

Brand Perceptions of TV Commercials During Super Bowl XXXVIII

By

Martha G. Russell, Ph.D.

Clickin Research, Inc; 1201 W. 24th St. Suite 204; Austin, TX 78705; ph. 512-236-9161; fax 512-236-9191; martha@clickin.com

John A. Fortunato, Ph.D.

**The University of Austin at Texas; Advertising Department; 1 University Station
Stop A1200; Austin, TX 78712; ph. 512-471-3482; fax 512-471-7018;
jfortunato@mail.utexas.edu**

Lila Valencia,

Clickin Research, Inc; 1201 W. 24th St. Suite 204; Austin, TX 78705; ph. 512-236-9161; fax 512-236-9191; lila@clickin.com

Neal M. Burns, Ph.D.

**The University of Texas at Austin; Advertising Department; 1 University Station
Stop A1200; Austin, TX 78712; ph. 512-471-1101; fax 512-471-7018;
nburns@mail.utexas.edu**

Martha G. Russell (Ph.D., University of Minnesota), President/CEO, Clickin

Research, Inc., martha@clickin.com

John Fortunato (Ph.D., University of Rutgers University), Assistant Professor of

Advertising, College of Communications, University of Texas at Austin,

jfortunato@mail.utexas.edu

Lila Valencia (M.A., College of William & Mary), Director of Research, Clickin

Research, Inc., lila@clickin.com

Neal M. Burns, (Ph.D., McGill University), Professor of Advertising, College of

Communications, University of Texas at Austin, nburns@mail.utexas.edu

Brand Perceptions of TV Commercials During Super Bowl XXXVIII

At an average of \$2.3 million for a 30-second commercial, advertising during the Super Bowl televised on 1 February 2004 required careful evaluation. This research assesses change in brand familiarity and likeability as a consequence of brand exposure during Super Bowl XXXVIII and as such serves as an estimate of the return on investment (ROI) the advertisers received. In a two-phase online study, findings revealed the greatest positive change in brand familiarity occurred for brands new to Super Bowl advertising. While well-established brands did not benefit greatly in terms of increased brand familiarity or likeability, these brands remained the favorites for their ads. Findings carry implications ranging from ad placement strategy to creative development.

At an average of \$2.3 million for a 30-second commercial spot, a logical question posed would simply be: “Is it worth it for corporations to advertise during the Super Bowl? While the Super Bowl is considered the most watched television event of the year, the large amount of the investment certainly encourages corporations to carefully evaluate the value of this advertising placement strategy. The goals of Super Bowl presence as part of the marketing strategy are no different than other communication strategies. Ideally, the advertiser hopes to reach their intended audience, and increase brand familiarity and meaning.

Advertising plays a pivotal role in brand familiarity, and different corporate brands occupy very different levels of familiarity, or recognition, in the minds of consumers. These corporate brands not only want to be familiar in the minds of their consumers, but also liked – in the sense that likeability frequently translates into purchase behavior (Kennedy et al. 2000).

The objective of this research was to assess brand recognition and likeability as a consequence of exposure during Super Bowl XXXVIII. (Similar efforts have been conducted on four of the previous Super Bowl events and helped to refine the procedures used in this report.) The research also sought to evaluate the value of advertising during high profile televised events such as the Super Bowl. Using a two-phase Internet study examining the effects of Super Bowl advertising on brand familiarity and likeability, the study revealed changes in consumer perception of selected brands advertised during Super Bowl XXXVIII, televised on February 1, 2004.

Literature Review

While the literature on brand and on brand relationships is rich in both the marketing and advertising literature (Aaker 1991; Aaker 1997; Davis 2002; Keller 1993; Sutherland and Galloway 1981) we wished to more closely examine the associations that are produced and referenced with the appearance of television advertising and its effectiveness in terms of impact on brand familiarity and likeability. The Super Bowl telecast showcases a complicated network of brand associations – the ads, the teams and the athletic contest – in the highly touted and expensive television commercials that air during the broadcast. Corporations make large investments in their brands and, along with the growth of the Super Bowl as a major televised event, some companies have aligned themselves with the image of the Super Bowl year after year. They do this in part because corporations can utilize the high publicity and public awareness this sports property receives to gain both access to and association with their target audience for greater exposure of their brand(s). Ideally, such associations yield increased sales.

Sutherland and Galloway (1981) state, 'products that are advertised heavily have a status conferred upon them – they are felt by customers to be 'the more popular' products. The media are assumed to carry that which is more important, more in demand, more notorious. Just as 'the ordinary person' does not appear on TV, neither does 'the ordinary product'" (p. 27). The authors conclude, "advertising (media prominence) functions as a significant cue to the customer in judging what is and is not acceptable and popular with others" (p. 28). A presence on the Super Bowl is currently seen as the *sine que non* of leadership status and popularity within a category. It is considered not only an

opportunity for big exposure but also for enhancing the perceived status of the brand (Russell and Burns 2001).

Commercials appearing on the Super Bowl seemingly have a special status conferred on them. During the so-called dot com “boom” newly formed entities rushed to advertise on the Super Bowl in the belief that such exposure would immediately elevate them to levels of business acumen and size normally associated with members of Fortune 100 companies that dominated the TV commercial line up for the game. Some of the ads were probably also placed in the hope of increasing the likelihood of investor interest in those start-up companies. The desired effects for some of those advertisers, however, were less than hoped (Russell, Burns and Valencia 2001). Generally, however, those corporations able to spend millions of dollars to advertise during the Super Bowl do so to establish or reinforce the brands as members of an elite set of brands. Thus, advertising during the Super Bowl can be a pivotal initiative and an important contributing element in an overall branding strategy.

Blackston (2000) points out that the brand is a collection of perceptions in the mind of the consumer and Davis (2002) explains, "A strong brand position means having a unique, credible, sustainable, fitting, and valued place in the customers' minds. It revolves around a benefit set that helps your product or service stand apart from the competition" (p. 25). Many of these associations are formed on the basis of the media selected for advertising the brand. Thus, certain products gain part of their identity from the publication or radio or television program in which they appear (Aaker 1997; Blackston 2000; Keller 1993). The Super Bowl television commercials and the buzz and reportage associated with each year's entrants becomes a strong brand association and is

thus interactive in that while the desired brand messages and images are created and communicated, the television audience for the event makes its evaluation of the brand.

Blackston (2000) emphasizes the relationship between the brand and the consumer requires observation and analysis of consumers' attitudes and behaviors toward the brand and the brand's attitudes and behaviors toward the consumer. He describes two components of a successful brand relationship: (1) trust in the brand, and (2) customer satisfaction with the brand. Brands also have assets that are essential in building brand equity. These assets could be trustworthiness, tradition, and overall reputation. Presence, participation, and support of the Super Bowl through advertising can become brand assets and contribute to the existing equity.

The notion of “equity” has been characterized as perceived quality, loyalty, and associations, combined with brand awareness (e.g., Aaker and Joachimsthaler 2000) and a Super Bowl presence certainly contributes to awareness. Keller (1998) explains that consumer brand equity is achieved when the consumer is not only familiar with the brand, but holds favorable, strong, and unique brand associations. It is these feelings toward a brand that will then drive the consumer behavior. The purpose of branding is to create brand awareness or familiarity and a positive image for the brand that can contribute to building brand equity (e.g., Blackston 2000; Keller 1993; Park and Srinivasan 1994). Such is the outcome that advertisers and ad agencies seek for the message they have presented and the money they have spent on Super Bowl advertising.

The critical part of any branding strategy is to select a strong and differentiating persuasive idea that can be communicated to the potential market in a memorable, persuasive and intrusive fashion. In that process the brand acquires meaning. Blackston

(2000) points out the brand efforts need to be made in "creating and communicating the correct attitudes and behaviors of our brands, because it is these which create meaning out of the message" (no emphasis added, p. 102). Anshuetz (1997) explains "to build brand popularity, a brand must integrate: integrate its target audience to include as many category users as possible, integrate its message to one that distinctly appeals to more and more different kinds of category consumers, and integrate its media to include those that reach more and more category users" (p. 65). The communication of the brand is where the advertising placement strategies become important decisions as an investment in brand management strategies and toward future sales. It is also where relevant and meaningful creative does its work. Just as the outlet where sold can contribute to the importance and meaning of a product (e.g., the famous blue Tiffany Box) so can the media vehicle where the advertisement is shown. Thus, as *Vogue* or *The New York Times* or *Meet The Press* each have their own audience and media strength, so does the Super Bowl.

The Super Bowl attracts a larger, more general audience than a typical NFL game, sporting event, or almost any other televised program. Included in the audience for the Super Bowl are "partygoers" and event junkies, as well as many Super Bowl viewers who describe themselves as sports fans. The sports literature offers insight into the tendencies of the many behaviors in which sports fans engage and also suggests a unique relationship to brands. McPherson, Curtis, and Loy (1989), e.g., point out that emotional involvement (affiliation) with particular athletes and/or teams is just one characteristic of a fan. They claim the behaviors that invest time or money, that increase knowledge of performers, statistics, strategies, and that use sport in conversation are all additional

characteristics that make a sports fan recognizable to others. The loyalty towards team and player represents a type of brand loyalty that is often manifested in the purchase of team-related merchandise. In speaking to McPherson et al.'s (1989) point about investment of time and money, the actions that embody being a fan of a particular team include attendance at games and the purchase of team merchandise (Fisher and Wakefield 1998).

In a study of college football fans, Madrigal (2000) found that fan identification could even extend from support of a team to support of companies that sponsor and are associated with that team. He states, "loyalty toward a preferred team may have beneficial consequences for corporate sponsors. Consistent with the idea of in-group favoritism, higher levels of team identification among attendees of a sporting event appear to be positively related to intentions to purchase a sponsor's products" (p. 21). Trusdell (1997) lends support for this claim describing one survey that found that over 70% of NASCAR fans purchase the products of NASCAR sponsors. Madrigal (2000) also claims, "favorable purchase intentions are more likely to occur as identification with the team increases and when intentions are perceived as a group norm" (p. 13). Comparable wisdom and aspirations undoubtedly exist for those companies that produce and place advertisements during the Super Bowl.

Enjoyment derived from sports often comes in the form of watching games and sporting events on television. Unless a person has a ticket to the game, television remains the most likely option for experiencing sports (Fortunato 2001). For advertisers, the needed behaviors of brand recall, familiarity, and purchase cannot occur if people are not aware of the brand's available products and services. McAllister (1996) emphasizes the

critical aspect of the proper exposure and argues that advertisers want to control the attention the viewer gives to the advertisement. He states, "Advertisers know that the first necessary (but not sufficient) condition for persuading a potential consumer to buy a product is to force the consumer to notice the message. If the consumer does not see the ad or ignores the ad, then the advertiser's message is wasted" (p. 18). The advertiser's investment is also wasted if the ad is not noticed, and hence, the chance of any return on that investment is reduced. The loyalty and high reliance on television on the part of the sports audience helps to maintain consistent ratings and keep a steady stream of advertisers.

Bellamy (1998) points out that, "with a seemingly endless proliferation of television channels, sports is seen as the programming that can best break through the clutter of channels and advertising and consistently produce a desirable audience for sale to advertisers" (p. 73). He also claims that sports broadcasts provide a television network, economically speaking, with "a level of product differentiation that distinguishes it from its rivals. This often takes the form of 'branding'" (p. 73). Wenner (1989) adds that sports programming is a good proposition because this type of programming offers the desirable, and relatively hard-to-reach, male audience between the ages of 18 and 49. He claims the sports programming demographic tends to be well educated with considerable disposable income and "advertisers are willing to pay top dollar for this audience because they tend to make purchase decisions about big-ticket items, such as automobiles and computers" (p. 14).

Advertising for Super Bowl XXXVIII

Advertisers paid a record average of \$2.3 million for a 30-second commercial for the February 1, 2004 broadcast of the Super Bowl on CBS, a 9% price increase from the 2003 game (Raine 2004). Advertisers purchased more than 60 commercial spots during the broadcast of the game. In addition to being an official sponsor of the game, Anheuser-Busch was the leading advertiser with five minutes of total advertising time and a financial investment of an estimated \$23 million (De Marco 2004; DeMarris 2004). Pepsi-Cola Co. was the second leading brand in terms of total commercial time commitment with three minutes split between its Pepsi, Pepsi /Apple iTunes, and Sierra Mist brands (De Marco 2004). Proctor and Gamble advertised during the Super Bowl for the first time in 2004 and held an internal competition for seven of its brands to determine which would earn the coveted advertising spot during the Super Bowl, with Charmin winning the honors (Raine 2004).

Tom McGovern, director of sports marketing at OMD whose group bought commercial time for clients such as FedEx, Visa, Frito-Lay, and Pepsi-Cola Co., stated, "the beauty of the Super Bowl is that it hasn't been impacted by the erosion of viewership and ratings that has affected the rest of television." He adds, "The ability to reach half the population at one time is still there." McGovern concludes, "the rate of inflation for the Super Bowl hasn't been on par with prime time this season. I hate to use the word 'bargain,' but it's a price relative to the goals and needs" (cited in Elliott 2003).

Shira Goodman, executive vice president of Staples, a company that advertised during the Super Bowl for the first time in 2004, stated, "it's not an insignificant chunk of change, but we believe it's cost effective" (cited in Raine 2004). Peter Gardiner, partner

and chief media officer at the Deutsch Agency added another critical element in the evaluation of Super Bowl advertising by suggesting that attention to TV commercials during the Super Bowl is traditionally higher than the advertising associated with other television shows. He stated, "there's the size of the audience you're talking to, and that rare thing -- consumers interested enough in your advertising that they look forward to it" (cited in Elliott 2003).

As if to underscore Elliot's New York Times report there are several "Super Bowl Buzz Reports" that appear online and are focused in large part on the ads that will be run (e.g., <http://www.multivisioninc.com/release11.html>). These reports provide answers to key questions that marketers and the media are asking about the Super Bowl news coverage. These include:

- How many news stories were aired about the advertising?
- What geographical markets covered the Super Bowl advertising?
- What stations devoted airtime to news about the commercials?
- Which advertiser was mentioned the most on the news?
- What creative techniques helped garner more publicity?
- Who scored the greatest pre-game buzz?
- Who scored the greatest post-game buzz?

Marketers will gain insight from this report that will help to justify not only a Super Bowl expenditure but also any large event marketing expense. The study described below represents an attempt to document the impact of Super Bowl advertising on brand perception and likeability – key variables in determining the effectiveness of the messages that are produced and run during the game. The critical issue is whether

positive change in familiarity and likeability can be demonstrated as a result of the exposure?

Methodology

The study assessed consumer perceptions of brands that ran advertisements during the Super Bowl XXXVIII game. A total of 13 brands that bought advertising time during the Super Bowl were tested. Those brands were:

Apple iTunes
Budweiser
Cadillac
Cialis
Dodge
FedEx
Frito-Lay
H&R Block
Levitra
Monster.com
Pepsi Cola
Staples
Visa.

In addition to these thirteen brands, two “control” brands, Charles Schwab (Control 1) and Viagra (Control 2), which did not advertise during Super Bowl XXXVIII, were also included in the brand assessment questions. The online survey was a two-phase study that assessed, using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all" (familiar, likeable) to "very" (familiar, likeable), brand familiarity and brand likeability before and immediately after the big game. The brands were presented in alphabetical order for each rating exercise. The responses to the five-point scale were then multiplied by twenty to give an overall percentage based on an index of 100. The survey also tested for likeability of the actual advertisements viewed during the Super Bowl. The assessment of the

likeability of advertisements was twofold, a Likert scale question plus an open-ended question that simply asked: Which advertisement in the Super Bowl did you like the best?

Online panelists were invited via e-mail to participate in the survey. Phase One of the study was completed up to three days before the start of the Super Bowl game. Phase Two of the online survey was conducted immediately after the Super Bowl game with respondents having 24 hours after the game to complete the survey.

Only data from respondents who completed both the pre-game and post-game sections of the survey were used for the analysis and this report, providing a total sample of 114 participants. The gender ratio among participants was male = 48%, female = 52%. Most respondents were between the ages of 30 and 39 or 40 and 49, with 32% of the sample in each of these age categories. An additional 15% of respondents were between 50 and 59, and 10% were between 20 and 29 years of age. Education backgrounds varied from high school to post graduate school, but the majority of respondents (89%) had at least some college education. The sample included respondents who worked as professionals (40%) or in management positions (21%). The sample was comprised of avid television viewers with 73% watching between 1 to 5 hours of television programs per week and an additional 19% watching more than 5 hours a week. Forty-three percent (43%) reported watching between 1 and 5 hours of sports television programs weekly. Ninety-five percent (95%) of respondents watched the Super Bowl in their own home or at someone else's home, and 82% described being surrounded by family during the game.

Results

Brand familiarity, brand likeability, and ad likeability were conceptualized in the context of participant responses prior to and after the Super Bowl to demonstrate changes on brand affinity based on their actual exposure to the respective brands' advertisements.

Pre and Post Brand Familiarity Comparison

Prior to exposure to the Super Bowl advertisements, familiarity with the established brands, such as Budweiser and Cadillac, tested in the survey was high among most respondents. Nine brands had familiarity scores of over 80%. These brands included: Budweiser, Cadillac, Dodge, FedEx, Frito-Lay, H&R Block, Pepsi, Staples, and Visa. Only three brands had brand familiarity scores under 50% (Cialis, Levitra and Apple iTunes), with Cialis having the lowest familiarity among participants at only 32%.

In comparing post Super Bowl responses of those participants having been exposed to the advertisements during the game (only data for those respondents that watched the specific quarter of the game during which the ads were shown were included in analyses), Cialis and Apple iTunes had the largest percentage increase with each increasing in brand familiarity by approximately ten percent ($t = -5.00$; $p < .001$; $t = -3.63$; $p < .001$). Levitra and Budweiser also had slight increases in brand familiarity, but these changes were not statistically significant. Interestingly enough, familiarity for the remaining brands, including both control brands, decreased. While most of the drops in familiarity were not statistically significant, Staples, H&R Block, and Dodge did incur statistically significant decreases in brand familiarity ($t = 3.90$; $p < .001$; $t = 3.48$; $p < .01$; $t = 2.97$; $p < .01$)

Place Table 1 about here

Furthermore, both control brands, Charles Schwab and Viagra, also incurred statistically significant decreases in familiarity ($t = 4.71$; $p < .001$; $t = 3.74$; $p < .001$), with Charles Schwab undergoing the greatest decrease in brand familiarity of all brands tested.

Pre and Post Brand Likeability Comparison

Many brands that had high familiarity scores prior to the Super Bowl also received high pre-Super Bowl brand likeability scores, with Frito-Lay and Visa achieving over 80% likeability. In addition to those two brands, eight other brands had likeability scores over 55%: They were: H&R Block, Monster, Budweiser, Cadillac, Dodge, Staples, and Pepsi. Similar to the trend in brand familiarity scores, the lowest brand scores for likeability were given to Cialis, Levitra, and Apple iTunes, all below 50%. Furthermore, the two control brands, Schwab and Viagra, also received relatively low pre-game likeability scores, with 54% likeability for Schwab and 46% likeability for Viagra.

In comparing post-game responses of participants having been exposed to the advertisements during the game to their responses given prior to the game, it was found that eight brands had increases in brand likeability, while five brands had decreases in likeability. Cialis had the largest brand likeability increase at 9% but remained below the 50% likeability level ($t = -3.71$; $p < .001$). Of the more established brands, Budweiser benefited from their Super Bowl exposure with an increase of five percent ($t = -2.05$; $p < .05$). Apple iTunes, Pepsi, and Levitra also improved in likeability following their Super

Bowl exposure. However, these brands' change in likeability was not statistically significant.

Two brands did incur statistically significant decreases in likeability, Visa and FedEx ($t = 2.82$; $p < .01$; $t = 2.01$; $p < .05$). For the control brands, neither of which aired ads during the Super Bowl, Charles Schwab (Control - 1) incurred a statistically significant decrease in brand likeability ($t = 5.83$; $p < .001$); and while Viagra (Control - 2) saw a slight increase in brand likeability, this change was not significant.

Place Table 2 about here

Controls vs. Super Bowl Brands Comparison

Brand familiarity scores for those brands that showcased their ads during the Super Bowl were averaged together to create a single "Super Bowl brand" familiarity mean score. A "control brand" familiarity mean score was also computed for the two control brands that did not advertise during the Super Bowl. The same averaging technique was used to distinguish mean likeability of brands showcased during the Super Bowl and mean likeability of the two control brands.

A mean comparison of the pre familiarity and post familiarity of the tested brands revealed that no significant change occurred. A mean comparison of the pre likeability and post likeability of the tested brands also revealed that no significant change occurred upon Super Bowl exposure. However, the same was not the case for the control brands. The control brands incurred statistically significant decreases in both brand familiarity (t

= 4.89; $p < .001$) and brand likeability ($t = 4.32$; $p < .001$) despite their absence of advertisement throughout the Super Bowl.

Advertisement Likeability

Participants provided ratings of Super Bowl advertisement likeability as well as open-ended responses to the question: Which advertisement in the Super Bowl did you like the best? For the ratings portion, Budweiser had the highest advertisement likeability at over 80%. Ratings of Pepsi and Frito-Lay followed in ad likeability with ad likeability at 75% and 71%, respectively.

One plausible explanation for the success of Budweiser is its advertising strategy of using different creative elements in the ads placed during the Super Bowl, rather than repeating one advertisement. Pepsi followed a similar strategy. Through this strategy a participant might not like one particular advertisement, but might enjoy another and therefore give that brand a positive advertisement likeability response.

The less familiar and less liked brands also had low scores for the likeability of their actual advertisement. Cialis and Levitra had the lowest advertisement likeability scores at approximately 45%. Although they did not advertise, both control brands received likeability scores of over 40% for advertisements that respondents did not actually see.

Place Table 3 about here

Respondent ratings of the Super Bowl ads likeability were segmented into top and bottom categories, in which scores of one or two on a five-point scale made up the

bottom likeability category and scores of four or five made up the top likeability category. Differences in change in likeability and familiarity of the brand between the top and bottom likeability categories were then explored.

Apple iTunes, Budweiser, Dodge, and Levitra benefited by showcasing ads that respondents enjoyed. Those respondents who gave higher ad likeability ratings for Apple iTunes also gave significantly higher brand familiarity ratings following the Super Bowl ($t = -2.79$; $p < .05$). Viewers who enjoyed the ad were subsequently significantly more familiar with the brand following the Super Bowl. Those respondents who gave higher ad likeability ratings for Budweiser, Dodge, and Levitra also gave significantly higher overall brand likeability ratings ($t = -3.73$; $p < .001$; $t = -2.30$; $p < .05$; $t = -3.16$; $p < .05$). They enjoyed the ad featured and attributed the positive features of the ad to the brands advertised during the Super Bowl game.

Cadillac, FedEx, H&R Block, Monster, and Staples suffered significant decreases in brand perception with those viewers who did not enjoy their Super Bowl ads. Those respondents who gave lower ad likeability ratings for the controls, H&R Block, Monster, and Staples also gave lower post Super Bowl brand familiarity scores for those same brands ($t = 2.66$; $p < .05$; $t = 2.48$; $p < .05$; $t = 2.42$; $p < .05$). Relatively well-established brands incurred losses in brand familiarity with those viewers who did not like the Super Bowl ad featured aired for those brands. Those respondents who gave lower ad likeability ratings for Cadillac, FedEx, H&R Block, and Visa also gave lower brand likeability scores for those brands following the Super Bowl ($t = 2.32$; $p < .05$; $t = 2.79$; $p < .05$; $t = 2.67$; $p < .05$; $t = 2.80$; $p < .05$). These brands lost viewer appeal among those viewers

who did not enjoy the ads featured for the brands. It can be argued that the viewers did not enjoy the ads and attributed the negative aspects of the ad to the overall brand.

Interestingly, while the two Control brands (Schwab and Viagra) did not advertise during the Super Bowl, they still incurred losses in brand familiarity and brand likeability among those viewers who reported not enjoying the ads featured by these brands during the Super Bowl though no ads were featured.

Discussion

The greatest positive change in brand familiarity among those brands studied here occurred for Cialis, Apple iTunes and Levitra. These brands, being relatively new to both the marketplace and Super Bowl advertising, benefited in familiarity by advertising during the game. One implication of this study is that there are great benefits to lesser-known companies that advertise during the Super Bowl. It seems that while well-established brands do not greatly benefit by their exposure during the Super Bowl, in terms of increased brand familiarity or likeability, they remain among the top favorites for their advertising campaigns during the big game. One potential explanation for a drop in brand familiarity for some of the well-established brands, even following ad exposure during the Super Bowl, is that the likeability of the particular ad, the context of the other brands, or the viewer's response to the game itself all could alter viewer affinity toward those well-established brands.

Brands like Cialis and Levitra are able, through their Super Bowl exposure and their association with Super Bowl, to gain brand familiarity and likeability by appearing in the same event with major brands. Further, the gains of the three "winners" in this

study (iTunes, Levitra and Cialis) appear to support the consumer appeal of the event and the price point of media entry.

Another implication of this study is an estimation of the value the brand receives in exchange for advertising during the Super Bowl at an average price of \$2.3 million for a 30-second commercial spot. This study measured how consumers feel about company brands, and distinguished between likeability and familiarity for a brand prior to and after exposure to the actual Super Bowl advertisements. While direct causality is difficult to demonstrate for any advertising strategy, this study's methodology attempted to limit other factors that could have caused a change in a respondents' brand familiarity and brand likeability by gathering responses only a few days prior to and immediately after exposure to the actual Super Bowl advertisement. Nevertheless, one factor that could limit the impact of exposure to the advertisement is the environment in which the advertisement was seen. With 82% of the respondents being surrounded by others during the game, interpersonal communication concurrent with the ad's airtime could also have been a factor in influencing the participants' responses.

This study's results showed that viewers' opinions of the ads affected their opinions of the overall brand, and this is consistent with similar findings on ad likeability (Ansheutz 1997; Davis 2000). Additionally, the increase or decrease of familiarity and likeability occurred in the context of viewers' responses to the event as well as the other ads aired during the event. Brand managers and their advertising agencies should note the potential impact on brand recognition and brand likeability that can occur when ads featured during the Super Bowl are not well received by viewers. Likewise, the comparative associations of other advertisements appearing during the same event and

the influence of the event itself may impact viewer responses. Future research should continue the evaluation of this costly advertising strategy.

Likeability (affiliation with a brand) establishes brand equity for the consumer, which helps to create the perception that the products from that company are better than those from a more generic competitor. This perception that brand's products are better can be seen in consumer behavior and the market share dominance enjoyed by certain brands in their respective product categories. Anschuetz (1997) explains that "with increased brand popularity comes greater frequency of brand buying, a greater number of heavier buyers in the brand's franchise, a greater level of brand loyalty as measured through repeat buying" (p. 51). Berry and Biel (1992) explain that brand equity reflects the judgment of the consumer, including a willingness to pay for a branded product. Davis (2002) points out that 72% of customers say they will pay a 20% premium for their brand of choice, relative to the closest competitive brand, 25% of customers state that price does not matter if they are buying a brand that owns their loyalty (p. 5), and "more than 50% of consumers believe a strong brand allows for more successful new product introductions and they are more willing to try a new product from a preferred brand because of the implied endorsement" (p. 6). He states, "A brand helps customers feel confident about their purchase decision" (p. 31).

Sponsorship strategies during pre-game or halftime shows are another potential influence on brand familiarity and brand likeability. For example, America Online, tested by Clickin in previous studies, purchased 90 seconds of advertising time and was also the official sponsor of the halftime show in Super Bowl XXXVIII. Particularly in the instance of sports, sponsorship and commercial buys are often used in conjunction with

one another to optimize exposure to this difficult to reach demographic. The sponsorship can help establish brand familiarity, while the commercial spots can further explain the services and features of the brand as well as promote brand likeability.

Table 1
Pre- and Post-Super Bowl Brand Familiarity Ratings

<i>Brand</i>	<i>Pre-SB Familiarity</i>	<i>Post-SB Familiarity</i>	<i>t – Value</i>
Apple iTunes	39	46	-3.63 ^b
Budweiser	92	93	-.631
Cadillac	86	83	1.97
Charles Schwab (Control 1)	76	67	4.71 ^b
Cialis	32	44	-5.00 ^b
Dodge	87	81	2.97 ^a
FedEx	91	88	1.74
Frito-Lay	92	91	.847
H&R Block	88	80	3.48 ^a
Levitra	48	49	-2.91
Monster	75	71	2.13*
Pepsi	95	92	1.49
Staples	90	83	3.90 ^b
Viagra (Control 2)	76	68	3.74 ^b
Visa	95	92	1.90

*p < .05;
^ap < .01;
^bp < .001

Table 2**Pre- and Post-Super Bowl Brand Likeability Ratings**

<i>Brand</i>	<i>Pre-SB Likeability</i>	<i>Post-SB Likeability</i>	<i>t – Value</i>
Apple iTunes	45	48	-1.89
Budweiser	63	68	-2.05*
Cadillac	64	64	.096
Charles Schwab (Control 1)	54	40	5.83 ^b
Cialis	40	48	-3.71 ^b
Dodge	66	66	.215
FedEx	78	74	2.01*
Frito-Lay	85	82	1.03
H&R Block	59	56	1.62
Levitra	39	41	-.917
Monster	60	60	.231
Pepsi	72	75	-1.44
Staples	72	72	0.00
Viagra (Control 2)	46	46	-.098
Visa	81	75	2.82 ^a

*p < .05;

^ap < .01;

^bp < .001

Table 3

Overall Super Bowl Ad Likeability

<i>Brand</i>	<i>Overall Super Bowl Ad Likeability</i>
Apple iTunes	59
Budweiser	84
Cadillac	65
Charles Schwab (Control 1)	50
Cialis	43
Dodge	64
FedEx	65
Frito-Lay	72
H&R Block	58
Levitra	43
Monster	59
Pepsi	76
Staples	68
Viagra (Control 2)	46
Visa	63

References

- Aaker, David A. (1991). Managing brand equity. NY: The Free Press.
- _____, and Joachimsthaler, Erich (2000). *Brand leadership*. NY: The Free Press.
- Aaker, Jennifer L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-356.
- Anschuetz, Ned (1997). Point of view: Building brand popularity: The myth of segmenting to brand success. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 37, 63-66.
- Bellamy, Robert V., jr. (1998). The evolving television sports marketplace. In Lawrence A. Wenner (Ed.), *Mediasport* (pp. 73-87). London: Routledge.
- Berry, Steven T., and Biel, Alexander L. (1992). How brand image drives brand equity. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 32(6), RC6-RC12.
- Blackston, Max. (2000). Observations: Building brand equity by managing the brand's relationships. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 40(6), 101-105.
- Branscombe, Nyla R. and Wann, Daniel L. (1991). The positive and self-concept consequences of sports team identification. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 15(2), 115-127.
- Davis, Scott M. (2002). *Brand asset management: Driving profitable growth through your brands*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- De Marco, Donna (2004, January 29). 30 seconds of fame: Diverse mix of companies try to grab TV's biggest audience. *The Washington Times*, p. C16.
- DeMarris, Kevin G. (2004, January 25). How effective are Super Bowl ads? *The Bergen Record*, p. B1.
- Elliott, Stuart (2003, November 3). Most TV spots sold three months before Super Bowl. *The New York Times*, p. C1.
- Fisher, Robert. and Wakefield, Kirk (1998). Factors leading to group identification: A field study of winners and losers. *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(1), 23-40.
- Fortunato, John A. (2001). *The ultimate assist: The relationship and broadcast strategies of the NBA and television networks*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Kapferer, Jean-Noel (1992). *Strategic brand management*. NY: The Free Press.

- Keller, Kevin L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Advertising*, 57(1), 1-22.
- _____ (1998). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kennedy, R., Sharp, B., and Rungie, C. (2000). How ad liking (LA) relates to branding & the implications for advertising testing, *Australian Journal of Marketing Research* (July) 9-19
- Madrigal, Robert (2000). The influence of social alliances with sports teams on intentions to purchase corporate sponsors' products. *Journal of Advertising*, 29(4), 13-24.
- McAlliser, Matthew P. (1996). *The commercialization of American culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McPherson, Barry D., Curtis, James E., and Loy, John W. (1989). *The social significance of sport: An introduction to the psychology of sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Park, Chan, and Srinivasan, V. (1994). A survey-based method for measuring and understanding brand equity and its extendibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, 271-288.
- Raine, George (2004, January 18). Advertisers pull out all stops for Super Bowl. *The San Francisco Chronicle*, p. 11.
- Russell, Martha G., Burns, Neal M., and Valencia, Lila. (2001) Quantifying Super Bowl Advertising Impact on Likeability. *Clickin Research White Paper*, Austin, TX.
- Shocker, Aallan D., Srivastava, Rajendra K., and Ruekert, Robert W. (1994). Challenges and opportunities facing brand management: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(2), 149-158.
- Sloan, Lloyd R. (1989). The motives of sports fans. In Jeffrey H. Goldstein (Ed.), *Sports, games, and play: Social and psychological viewpoints* (pp. 175-240). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sutherland, Max, and Galloway, John (1981). Role of advertising: Persuasion or agenda-setting? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 21(5), 25-29.
- Trusdell, Brian (1997). Life in the fast lane. *Sales & Marketing Management*, 149(2), 66-71.
- Wenner, Lawrence A. (1989). Media, sports, and society: The research agenda. In Lawrence A. Wenner (Ed.), *Media, sports, and society* (pp. 13-48). Newbury Park: Sage.