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ABSTRACT

GREGORY J. DRISCOLL: An Analysis of the working relationships between in-house and outsourced sports marketing departments in Division I-A college athletics.

The purpose of this study was to examine the working relationships between the in-house and outsourced marketing groups of major NCAA Division I athletics programs. Forty-four outsourced general managers (GMs) and 39 senior in-house marketing administrators (SMAs) participated for a response rate of 69.2%. Descriptive analysis indicated the firms were similar in regards to office location, amount of contact, work experience, and pressure. The data also indicated possible inherent differences between the outsourced and in-house realms. Actual outsourced pressure exceeded in-house pressure, and the GMs and SMAs tended to overstate their counterparts’ pressure levels. Also, GMs had more experience working in-house than SMAs had working for outsourced firms. Responses from GMs and SMAs indicated a healthy relationship despite the presence of the arms race in college athletics, as each group exhibited tendencies of conceding portions of their own ideals for the benefit of the overall working relationship.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

One of the highly disputed debates in intercollegiate athletics arises from the big-business culture of major Division I-A athletics, caused by increased spending by the largest athletic departments in the country. While college athletics reform groups such as the Knight Commission claim that higher expenditures do not lead to winning programs, these claims have not stopped athletic departments from spending in the hopes of garnering more success. This simple supposition that “more is better” drives to the heart of major college athletics in what many people now refer to as the “arms race,” as universities committed to staying in stride with the race build up multi-million athletic facilities and often pay football and basketball head coaches more than the CEO’s of their institutions. In 2005, as this arms race has proliferated into what many critics would call an epidemic, the face of big-time college sports has become as commercialized as ever in order to combat costs associated with the race. There exists “a frantic, money-oriented modus operandi that defies responsibility dominates the structure of big-time football and basketball,” according to the Knight Commission (“Knight Commission Report,” June 2001).

The NCAA maintains an expectation that Division I athletic departments should be self-sufficient, and while most athletic departments fall short of this standard and accept
institutional support, the pressure to generate revenue remains intense. There is no apparent end to this arms race, as schools fear falling behind their counterparts if they are the first to curb spending. The Knight Commission’s 2001 report stated “the arms race isn’t entered into by NCAA fiat. Institutions, not the NCAA, decide what’s best for themselves, and for many that means joining the arms race. Presidents and trustees accept their athletics department’s argument that they have to keep up with the competition” (“Knight Commission Report,” June 2001). To keep up with the arms race and reach the standard break-even point for non-profit entities, the common alternative for athletic departments is to further cultivate sources and tap into new revenue streams, rather than to restrain spending. Part of the solution to remain competitive in the college athletics arms race was for athletic departments to begin transforming the responsibilities of their marketing staffs. Outsourcing sports marketing operations, in the form of sponsorship and advertising, soon became a solution to generate more revenue for an athletic department, often at guaranteed million dollar levels (Johnson, February 21-27, 2005).

History of collegiate sports marketing

The term “in-house sports marketing” is used to describe the group of university employees who work for the athletic department in marketing and promoting sports at the university. Prior to the 1980’s, the in-house marketing staff at a Division I institution was expected to generate revenue by selling advertisements and sponsorships, mostly to area merchants in need of increased exposure and customer traffic through their doors. This remains largely the case today in Division I-AA, II, and III athletics. Compared to the current arrangements being made with corporate sponsors at the Division I-A level that involve a complexity of multimedia rights, the inventory available at the time was relatively
simple in nature. University of Oregon athletic director Bill Moos described the simplicity of the times by saying “you know it used to be…pass out some pompoms and make sure the "Beat the Beavers" buttons are on everyone's seat. [Now], that's been elevated to the need to have big sponsors paying big dollars to have their names on the scoreboard or at courtside” (“An interview with Bill Moos,” 2002, p. 15). This change in marketing to which Moos refers occurred in conjunction with the arms race of the 1990’s and early 2000’s.

The arms race and its connection with commercialization and outsourced sports marketing

The foundations for the arms race truly started to take hold in the 1990’s, predominantly in the sports of football and men’s basketball. Universities were building new stadiums and facilities in order to attract the highest caliber of recruit and logically, have the best chance at winning. Additionally, head coaches salaries, again predominantly in football and men’s basketball, started to escalate at a high rate (Fish, June 2, 2003). These trends served to fuel the arms race and universities were forced to either comply or fall by the wayside.

Financial demands were at an all-time high for those athletic departments wishing to remain in stride with the arms race. The current methods of generating marketing revenue often did not meet the needs of an athletic department operating in the landscape of big-time college athletics (Johnson, February 21-27, 2005). In addition, they carried no guaranteed levels of revenue from year to year. Thus, many major Division I athletic programs made the crucial decision to begin outsourcing their selling and marketing responsibilities to external firms, which specialize in the marketing and selling of such inventory. These outsourced groups include major media firms such as ESPN Plus (ESPN), Host Communications (HOST), Learfield Communications (Learfield), ISP Sports (ISP), Nelligan Sports Marketing
(Nelligan), and Viacom Sports (Viacom). For the purposes of this study, these six firms are referred to collectively as the “Big Six.”

While the University of Kentucky has the longest running relationship with a property holder (Host), most arrangements with the Big Six were made between 1998 and today (Johnson, February 21-27, 2005). This period of time when many Division I universities decided to outsource their marketing rights came, not coincidentally, during the burgeoning period of the arms race in college athletics. With this decision to outsource came an upfront payment in the millions of dollars for most Division I-A schools from the media companies: money that could help fund an athletic department and keep its spending on par with other athletic departments around the country. Thus, the arms race of facilities improvements and multi-million dollar coaching salaries is inextricably tied to the concept of commercialism in college athletics, because with increased spending in college athletics came the need for a guaranteed source of revenue to help cover costs. Outsourcing marketing rights proved to be a viable way for athletic departments to do so. As Oregon athletic director Bill Moos said, “Of our $30 million budget there is well over $3 million, maybe even as high as $4 million, realized each year in sponsorships. Or something relating to those kinds of sponsorships, so it's grown in leaps and bounds. And it has become an integral part of an intercollegiate athletic program's ability to fund itself” (“An interview with Bill Moos,” 2002, p. 15).

Besides a level of guaranteed revenue, there were multiple other reasons for athletic departments to begin forming business relationships with outsourced marketing firms. Big-time college athletics, notably football and basketball, were taking on a decidedly professional look. Many athletic departments felt that the commercialism used to support big-time college athletics did not align well with a university’s academic mission. Thus, one
of the main reasons to outsource was simply for strategic purposes (Johnson, February 21-27, 2005). As Tar Heel Sports Marketing General Manager, Gary Sobba, said, “The university’s mission is to educate students, and corporate sales doesn’t necessarily align with that. This is the one piece of business that university administrators may not have as much knowledge of” (Johnson, February 21-27, 2005, p. 21). Multimedia giants like the “Big Six” are often more apt at soliciting these lucrative sponsorships through their network of partnerships around the country. They also have the abilities to pool resources and minimize costs. The commercialized look that big-time college athletics began to take on formed a stark contrast with the overall mission of higher education, and many schools preferred to let an external firm take over marketing operations (Johnson, February 21-27, 2005).

Other reasons existed to support the move for many athletic departments to outsource marketing. In an industry becoming more focused on selling, the bureaucratic nature of a public institution did not bode well for schools hoping to keep up with the arms race with an in-house group. Commissions for salespeople, vital in a selling industry, were not available for state employees, including in-house marketing staffs. In addition, the unrelated business income tax (“UBIT”) would dictate that a public university pay 40% in taxes for every sponsorship that it sold. Finally, sheer space and manpower were additional reasons for outsourcing marketing needs. University athletic departments often did not have the office space necessary to house handfuls of salespeople (Personal communication with Norwood T. Teague, 2005).

While responsibilities vary across outsourced marketing arms, each outsourced firm is primarily responsible for cultivating relationships with corporate sponsors, providing millions of dollars in revenue to the athletic department. The outsourced group’s typical
inventory includes radio and television commercials for games and coaches shows, print and Internet advertising, stadium signage, game promotions, corporate hospitality, and sometimes licensing on behalf of the athletic department.

The tasks of the in-house marketing departments have changed as the outsourced marketing firms have taken on the primary selling responsibilities. For athletic departments that choose to outsource, the in-house marketing staff is now typically responsible for overseeing the outsourced firm and acting as a liaison between the firm and university’s overall interests. This often results in a relationship filled with complexities, and sometimes tension as well. University faculty generally does not want the athletic department to siphon funds from the school itself, in the form of student fees. However, at the same time, the university also does not want the athletic department to take on an overly commercialized look by accepting throngs of money from corporate sponsors. Joel Cohen, University of Maryland professor and member of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, reflected on this conundrum by saying, “On one hand, we’re telling athletic directors we don’t want them to cost (the academic side) so much money, but at the same time we’re telling them not to accept too much commercial money. I admit it’s a mixed message” (Sylwester & Witosky, February 18, 2004). Pressures exist from the outside as well, as General Managers at companies like ESPN, Host, ISP, Learfield, Nelligan and Viacom constantly push for more sales to improve their bottom lines. After all, they are operating businesses in a competitive industry.

Commercialism in college sport, as heated of a debate as it is, adds many complexities to the relationship between the athletic department and the outsourced marketing firm. Since outsourcing in college athletics is a relatively new trend, there may
not exist a uniform standard of business in place at each university in dealing with the outsourced firm. Thus, significant differences may be found in this study between these entities. Commercialism in college athletics strikes different chords at different universities. Some athletic departments are seen as ultra-conservative in which types of inventory they are willing to sell, while others often push the envelope and expand inventory in order to generate additional revenue to compete in the arms race. “In my experience working in college athletics, I have noticed that the level to which an athletic department will commercialize itself definitely varies from university to university. The tolerance levels at some schools are very low, while at others they are more willing to push the envelope” (personal communication with Norwood T. Teague, 200). For example, Michigan Stadium does not have permanent signage on premise (Sullivan, March 8, 2001), and the Dean E. Smith Center on the campus of the North Carolina just recently added permanent signage on premise after a long history of refusing to do so (“Wachovia and UNC announce enhanced partnership, November 22, 2005). Other universities have had little problem in not only having corporate signage in the stadium, but also on the actual playing surfaces, as evidenced by Wachovia’s logo presence at the University of Virginia’s basketball venue. Some universities have even offered corporate naming rights for their athletic venues. Thus, the level of commercialism that each university condones varies widely. What remains to be seen is if this level of commercialism varies by the outsourced marketing group as well.

The different priorities that the in-house department and outsourced group have, as well as different stakeholders that they each represent, help to add further complexities to this relationship. The senior marketing administrator at in-house marketing heeds to the orders of the athletic director on issues regarding the extent of commercialization at the school. The
outsourced marketing general manager, on the other hand, strives to continue selling sponsorships and expanding available inventory in order to bring more money to the firm. The in-house senior marketing administrator thus often serves as the mediator between how much the outsourced marketing group pushes to sell, and how much the athletic department limits the commercialization of the property (Personal communication with Norwood T. Teague, 2005). Depending on the extent to which an athletic department commercializes itself (“commercialized culture”) the senior marketing administrator has pressure from two different directions in order to satisfy both involved constituents.

This research study will determine if there are any differences in working relationships between the in-house marketing departments and the Big Six outsourced sports marketing firms, with respect to physical office proximity, amount of daily contact, work experience of marketing executives, internal and external pressure, satisfaction levels, and goal matching. These issues may be important, in an age where commercialism reigns supreme in college athletics, yet pressures always exist in keeping the amateurism and integrity of the game. A close relationship with the in-house marketing department and university as a whole serves as a reminder to the outsourced firm that it is not simply generating money for a sports team, but rather for a university with student-athletes instead of paid professionals. With the proper working relationships, the outsourced marketing firm and the in-house marketing department can create a symbiotic relationship as the arms race in college athletics forges ahead.
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine and compare the working relationships between the in-house and outsourced marketing groups of major NCAA Division I athletics programs, between and within each outsourced firm studied.

Null Hypothesis

There is no significant statistical difference between the working relationships of ESPN Plus, Host Communications, Learfield Communications, ISP Sports, Nelligan Sports Marketing and Viacom Sports, nor within each company, with their respective in-house marketing departments.

Research Questions

- Is there a relationship between the physical office proximity to the in-house department and the outsourced firm contracted?
- Is there a relationship in the amount of daily contact with the in-house marketing department and the outsourced firm contracted?
- Is there a relationship in the amount of college sports work experience and college sports marketing work experience and the Big Six outsourced marketing firms?
- Is there a relationship between the external pressure and the outsourced firm contracted?
- Is there a relationship between the internal pressure and the outsourced firm contracted?
- Is there a relationship between the level of satisfaction with the in-house marketing department and the outsourced firm contracted?
- Is there a relationship between goal matching and the outsourced firm contracted?
- Is there a relationship between work experience and satisfaction levels?
- Is there a relationship between physical office proximity and the outsourced firm’s level of inclusion in the athletic department?
- Is there a relationship between internal pressure and conference type affiliation?
- Is there a relationship between external pressure and conference type affiliation?
- Is there a relationship between satisfaction levels and conference type affiliation?
Definitions of terms

- Division I – the highest level of competition in the National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- In-house marketing – the group of university athletic department employees who work to promote the university’s athletic programs.
- NCAA – National Collegiate Athletic Association – the governing body of intercollegiate athletics.
- Outsourced marketing firm – a firm, independent of the university and athletic department, with the responsibility of selling radio and television commercials, stadium signage, game promotions, print advertising, and other inventory on behalf of the athletic department.
- Physical office proximity – the distance between the in-house marketing department and the outsourced marketing offices of that athletic department’s multi-media rights holder. Expressed as either on campus within the same office complex, on campus but not within the same office complex, off campus but within five miles, or off campus and not within five miles.
- Overall college sports work experience – the total number of years that an in-house marketing director and an outsourced marketing general manager have working in college sports.
- Marketing work experience – the number of years that an in-house marketing director and an outsourced marketing general manager have working in marketing in college sports.
- Power conferences – the most competitive six conferences in NCAA Division I, formerly known as “BCS conferences.” For this study, includes the Atlantic Coast Conference, the Big East Conference, the Big Ten Conference, the Big Twelve Conference, the Pacific Ten Conference, and the Southeastern Conference.
- Non-power conference – the rest of the conferences in NCAA Division I, not including the power conferences. For this study, includes Conference USA, the Mid-Atlantic Conference, the Mountain West Conference, the Western Athletic Conference, and Independent (football).
- Conference type affiliation – designated as either a power conference or a non-power conference.
- External pressure – the amount of pressure applied to outsourced marketing firm general managers by their superiors at corporate offices.
- Internal pressure – the amount of pressure applied to in-house marketing administrators by the athletic directors at their universities.

Limitations

- Respondents may be hesitant to answer the survey questions truthfully, for fear of upsetting the other marketing group in the relationship.
Delimitations

- This study was limited to only Division I universities represented by one of the Big Six multimedia marketing companies (ESPN Plus, Host Communications, ISP Sports Properties, Learfield Communications, Nelligan Sports Marketing and Viacom Sports). It did not include universities not represented by one of these six firms, nor universities represented by Nelligan Sports Marketing which do not sponsor football as a Division I-A sport.

Assumptions

- Respondents answered questions truthfully and to the best of their knowledge.
- The returned surveys provided a large enough and representative sample of outsourcing in NCAA Division I athletics.
Significance of the study

This study may be of use to athletic departments and outsourced marketing firms associated with the universities. Outsourcing collegiate sports marketing is a relatively new trend in the NCAA, with the first agreement occurring in 1970 and the majority occurring within the last ten years. Consequently, standard operating procedures from firm to firm do not exist currently in the industry. This study provides the reader with a better understanding of the working relationship between the two marketing entities. In-house marketing departments and outsourced media firms must work together collaboratively in order to be as effective as possible in marketing the athletic program and selling sponsorships. At the same time, many complexities in this relationship exist as the in-house marketing group, depending on the commercialism of the school, feels a constant tension between what the athletic department wants to preserve and what the outsourced group wants to sell. While outsourced marketing firms are not actual parts of the university, a close relationship with the athletic department is vital in terms of public perception in today’s age of collegiate sports commercialism, as well as with regards to revenue generation.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature will begin with an overview of the Big Six outsourced collegiate sport marketing firms. It will continue with a summary of corporate sponsorship in intercollegiate athletics. The third section will be an overview of the concept of outsourcing in business, including a definition of outsourcing and how companies currently utilize this practice today. The chapter will then examine the history of outsourcing in college athletics, as it relates to corporate sponsorship in Division I-A athletics. In the final section, research in the field of outsourced collegiate sports marketing will be analyzed, exploring the gap that exists in current research.

The Big Six Outsourced Collegiate Sport Marketing Firms

Host Communications

Host Communications, recently celebrating its 30th anniversary in 2002, has been named one of the top five companies in the sports marketing industry by Sports Business Journal (“About us: Corporate Overview,” 2005). Being acquired by its parent company, Bull Run Corporation, in 1999, Host represents one of the major firms on the collegiate sports marketing scene. Currently, the company has 325 employees, and in addition to its
Host’s history with college athletics and the NCAA is quite extensive, as in 1974 the company reached an agreement with the University of Kentucky to sell advertising space for the school’s football and men’s basketball game broadcasts. In 1975, the company secured the first-ever broadcast relationship with the Final Four, and the company also has the distinction of founding the NCAA’s corporate partner program in 1985. Thanks to a five year, $75 million deal with the NCAA in 1996, Host gained exclusive rights to the NCAA’s Corporate Partner program and their logos and marks, management of championship game broadcasts, as well as publication and distribution rights for championship printed materials, such as game programs (Reith, 1996). Host Communications has the longest running relationship with the NCAA, and through an agreement with CBS Sports, represents the NCAA directly in many fashions, including licensing, printing and publishing, as well as operating NCAA Hoop City, a fan-friendly interactive event which occurs in the host city of each men’s and women’s Final Four. The deal between Host and the NCAA was recently renewed for another eleven years, slated to run through 2013 (“Host Communications signs 11-year deal with CBS Sports,” July 10, 2001).

Host has been a dominant presence in the collegiate sports marketing industry since it first began its partnership with Kentucky. Its hold on college football is also quite strong, being a leading presence in the promotion of the official website of college football, NCAAFootball.net (“Collegiate Marketing and NCAA,” 2005).

Host helps corporations to reach their target audiences through various avenues and it has a diverse array of services under its company name. In addition to collegiate sports
marketing and the NCAA, Host also serves areas of Association Management, Printing and Publishing, and Radio and Television (“About us: Corporate overview,” 2005). Host offers the concept of Total Campus Marketing® to its clients as well. The concept of TCM extends the marketing efforts that Host provides beyond the athletic department and into the actual college campuses themselves (“Total Campus Marketing,” 2005).

Today, Host represents some of the most prestigious athletic programs in the country, as its portfolio includes the University of Arizona, Boston College, Florida State University, the University of Kentucky, the University of Michigan, Oklahoma State University, the University of Tennessee, and the University of Texas, in addition to its representation of the Southeastern Conference and Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

*Learfield Communications*

Once Host Communications created an industry with its budding partnership with the University of Kentucky, it did not take long for other companies realize the profits that could be made representing an athletic department’s marketing rights. The first one to do so in response to Host’s exploits was Learfield Communications, based out of Jefferson City, Missouri.

Learfield Communications, as a multimedia giant today, began as a small company in 1973. Operating out of a newly-created radio station alongside of a lumberyard in Missouri with only nine affiliates, Derry Brownfield and Clyde Lear created a farm network which provided news to farmers around the state. In two short years, a news network was added and an eventual expansion into sports broadcasting arrived as well. Names like John Rooney, Bob Costas, Jack Buck, and Kevin Harlan have represented Learfield over the radio
waves, and Learfield today is one of the country’s most successful multimedia companies (“A brief history of Learfield Communications,” 2005).

Learfield Sports is a division of Learfield Communications, and it represents twenty-two collegiate athletic departments’ marketing rights: the University of Alabama, Clemson University, the University of Colorado, Fresno State University, the University of Georgia, Indiana University, the University of Iowa, Kansas State University, the University of Memphis, the University of Miami (Fl.), the University of Minnesota, the University of Missouri, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, the University of Oklahoma, Oregon State University, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, the University of South Carolina, the University of Tulsa, the University of Washington, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Wyoming. It has continually expanded over the years and is still looking to add to its client portfolio (Personal communication with Gary Sobba, October 21, 2005).

*International Sports Properties (ISP)*

International Sports Properties (ISP) was founded in 1992 in Winston-Salem, NC. The company has experienced growth since the late 1990’s, gradually adding collegiate clients to its portfolio. The company now has collegiate properties covering the entire country, with a strong presence in the southeastern part of the United States.

With 450 radio affiliates and over 100 television outlets, ISP has a strong multimedia presence in the industry, making it a point of serious competition for other outsourced collegiate sport marketing firms. In addition to its headquarters in Winston-Salem, the company has twenty other offices and approximately 100 total employees. ISP divides its

ISP currently represents twenty-four colleges and universities around the country: the University of Alabama, the University of Alabama-Birmingham, Auburn University, the University of California-Berkeley, the University of Cincinnati, Clemson University, the University of Georgia, Georgia Tech Institute of Technology, the University of Houston, Marshall University, the University of Miami (Fl.), Ohio University, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of South Carolina, the University of Southern Mississippi, Syracuse University, Tulane University, the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA), Vanderbilt University, Villanova University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech), the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA), the University of Central Florida and Wake Forest University.

Viacom Sports

Of the “Big Six,” Viacom Sports represents one of the latest firms to enter the collegiate sport marketing industry, incorporating in 1984 as Premier Sports Marketing. However, the company has made recent moves in order to position itself competitively alongside of its counterparts. Formerly Infinity Outdoor Sports Marketing, Viacom Sports exists as a division of Viacom, one of the largest media corporations in the world, which also owns CBS, MTV, Nickelodeon, Paramount Pictures, and Infinity Broadcasting, among others. Viacom Sports strives to include “dynamic strategic planning, strong leadership and personal management, effective marketing and communications, aggressive business development, integrated and innovative sales, superior customer service, and sound fiscal

Viacom Sports currently represents the Air Force Academy, Arizona State University, Louisiana State University, the University of Maryland, Northwestern University, Stanford University, and the University of Virginia. By winning recent bidding wars for both the LSU and Stanford properties, Viacom Sports has positioned itself to represent a point of major competition for the remaining members of the Big Six.

Viacom Sports actively promotes the strong relationships it has forged with its collegiate partners through its corporate website. The firm touches on the close relationship between the in-house staffs and outsourced staffs by saying the following about its Arizona State, Northwestern, Air Force, and Virginia properties.

- “The Sun Devil Sports Marketing team has forged a close and seamless relationship with its client and is considered part of the ASU Athletic Department by the university and sponsors alike” (Partner Details, Arizona State University, 2005).
- “This is the first time the university has outsourced its sponsorship sales program, and it considers Wildcat Sports Marketing to be an important arm of its athletic department” (Partner Details, Northwestern University, 2005).
- “Housed in the USAFA athletic department, Falcon Sports Marketing has forged a strong relationship with the academy and assists the USAFA marketing department in its day-to-day marketing operations” (Partner Details, Air Force Academy, 2005).
- “Our philosophy of ‘less is more’ has complemented the goals of a conservative institution like Virginia and has made it one of our most successful and ambitious programs to date” (Partner Details, University of Virginia, 2005).

Viacom has made a commitment to integrate itself into the various athletic department properties that the firm represents. This study will help to discover if there are significant differences in the working relationship that Viacom has with its collegiate partners to the other five outsourced collegiate sport marketing firms.
ESPN Plus (ESPN Regional)

ESPN Plus, also known as ESPN Regional, has operated in the collegiate production, syndication, event ownership, multi-media and sports marketing business since 1984, when it was known as Creative Sports prior to ESPN’s purchase (“ESPN Plus,” 2005). A wholly-owned subsidiary of ESPN, Inc., it employs over 100 people in its Charlotte headquarters and at additional offices around the country.

ESPN Plus produces more than 2,000 hours of sports programming each year through ESPN, ESPN 2, ABC, ESPN U, ESPN Full Court, ESPN Gameplan, and other regional outlets, making it the world’s largest supplier of syndicated sports programming (“ESPN Plus,” 2005). The firm owns the exclusive rights to the television programming of the Big East Conference, Big Ten Conference, Conference-USA, and Big 12 men’s basketball. ESPN Plus’ programming expands even further, as the firm has responsibilities in the programming of other “NCAA Basketball and Football, a multitude of NCAA Championships including the College World Series Regionals, the Home Depot College Football Awards, the PGA Tour, the Skins Game, Champions Skins Game, LPGA Tour and Par 3 Shootout, NHRA drag racing, NFL Preseason Football, the Arena Football League, Friday Night Fights, the McDonald’s All-American Game, America’s Cup, Women’s Professional Softball League, Little League World Series and the Women’s World Cup” (“ESPN Plus,” 2005).

Aside from its stranglehold on the sports syndication market, ESPN Plus is also the multimedia rights holder at the University of Kansas, the University of Oregon, the University of South Florida, and Texas Christian University (“ESPN Plus,” 2005).
Nelligan Sports Marketing

Nelligan Sports Marketing represents the most recent of the Big Six firms to enter the collegiate sport marketing industry. The company was founded in 1999 by the former President of Host’s Sports Division, T.J. Nelligan, and is currently based out of Little Falls, NJ. Nelligan Sports Marketing has negotiated over $300 million in sponsorship agreements with blue chip companies since its incorporation in 1999. While still a niche firm representing mostly mid-major universities, Nelligan is growing and continues to add clients to its portfolio (“Board of Directors,” 2005).

Nelligan currently represents Ball State University, Colorado State University, DePaul University, the University of Louisville, Marquette University, Princeton University, Providence College, Rutgers, Saint Johns University, and Seton Hall University. For the purposes of equity of universities studied with this research, only Colorado State, Louisville, and Rutgers are considered. Universities which do not sponsor Division I-A football, such as Marquette, Princeton, Providence, and Saint John’s, were not included.

One of Nelligan’s most successful properties resides at the University of Louisville, which first signed on with the firm in 2002. Within the first two years, marketing efforts at the university yielded almost $700,000 in unexpected revenue, and the firm was able to cut expenses as well, resulting in a $2 million turnaround (Crawford, June 4, 2003, pg. 2). In addition to its collegiate clients, Nelligan Sports Marketing represents the Big East Conference, the Colonial Athletic Association and all its member universities, the Jimmy V Classic, the Meadowlands Sports Complex, and Madison Square Garden (“Nelligan Sports Marketing,” 2005). Much of the firm’s presence lies in the northeastern portion of the United States.
Corporate Sponsorship in Intercollegiate Athletics

Biannually since 1969, the NCAA has commissioned a research study to analyze the financial state of college athletics. Since 1994, this study has been a joint effort of an NCAA research staff and Transylvania University professor David Fulks. Titled “Revenues and Expenses of Divisions I and II Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Report,” it is commonly referred to as the “Fulks Report.” The latest Fulks Report culminated from a survey sent to every NCAA member institution in the fall of 2003. Fulks received completed surveys from 916 NCAA member institutions, for an 89% response rate in the study. The 2003 report found that the average Division I-A school received $2.12 million in revenue from radio and television deals, $1.26 million from signage and other forms of sponsorship, and $117,000 from program sales and advertising, representing over 11% of the average $29.4 million athletic department budget for Division I-A (Fulks, 2003).

From 1997 to 2001, sponsorship revenue in Division I-A spiked by 91%, or $539,000 per institution (Fulks, 2003). Much of this increase coincides with and can be attributed to schools’ decisions to turn to outsourced sports marketing. With increased strains on budgets at virtually every Division I-A athletic department in the country, the influx of marketing dollars has been welcomed by each university.

Fulks also organizes the revenues and expenses data in Division I-A by conference, which provides useful insight into the trends taking place in major college athletics over the past ten years. The data collected and organized by Fulks illustrates that growth of revenues and expenses in the “power conferences” (the Atlantic Coast Conference – ACC, the Big East Conference, the Big 10 Conference, the Big 12 Conference, the Southeastern Conference – SEC, and the Pacific-10 Conference – PAC-10) outpaces the growth in non-power
conferences (*Conference USA, Independent, Mid-Atlantic Conference, Mountain West Conference, Sun Belt Conference, and the Western Athletic Conference*).

![Revenues and Expenses of BCS vs. non-BCS Athletic Departments in 2002](chart)

(Fulks, 2003)

The arms race becomes apparent when comparing the revenues and expenses of BCS schools to non-BCS schools (note: these designations are not currently applicable, as all universities are considered “BCS schools”). In order to cover these large expenses, a majority of BCS universities have decided to outsource their marketing rights, which in turn, has helped lead to larger revenue streams. On the whole, the non-BCS conferences and member universities are not as entrenched in the arms race as BCS universities are and have typically not had as much of a need for outsourcing marketing. The national exposure of a non-BCS university is also generally not as strong as the exposure of their BCS counterparts. The Big Six marketing firms see BCS universities as the most lucrative ones to endorse.
Outsourcing of marketing in business

Outsourcing is defined as “the delegation of non-core operations or jobs from internal production to an external entity (such as a subcontractor) that specializes in that operation” (“Outsourcing,” 2004). In the business market, outsourcing is tied closely together with the concept of globalization, and shipping jobs that were once in the United States to overseas locations. The benefits of outsourcing are numerous. By focusing on core initiatives and outsourcing the non-core initiatives, companies can spotlight funds, control head counts and define clear management guidelines to monitor future performance (Schildge, p. 37). The clearest advantage for outsourcing is to save money.

Geoffrey Moore (2000), author of the book *Living on the Fault Line*, a book concerning managing shareholder value, argued that a company should focus on ‘core activities,’ which are those activities which directly contribute to the company’s competitive advantage and increase shareholder value. All other activities are referred to as ‘context activities,’ and are possible alternatives for outsourcing (Schildge, p. 37). Moore’s beliefs may carry a strong parallel with athletic departments and outsourced marketing activities. The ‘core activities’ of an athletic department are fielding successful programs and graduating student-athletes, because they directly contribute to the department’s national reputation. These two facets, winning and graduating, contribute to an athletic department’s competitive advantage by having an impact in rankings like the Director’s Cup, the annual all-sports success measure, and the Academic Progress Rate (APR), which track the academic progress of student-athletes in all varsity programs. In keeping with the amateurism of the game, the NCAA would hold that marketing, and especially multi-million dollar agreements, should not be core activities for member universities’ athletic
departments. Add that outsourcing collegiate sport marketing also offers the benefits of flexibility, a larger and more knowledgeable sales force, and the possibility of commission, the decision to outsource has become natural for many athletic departments to make in recent years.

**Studies of Corporate Sponsorship in Collegiate Sports Marketing**

Burden and Li (2003) completed a study entitled *Differentiation of NCAA Division I Athletic Departments in Outsourcing of Sport Marketing Operations: A Discriminant Analysis of Financial-Related Institutional Variables*, which examined the financial variables which drove to the athletic department’s decision to outsource or keep its marketing in-house. The variables looked at in the study were overall operating budget, football operating budget, revenue from football operations, revenue from men’s programs, revenue from women’s programs, total expenses for men’s programs, total expenses for women’s programs, athletic giving received, and profitability of athletic program (Burden and Li, 2003, 78).

Out of 236 surveys sent out to Division I athletic directors, 110 were returned and usable, amounting to a 47% response rate for the study. Of the 110 responses, 47 athletic directors indicated that their departments outsourced their marketing rights to a multimedia company. The stepwise model used determined that certain variables were important in determining if an athletic department chose to outsource its marketing operations. The overall annual operating budget, the annual operating budget for football, and the total expense for men’s programs variables were all significant (p < .00) in differentiating those athletic programs which outsourced their marketing operations from those that did kept operations in-house (Burden and Li, 2003, 79).
Two theses from the University of North Carolina’s graduate program in Sport Administration also prove relevant to this current study. Both Robert H. Zullo and Kyle Johnson wrote masters theses relating to outsourced collegiate sports marketing.

Zullo (2000) examined corporate sponsorship in research, titled *A Study of the Level of Satisfaction with Outsourcing Marketing Groups at Major Division I-A National Collegiate Athletic Association Schools*. The main purpose was to gauge satisfaction ratings among athletic directors and sport marketing directors with their outsourced marketing arms at 83 of the 117 Division I-A NCAA institutions. While its main purpose was to measure satisfaction, the study also examined selling responsibilities, revenue streams, and the greatest strengths and weaknesses of the outsourced group.

Of 166 surveys sent, 59 were completed for a 35.5% response rate. Of the 59 surveys returned, 23 were from Sport Marketing Directors and 18 were from Associate Athletic Directors, the two largest response categories (Zullo, 2000). No surveys were sent to outsourced firm representatives for this study.

If a school chose not to employ an outsourced marketing firm, its representative was prompted to rank the reasons for keeping marketing in-house. The primary reason cited by the in-house respondents was the lack of control over the marketing process they felt they would encounter if the department employed an outsourced firm. Additionally, some schools chose not to outsource because they had previous experiences with outsourced groups where there was a lack of communication between the two entities (Zullo, 2000, pg. 22). In addition, “Poor Communication” and “Different Goals” were both cited as weaknesses that the in-house group felt with the outsourced firm (Zullo, 31). These results point to an imperfect working relationship between the two entities. While Zullo (2000) described the
overall contractual agreements between the in-house and outsourced groups, the main purpose of the Driscoll study was to examine the daily working relationships between the two entities, and to analyze if there were statistically significant different approaches to those working relationships based on the outsourced firm contracted. While Zullo touched on satisfaction levels, revenue streams, and intent to renew contracts, his research did not provide insight into the daily workings between the two marketing entities, including the levels of collaboration and cooperation between the in-house and outsourced firm.

The main purpose of Johnson’s (2001) thesis, *Multi-Media Rights Analysis in Major College Athletics* was to track the history and prevailing trends in multimedia agreements in collegiate sports. Similar to Zullo (2000), this study sought to interpret satisfaction ratings within athletic departments, as well as motivations for using outsourced firms (Johnson, 7). Johnson’s results were similar to those Zullo, with both studies finding a trend towards the decision to outsource marketing rights and an overall satisfied group of in-house marketing representatives. However, these two studies leave a gap in the research conducted on working relationships between the two marketing entities.

A recent article published in the *Sports Business Journal*, which cited the Zullo study helps explain the outsourcing trend in collegiate athletics. In an age of intense scrutiny on athletic departments resulting in front-page scandals around the country, the notion of institutional control remains paramount. This concept holds true for the relationship between the in-house and outsourced marketing groups as well. Kyle Moats, senior associate athletic director at Marquette University said that “Regardless of the school, regardless of the company, those are the issues that you have to look at. Does it make more sense to have outsiders, if you will, representing the university’s best interest and the athletic department’s?"
To me, that’s the first hurdle you have to get over. If you’re comfortable with that, based upon how you’re set up and how your control mechanisms are, then you move on to the next step” (Johnson, Kris, February 21-27, 2005, 21).

According to the article, the University of Kentucky and the University of North Carolina, two of the most prestigious athletic programs in the country, both show a considerable amount of institutional control over their outsourced groups. According to the article, Steve Angelucci, Host’s Vice President and General Manager, is a regular attendee of senior staff meetings within Kentucky’s athletic department. New hires for Host’s University of Kentucky property filter through the athletic department’s compliance office, in order to “avoid any pitfalls” (Johnson, Kris, February 21-27, 2005, 21).

At the University of North Carolina, the amount of institutional control can be seen when examining the cooperation and working relationship between Norwood Teague, Associate Athletic Director for Marketing and Promotions at UNC, and Gary Sobba, General Manager of Learfield’s Tar Heel Sports Marketing property. According to the article, “Teague said he is on the phone repeatedly every day with Sobba, who is based in Chapel Hill. ‘I don’t think our athletic director [Dick Baddour] feels a lack of control because we’re so on the same page,’ Teague said” (Johnson, Kris, February 21-27, 2005, 21).

While previous research has been conducted to determine the recent trends in outsourced sports marketing, little research has been found that determines the working relationships between the two entities, in how they interact and work together on a daily basis for the betterment of the athletic department and generation of marketing revenue.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Subjects

This study involved in-house marketing directors and outsourced sports marketing firm general managers associated with the six outsourced firms of collegiate sports marketing: ESPN Regional, Host Communications, International Sports Properties, Learfield Communications, Nelligan Sports Marketing and Viacom Sports. These 60 universities come from ten different Division I-A conferences, with the majority being the six power conferences. The breakdown is: Atlantic Coast Conference (Boston College, Clemson, Florida State, Georgia Tech, Maryland, Miami (Fl.), North Carolina, Virginia, Virginia Tech, and Wake Forest); Big East Conference (Cincinnati, Louisville, Pittsburgh, Rutgers, South Florida, Syracuse, and Villanova), Big Ten Conference (Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Northwestern, Penn State, Purdue, Wisconsin); Big Twelve Conference (Baylor, Colorado, Kansas, Kansas State, Missouri, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State, Texas); Pacific Ten Conference (Arizona, Arizona State, California, Oregon, Oregon State, Stanford, UCLA, Washington); Southeastern Conference (Alabama, Auburn, Georgia, Kentucky, LSU, Mississippi State, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vanderbilt). The remaining non-power conferences were: Conference-USA (Houston, Memphis, Southern Mississippi, Tulane,
UAB); Mid-American Conference (Central Florida, Marshall, Ohio); Mountain West Conference (Air Force, Colorado State, TCU, UNLV, Wyoming); Western Athletic Conference (Fresno State, Tulsa).

The athletic departments represented by these six outsourced sports marketing firms represent the vast majority of schools which do indeed choose to outsource their marketing rights. They are the established companies in an industry for which it is difficult to gain entry to represent high-profile Division I schools. The schools which have chosen to contract with ESPN Regional, Host, ISP, Learfield, Nelligan or Viacom make their decisions largely based on the name recognition and experience that each firm has with collegiate sports marketing. These reputable firms also have the ability to pool resources, thus making them attractive options for athletic departments looking to outsource.

In a relatively new industry with new practices of outsourcing marketing rights, there exists no one standard operating procedure or working relationship between the in-house department and the outsourced marketing group. Survey results will be compared across the outsourced sports marketing firm used, to see if there are statistically significant differences in outsourced office location, daily contact between the two entities, commercialized culture, internal and external pressure, goal matching, and satisfaction levels between the in-house and outsourced entities (p < .05).

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was designed for this study, using the input of the researcher, advisor, thesis committee, and administrative personnel within the University of North Carolina’s sports marketing office as well as those working for Tar Heel Sports Marketing.
The survey was designed to help determine the working relationship between the in-house marketing group and the outsourced marketing firm. Section one included college sports work experience, which outsourced firm the university currently uses and which ones it has used in the past. Section two includes questions about the physical location of the outsourced offices, why the outsourced office is located where it is, as well as preferences regarding the location of the outsourced office. Section three contains questions about the amount of contact the outsourced staff and the in-house staff have with each other, including satisfaction ratings for this amount of contact. Section four includes questions on the pressure and culture established by work environments, and Section five concludes the survey with questions about goal matching and overall satisfaction levels. Survey answers were kept confidential.

Procedures

The survey was emailed to each of the 60 schools and their corresponding outsourced marketing firm, for a total of 120 possible respondents (in-house marketing directors and outsourced marketing firm general managers). Prior to emailing the survey, a cover letter was sent in order to explain the purpose of the study, co-signed by University of North Carolina Associate Athletic Director for Marketing, Norwood Teague, and Tar Heel Sports Marketing General Manager Gary Sobba. The letter also encourages these industry professionals to take the time to complete the survey. Respondents were given the opportunity to see the results of the survey, if desired.

Statistical Analysis

Frequencies and descriptive statistics were calculated in order to compare results from institutions and outsourced marketing arms. With categorized data for the majority of
survey answers, Chi Squares were used in order to determine if there was a relationship between the independent variable (which outsourced firm is used) and the dependent variable (outsourced office locations, amount of contact between the two marketing entities, the internal and external pressure and culture affecting each marketing arrangement, and the goal matching and overall satisfaction levels with the corresponding marketing arm).
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter will report the logistics of survey distribution and collection, as well as the major findings of the research study. It addresses the research questions presented in the Introduction, as well as explains the logic of using descriptive and qualitative analysis rather than a Chi-Square analysis.

A package was mailed to sixty (60) general managers who work for the outsourced firms of ESPN Plus, HOST Communications, ISP Sports, Learfield Communications, Nelligan Sports Marketing, and Viacom Sports, as well as the sixty senior in-house marketing administrators who oversee these firms within the athletic department. The package contained an informed consent letter from Mr. Driscoll and his faculty advisor, Dr. Nathan Tomasini. The informed consent letter outlined the purpose of the study, possible risks and benefits, and assured the participant that confidentiality would be protected in a variety of ways. The package mailed to each recipient also contained a cover letter signed by Mr. Norwood T. Teague, Senior Associate Athletic Director at the University of North Carolina, and Mr. Gary Sobba, General Manager at Tar Heel Sports Marketing. The Teague and Sobba letter served to encourage the recipients to participate in the study, noting its benefits in the industry.
The general managers and senior marketing administrators were emailed approximately one week after receiving the package, and were directed to SurveyMonkey.com, where they could complete the survey. After a second email one week after the initial message, it was determined that there were enough responses to proceed with data analysis. Of the 120 surveys sent out, 83 (69.2%) were returned, with 44 coming from the outsourced general managers and 39 from the in-house senior marketing administrators. Data from these 83 surveys were collected and analyzed using SPSS statistical software.

The intent for the analysis of data was to use a Chi-Square, in order to determine if there were significant relationships present between the factors. However, because most of the cell counts in the Chi-Squares had expected counts less than five, the data in this case carried percentages mostly over 85-90%. The rule of thumb among statisticians is to interpret with distinct caution any data with over 25% of cells having expected counts less than five (Personal communication with Dr. Edgar Shields, March 28, 2006). Therefore, it was determined to analyze the results using descriptive and empirical analysis. With an overall response rate of 70% of the total population, it was determined the data would be a close representation of the entire population of athletic departments that outsource to these major firms in collegiate sports marketing.

Research Question #1: Is there a relationship between physical office proximity to the in-house department and the outsourced firm contracted?

The location of the outsource sports marketing offices varies, as respondents were given the option of choosing “In the same office complex,” “On campus but not within the same office complex,” “Off campus but within 5 miles,” “Off campus and greater than 5
miles,” and “Other.” Of the five general managers from Viacom Sports who responded to the survey, four worked in outsourced offices in the same office complex as the in-house marketing department, while one was located off campus but within five miles. Three of four ESPN Plus general managers who responded have their outsourced offices adjacent to the in-house marketing offices of the athletic department. Seven (50.0%) of Learfield general managers who participated indicated that their offices were located in the same office complex, while another three (21.4%) have offices on campus. ISP Sports, on the other hand, only had three (23.1%) who were located in the same offices as in-house, and four (30.8%) on campus. Six (46.2%) ISP general managers indicated that their offices were located off campus, but within five miles. Of the three HOST general managers, none indicated that their offices were on campus. The lone Nelligan general manager who participated indicated that outsourced offices were co-located with in-house marketing offices.

In-house senior marketing administrators were also asked the location of their outsourced firm, in relation to the in-house offices of the athletic department. Four of the five SMAs who oversee Viacom firms indicated that their properties are located on campus, while the remaining was located off campus but within five miles. All three Nelligan-associated SMAs responded that their outsourced offices are co-located, while five Learfield SMAs (50%) and three ISP SMAs (30%) claimed to have outsourced offices located in the same complex as in-house offices. As with the general managers indications from HOST, all four HOST-associated SMAs responded that the outsourced offices are located off campus.
Table 1: Firm and Physical Office Proximity - GMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number located adjacent</th>
<th>Percent located adjacent</th>
<th>Number located on campus</th>
<th>Percent located on campus</th>
<th>Number located w/in 5 miles</th>
<th>Percent located w/in 5 miles</th>
<th>Number located greater than 5 miles</th>
<th>Percent located greater than 5 miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Firm and Physical Office Proximity – SMAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number located adjacent</th>
<th>Percent located adjacent</th>
<th>Number located on campus</th>
<th>Percent located on campus</th>
<th>Number located w/in 5 miles</th>
<th>Percent located w/in 5 miles</th>
<th>Number located greater than 5 miles</th>
<th>Percent located greater than 5 miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #2: Is there a relationship in the amount of daily contact with the in-house marketing department and the outsourced firm contracted?

This research question is a combination of three different survey questions, which asked the respondent how many face-to-face meetings held each week with the SMA, along with how many phone calls and emails were shared between the general manager and SMA each day. For the face-to-face meetings, ISP Sports had the most of any firm. Two ISP respondents claimed to have over 10 weekly meetings with their SMAs, while two replied with 6-10, and seven replied with 1-5. Learfield Communications had the next most of any firm, with three respondents claiming 6-10 weekly meetings, and nine respondents claiming 1-5 meetings.
For the question regarding the number of daily phone calls, only one respondent, who worked for ISP, replied “More than 10.” 73.8% of respondents across all firms replied that they shared between 1-5 phone calls per day with their respective SMAs.

Regarding daily emails exchanged between the general manager and SMA, only one respondent, from Viacom Sports, claimed to exchange more than ten per emails per day. 66.7% of all general manager respondents claimed to share between 1-5 emails per day with the SMA.

Table 3: Firm and Number of One-on-one meetings (number and percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number less than 1</th>
<th>Percent less than 1</th>
<th>Number 1-5</th>
<th>Percent 1-5</th>
<th>Number 6-10</th>
<th>Percent 6-10</th>
<th>Number More than 10</th>
<th>Percent More than 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Firm and Number of Phone calls (number and percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number less than 1</th>
<th>Percent less than 1</th>
<th>Number 1-5</th>
<th>Percent 1-5</th>
<th>Number 6-10</th>
<th>Percent 6-10</th>
<th>Number More than 10</th>
<th>Percent More than 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #3: Is there a relationship between the overall college sports work experience and in-house/outsourced college sports marketing experience and the outsourced firm contracted?

Of the general managers who responded to the survey, six of them have over 15 years of experience working in college athletics: three from Learfield (21.4%), two from ISP (14.3%), and one from HOST (33.3%). Eleven general managers replied with 7-9 years of experience, and another eleven replied with 10-12 years, with these two groups accounting for 50% of the data. Viacom Sports and Learfield Sports each employ one general manager who has 1-3 years of experience working in college athletics.

General managers were also asked how many years experience they had in outsourced collegiate sports marketing. One HOST executive and one ISP executive each had over 15 years experience working on the outsourced realm of college athletics. Seven Learfield general managers (50%) and four ISP general managers (28.6%) responded that they had between 1-3 years of experience working in outsourced sports marketing. 84.1% of all general managers had less than ten years experience working in outsourced collegiate sports marketing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number less than 1</th>
<th>Percent less than 1</th>
<th>Number 1-5</th>
<th>Percent 1-5</th>
<th>Number 6-10</th>
<th>Percent 6-10</th>
<th>Number More than 10</th>
<th>Percent More than 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-nine (65.9%) general managers had experience working on the in-house side prior to their appointment to the general manager position. 78.6% of ISP general managers, 71.4% of Learfield general managers, and 60.0% of Viacom general managers had experience working in-house. 72.4% of the general managers with in-house experience had less than six years working in that realm before taking a general manager position.

In-house senior marketing administrators were also asked of their overall work experience, number of years worked in-house, and if they had had outsourced experience. Twenty percent of SMAs replied had 7-9 years overall experience, 20% had 10-12 years overall experience, and another 20% had 13-15 overall years experience in college athletics. Ten percent of SMAs replied with 4-6 years, while the remaining 10% claimed to have 1-3 years experience.

Three SMAs had over 15 years of experience working in in-house sports marketing, accounting for 7.5% of all SMAs responding. Eleven SMAs, accounting for 27.5% of the data, claim to have 4-6 years experience working in the in-house realm. Thirty-two SMAs, or 80% of all that responded, had no experience working in outsourced collegiate sports marketing.

Table 6: Firm and GMs’ overall college sports work experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7-9 years</th>
<th>10-12 years</th>
<th>13-15 years</th>
<th>More than 15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Firm and GMs’ experience in-house

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>Percentage &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>Number &quot;No&quot;</th>
<th>Percentage &quot;No&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Firm and SMAs’ overall college work experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7-9 years</th>
<th>10-12 years</th>
<th>13-15 years</th>
<th>More than 15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Firm and SMAs’ outsourced experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>Percentage &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>Number &quot;No&quot;</th>
<th>Percentage &quot;No&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #4: Is there a relationship between external pressure and the outsourced firm contracted?

The general managers were asked how much pressure they felt they had, on a scale of 1-7 (with 1 being no pressure and 7 being extreme pressure), from company executives to continue expanding inventory and generating revenue. Twenty-three general managers,
accounting for 56.1% of the data, claimed that their pressure on this scale equated to “five.” 71.4% of Learfield GMs, and 66.7% of ISP GMs responded with a pressure level of 5 as well. One HOST, one ISP, and one Learfield GM replied that they had the highest possible level of pressure from company executives. The lowest response came from an ESPN Plus general manager, who responded by claiming his pressure level was akin to a 2 on this scale.

The average pressure ratings from low to high were ESPN Plus with 3.75, Viacom with 4.40, ISP Sports with 4.83, Learfield with 4.86, Nelligan with 5.00, ISP/Learfield joint with 5.67, and HOST with 6.50.

Table 10: Firm and External Pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>1 - No pressure</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 - Extreme pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #5: Is there a relationship between internal pressure and the outsourced firm contracted?

Twelve SMAs (30.8%) responded that their pressure level equated to a 4 on the scale provided on the survey. Of the three HOST-related SMAs responding to the survey, one had a pressure level of 6 and the other had a pressure level of 7. Only one SMA from the entire group, who was affiliated with ISP Sports, responded with a pressure level of only 1. ISP and Learfield each had four respondents reply with a pressure level equal to 4, accounting for 40% of each firm.
## Table 11: Firm and Internal Pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>1 - No pressure</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 - Extreme pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question #6:** Is there a relationship between the level of satisfaction and the outsourced firm contracted?

Both general managers and senior in-house marketing administrators were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the overall working relationship in place. The options for responses were “Very satisfied,” “Moderately satisfied,” “Satisfied,” Moderately dissatisfied,” and “Very dissatisfied.” Of the general managers that responded, 45% claimed to have the highest possible level of satisfaction with their overall working relationship with the athletic department. Another 30% claim to be Moderately Satisfied, while 17.5% said that they were Satisfied with the relationship. 58.3% of ISP GMs, and 42.9% of Learfield GMs responded that they were Very Satisfied. One general manager, from an ISP/Learfield joint partnership, claimed to be Very Dissatisfied, while another Learfield and Viacom general manager replied saying that they were Moderately Dissatisfied.

Of the SMAs that replied, nineteen (48.7%) responded that they were Very Satisfied with their overall working relationship with the outsourced firm. Seven Learfield-affiliated SMAs (70%) and three Viacom-affiliated SMAs (60%) were Very Satisfied, while another two Learfield and one Viacom SMA were Moderately Satisfied.
Table 12: Firm and GMs’ Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Firm and SMAs’ Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPN Plus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Sports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP/Learfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelligan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #7: Is there a relationship between goal matching and the outsourced firm contracted?

A set of questions concerning the goals and perceived goals of both the outsourced and in-house group were presented to the GMs and SMAs in this study. A trend that developed from this data was that the goal “Keep the outsourced group satisfied” was rated lowly in both the in-house’s actual goals and the outsourced perceptions of those same goals. Only seven SMAs rated this goal as a higher priority than fourth, while only seven GMs rated the same goal as a higher priority than fourth. On the list of goals provided, “Keep the outsourced group satisfied” was by far the lowest priority acknowledged by both groups. However, “Keep the University satisfied” had a much higher standing on the outsourced list of goals, and of those perceived by the in-house SMAs. The GMs rated this goal on average
as the second most important of all, while SMAs believed it to be the fourth-most important goal, just behind “Expand inventory.”

The matching data, consisting of the 24 cases, provides a useful group for which to compare goals and perceived goals as well. Within this group, there were six general managers who had perfect matches on their perceptions of their counterparts’ in-house goals, and the actual in-house goals of those same counterparts. In addition, not one SMA correctly perceived all the goals of his/her outsourced counterpart in comparison with the actual outsourced goals claimed by the GM.

**Research Question #8**: Is there a relationship between overall work experience and satisfaction levels?

Of the eighteen respondents who rated their satisfaction level as Very Satisfied, the overall work experience varied slightly. One respondent (5.6%) had experience between 1-3 years, two respondents (11.1%) selected 4-6, four respondents (22.2%) selected 7-9, six respondents (33.3%) selected 10-12, three respondents (16.7%) selected 13-15, and two respondents (11.1%) selected over 15 years.

On the whole, the SMAs responded that they were Very Satisfied with the relationship as well. Of the respondents who indicated this high level of satisfaction with outsourcing, the Overall Work Experience appeared to be evenly distributed. The one SMA who was Very Dissatisfied with the working relationship had over 15 years experience working in college athletics.
Table 14: Overall Work Experience and Satisfaction Levels – GMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Work Exp.</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Overall Work Experience and Satisfaction Levels - SMAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Work Exp.</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #9: Is there a relationship between physical office proximity and the outsourced firm’s level of inclusion in the athletic department?

Though a Chi-Square analysis was deemed improper for this study, it is important to note that Overall Work Experience and Satisfaction Levels provided a p-value of .008.

For those firms co-located with the in-house offices, four (22.2%) of general managers claimed that their employee status was equal to a 5, while twelve (66.7%) had an employee status of 6, and two (11.1%) had an employee status of 7. For those firms that were located on campus, but not in the same office complex, the data was skewed towards higher numbers as well. One respondent (11.1%) rated employee status a 1, but 2 GMs each (22.2%) each rated it as a 4 or 5, and 4 (44.4%) rated it as a 6. For those GMs working in firms off campus but within five miles, the data was varied across each employee status.
rating. There was only one GM who had offices greater than five miles off campus, and this GM rated Employee Status as a 5.

Table 16: Physical Office Proximity and Employee Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the same office complex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus, but not same complex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus, but within 5 miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus, and greater than 5 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #10: Is there a relationship between internal pressure and conference type affiliation?

Respondents were coded as being affiliated with a Power Conference university or non-Power Conference university. For the purposes of this study, the power conferences are the former Bowl Championship Series conferences which receive automatic bids into the BCS bowl games. These conferences are the Atlantic Coast Conference, the Big East Conference, the Big Ten Conference, the Big Twelve Conference, the Pacific Ten Conference, and the Southeastern Conference. Non-power conferences, for the purpose of this study, are all Division I-A conferences that are not power conferences.

There were 32 SMA respondents who hailed from a Power Conference, and seven who were affiliated with a non-Power Conference. Nobody from a non-Power Conference rated their pressure from the athletic department and university to limit commercialization as more than a 4. On the scale of 1 to 7, one SMA responded with an answer of 1, two responded with an answer of 3, and four responded with an answer of 4. From the Power Conference SMAs, nobody responded with a pressure level of 1, six (18.8%) responded with
2, seven (21.9%) with 3, eight (25.0%) with 4, six (18.8%) with 5, four (12.5%) with 6, and one (3.1%) with the highest level of internal pressure, a 7.

**Table 17: Internal Pressure and Conference Type Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Conference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #11: Is there a relationship between external pressure and conference type affiliation?

Thirty four GMs work with universities that can be classified as part of a Power Conference, while seven were affiliated with a non-Power Conference. Of the Power Conference respondents, one (2.9%) responded with an external pressure rating of 2, three (8.8%) responded with 3, four (11.8%) with 4, 19 (55.9%) with 5, four (11.8%) with 6, and three (8.8%) with 7. Of the non-Power Conference GMs, nobody responded with a rating greater than 5. One (14.3%) responded with 3, two (28.6%) responded with 4, and four (57.1%) responded with 5.

**Table 18: External Pressure and Conference Type Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Conference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #12: Is there a relationship between satisfaction levels and conference type affiliation?

There were no non-Power Conference GMs who were either Very Dissatisfied or Moderately Dissatisfied with their overall working relationship with in-house marketing, as
all seven were either Satisfied, Moderately Satisfied, or Very Satisfied. Of the Power
Conference GMs, fifteen (45.5%) were Very Satisfied, nine (27.3%) were Moderately
Satisfied, six (18.2%) were Satisfied, two (6.1%) were Moderately Dissatisfied, and one
(3.0%) was Very Dissatisfied.

Of the non-Power Conference SMAs, three (42.9%) were Very Satisfied, two
(28.6%) were Moderately Satisfied, one (14.3%) was Satisfied, and one (14.3%) was
Moderately Dissatisfied. No non-Power Conference SMAs were Very Dissatisfied with their
overall working relationship with the outsourced firm. Of the Power Conference SMAs, 16
(50.0%) were Very Satisfied, ten (31.3%) were Moderately Satisfied, three (9.4%) were
Satisfied, two (6.3%) were Moderately Dissatisfied, and one (3.1%) was Very Dissatisfied.

Table 19: Conference Type Affiliation and Satisfaction Levels (GMs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Conference</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

The data collected in this study helps to provide a useful picture of the landscape of outsourcing in collegiate sports marketing. This chapter analyzes the issues of Office Location, Employee Status, Work Experience, Internal and External Pressure, Goals and Goal Matching, Senior Staff, Long-term Sacrifice for Short-term Gain, and Career Goals Hindered. It draws conclusions from the data and points to recommendations for future research in the field of collegiate sports marketing that can help build upon the consensus established by this study.

Office Location

The data examined concerning the physical office proximity of the outsourced offices appeared to show a conflict of interest between the in-house and outsourced departments. While 36 of 39 (93.2%) of all senior marketing administrators in-house prefer the outsourced offices to be co-located inside the athletic department, there were 22 of 41 (53.7%) of general managers surveyed who prefer this location. Further examination of the data revealed 19 (86.3%) of these general managers already have offices located within the athletic department. Therefore, three general managers who have offices located somewhere off campus would actually prefer to have them located adjacent to the in-house offices. The
general managers who participated in the study are a group that, on the majority, would like their offices to be off-campus. Possible reasons for the GMs wanting their offices to be located off campus are the desire to be closer to clients in major metro areas, as well as the inclination to avoid being hassled by other athletic department employees.

Viacom Sports, through its website, touts its properties as being very close to the actual athletic departments to which they are contracted to represent. The ViacomSports.com website promotes Sun Devil Sports Marketing as a “close and seamless relationship… considered part of the ASU Athletic Department” (Partner Details, Arizona State University, 2005). Additionally, Wildcat Sports Marketing at Northwestern University is considered by the university to be “an important arm of its athletic department” (Partner Details, Northwestern University, 2005). At the Air Force Academy (USAFA), Falcon Sports Marketing is “housed within the athletic department, [and] has forged a strong relationship with the academy and assists the USAFA marketing department in its day-to-day marketing operations” (Partner Details, Air Force Academy, 2005). Viacom Sports makes a concerted effort to exude to clients their close relationships with respective universities and athletic departments, and much of this intimacy can be attributed to the co-location of in-house and outsourced marketing offices, which is a location this data indicated.

The data also revealed ESPN Plus and Nelligan firms also are located alongside of the in-house marketing offices of the athletic department. As relative startups in this outsourced collegiate sports marketing industry by incorporating within the past ten years, it is possible that these firms view their properties as flagships for the company. Therefore, it remains in the best interest of the firm to maintain a steady working relationship with the athletic department. Firms such as HOST, ISP, and Learfield, which have been in existence since the
1980s and early 1990s, likely have their operations streamlined enough to be able to move some of their properties off campus. Indeed, a crosstabulation examination of the length of affiliation between the firm and athletic department and location of the firm demonstrated a trend for the younger enterprises to have the outsourced offices on campus, while the more mature partnerships tended to have outsourced offices located off campus.

**Employee Status**

An outsourced collegiate sports marketing employee is often in a unique situation, in that the employee works for a for-profit business, but on behalf of a non-profit organization. The outsourced employee must have daily interactions with the university and athletic department and often works within the physical confines of the actual athletic department. Because of the unique nature of this relationship, outsourced GMs were asked in this study to what extent they considered their employees to be a part of the athletic department. The question had a scale of 1-7, with 1 being “not a part of athletic department” and 7 being “employee-like status.”

On the whole, the GM respondents in this survey feel their outsourced employees could somewhat be considered a part of the athletic department. With 75.0% of GMs rating their employees as a 5 on the 1-7 scale, it may be evident that athletic departments have, on the whole, embraced the outsourced employees. All four ESPN GMs rated their employees as a 6 or 7 on this scale, and aside from one general manager from Viacom, this firm can claim the same employee-like status. It should be no coincidence that both ESPN and Viacom sales associates and support staff associate themselves with the athletic department. With a majority of ESPN and Viacom offices being co-located along with the in-house offices, the outsourced employees are brought into the day-to-day aspects of the athletic
department. They interact with not only the in-house marketing staff, but often the ticket, development, and business offices. While technically not “employees” of the athletic department, this difference cannot be easily determined at first glance. The firms that have offices more spread out, such as HOST, ISP, and Learfield, did not claim the same level of employee-like status within the athletic department.

**Work Experience**

While 65.9% of all GMs surveyed have worked in in-house marketing and 75.0% have had a staff member work in-house, 20.0% of SMAs have worked in the outsourced realm and 17.5% have had a staff member work in-house. Clearly, the data was skewed towards the GMs having more experience in the opposite realm than the SMAs can claim.

A couple of factors could cause these numbers to have such a stated difference. As the introduction and review of literature have stated, outsourcing is a relatively new trend in college athletics. While it began in the 1970s and 1980s at a handful of universities, the industry started to expand dramatically in the 1990s. In-house marketing departments, on the other hand, have had roots across the country since the early 1970s. Clearly, more opportunities have existed over the past thirty years for these executives to have worked in in-house collegiate sports marketing. The average number of overall years of college athletics experience for the outsourced GMs (10.07 years) almost equates exactly to the number of years that the SMAs have had in college athletics (9.70 years). However, the number of years the GMs have worked in the outsourced realm falls short of the number of years the SMAs have worked in in-house sports marketing (5.43 years compared to 6.40 years). The data may help to illustrate that there could exist a threshold in collegiate athletics where the in-house administrator decided to make a move to the outsourced realm. While
overall work experience in college athletics may be very similar, the GMs have made moves to the outsourced realm in the past few years while SMAs have elected to stay in-house. Possible reasons for the career switch could come from a raise in salary, newfound freedom on the outsourced side, as well as new challenges in that realm.

**Internal and External Pressure**

By utilizing a crosstabulation analysis, the external pressure on GMs and the perceived external pressure by the SMAs were higher than both the internal pressure on SMAs and the perceived internal pressure by the GMs. The perceived levels of pressure also outpaced the actual levels for both internal and external types. Only eleven GMs (25.0%) perceived the pressure on their in-house counterpart to be more than the pressure on themselves, and only one SMA (2.6%) felt that his own pressure exceeded that of his outsourced counterpart. This collective data may point towards one side of this relationship having a lopsided amount of pressure. Both the in-house and outsourced executives felt the greater sense of pressure comes on the external, or outsourced side. In addition, both the general managers and the senior in-house marketing administrators tend to give a bit too much credit in terms of the pressure that his/her counterpart experiences on a daily basis. This slight error in judgment may be attributed to a lack of proper communication, an overall lack of understanding out the counterpart’s job responsibilities, or possibly, a different inherent pressure scale altogether. There is no way to determine if the GMs and SMAs see the pressure scale from 1-7 in the same fashion.

There were a total of 24 cases in this study where a complete survey was received by both the in-house and outsourced representatives at a particular school. These matching data points provided an examination of the actual and perceived pressure levels that these
administrators felt on a day-to-day basis. The data from these 24 cases was somewhat similar to the overall body of data, as the actual and perceived external pressure outpaced both the actual and perceived internal pressure. However, in the case of these matching data, the actual internal pressure felt by SMAs was slightly greater than the perceived pressure claimed by the GMs.

With these 24 matching cases, it provided an opportunity to further examine the data as it explains which group of administrators have the best understanding of the other’s pressure level. The baseline, actual pressure felt by each group can be compared directly to the perceived pressure pinned by the counterpart. In analyzing the external pressure felt by outsourced GMs, there were three cases where the actual pressure was more than perceived, five cases where the actual pressure was equal to perceived, and sixteen cases where the actual pressure was less than perceived by the SMA. With regard to internal pressure, there were eight cases where actual pressure was more than perceived, seven cases where actual pressure was equal to perceived, and nine cases where the actual pressure was less than perceived by the GM. With this data, the GM was much more successful in pinning the actual pressure level of the SMA, than vice versa. The outsourced perceptions were off by +0.05 points, while the in-house perceptions erred by twenty-fold in the opposite direction, at -1.00 points.

With the sixteen cases where the SMA’s perception of the GM’s pressure may have been overstated, there appeared to be a misconception among SMAs about the pressure involved with the GM’s work. The outsourced GMs did not experience as much pressure from their firm’s executives as the SMAs believed them to have. This discrepancy may have arisen from only 20.0% of the SMAs in the study having experience working in outsourced
collegiate sports marketing. On the whole, there exists a possibility they are unfamiliar with the nature of outsourced marketing, and the pressures that do or do not exist from firm executives at the corporate level. General managers must learn to adapt to the rigors of outsourced work, all while accepting the pressure that exists in a profit-driven business. One general manager participating in the study downplayed the level of pressure felt by firm executives, stating that “we just need to hit that [sales] goal. It’s up to us to figure it out.” Reaching sales goals may be a concept that is largely foreign to the SMAs without outsourced experience, and the level of perceived pressure is a bit overstated.

**Goals and Goal Matching**

This trend in the data possibly points to a mismatched dependence that each group has on the other. When an athletic department decides to outsource its marketing rights, it puts those rights up for bid in the open market. The different outsourced firms submit their bid to represent the entity, and the athletic department and university decide on the firm that suits their overall interests. Once an outsourced group is locked in by contract, it is of its own interest to generate as much revenue as possible on behalf of itself and the athletic department. The athletic department knows that no matter how satisfied the outsourced group is, it will still continue to generate as much revenue as possible in order to benefit from the partnership. A malcontent outsourced group will still generate revenue for its own well-being, and as a by-product the university will accrue revenue as well. On the other hand, a discontented athletic department could lead to it choosing a new outsourced firm for which to outsource its marketing rights, once the initial contract expires. The outsourced group has more of a vested interest in keeping the athletic department content, while the athletic department is under no such obligation towards the outsourced firm. These reasons may also
point to why “Keep University Satisfied” was regarded as more important than “Keep outsourced group satisfied” in this study.

With the matching analysis of the 24 cases, the outsourced GMs were more successful in pinpointing the goals of the SMAs than vice versa. As with the pressure perceptions, this may have arisen due to the fact that many of the GMs have had experience working on the in-house side prior to moving to the outsourced realm. There exists a possibility that the SMAs in this study simply were not as familiar on the whole with the nature of outsourced work, thus helping to explain why no SMAs correctly matched all five goals with the outsourced counterpart. Communication between the two parties is essential in order to understand the challenges and goals that each side carries.

**Senior Staff**

The data indicated 27.5% of GMs were members of their athletic departments’ senior staffs. However, 62.0% of those who were not senior staff members would prefer to have such a position. This may raise the question of why the outsourced GMs have not, on the whole, been afforded the opportunity to become a senior staff member of the athletic department. The data included in this study has pointed towards a group of general managers that had experience working in-house, had staff members with experience working in-house, was familiar with the goals of the in-house marketing department, and was sensitive and accurate with the pressure perceptions of the SMA’s job responsibilities. At the same time, many of the SMAs in this study have indicated they wanted to make the outsourced group feel like a part of the athletic department. Buzzwords like “streamlining” and “synergizing” were used by general managers in this study when describing the ideal relationship between in-house and outsourced marketing departments.
Including the GM in the senior staff of the athletic department, provided the GM does have the proper work experience, may benefit all parties. The outsourced group may obtain a better perspective of the inner-workings of the athletic department, but perhaps more importantly, the entire athletic department would become more sensitive to how outsourced firms operate on behalf of their own department.

**Conclusion**

In-house respondents were asked if they felt that the long-term good of the athletic department was ever sacrificed for a short-term, likely monetary gain. With almost 60% of SMAs claiming that this was never the case, this data is encouraging for the future of outsourcing in intercollegiate athletics. In addition, GMs were asked if they felt their career goals were ever hindered by sponsorship restrictions of the athletic departments they work on behalf of, or by college athletics in general. Almost half (48.8%) of the general managers claimed their career goals were never hindered.

These two variables, when examined together, point towards the future of outsourcing collegiate sports marketing forging ahead. The very nature of outsourcing marketing rights in college athletics presents two very different sets of priorities for the in-house and outsourced agencies. The fact that 60% of SMAs and approximately 50% of GMs claimed that the relationship was not affecting either long-term good or their own revenue-driven career goals pointed toward a harmonious coexistence among in-house and outsourced groups. Athletic departments were able to salvage some sense of long-term good, and at the same time, the outsourced firms may not be suffocating their general managers by placing them in a restrictive sales environment. These numbers may demonstrate each side acquiescing a bit to the other, yet still holding on to the principles and ideals that are inherent
in each side’s industry. The future of outsourcing appears to be quite strong and the trend
does not appear to be fading, which coincides with previous research in this field.

Recommendations

Outsourcing remains a prevalent method in business to cut costs and streamline job
functions to create more efficiency. The trend of outsourcing marketing in college athletics
appears to be gaining more strength, as it is starting to sweep across the landscape and into
the non-Power Conferences. Several recommendations are in place for further research to
help understand the nature of this trend and how it affects athletic departments across the
country.

Further research should explore the reasons why general managers have made the
career change from the in-house to outsourced realm, as opposed to general managers
moving into a senior position on the in-house. Possible reasons for the switches could
include increased salaries available in outsourcing, as well as new challenges for the
marketing executive, but further research much be done to determine why the career changes
seem to be one-sided.

Future research should also focus on the differences between athletic departments that
have allowed their outsourced firm’s general manager to be part of the senior staff versus
those that have not done so. Differences in the overall commercialized culture of the
university and revenue streams should be analyzed based on whether an athletic department
allows the GM to be part of this high-level staff. Additionally, opinions of the GM, the
SMA, and the athletic director should be analyzed to obtain a better understanding of why or
why not the GM is included as part of the senior staff.
The trend now appears to be for non-Power Conference schools to be outsourcing their marketing rights as well. With universities like Wyoming, Alabama-Birmingham, and ECU signing on with one of the Big Six firms, the opportunity is available for smaller Division I-A universities, as well as Division I-AA and I-AAA ones to begin outsourcing. Future research in this area should examine the schools that have not yet outsourced their marketing rights, and observe the pros and cons of doing so. A study such as this would help universities when deciding whether to make the jump to outsourcing, by providing all relevant details that go into that decision.

Further research needs to be completed looking at both the long-term sacrifices of the athletic department and the hindering of career goals for the outsourced GM. These two issues remain at the forefront of this in-house-outsourced marketing relationship in college athletics. If too much of the long-term good is sacrificed in the name of generating revenue, college athletics loses any of the pure appeal it has left which distinguishes it from professional sports. On the other hand, if the GMs feel that their career goals are hindered to a great extent, many of them will move away from college athletics leaving a dearth of the most competent sales people in the industry. It is important that this relationship stays in balance, and future studies can examine this balance to discover if it varies across different athletic departments, conferences, or outsourced firms.
APPENDIX 6.1: INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, EXERCISE & SPORT SCIENCE
INFORMED CONSENT FORM TO ACT AS A HUMAN SUBJECT

This research study focuses on the working relationship between the in-house and outsourced sports marketing departments in Division I-A college athletics, due to the financial implications inherent in these arrangements and the lack of current research in the area. You were selected to participate in this study because of your current position as either an in-house senior marketing administrator, or as a general manager of an outsourced college sports marketing property.

You will be emailed in the next few days, directing you to the link where the survey may be completed, should you choose to do so (SurveyMonkey.com). Returning the completed survey indicates your consent to participate in this study. The survey is comprised of questions addressing the daily working relationship between the two sports marketing entities, including type of communication, distance between offices, satisfaction, and comparisons to past experiences in relation to each other. It should not take any longer than ten (10) minutes to complete the survey. You are free to answer or not answer any particular question and have no obligation to complete the survey once you begin.

Your anonymity is protected when completing this survey. No personal identifying information will need to be given in response to any question. Survey response data will be organized by the type of outsourced firm used, so that no university or one single property will be singled out in this study. The only persons who will have access to the data are the investigators named on this letter.

Confidentiality is assured with the study in order to eliminate all risks, such as replying to the survey questions in a way that may not be agreeable to your working counterpart. Each subject that completes a survey will have the opportunity to obtain a copy of this research study.

The Behavioral Institutional Review Board (Behavioral IRB) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has approved this study. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this study, please contact the Behavioral IRB at 919-962-7761 or at aa-irb@unc.edu.

Thank you for considering participation in this study. We hope that your responses to the survey will help provide insight into the working relationships between in-house and outsourced sports marketing firms in Division I college athletics. You may contact me with questions at (919) 962-5218 or by email at gdriscoll@unca.unc.edu, and Dr. Nathan Tomasini at tomasini@email.unc.edu or at (919) 843-0336.

Greg Driscoll
Graduate Student
UNC Sport Administration ’06

Nathan Tomasini
Faculty Advisor
UNC Sport Administration
APPENDIX 6.2: COVER LETTER

February 13, 2006

Dear:

We are writing to request your support of this research study conducted by Greg Driscoll, a graduate student in the University of North Carolina’s Sport Administration program. Because the sample size of this study is small, consisting of the senior marketing administrators in-house and the general managers at outsourced properties, your participation is vital to the success of this study.

Mr. Driscoll’s research study will help to shed light on the daily working relationship, and the overall dynamic, which exists between in-house and outsourced offices. It seeks to explain communication issues with relation to office proximity, the pressures that exist on both sides of this relationship, and the extent of goal matching between the two entities. We feel that his research will be quite valuable to the industry in helping to paint a picture of the current landscape of outsourced collegiate sports marketing, and the working relationship that exists between the athletic department and the outsourced firm.

Complete anonymity will be protected with completion of this study, and only Mr. Driscoll and Dr. Nathan Tomasini, his faculty advisor, will have access to the data. With participation in this study, you will have access to the results and analysis of it, helping to provide a clearer picture of the industry today.

The survey will take no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your consideration in participating in this research study. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Mr. Driscoll at gdriscoll@uncaa.unc.edu or (919) 962-5218. His faculty advisor, Mr. Nathan Tomasini, can be reached at tomasini@email.unc.edu or at (919) 843-0336. We hope that you will also see the importance of this study and will take the time to participate.

Sincerely,

Norwood Teague
Associate Athletic Director
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Gary Sobba
General Manager
Tar Heel Sports Marketing
APPENDIX 6.3 – IN-HOUSE MARKETING SURVEY

1. How many years experience do you have working in college athletics, in any capacity? ____

2. How many years do you have working in collegiate sports marketing (in-house and outsourced)? ____

3. Have you had experience working on the outsourced collegiate marketing side?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

4. How many total years have you worked for an outsourced collegiate sports marketing firm? ____

5. Please select which firm(s) you have worked for in collegiate sports marketing:
   ____ ESPN Plus  ____ Host Communications
   ____ ISP Sports  ____ Learfield Communications
   ____ ISP/Learfield joint  ____ Nelligan Sports Marketing
   ____ Viacom Sports  ____ Other

6. Has any member of your staff worked for an outsourced collegiate sports marketing firm?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

7. How many total years has your staff worked for an outsourced collegiate sports marketing firm?
   __________

8. Which firm does your athletic department currently outsource some or all of its marketing rights to?
   ____ ESPN Plus  ____ Host Communications
   ____ ISP Sports  ____ Learfield Communications
   ____ ISP/Learfield joint  ____ Nelligan Sports Marketing
   ____ Viacom Sports  ____ Other

9. How long has the outsourced firm owned this property? ____

10. Has any other outsourced firm(s) owned the rights to this property since the athletic department decided to outsource?
    ____ Yes  ____ No
11. If you answered ‘Yes’ to Question 10, please select the outsourced firm(s) that have owned the property since it was first outsourced:

   ____ ESPN Plus   ____ Host Communications
   ____ ISP Sports   ____ Learfield Communications
   ____ ISP/Learfield joint  ____ Nelligan Sports Marketing
   ____ Viacom Sports   ____ Other

12. Are you familiar with the UBIT tax?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

13. If you answered ‘Yes’ to Question 12, with 1 being “not important” and 7 being “extremely important,” how important was the presence of a UBIT tax in your athletic department’s decision to outsource?

   Not important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 Extremely important

14. Please select the location of the outsourced marketing office to which your athletic department contracts out. If there is more than one outsourced marketing office, please check all that apply.

   ____ In the same office complex   ____ On campus, but not within same complex
   ____ Off campus, but within 5 miles  ____ Off campus, and greater than 5 miles
   ____ Other

15. If an option, in relation to the location of the in-house marketing offices, where would you prefer to locate the outsourced marketing offices?

   ____ Further away  ____ Closer  ____ Same distance as they are now
   ____ Other

16. Are there any unique reasons for the current location of the outsourced marketing offices?

17. Please select the number of times per month that the in-house marketing staff has organized meeting(s) with the outsourced marketing staff.

   ____ None  ____ Once  ____ Twice  ____ Three  ____ Four  ____ Five
   ____ Quarterly  ____ Every Six Months  ____ Annually  ____ Other
Questions 18-21 pertain to how much daily contact you have with the general manager at your outsourced marketing firm:

18. Please select the number of meetings per week, organized or unorganized, that you have with the general manager at the outsourced marketing firm.

   ____ Less than 1   _____ 1-5   _____ 6-10   _____ More than 10

19. Please select the number of phone calls per day that are typically shared between you and the general manager at the outsourced marketing firm.

   ____ Less than 1   _____ 1-5   _____ 6-10   _____ More than 10

20. Please select how many emails are exchanged per day with the general manager at the outsourced marketing firm?

   ____ Less than 1   _____ 1-5   _____ 6-10   _____ More than 10

21. On a scale of 1-7 with 1 being “extremely dissatisfied” and 7 being “extremely satisfied”, please rate your satisfaction with the amount of contact you have with the outsourced sports marketing firm.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Extremely dissatisfied  Extremely satisfied

22. Does the in-house marketing group retain any rights to selling sponsorship?

   ____ Yes   _____ No

23. If so, which pieces of inventory can the in-house group sell?

   ____ Schedule cards (football/men’s basketball)   _____ Team poster (football/men’s basketball)
   ____ Schedule cards (other)   _____ Team poster (other)
   ____ Game program (football/men’s basketball)   _____ On-site promotions (football/basketball)
   ____ Game program other   _____ On-site promotions (other)
   ____ Radio   _____ TV Coaches shows
   ____ Signage at football/men’s basketball   _____ Radio Coaches shows
   ____ Signage at other venues   _____ Internet advertising

24. Have you worked in another in-house sports marketing department at another Division I institution?

   ____ Yes   _____ No
25. If you answered yes to question 23, is the current pressure from the athletic director to limit the expansion of inventory more or less than at your previous institution?
   ___ More    ___ Less    ___ About the same    ___ Don’t know

26. Have you had experience working in this position in college athletics, overseeing a different outsourced sports marketing company?
   ___ Yes    ___ No

27. If you answered yes to Question 25, please select which of the following outsourced sports marketing companies you have overseen in your position as in-house marketing administrator:
   ___ Host Communications    ___ ISP Sports
   ___ Learfield Communications    ___ Viacom Sports
   ___ Other    ___ Same company as current one

28. If you answered yes to Question 25, is the pressure from the current outsourced sports marketing firm to expand inventory and increase sponsorship more or less than with the previous firm you oversaw?
   ___ More    ___ Less    ___ About the same

29. On a scale of 1-7 with 1 being “no pressure” and 7 being “intense pressure”, how much pressure do you feel you have from athletic department and university culture to limit commercialization?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   No pressure    Intense pressure

30. In your opinion, on a scale of 1-7 with 1 being “no pressure” and 7 being the “intense pressure”, how much pressure do you think your outsourced general manager has on him from firm executives to continue selling and keep expanding inventory?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   No pressure    Intense pressure

31. Please rank the following goals as they relate to your current in-house marketing position, with 1 being the most important and 5 being the least important:
   ___ Sell tickets to university sporting events
   ___ Enhance the gameday atmosphere at university sporting events
   ___ Market and promote the Olympic sports at the university
   ___ Keep the relationship between the in-house and outsourced marketing groups in check
   ___ Keep the outsourced group satisfied
   ___ Other
32. Please rank, in your opinion, the goals of the GM at your outsourced marketing firm, with 1 being the most important and 5 being the least important.
   ___ Expand inventory and offer more sponsorship options each year
   ___ Generate revenue growth from year to year
   ___ Enhance or maintain the quality of the network broadcast
   ___ Keep university satisfied
   ___ Keep clients satisfied
   ___ Other

33. How satisfied are you with your overall working relationship with the outsourced marketing firm used?
   ___ Very satisfied       ___ Moderately satisfied       ___ Satisfied
   ___ Moderately Dissatisfied       ___ Dissatisfied

34. At this school, have you ever felt that the long-term good or reputation of the athletic department is affected by the short term monetary gain?
   ___ Yes       ___ No       ___ Not sure
APPENDIX 6.4 – OUTSOURCED MARKETING SURVEY

1. How many years experience do you have working in college athletics, in any capacity? ____

2. How many years do you have working in collegiate sports marketing (in-house and outsourced)? ____

3. Have you had experience working on the in-house collegiate marketing side?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

4. How many total years have you worked for an in-house collegiate sports marketing department? ____

5. Has any member of your staff worked for an in-house collegiate sports marketing department?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

6. How many total years has your staff worked for an in-house collegiate sports marketing department? ____________

7. Which outsourced firm do you work for?
   ____ ESPN Plus  ____ Host Communications
   ____ ISP Sports  ____ Learfield Communications
   ____ ISP/Learfield joint  ____ Nelligan Sports Marketing
   ____ Viacom Sports  ____ Other

8. How long has your firm owned this property, in years? ___

9. Has any other outsourced firm(s) owned the marketing rights to this property since the athletic department decided to outsource?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

10. If you answered ‘Yes’ to Question 9, please select the outsourced firm(s) that have owned the property since it was first outsourced:
    ____ ESPN Plus  ____ Host Communications
    ____ ISP Sports  ____ Learfield Communications
    ____ ISP/Learfield joint  ____ Nelligan Sports Marketing
    ____ Viacom Sports  ____ Other
11. Please select the location of the outsourced marketing office to which your athletic department contracts out. If there is more than one outsourced marketing office, please check all that apply.

___ In the same office complex  ___ On campus, but not within same complex
___ Off campus, but within 5 miles  ___ Off campus, and greater than 5 miles
___ Other

12. If an option, in relation to the location of the in-house marketing offices, where would you prefer to locate the outsourced marketing offices?

___ Further away  ___ Closer  ___ Same distance as they are now
___ Other

13. Are there any unique reasons for the current location of the outsourced marketing offices?

14. Please select the number of times per month that the outsourced sports marketing staff has organized meeting(s) with the in-house sports marketing department.

___ None  ___ Once  ___ Twice  ___ Three  ___ Four  ___ Five
___ Quarterly  ___ Every Six Months  ___ Annually  ___ Other

Questions 15-18 pertain to how much daily contact you have with the senior marketing administrator at your university:

15. Please select the number of meetings per week, organized or unorganized, that you have with the senior marketing administrator of the in-house sports marketing department.

___ Less than 1  ___ 1-5  ___ 6-10  ___ More than 10

16. Please select the number of phone calls per day that are typically shared between you and the senior marketing administrator of the in-house sports marketing department.

___ Less than 1  ___ 1-5  ___ 6-10  ___ More than 10

17. Please select how many emails are exchanged per day with the senior marketing administrator of the in-house sports marketing department.

___ Less than 1  ___ 1-5  ___ 6-10  ___ More than 10

18. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being “extremely dissatisfied” and 7 being “extremely satisfied”, please rate your satisfaction with the amount of contact you have with the in-house marketing department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Is the outsourced sports marketing staff invited to **athletic department-wide** meetings?
   ___ Yes    ___ No

20. If yes, how many **athletic department-wide** meetings does your staff attend each month?
   ___ None    ___ One    ___ Two    ___ Three    ___ More than three

21. Are you a member of the athletic department’s senior staff?
   ___ Yes    ___ No

22. If no, and it was an option, would you prefer to be a member of the athletic department’s senior staff?
   ___ Yes    ___ No    ___ Unsure    ___ I already am a member of the senior staff

23. Does the in-house marketing group retain any rights to selling sponsorship?
   ___ Yes    ___ No

24. If so, which pieces of inventory can the in-house department sell?
   ___ Schedule cards (football/men’s basketball)    ___ Team poster (football/men’s basketball)
   ___ Schedule cards (other)    ___ Team poster (other)
   ___ Game program (football/men’s basketball)    ___ On-site promotions (football/basketball)
   ___ Game program other    ___ On-site promotions (other)
   ___ Radio    ___ TV Coaches shows
   ___ Signage at football/men’s basketball    ___ Radio Coaches shows
   ___ Signage at other venues    ___ Internet advertising

25. Please estimate at what percentage of your available inventory is currently full: ___

26. Have you worked in a similar position (General Manager, Senior Sales Executive) for an outsourced collegiate sports marketing firm, with a **different** athletic department property?
   ___ Yes    ___ No

27. If yes, how does the **current** pressure from the athletic department to limit commercialization compare to the pressure coming from the previous athletic department property?
   ___ More    ___ Less    ___ About the same    ___ Do not know
28. Have you worked in a similar position (General Manager, Senior Sales Executive) for a different outsourced collegiate sports marketing firm?
   ___ Yes  ___ No

29. If yes, is the pressure to continually sell and expand inventory with your current firm more or less than the pressure with your immediately previous firm?
   ___ More than previous  ___ Less than previous  ___ About the same as previous

30. On a scale of 1-7 with 1 being “no pressure” and 7 being the “intense pressure”, how much pressure do you feel you have from your firm’s executives to keep expanding inventory for your current property?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   No pressure  Intense pressure

31. On a scale of 1-7 with 1 being “no pressure” and 7 being “intense pressure”:
   How much pressure do you think that the in-house marketing administrator has from athletic department and university culture to limit commercialization?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   No pressure  Intense pressure

32. Have you ever felt that your career goals are hindered by the restrictions placed on sponsorship from the athletic department and university that you are affiliated with?
   ___ Often  ___ Sometimes  ___ Never

33. Please rank the following goals as they relate to your current general manager position, with 1 being the most important and 5 being the least important:
   ___ Expand inventory and offer more sponsorship options each year
   ___ Generate revenue growth from year to year
   ___ Enhance or maintain the quality of the network broadcast
   ___ Keep university satisfied
   ___ Keep clients satisfied
   ___ Other

34. Please rank, in your opinion, the goals of the in-house athletics marketing director at your affiliated university, with 1 being the most important and 5 being the least important:
   ___ Sell tickets to university sporting events
   ___ Enhance the gameday atmosphere at university sporting events
   ___ Market and promote the Olympic sports at the university
   ___ Keep the relationship between the in-house and outsourced marketing groups in check
   ___ Keep the outsourced group satisfied
   ___ Other
35. In your opinion, on a scale from 1-7, with 1 being “no part at all” and 7 being “employee-like status”, please rank how much you believe your outsourced staff to be part of the athletic department:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
No part at all Employee-like status

36. How satisfied are you with your overall working relationship with your in-house marketing department?

_____ Very satisfied _____ Moderately satisfied _____ Satisfied
_____ Moderately Dissatisfied _____ Dissatisfied
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