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Pourquoi la révélation des parrains par embuscade n’est pas suffisante ? Le rôle des attitudes implicites et explicites.

Résumé

Les recherches existantes indiquent que l’utilisation d’un article de presse pour révéler qu’une marque pratique le parrainage par embuscade conduit les consommateurs à revoir l’évaluation de cette marque à la baisse. Ces résultats sont toutefois uniquement basés sur l’utilisation de mesures explicites. Dans 2 expériences nous montrons qu’un article de presse est efficace pour changer l’attitude explicite envers un parrain par embuscade mais est inefficace pour changer l’attitude implicite. L’attitude implicite peut toutefois être modifiée lorsque la révélation est faite à l’aide de publicités utilisant des informations visuelles et pouvant être traitées de manière associative. Nous montrons également que l’attitude implicite change plus lentement que l’attitude explicite et nécessite donc un plus grand nombre de répétition du message. Ces résultats sont théoriquement justifiés par les modèles dux du traitement de l’information.
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Abstract

Existing researches, based on explicit measures, suggest that disclosing ambush sponsors using press articles leads audiences to perceive ambushers poorly. In two experiments we show that while press articles are effective in changing explicit attitude toward an ambush sponsor, they are ineffective in changing implicit attitude. However, implicit attitude can be reversed when ads based on associative visual information are used. We also show that whereas explicit attitudes change rapidly, reversing implicit attitudes require more ad repetition. These results are grounded in dual process models.

Keywords: Ambush Marketing, Attitude change, Implicit Measures, Sponsorship.
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Introduction

Why were 36 good looking women wearing skimpy orange dresses arrested in a soccer stadium during the 2010 soccer world cup? They were accused of being part of an ambush marketing campaign to promote a Dutch brewery - Bavaria. Millions have read this news story. FIFA fiercely protects its sponsors (like Anheuser Busch's Budweiser) from brands which are not FIFA sponsors (i.e. ambushers). Ambush Marketing is perceived as a major threat by event organizers. Therefore, event organizers disclose ambush marketing to the general public (see Appendix A), mainly via public relations activities such as press releases and press conferences with the goal that numerous news stories that “name and shame” ambushing brands be published (Humphreys & al., 2010).

Past findings suggest that such a strategy is effective in harming the image of the ambusher (Mazodier, Quester, and Chandon, in press; Meenaghan, 1996). However, these findings do not consider the method of disclosure and are based on explicit measures (i.e., traditional self-report questions) and not on implicit measures that are specialized techniques used to assess automatic changes in the associative structure of memory (DeCoster & al., 2006; Gawronski and Bodenhausen, 2006, 2007). Yet, implicit attitudes have been shown to respond differently to counterattitudinal information. In particular, implicit attitudes seem harder to reverse than their self-reported counterparts (Gregg, Seibt, and Banaji, 2006; Petty & al., 2006).

This research investigates if disclosing ambush marketing tactics once a positive attitude toward the ambusher is formed actually harms ambushers. More precisely, in two experiments we study the change of implicit and explicit attitude toward ambush sponsors
after disclosure of the ambush tactic in the context of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games. We also compare the relative effectiveness of the two most common types of disclosure: news article and advertisement.

1. Theoretical background

1.1 Ambush marketing disclosure as a sponsorship protection strategy

Associating a brand with an event through sponsorship is a major brand leveraging tool (Cornwell, 2008; Fleck-Dousteyssier, 2007; Walliser, 2003). Yet, limited sponsorship opportunities for major events and high sponsorship fees have spurred on a new kind of association with events: ambush marketing. According to Sandler and Shani (1989, p. 11), “Ambush Marketing is a planned effort by an organization to associate itself indirectly with an event in order to gain at least some of the recognition and benefits that are associated with being an official sponsor”. It represents one of the biggest threats to the future of major sport events (IOC, 2010). Therefore, sponsors and event organizers have developed strategies against ambushers. The first strategy is to pursue legal action against ambushers. However, anti-ambushing legislation is clearly not enough to avoid ambushing attempts (McKelvey and Grady, 2008). The second counter-ambushing strategy is ad campaigns stressing that ambushers harm the event (Meenaghan 1996) and the third, and most common, strategy is disclosing ambush attempts through public relations activities such as press releases and press conferences with the goal that numerous news articles describing the ambush practice and naming the ambusher be published (Humphreys & al., 2010).

Few studies have examined the effects of disclosing ambush marketing and only one relied on laboratory experiments (Humphreys & al., 2010). However, their study is concerned about memory effects only. According to Meenaghan (1998), audiences perceive ambushers poorly once they have been made aware of the distinction between sponsors and ambushers.
Recently, Mazodier, Quester and Chandon (in press) have shown that ambush disclosure negatively influences perceived integrity, affective response and purchase intentions for the ambusher. However, these results do not consider the specific strategy of disclosure used and are limited to explicit measures.

1.2 Implicit and explicit attitudes change

The study of attitude change has for long depended solely on self-reported, direct (or explicit) measures of attitudes (e.g., Petty and Wegener, 1998). The development of implicit measures has challenged the classic view of attitude change that assumes that the old attitude is replaced with a new one (Petty & al., 2006). Implicit measures are specialized techniques that rely on respondents’ non-declarative responses, instead reflecting particular associations automatically activated when encountering a relevant stimulus. These measures use diverse methodologies but most often rely on response latency such as the evaluative priming tasks (e.g., Fazio & al., 1995). In this research we focus on attitude change and contrast explicit with implicit attitudes.

Several proponents of dual-process theories of reasoning suggest that explicit and implicit attitudes reflect outcomes of two different systems of reasoning (Gawronski and Bodenhausen, 2006, 2007; Smith and DeCoste, 2000; Strack and Deutsch, 2004; Wilson, Lindsey, and Schooler, 2000). According to Gawronski and Bodenhausen (2006), implicit attitudes can be conceived as automatic evaluative reactions based on associative processes (i.e. the memory associations automatically activated when one encounters the attitude object) whereas explicit attitudes can be conceived as evaluative judgments about an attitude object and are based on propositional reasoning (i.e., higher order reflective processes).

The former operates by using paired associations based on similarity and contiguity. Learning is based on the slow accumulation of information over time that forms or transforms
connectionist representations. Importantly, associative processes are independent of the assignment of truth value. That is, associations can be activated independently of whether a person considers the evaluation implied by those associations as accurate (see also Devine, 1989). The second system of reasoning is a fast learning rule-based system that relies on logical, verbal, or symbolic representations. During such propositional reasoning, the validity of evaluations and beliefs is determined by assessing their consistency with other relevant propositions. The evaluation implied by the propositional process is thus dependent on truth values.

Implicit and explicit attitudes are thought to reflect these two different systems by which information is processed. Consistently with this view, researchers have shown that implicit and explicit attitudes are differentially sensitive to different kinds of information (e.g. conscious versus unconscious, Rydell & al., 2006). Yet, the two systems are not mutually independent. According to the associative-propositional evaluation (APE) model developed by Gawronski and Bodenhäusen (2006, 2007) associative processes often influence propositional processes in that associations automatically activated in memory often provide the basis for evaluative judgments (i.e. explicit attitudes). This is the case, unless other propositions that are considered for the judgment at hand (e.g. factual beliefs) are inconsistent with the automatic evaluative reaction (i.e. implicit attitude). In which case, the respondent will modify its explicit attitude accordingly (Gawronski and LeBel, 2008). Propositional processes can also influence associative processes. This is the case when propositional reasoning activates new evaluative associations or confirms existing evaluative associations. This can explain why abstract supposition, a prototypical example of propositional learning, is as effective as associative learning (e.g. associative conditioning) to form evaluative associations (i.e. implicit attitude) toward novel objects (Gregg, Seibt and Banaji, 2006). However, propositional processes should leave existing implicit attitudes unchanged when
propositional reasoning implies a negation of an existing evaluation because truth-value cannot be assigned associatively (Deutsch, Gawronski and Strack, 2006).

2. Overview of the current research

In this research, we assess the change in explicit and implicit attitudes toward an ambushing brand following the disclosure of the ambushing tactic. Based on the previous discussion, we predict that the most common tactic currently used – disclosure by news articles – will negatively influence explicit attitude toward the ambush sponsor but will leave implicit attitude unchanged. The rationale is that textual information explaining ambush practices and describing an ambush attempt should mainly generate propositional learning (Epstein and Pacini, 1999; Gregg, Seibt and Banaji, 2006; Sloman, 1996). Such articles often rely on propositional negations by explicitly stating that a given brand tried to masquerade as an official sponsor. Because the validation process of negating a proposition cannot be performed associatively, it should leave implicit attitude unchanged (Deutsch, Gawronski and Strack, 2006). We test this prediction in experiment 1.

Because implicit attitudes are sensitive to associative processing, we suggest that it should be possible to change implicit attitude toward an ambush sponsor through a counter-ambushing strategy that relies on ad campaigns using visuals that can be processed by the associative system. In this case, the implicit attitude should provide the basis for the explicit attitude, which should, therefore, also be influenced by this type of counter-ambushing strategy. We test these predictions in experiment 2. In this experiment, we also assess the sensitivity of both explicit and implicit attitudes to ad repetition.

3. Experiment 1: Ambush disclosure by news article
Experiment 1 tests our prediction that disclosing an ambush attempt using a press article is only effective in changing explicit attitude toward the ambusher, but not implicit attitude.

3.1 Method
86 undergraduate students (55 male) at a European business school took part in this experiment as part of a course requirement. The experiment was a 3 (no ambush disclosure, ambush disclosure by news article, immediate ambush disclosure by news article) pretest-posttest between subject design. Because our prediction concerning implicit attitude is based on a null result (i.e., no change in implicit attitude between pretest and posttest), we decided to include a condition of immediate disclosure at the beginning of the experiment to illustrate that implicit attitude toward an ambush sponsor is sensitive to this kind of manipulation.

Stimuli. We tested our prediction in the context of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games. We used an unknown target brand, Beifa, as ambush sponsor.

Procedure. The first task was a classical conditioning procedure designed to establish initial explicit and implicit positive attitude toward the target brand Beifa. Participants were told that they were going to see a slideshow with several pictures taken during the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games (e.g. known athletes, opening ceremony in the “bird’s nest national stadium”) as well as print ads displayed during the Games (including three ads for Beifa). The advertising stimuli for Beifa (see Appendix B) aimed to deceive participants by giving the impression that Beifa was an Olympic sponsor, a common practice for ambush sponsors (Meenaghan 1996).

As a second task, participants had to indicate from a list of 10 brands (including the previous brands) which ones were official sponsors of the 2008 Games. We then assessed implicit and
explicit attitudes (in this order\(^1\)) toward Beifa. Implicit attitude was assessed with an evaluative priming measure (Fazio & al., 1986) (see below). The implicit attitude was always measured first, to avoid contamination of the implicit by the explicit measure.

Participants in the ‘ambush disclosure by news article’ condition then had to read an article dealing with ambush marketing. The article included an official announcement used by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) in 2006 to inform consumers about ambush marketing (see Appendix A), provided several examples of ambush practices during the 2008 Beijing Olympics and explicitly reported Beifa’s ambush marketing activities during this event. Importantly, the article used propositional negation that cannot be processed associatively. Participants were also asked to provide a short summary of this article. Participants in the control condition (i.e. no ambush disclosure) were exposed to a neutral article of about the same length. Participants in the ‘immediate ambush disclosure’ condition were exposed to the news article disclosing the ambush practices of Beifa at the beginning of the experiment, before the slideshow presenting the ads for Beifa. After the first measure of implicit and explicit attitudes toward Beifa, these participants were exposed to the same neutral article than the control group. Finally, we reassessed implicit and explicit attitude (in this order) toward Beifa with the same measures as used previously.

**Implicit Measures.** We assessed participants’ implicit attitude toward Beifa with an implicit measure based on the Fazio & al. (1986) evaluative priming paradigm (for a description of this measure, see Appendix C).

**Explicit Measures.** Explicit attitudes toward the brands were assessed using a three items semantic differential scale with seven points: bad/good, negative/positive and pleasant/unpleasant.

\(^1\) It can nevertheless be noted that, in their meta-analysis, Hofmann et al. (2005) did not obtain any effect of the order of explicit and implicit measures. Moreover,
3.2 Results

Manipulation checks. All but two participants (leaving 84 participants for data analysis) believed that Beifa was an official sponsor and correctly understood the articles provided.

Explicit attitude formation. We computed participants’ initial explicit attitude toward Beifa by averaging the three self-report attitude measures taken after the exposure to the slideshow ($\alpha = .98$). Participants in the immediate disclosure condition had more negative attitudes toward Beifa (M\text{ImDisc} = 2.77) than those in the no disclosure condition (M\text{NoDisc} = 4.96, F(1, 81) = 36.84, p < .001) and in the disclosure condition (M\text{Disc} = 4.83, F(1, 81) = 33.64, p < .001).

Implicit attitude formation. We used the procedure from Fazio & al. (1995) to analyze the data. The higher the value, the more positive was the participant’s implicit attitude. Participants in the immediate disclosure condition had more negative implicit attitudes toward Beifa (M\text{ImDisc} = -.41) compared to those in the no disclosure condition (M\text{NoDisc} = .42, F(1, 81) = 36.72, p < .001) and in the disclosure condition (M\text{Disc} = .34, F(1, 81) = 30.58, p < .001). We also obtained (all p’s < .001) that 1) both positive explicit and implicit attitudes toward Beifa were formed when learning was based on a classical conditioning procedure that mainly relied on associative processes and that 2) both negative explicit and implicit attitudes toward Beifa were formed when learning was based on a news article that mainly relied on propositional processes.

Explicit attitude change. In order to assess change in explicit attitude, we computed participants’ final explicit attitude toward Beifa by averaging the three self-report attitude measures taken at the end of the experimental protocol ($\alpha = .97$). We then computed difference scores between final and initial explicit attitudes toward Beifa. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the difference scores indicates that the magnitude of explicit attitude change was dependent on experimental condition (F(2, 81) = 15.14, p < .001). The magnitude
of change was significantly greater in the disclosure condition (M_{changeDisc} = -1.64) than in the no disclosure (M_{changeNoDisc} = -.20, F(1, 81) = 21.81, p < .001) and the immediate disclosure (M_{changeImDisc} = -.14, F(1, 81) = 22.75, p < .001) conditions. Before-after analysis show that explicit attitude toward Beifa decreased significantly in the disclosure condition (F(1, 29) = 46.24, p < .001) but remained unchanged in the no disclosure condition and immediate disclosure condition (both F < 1.44) (see Figure 1). Because an ANOVA on the final explicit attitude toward Beifa revealed a main effect of experimental condition (F(2, 81) = 21.85, p < .001) we performed post hoc comparisons (using Tuckey’s HSD) that showed that final explicit attitude toward Beifa did not differ significantly between the disclosure and immediate disclosure conditions (p = .22) and also that both attitudes were significantly lower than in the no disclosure condition (both p < .001) (Figure 1). Finally, it can be noted that participants in the disclosure and immediate disclosure conditions had a final explicit attitude significantly lower than the scale midpoint (i.e., four), and in the no disclosure conditions participants had a final explicit attitude significantly higher than the scale midpoint (all p’s < .001).

In sum, participants in the disclosure condition reversed their initial explicit attitude toward Beifa after disclosure, whereas participants in the no disclosure and immediate disclosure conditions retained their initial explicit attitudes.

![Figure 1. Explicit attitude toward the ambusher “BEIFA”](image-url)
*Implicit attitude change.* We computed difference scores between final and initial implicit attitudes toward Beifa. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the difference scores indicates that the magnitude of implicit attitude change was not significantly different between experimental conditions \((F(2, 81) < 1)\). Before-after analysis show that implicit attitude toward Beifa remained unchanged in all the conditions \((all\ F < 1.08)\) (see Figure 2). Finally, because an ANOVA on the final implicit attitude toward Beifa revealed a main effect of experimental condition \((F(2, 81) = 24.36, p < .001)\) we performed post hoc comparisons (using Tuckey’s HSD). This showed the final implicit attitude toward Beifa did not differ significantly between the no disclosure and disclosure conditions \((p = .92)\) and that these two attitudes were significantly higher than in the immediate disclosure condition \((both\ p < .001)\) (Figure 2). It can also be noted that participants in the disclosure and no disclosure conditions had a final implicit attitude significantly higher than the scale midpoint \((i.e.\ zero)\) and that in the immediate disclosure conditions participants had a final implicit attitude significantly lower than the scale midpoint \((all\ p’s < .001)\). In sum, participants in the disclosure condition did not change their initial implicit attitude after disclosure by news article.

![Figure 2. Implicit attitude toward the ambusher “BEIFA”](image)

### 3.3 Discussion
Results of experiment 1 illustrate that the most common tactic used by sponsored events to fight ambush marketing – disclosure by news articles – is effective to negatively influence existing explicit attitudes toward ambusher, yet leaves implicit attitudes largely unchanged. This is the case although participants did summarize the article satisfactorily. These results are thus consistent with dual-process models that suggest that already established implicit attitudes are resistant to change by propositional processes.

4. Experiment 2: Ambush disclosure with drawings

In experiment 2 we test the prediction that explicit attitudes and, more importantly, implicit attitudes toward an ambusher can be reversed when disclosure is done with ads that can be processed by the associative system. Instead of using complete (visual & copy) ads we decided to focus only on the visual part of ads by using drawings. The logic for focusing on the visual is that it is a source of information that can often be processed by the associative system (Sloman 1996; Epstein and Pacini 1999). In this experiment, the ambushing brand was personified in the visuals (i.e. the brand was represented as a person). The literature on person impression formation suggests that spontaneous inferences concerning impressions of other people are usual and that such inferences are implicitly linked to actors by mere association (Uleman 1999). Implicit attitudes should thus be influenced by these spontaneous inferences. In this experiment, we also test the prediction that explicit attitudes toward the ambusher change quickly and are insensitive to the number of drawing repetitions whereas implicit attitudes toward the ambusher change more slowly and decrease with an increase in the number of drawing repetitions.

4.1 Method
71 students and employee (37 males; average age 27 years; 41 students) at a European business school took part in this experiment in exchange for an 8 € Amazon.com gift certificate. The experiment was a 3 (no ambush disclosure, ambush disclosure with 3 drawings, ambush disclosure with 6 drawings) pretest-posttest between subject design.

**Stimuli and procedure.** The stimuli and procedure were identical to the one used in experiment 1 except that ambush disclosure was not done with a press article but with drawings. Participants were told that the IOC was about to launch an ad campaign to prevent ambushers such as Beifa. They were told that they will be presented with drawings representing the visuals of rough print ads used for testing the IOC ad campaign. Based on a pretest, we selected three drawings that most spontaneously conveyed the same message as the press article used in experiment 1 (see Appendix D for an example). In particular, the victim status of the IOC and the ambusher status of Beifa were spontaneously inferred from the drawings (Uleman, 1999) and did not require strategic processing. Participants in the disclosure conditions were exposed to 3 or to 6 (2 exposures to each) drawings. The no disclosure condition was identical to experiment 1.

**Implicit and explicit measures.** Implicit and Explicit attitudes toward Beifa were assessed using the same measures as in experiment 1.

### 4.2 Results

**Manipulation checks.** All but one participant (leaving 70 participants) were correctly deceived.

**Explicit attitude formation.** We computed participants’ initial explicit attitude toward Beifa by averaging the three self-report attitude measures taken after the exposure to the slideshow ($\alpha = .95$). The initial explicit attitude toward Beifa did not differ between the three
experimental conditions (F < 1). Also, Participants’ explicit attitude toward Beifa was significantly higher than the scale midpoint (i.e. four) (F(1, 69) = 11.90, p < .001).

*Implicit attitude formation.* The initial implicit attitude toward Beifa did not differ between the three experimental conditions (F < 1). Participants’ implicit attitude toward Beifa was significantly higher than zero (i.e. the neutral point) (F(1, 69) = 52.27, p < .001). Thus, like in experiment 1, both positive explicit and implicit attitudes toward Beifa were formed when learning was based on a classical conditioning procedure that mainly relied on associative processes.

*Explicit attitude change.* An ANOVA on the difference scores indicates that the magnitude of explicit attitude change depended on experimental condition (F(2, 67) = 8.90, p < .001). Planned comparisons indicate that the magnitude of change was significantly greater in the disclosure with 3 drawings condition (M_{changeDisc 3drawings} = -2.08) and disclosure with 6 drawings condition (M_{changeDisc 6drawings} = -1.97) compared to the no disclosure condition (M_{changeNoDisc} = -.33, F(1, 67) = 14.59, p < .001 and F(1, 67) = 12.32, p < .001 respectively).

Before-after analysis show that explicit attitude toward Beifa decreased significantly in the disclosure with 3 (F(1, 24) = 37.45, p < .001) and 6 drawings conditions (F(1, 22) = 23.14, p < .001) but, unexpectedly, also in the no disclosure condition (F(1, 21) = 5.62, p = .03) (see Figure 3). However, in the no disclosure condition participants’ final explicit attitude toward Beifa was not significantly different from the scale midpoint (i.e., a neutral attitude) (F < 1) whereas in the disclosure conditions participants had a clearly negative explicit attitude toward Beifa (F(1, 24) = 72.59, p < .001 and F(1, 22) = 32.04, p < .001 respectively for the disclosure with 3 and 6 drawings).

Overall, participants in the disclosure with 3 or 6 drawings condition reversed their initial explicit attitude toward Beifa after disclosure, whereas participants in the no disclosure condition kept a neutral explicit attitude toward Beifa.
Implicit attitude change. An ANOVA on the difference scores indicates that the magnitude of implicit attitude change depended on experimental condition ($F(2, 67) = 3.06$, $p = .05$). Planned comparisons indicate that the magnitude of change was marginally greater in the disclosure with 3 drawings condition ($M_{\text{changeDisc 3drawings}} = -0.45$) and significantly greater in the disclosure with 6 drawings condition ($M_{\text{changeDisc 6drawings}} = -0.59$) compared to the no disclosure condition ($M_{\text{changeNoDisc}} = -0.07, F(1, 67) = 3.24, p = .08$ and $F(1, 67) = 5.66, p = .02$ respectively). Before-after analysis show that implicit attitude toward Beifa decreased significantly in the disclosure with 3 ($F(1, 24) = 9.24, p < .01$) and 6 drawings conditions ($F(1, 22) = 10.63, p < .01$) but not in the no disclosure condition ($F < 1$) (see Figure 4).

In sum, participants in both disclosure conditions did significantly decrease their initial implicit attitude toward Beifa after ambush disclosure by drawings.
**Speed of explicit and implicit attitudes change.** We conducted a 2 (ranked transformed final attitude score: final explicit attitude, final implicit attitude) x 3 (disclosure condition: no disclosure, disclosure with 3 drawings, disclosure with 6 drawings) repeated measure ANCOVA (with the former factor within subject), using ranked transformed initial attitudes as covariates (Conover and Iman, 1982). Using parametric ANCOVA on the ranked pretest and posttest scores has been advocated when the data violate the homogeneity of within-groups regression coefficients (Bonate, 2000). The results revealed the predicted two-way interaction (F(2, 65) = 3.32, p = .04). We thus examined the simple effect of disclosure condition for explicit and implicit attitudes separately.

Explicit attitudes were examined with a one-way ANCOVA of disclosure condition (using initial explicit attitude as the covariate). Although explicit attitudes did show a significant linear trend (F(1, 66) = 15.39, p < .001), it also deviated significantly from linearity as a quadratic trend significantly predicted explicit attitudes (F(1, 66) = 17.12, p < .001). Thus a linear trend does not best account for the explicit attitude data pattern (see Figure 3).

Implicit attitudes were examined with a one-way ANCOVA of disclosure condition (using initial implicit attitude as the covariate). Implicit attitudes did show a significant linear trend (F(1, 66) = 32.09, p < .001) but the quadratic trend was not significant (F(1, 66) = 1.82, p = .18). Thus a decreasing linear trend does best account for the implicit attitude data pattern, as is evident in Figure 4. Moreover, implicit attitudes toward Beifa were marginally lower in the disclosure condition with 6 drawings compared to 3 drawings (F(1, 66) = 3.24, p = .07).

In sum, whereas explicit attitudes toward Beifa were not sensitive to the number of repetitions, implicit attitudes were.

**4.3 Discussion**
Results of experiment 2 illustrate that it is possible to reverse not only initially positive explicit attitudes, but also initially positive implicit attitudes toward an ambushing brand when disclosure is done with ads that can be processed by the associative system. However, consistently with predictions of dual-process models, implicit attitudes are slower to respond and need more repetitions of information to be reversed. In a third experiment, not presented here due to space constraints, we show that disclosure by press release makes no difference (from no disclosure) in consumers’ likelihood of choosing ambusher’s products when consumers are under time pressure during choice (see also Friese, Wanke, and Plessne 2006; Gibson 2008).

**Conclusion**

These results suggest that if an event organizer wants to create a negative attitude toward ambush sponsors, it is not enough to reveal ambushers’ practices: The specific strategy of disclosure needs to be considered. In particular, press articles are ineffective to change implicit attitudes toward ambushers. It is important to consider both explicit and implicit attitudes towards an object because they predict different types of behavior. Implicit attitudes predict subtle, spontaneous behaviors whereas explicit attitudes predict more deliberate or intentional behaviors (e.g. McConnell and Leibold 2001; Rydell and McConnell 2006).

Implications of this research are not limited to sponsorship and can be extended to research on corrective information in general and corrective advertising in particular (Darke, Ashworth and Ritchi, 2008). Our research suggests that common corrective advertising campaigns relying on textual information may be less effective that what existing studies imply.

Finally, our research also presents some limitations. In particular the generalization of findings is limited to a specific type of sport sponsorship and to a student population.
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Appendix A. IOC 2006 statement against ambush marketing.

OLYMPIC ATHLETES PROVIDE THE EXCITEMENT.

OLYMPIC SPONSORS PROVIDE THE SUPPORT.

TOGETHER, THEY PROVIDE THE DREAM.

However, some companies will claim to be Olympic sponsors or create the false impression that they are. Those that do are cheating the dream. By using Olympic emblems or imagery without authorization, or by presenting themselves as having an official association with the Olympic Games, these companies undermine the future of the Olympic Games.

Only Official Olympic Sponsors have the right to use Olympic emblems or imagery in their advertising. A right they have earned by providing the products, services and financial support that help make the Olympic Games possible.

With the Torino 2006 Olympic Winter Games fast approaching, show your support for companies that are Official Olympic Sponsors and Licensees. Thank you.

Worldwide Olympic Partners

Coca-Cola, GE, Kodak, IBM, Manulife, McDonalds, Omega, Panasonic, Samsung, Visa

Partners in Sport van NOC*NSF en het Nederlands Olympisch Team

DSM, Unilever, Randstad, Ernst & Young, Lotto

Suppliers: ATC, ASICS, Coca Cola, Achmea, Volkswagen, Nashua, NOS, Perry Sport, P&G, Nedlloyd, Pfizer, PIET ZOOMERS, Rabobank, Oxxio

www.olympic.org
Appendix B. Example of advertisement for Beifa.
Appendix C. Description of the evaluative priming procedure.

We asked participants to rate target words appearing on the center of the computer screen as being either good or bad, and reaction times were recorded. Before each word (i.e. each trial), we briefly presented a brand logo to assess its impact on response times. Participants were asked to evaluate the target words using their keyboard, by typing “k” if the word made them feel good or by typing “d” if the word made them feel bad. They were told to be “fast and accurate” and “to pay attention to the brands’ logos” because they will be questioned about these brands later. However they were supposed to do nothing on the basis of the logos. The rationale for this procedure is that if a person has a positive evaluation associated with a brand in memory, then seeing that brand logo should facilitate the identification of a subsequent positive stimulus as good and inhibit the identification of a subsequent negative stimulus as bad. Target words were partly drawn from the list of words used by Bargh & al. (1992) and partly from our own pretesting. For critical trials (i.e. trials on which logos of Beifa were the prime), only words that were clearly positive (e.g., holiday, friend, or love) or negative (e.g., failure, cancer, or suicide) were used. Some neutral words were also used in filler trials to reduce suspicion. On critical trials, logos of Beifa served as a prime six times: three times followed by a positive stimulus and three times followed by a negative stimulus. To reduce participants’ focus on the logos of Beifa, logos from the brands used in previous tasks (e.g. Nike, Mobi, Speedo …) were used as filler trials. This resulted in 48 filler trials. Target words for the priming trials were assigned randomly and subsequent critical trials were always separated by at least two filler trials. Before each trial a star was displayed on the center of the computer screen for 2.5 s. Following Fazio & al. (1995), all primes (i.e. brand logos) were presented for 315 ms, followed by a 135-ms interval before onset of the target word.
Appendix D. Example of drawing disclosing the ambusher “Beifa”.