

Table A8.50: Model fit indices MAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.51 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of TAS. As shown, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.51: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of MAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAT_1</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT_2</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT_3</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA on the combined sample for MAT is shown in Figure A8.9.
Word-of-Mouth sports team intention (WOMST)

The WOMST construct consisted of four items which underwent one-factor congeneric model testing. As shown in Table A8.52 model fit indices demonstrated adequate model fit on all four items.

Table A8.52: Model fit indices WOMST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.53 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of WOMST. As depicted, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.53: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of WOMST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMST_1</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST_2</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST_3</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMST_4</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA on the combined sample for WOMST is shown in Figure A8.10.
Merchandise purchasing intention (MP)

One-factor congeneric model testing was conducted on MP which consisted of three items following the removal of one problematic item in stage one of one-factor congeneric model testing. Therefore, one item was fixed to another to ensure that a minimum d.f. value was achieved. As highlighted in Table A8.54, model fit indices returned adequate model fit for the MP construct.

Table A8.54: Model fit indices MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.55 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of MP. As depicted, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.55: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of MP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP_1</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP_2</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP_4</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA for MP is shown in Figure A8.11 for the combined sample.
Figure A8.11: CFA outcome MP - combined sample

Word-of-Mouth NPO intention (WOMNPO)

WOMNPO was the final construct to undergo one-factor congeneric model testing on a combined sample. The construct consisted of four items. As depicted in Table A8.56, model fit indices demonstrated adequate model fit.

Table A8.56: Model fit indices WOMNPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.969</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A8.57 shows the standardised regression weights and squared multiple correlations of WOMNPO. As depicted, all standardised regression weights were greater than the minimum recommended value of 0.500.

Table A8.57: Standardised regression weights & squared multiple correlations of WOMNPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Standardised regression weights</th>
<th>Squared multiple correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO_1</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO_2</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO_3</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMNPO_4</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the CFA on the combined sample for WOMNPO is shown in Figure A8.12.
After conducting one-factor congeneric model testing on all constructs across a combined sample, one additional item (AWA_1) was dropped.