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"It's no secret that Tiger Woods is a marketer's dream. No company has capitalized on the appeal of the good looking, clean-cut, articulate, scandal-free golf whiz more than Nike”

(DiCarlo, 2004)
Abstract

Many brands are using celebrities as spokespeople, to enhance the brand image. This investigation aims to research the effects of athlete endorsements on brand image, in particular, whether Nike has been affected by the change in Tiger Woods’ image due to his recent personal life difficulties. Firstly, whether the perceived brand image is concurrent with the brand’s identity, and if not then if the image gap could be caused by the brand’s association to Tiger Woods. The topic is very current as the number of athletes who drastically deviate from their image has increased, at the same time as athlete endorsements are very popular. If changes in the image of an endorser come to affect consumer perception of the brand, then one could assume that there would be a decline in such endorsements.

In investigating the research question, literature and articles regarding endorsements and brand associations was consulted to gain a deeper understanding of how associations work. Data regarding Nike was collected from secondary sources in order to form an accurate view of the company identity. This would be compared to data collected on consumer attitudes toward Nike and Tiger Woods using a questionnaire sent out to participants with a variety of characteristics so as to be able to see if there were differences in attitudes between segments.

It was found that there is an image gap between Nike’s desired image and its perceived image. However, the low number of respondents who claimed that their opinions of Nike had changed because of Tiger Woods suggests that his association to Nike is not to blame for the gap. Reasons discussed for the low level of transferability of Tiger Woods’ ‘new’ characteristics to Nike are that the fit between the brand and the athlete is good in the relevant categories, whereas they are irrelevant to the collaboration. Furthermore, the strength of the associations is seen as a factor – it is not strong enough to or too connected to Tiger Woods to transfer – as well as the respondent attributes and background. Finally, the attachment to Nike is seen as possibly a contributing factor, as people who own Nike seem to stay loyal to the brand despite the so called ‘Tigergate’.
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1. Introduction

The market today is filled to the brim with products, however, the abundance of substitutes and complimentary items available means that it is no longer solely the product that is the decisive factor for consumers but also the intangible messages connected to it. A product alone is no longer enough – customers usually look for that something extra that makes it stand out from the rest – the brand. The brand distinguishes a company from its competitors using the unique assets connected to the company, which therefore means that having a strong brand is extremely important (Ueltschy & Laroche, 2004, pp.91-92).

Using image and associations are probably the most widely recognised ways of building brands, and drawing on secondary associations such as the ones stemming from celebrity endorsers is a way of doing this with the hopes of creating strong, favourable and unique associations to the brand (Aaker, 1992, p.28) (Keller et al., 2008, pp.36-37). The image is how consumers perceive the identity, which is signalled through messages emanating from the company. These messages can come in the shape of people. Celebrities and athletes are frequently seen in advertisements endorsing all kinds of products, with companies aiming to generate awareness for the brand and increase the will to purchase their products. (Keller et al., 2008, p.320) The sportswear corporation Nike has one of the strongest brands in the world, and is famous for using celebrated athletes in its advertisements displaying what the brand is. Nike has a history of sponsoring athletes such as Michael Jordan and Tiger Woods, and a lot of the brand’s meaning has been acquired through repeated association with these endorsers, borrowing pieces of their images and adding to its own. (Goldman & Papson, 2000, pp.17, 25)

The success of the endorsement process builds on the star power of the sponsored athlete, and the fact that the right associations are transferred from the person to the brand – that the right message is sent and interpreted. In other words, the company only wants the desirable qualities of the endorsed athlete to translate to and enhance the brand’s image, trying to tie popular individuals to the brand. However, consumer perception of people is prone to change – sometimes rather rapidly. (Jones & Schumann, 2004, p.109) This aspect of changing consumer attitudes is particularly interesting in contemporary society, as the flow of information is mediated not only by traditional media such as the press, but also through new media like the internet and all the communicative opportunities
it provides. Thus, using outside entities as sources for secondary associations constitutes a major risk for companies, as they essentially relinquish control over one of their most valuable assets (Uggla, 2004, p.116).

For Nike, this has recently become a major issue with the emergence of stories of one of their endorsers’, Tiger Woods, private life. Reportedly Tiger Woods has had affairs with multiple women behind his wife’s back over the course of several years (Lamport-Stokes, 2010-04-27). These revelations contradicted his image as the, in the words of Goldman and Papson (2000, p. 114), ‘ultimate role model’. Prior to information regarding his indiscretions became public knowledge a full 92% of Tiger Woods’ earnings came from endorsements rather than sports achievements (Freedman, 2009). Mark Ritson (2010-04-15) states that brands chose Tiger Woods for his control, invulnerability and precision, and that his recent actions are in direct opposition to these associations, causing many of his sponsors to terminate their contracts. Amongst these were major sponsors Accenture and AT&T, as well as Gillette and Tag Heuer who scaled down their involvement with him (BBC, 2010-04-27). However, Nike decided to remain committed to Tiger Woods and in conjunction with the Masters tournament at Augusta National released a new advertisement featuring the golfer (Donegan, 2010-04-27).

Tiger Woods is not the only sports star that has fallen out of grace with his sponsors, many star athletes have had their contracts ended prematurely as a result of misbehaviour in their personal life. Michael Phelps smoked marijuana and had his deal with Kellogg’s terminated, and Kobe Bryant lost several deals because of rape charges in 2003. However, others have managed to get through such crises relatively unscathed, like John Terry who after reports of his indiscretion with his team-mate and friend’s wife surfaced in 2010 retained the majority of his endorsements (albeit losing his England captaincy). (Ritson, 2010-04-15) As stated earlier, companies are gambling when tying their brands to external sources, relying on the fact that the right associations transfer from the source to the brand. Nike is through basing their golf line on Woods heavily involved with the athlete, and has a multi-year contract with Woods worth $105 million. Further proof of the strong ties between the athlete and the brand is that Tiger is seen wearing Nike on almost all occasions; even in advertisements for other endorsers, meaning that, in the words of Interbrand chief
strategy officer Gary Singer, "Tiger is so closely associated with Nike that whether you see [other] brands or not, you think of Nike." (DiCarlo, 2004)

1.1 Aim and Research Objective
The aim of this investigation is to examine what happens with consumer perception of an endorsed brand when the athlete does something that may cause the associations to change. Specifically, does the possible change in Tiger Woods’ image affect how consumers perceive Nike?

Does the brand knowledge of Nike, with reference to personality and image associations, acquired from the endorsement of Tiger Woods impact consumer attitudes towards the brand?

This aim has three parts; firstly, to identify whether consumers have changed their opinion of Tiger. Secondly, whether this change has affected how they perceive Nike; do the new associations translate to the brand, or is it unaffected? Nike has a desired image – its identity – does the endorsement of Tiger Woods convey that accurately? And lastly, if the new associations affect the brand, then how, and if not then what could be the reasons for that?

1.2 Limitations
Whereas there are several areas of secondary associations, the scope of this investigation only allows for one of these to be investigated, which is why the focus will be on endorsements’ effects on consumer perception of the brand. Thus, while acknowledging that other forms of secondary associations may be of value, the author has chosen to focus exclusively on the associations created by an endorser. Further, the research question will be investigated in relation to the recent example of Tiger Woods, in order for participants of the study to be fully aware of the situation. This means that the results will be true for this particular case, and could be used as an indication for others, but it does not mean that results will be able to be used for generalisations in other instances as brands and associations are very dependent on the actors and the situation. Also, while the subject is applicable in all of the markets where Nike is present the time and resources available only permits for one market to be investigated. Therefore the research conducted in this paper is focused to Sweden.
1.3 Outline
After this introductory section a review of the relevant literature and theory will follow. Firstly, there will be a deeper discussion of the concept of brand equity and how it may be built. This will lead into the concept of brand knowledge, including brand awareness and image, and will be followed by a section on secondary brand associations and endorsements. Next, the effects of endorsements on consumer behaviour will present the working model, through which the collected data will be analysed. This leads into the methodology section, where the methods used will be explained and supported. After the methodology is explained there will be a presentation of the collected data, followed by a discussion of the results before arriving at a conclusion.


2. Literature Review

2.1 Brand Equity – The Value of a Brand

Firstly, what is a brand? One definition is that it is a set of mental associations that add to the perceived value of a product or service. They are intangible and conditional, as the brand in itself needs a product or service to carry it. The product or service is effectively the embodiment of the brand. (Kapferer, 2008, p.10)

Brand equity, according to Keller et al. (2008, p. 43), is the power generated by consumers’ associations, knowledge and experiences of a brand. This knowledge consists of a set of assets or liabilities that are connected to the brand which can add or subtract value from the value provided by a good or service (Aaker, 1992, p.28). According to Aaker (1992, p. 28) these assets are awareness, perceived quality, associations and differentiation, loyalty, and ‘other assets’ (such as price and distribution, patents, and trademarks) and can be categorised into product related assets or non-product related assets (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.54). All things similar, the brand adds value when consumers consciously choose a product with the brand name over the same product without the brand. In other words, the knowledge a consumer has of a brand creates equity if it leads to greater consumer preference. (Batra et al., 1996, p.318) Consumers’ perception of product performance may be influenced by their perception of the brand. Thus, it is essentially what resides in the minds of consumers that constitute the brand’s value – which makes it imperative that consumers have the right type of experiences and feelings toward the brand. The stronger, more favourable and unique associations that consumers have toward a brand the more powerful it will be. (Keller et al., 2008, pp.43-49)

2.2 Brand Knowledge

Brand knowledge can be characterised by two broad components (which include the above mentioned categories described by Aaker) – awareness and image. To form an opinion of a brand, the first step is to be aware of its existence. However, awareness in itself is rarely enough to create sustainable equity for a brand. The image is made up of consumers’ associations with the brand, which helps them create a meaning of it (Keller et al., 2008, pp.47, 49). The two components of brand knowledge are depicted in Figure 1, and discussed in the following sections.
2.2.1 Brand Awareness

That awareness is important for ubiquity is hardly an overstatement. Consumers tend to feel more secure with, and place more faith in, well-known rather than less recognised brands – if they are aware of the brand then chances are that others are too (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.54) (Kapferer, 2008, p.21). The stronger the awareness of the brand is in the mind of a consumer, the greater the likelihood that he or she will purchase it and in the future become a loyal customer (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.54). Without at least some awareness, it is difficult for companies to establish an image (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.151). Its role in consumers’ decision making process is threefold; it allows them to learn about brand associations, it places it in the ‘consideration set’ of brands possible for purchase, and it provides consumers with an additional alternative when they lack...
motivation or knowledge of a product – prompting them to select the most well-known brand (Keller et al., 2008, p.50).

2.2.1.1 Aspects of Brand Awareness
Brand awareness can be categorised into two parts – brand recall and brand recognition (Keller et al., 2008, p.49) (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.150). Brand recall is when a person remembers the brand without help from external sources; for example, if the mind automatically jumps to ‘Coca Cola’ when being asked about soda (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.150). As Keller et al. (2008, p. 49) so accurately put it, ‘it relates to consumers’ ability to retrieve the brand from memory’ when given, for example, the product category or the needs it would satisfy. Awareness at this level affects which brands are considered in advance and thus influences selection (Aaker, 1992, p.30). Thus brand recall is important when the decision to purchase is made in settings away from the point of purchase (Keller et al., 2008, p.49).

Contrary to recall, brand recognition is not only about giving cues, but subjecting consumers to images of a brand. It describes a situation when a consumer recognises the brand and can identify it based on previous exposure. This requires that the consumer has seen the brand before and has enough recognition of it to make the connection between symbol and company. Recognition is most valuable for brands when the purchase decision is made ‘on the spot’, facing a choice of visible names, logos and packaging. (Keller et al., 2008, p.49) (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, pp.150-51)

2.2.1.2 Creation of Brand Awareness
Awareness is created through increasing familiarity with the brand through repetitive marketing efforts (Keller et al., 2008, p.51). However, there is a difference between stimulating brand recall and recognition. While recognition can be induced through exposure to the brand elements (such as the brand logo, packaging and its colours and formats), recall is best prompted through a repetition of the association between the product category and the brand. (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.151) It is important to include as many brand elements as possible in the marketing efforts as it gives consumers many alternative routes for arriving at the end station – recognising the brand (Keller et al., 2008, p.51).
2.2.2 Brand Image

The second part of brand knowledge is image. As can be derived from Figure 1, the brand image is based on the associations people have towards brands; the strength of the brand depends on the precedence and positivity of these associations in consumers’ minds (Keller et al., 2008, p.52) (Batra et al., 1996, p.319) (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.17) (Varey, 2002, p.152). It is thus important for companies to try to control what kind of associations can be made from the signals that they are projecting, which is why it is imperative for a company to have a clear brand identity. The identity is essentially how a company sees itself, how it defines its self-image, meaning and aim. Simply put, the identity originates from within the company, whereas the image is formed externally by the consumers based on their interpretation of the messages sent out regarding the brand. (Kapferer, 2008, p.174) This relationship is described in the figure on the following page.

![Brand Identity and Image](image)

**Figure 2 – Brand Identity and Image, adapted from Kapferer, 2008, p. 174**

To avoid the occurrence of an image gap between the brand identity and image it is important that the signals emanating from the company are congruent and clear, limiting the number of possible perceptions and therefore preventing confusion (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007, p.17).

According to Keller (1993), there are three different types of brand associations – attributes, benefits and attitudes (see Figure 1, p.11). Firstly, attributes refer to the descriptive characterisations of a product or service; secondly, the benefits are the personal
values that consumers attach to the attributes; and lastly, the attitude is the consumer’s overall appreciation or evaluation of a brand. Thus, a lot of how a brand is perceived hinges on the attributes. Attributes can be split into two categories – product related and non-product related (Keller et al., 2008, p.53). Fundamentally, the product related attributes refer to the physical aspects of a product or service, whereas the non-product related attributes are external views on the good or service in relation to its purchase or consumption. Included in this category are price, product appearance information, user imagery and usage imagery. (Keller, 1993, p.4) Importantly, he states that the view of the typical user (user imagery) and the user situation (usage imagery) helps build and constitute the brand personality, something that is reaffirmed by Batra et al. (1996, p. 321), and which is a concept that will be discussed in the next section.

2.2.2.1 Brand Personality
Just as humans have certain traits that together comprise their personality, the associations that brands have with particular characters, symbols, endorsers or lifestyles comprise their personality (Batra et al., 1996, p.321). The brand personality is defined as the ‘set of human characteristics associated with a brand’, and is seen as a more symbolic function than the product related attributes discussed above. It is useful to brands as it evokes feelings with consumers and can increase consumer preference and usage, as well as fostering trust and loyalty with the brand. (Aaker, 1997, p.347)

Like a person, a brand can be seen in many different lights. According to Aaker (1997), brand personality consists of five dimensions: sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness. These are displayed in the table on the following page.
For example, Marlboro would be a brand characterised by ruggedness, building on being masculine and strong symbolised by a cowboy, whereas Mercedes could be seen as having a sophisticated personality (Aaker, 1997, p.363) (Solomon, 2007, p.72). According to social congruence theory consumers look to brands to enhance their self-image, and thus seek brands that are congruent with their selves or their ideal selves (Solomon, 2007, pp.161-62). Thus, the self concept is in a manner of speaking defined by what consumers buy and surround themselves with (Solomon, 2007, p.187), and the self image is created through the relationship and attitude consumers have to brands (Kapferer, 2008, p.186) (Keller et al., 2008, p.420) (Grubb & Grathwohl, 1967, p.24).

As mentioned earlier, personality is shaped by advertising the imagery associated to the brand (such as Marlboro’s cowboy), the people using it and in which situations it is used. This could refer to either observing people using things in their daily life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Image</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Down to earth</td>
<td>Family-oriented, conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Sincere, real, ethical, thoughtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>Genuine, classic, old fashioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>Warm, sentimental, happy, friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>Trendy, exciting, provocative, flashy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>Cool, young, lively, adventurous, outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Unique, humorous, surprising, fun, artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to date</td>
<td>Independent, contemporary, innovative, aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Hard-working, secure, efficient, trustworthy, careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Technical, serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Leader, confident, influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>Glamorous, good-looking, pretentious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>Feminine, smooth, gentle, sexy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>Masculine, active, athletic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>Rugged, strong, no-nonsense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Brand Personality Factors (Varey, 2002, p.155)
or having somebody endorse the product to appear alongside it. However, word of mouth information and media reports are also important for creating a personality – things that are not always in the company’s control. (Batra et al., 1996, p.322) Aaker (1997, p. 348), suggests that direct as well as indirect contact with the brand will shape how the consumer appreciates its personality. In fact, many things that the company cannot entirely control are determinants of how the personality of the brand will be perceived and the image will be construed (Keller et al., 2008, p.287). The easiest way of creating brand personality is through giving the brand a famous spokesperson or figurehead, whether real or fictional (Kapferer, 2008, p.164).

2.2.3 Secondary Brand Associations
Brand knowledge, as described in the previous section, can not only be generated by the associations created by a company but also be formed by secondary brand associations. Brands may be linked to other entities, with their own knowledge structures, which may cause consumers to assume that what is true for the other entity must also be true for the brand. (Keller et al., 2008, p.287) These entities may be, for example, companies, countries, co-brands, celebrities (through endorsement) or events (through sponsorship). Secondary brand knowledge can be used to create strong, favourable and unique associations to a brand and is most likely going to affect consumers in situations when there is a lack of motivation or ability to judge product related questions (Keller et al., 2008, pp.287, 289). However, it is a strategically risky move as it places some control of the brand image in the hands of an outsider (Keller et al., 2008, p.291).

In order for equity to be derived from such an association, it is important that people are aware of the other entity and to know whether knowledge of it will affect the perception of the brand through association. In other words, the usefulness of a secondary association depends on 1) awareness of the entity, 2) the knowledge previously held toward the entity, and 3) the transferability of this knowledge. However, it is generally likely that feelings or judgements about an entity transfers, rather than the specific desired associations which may be too strongly linked to the entity itself to be transferred. Thus it is difficult to manage the transfer process so that only the relevant secondary knowledge becomes linked with the brand. Also, the knowledge of the entity may change over time and
the new feelings, judgements or associations may not be beneficial to the brand. (Keller et al., 2008, pp.289-91)

2.3 Endorsements
One way of creating secondary brand knowledge is to use celebrity endorsers (Keller et al., 2008, p.330). It is a means for the brand of communicating its identity to consumers, and to differentiate themselves from their competitors (Roll, 2010-04-17) (Erdogan & Drollinger, 2008, p.573). A famous person, such as a celebrity or an athlete, draws consumers’ attention to a brand and helps forming their perception of it based on assumptions made in regards to the knowledge of the endorser. Thus, for the strategy to be viable the celebrity chosen must be well enough known to be able to contribute in improving awareness and image of the brand. (Keller et al., 2008, p.330)

2.3.1 Identification – Why People Buy Endorsed Brands
The premise of endorsements is to make consumers buy products or brands through influence from other people. One of the main aspects of celebrity endorsement is the process of identification – where a person adopts the behaviour of someone else because he or she aspires to be like that person. In other words, companies aim to appeal to fans of athletes or celebrities and provide them with a way to be like their idol. (Bailey et al., 2004, p.135) For example, consulting firm Accenture signed Tiger Woods as an endorser in 2003 and developed the slogan ‘Go on, be a Tiger’, building on characteristics associated with Tiger Woods’ personality (Stelter, 2009). According to McCracken (1989), celebrity endorsers are more effective than anonymous endorsers in bringing personality and lifestyle to the endorsement process.

Identification is an important aspect for people in creating their selves. The self-concept is the result of the ideas that a person has about him- or herself, and how they value these ideas. Within this concept there is a distinction between the actual self and the ideal self; where the actual self is a more grounded appreciation of who a person is whereas the ideal self is a conception of who a person would like to be. The ideal self is partly shaped by cultural norms, and therefore relates to the advertisements depicting successful individuals. Thus, purchasing an item or a brand endorsed by a ‘perfect’ person might make a person believe that he or she is one step closer to attaining the ideal self constructed in
their minds. (Solomon, 2007, p.157) Celebrity endorsements aim to promote the opportunity for regular people to be like them, substituting the question ‘Who am I?’ for ‘Who could I become if I am associated with you?’ Being associated with the ‘right’ thing or person reaffirms a person’s sense of identity. (Varey, 2002, p.34)

2.3.2 What Benefits can be derived from Endorsement Agreements?

According to Batra et al. (1996), there are three types of benefits that can be accessed through the use of a famous endorser. First, as previously mentioned, celebrity endorsement of a product or a brand has the potential to increase awareness about it (Batra et al., 1996, p.401). However, questions arise as to who benefits most from the advertisement – the celebrity or the brand. The brand may find that the celebrity receives the majority of the attention generated by the ad, and that consumers fail to grasp the intended message about the brand. (Keller et al., 2008, p.334) (Rossiter & Percy, 1998, p.261) There is also a risk that the ad is seen more as entertainment than an actual advertising message (Jones & Schumann, 2004, p.109).

Secondly, celebrities can generate a positive attitude toward the brand and its products (Batra et al., 1996, p.401). This is highly dependent on the credibility of the spokesperson; one would, for example, be more likely to trust former basketball player Michael Jordan praising healthy breakfast cereal, drawing on a healthy athlete image, than if he talked about something completely unrelated to his area of expertise (Rossiter & Percy, 1998, p.262). The concept of credibility of an endorser will be discussed further in a forthcoming section of this essay.

The third potential benefit of using famous endorsers is that the personality characteristics of an endorser can become associated with the brand’s imagery (Batra et al., 1996, p.401). Athletes are very useful endorsers as their personal brands often symbolise attributes such as success, confidence and special talent – attributes that many brands would like to be associated with (Jones & Schumann, 2004, p.108). According to Carlson and Donovan (2008, p. 154), approximately 60 percent of the celebrity endorsed advertisements feature athletes, and nearly 10 percent of advertising expenditure can be attributed to the endorsers’ salaries.
2.3.3 Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Endorsements – Credibility, Compatibility and Risk

Though there are benefits that can be reaped from using endorsements, they are only accessed if the endorsements are performed efficiently. This implies selecting an appropriate celebrity for the brand in question, ensuring that the qualities of the person are concurrent with the characteristics of the brand. Also, it requires a certain degree of credibility; that the spokesperson actually means what he or she is saying. (Keller et al., 2008, p.334) The questions of credibility and congruency between the endorser and the brand are discussed below.

In order for the endorser to successfully deliver the message he or she must be perceived by consumers as credible. The traditional view held by researchers is that the endorser is seen as the source of the message, rather than the more modern perspective that he or she is more of a conveyer of information. Regardless, the perceived power, prestige and expertise, as well as the attractiveness and general trustworthiness of the endorser, all factor in how credible consumers find an endorser. (Batra et al., 1996, p.403)

Rossiter and Percy (1998, pp. 263-265), state that the two major components that comprise credibility are objectivity and expertise. Objectivity refers to the endorser’s reputation as a trustworthy and unbiased person, able to give a rational argument as to why he or she chooses a certain brand. Expertise, however, refers to the endorser’s perceived knowledge about the product and product category in question. Furthermore, many celebrities make the mistake of endorsing too many products, which leads consumers to perceive them as insincere and less reliable, simply driven more by monetary interests (Keller et al., 2008, p.334). To prevent this loss of faith, celebrities limit the number of brands that they endorse and choose only the brands that best fit and complement their own images (Parulekar & Raheja, 2006, p.162).

Several researchers have concluded that that there is a need for a certain level of congruency between the image of the celebrity and the image of the brand for endorsements to be successful (Parulekar & Raheja, 2006, p.163). Fizel et al. (2008, p.252) call this the match-up hypothesis, according to which athletes would be considered most relevant for advertisements featuring sporting equipment, since that is where their knowledge logically resides. Therefore, the source of an individual’s celebrity is a factor in
what makes him or her appealing as an endorser for the brand (Carlson & Donovan, 2008, p.155). Not only is it important that the athlete and the product category match for the credibility of the endorsement, however, but also that the image of the endorser is compatible with the image of the brand. This is imperative as it allows for the right, or desired, associations to transfer from the person to the brand. Keller et al. (2008, p. 334) provides an example of a mismatch of person and brand in Bic using notorious two-day-stubble tennis ace John McEnroe as a spokesperson for their disposable razors.

A major concern for companies when signing external spokespeople is that they are leveraging their brand on something as unpredictable as a human being. Celebrities and athletes – famous people in general – can quickly both gain and lose popularity depending on events outside of the company’s control. (Keller et al., 2008, p.334) To prevent the inappropriate associations from transferring from the endorser to the brand, companies are making sure that they have a way to disaffiliate themselves from the endorser should it be necessary. (Augustine-Schlossinger, 2003)

2.4 Endorser and Brand Relationships
As has been stated in the above sections of this paper, the image of a brand is based on associations that can be drawn to it. Endorsers create such associations. The study conducted in this paper will investigate whether the image conveyed by these associations is concurrent with the brand identity. In other words, as companies desire their image to be a reflection of their identity, the endorser should convey the message of the identity in an unequivocal manner in order to create the desired image (see figure 3 below).

Thus, the personality traits of the endorser should be similar to those of the brand, as the endorser should work as an amplifier of these traits for the brand. Further, failing to
communicate these values would, logically, lead to an undesired, mediated perception of image, muddled with other associations, as per figure 4 below.

What happens if the undesired associations are transferred from the endorser to the brand? As stated earlier, it is difficult for the company to control which associations become connected to their brand. Unwanted imagery may reach it from the endorser, but does this affect the overall perception of the brand? In other words, does the desired image differ from the actual perceived image because of the endorser’s involvement? And how does the involvement affect consumer attitude towards the brand? The relationship between the brand, endorser and image is displayed in Figure 5 on the following page.

Figure 4 – If Brand Identity and the Endorser Associations are NOT Concurrent
Looking at Figure 5, this investigation adopts the modern view of the endorser as a conveyer of information (rather than the source), forwarding and strengthening the image of the brand to consumers. Therefore it is important that the knowledge of the messenger is in line with knowledge of the brand, to not result in the situation described in Figure 4. The message about the company must be clear as well as credible, which therefore includes the information and knowledge a person has about the messenger. Based on the collected knowledge of the endorser and the brand, consumers are then able to subjectively create an image of the brand. The ‘noise’ category refers to the other activities which may affect the shaping of the image, such as other advertising activities, CSR or press.
3. Method

3.1 Choice of Topic and Literature

The decision to focus on brands and consumer behaviour with regard to the brand image was made early, as was the choice to focus on endorser effects. In light of current events the topic has been debated a lot in media, focusing on the various scandals involving celebrities, and has led to several brands ending their support for the individuals who have strayed from their former image and personality. However, Nike – the brand specifically investigated in this paper – decided not to terminate their contract with Tiger Woods, despite the fact that he left his image far behind with his actions outside of his golfing career. Obviously a mighty brand such as Nike must have its reasons; however, people are discussing its continued involvement to the discredited star. This discussion is what originated the focus of the investigation – Nike still believes that its brand will not be affected negatively by its association to Tiger Woods (hence the continued support), however, the question is whether this belief is accurate or not. Do consumers separate their feelings regarding the person Tiger and the golfer Tiger, and associate Nike simply with the professional aspects? The answer to this question will provide valuable information for brands attached to celebrities that have strayed from and betrayed their images, and will either reaffirm the decision Nike has made to stay with Tiger, or question the validity of that decision.

The literature used in this investigation is primarily works by recognised brand specialists, such as David A. Aaker, Jean-Noël Kapferer and Kevin Keller. Additionally, articles have been found in reputable journals to ensure a high standard of the information gathered for the literature review. Furthermore, information pertaining to the case in question has been collected from newspapers, magazines and also, to some extent, blogs belonging to brand researchers or people with deep brand knowledge. As the topic is very current very little research has been found as to its effects on Tiger Woods, and indeed on Nike, in academic journals, which is why alternative kinds of sources have had to be consulted. This does not necessarily mean that they are of poor quality. The author has throughout the process of gathering information maintained a critical view on the sources, as well as on the information that they provide.
3.2 Choice of Method for Data Collection

The objective of this study is primarily to understand what people think and how they react, and then after having grasped the situation to make an attempt at explaining it using the theories discussed in the literature review. Such an investigation is called a descripto-explanatory study. To get an estimate of people’s opinions, a quantitative method for research has been chosen. A survey is a tool for measuring large amounts of data that can be used to explain relationships, which makes it a suitable choice of method for data collection for this study. (Saunders et al., 2009, pp.140-44)

To complement the primary research on consumer attitudes, secondary sources will be evaluated in order to gain knowledge about Nike and other endorsement cases. Documentary secondary data includes, amongst others, journal and newspaper articles, transcripts, books and notices. An advantage of the secondary data is that it provides a comparability aspect to the study, where findings from the primary research can be compared to collected secondary data. This section will constitute an important part of the investigation since it revolves around whether or not the image transmitted from Nike – and amplified by Tiger Woods – is concurrent with the brand’s image or if there is an image gap. (Saunders et al., 2009, pp.258-72) The sources used will primarily consist of official documents from Nike’s website, books on the Nike company and brand, market and company overviews from research company Datamonitor, as well as newspaper reports.

3.3 Operationalisation and Construction of the Questionnaire

According to Saunders et al. (2009, pp. 125, 597), operationalisation is the way that the concepts and theory that is being researched are translated to measure real life situations. This paper aims to investigate the impact of the endorser, Tiger Woods, on consumers overall perception of the brand, Nike, and whether he conveys the message that the company intends it to. Operationalising this problem therefore includes using secondary sources to find out about Nike’s identity, and then asking consumers about their attitudes to both Nike and Tiger Woods and then work out whether there is a link between the two.

The questionnaire is aimed at investigating how people’s knowledge of Tiger Woods affects how they view Nike. As no past research has been found regarding people’s
attitudes towards Tiger Woods prior to the recent infidelity affairs, the focus lies on investigating whether people’s opinions towards him – and Nike – have changed. Firstly, questions regarding the attributes, behaviour and opinions of people are posed. There are several attribute categories included in the questionnaire, as that provides the opportunity to see how different segments differ in opinion. (Saunders et al., 2009, p.368) Care has been taken to ensure that the questions follow a logical order and are arranged topically. Within the topics, questions were asked using the funnel approach, where broad or general questions are asked first followed by more specific questions. (Malhotra & Peterson, 2006, p.304) Thus, the approach used in this study is first to catalogue the respondents’ attributes, then ask them questions about their attitude toward sports, followed by questions on Nike and Tiger Woods, and lastly about the relationship between them. The following section aims to explain each section of the questionnaire and how the questions asked will aid in analysis process. For the full questionnaire see Appendix I.

3.3.1 Page 1: Gender, Age, Relationship Status, Sports Interest and Exercise Behaviour
These questions concern who the respondents are, and their relationship to sports, allowing for questions such as if there are any differences between age segments as to how they view Tiger Woods. Respondents are given the opportunity to imply whether they are in one of these age groups; younger than 20, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49 or 50 or older. The relationship status is also addressed, are married people more critical of the athlete and perhaps more critical in their view of Nike? These attribute questions will provide results that allow for comparison between different age groups as well as whether they are single or in a relationship with someone else.

While the views of all consumers are important when it comes to brand equity and image, for Nike the most focal interest group would reside in the group that constitute the potential customers. A distinction between those who exercise and those who do not enables an analysis on how their respective opinions are impacted.

3.3.2 Page 2: Brands, Nike and Nike Personality Characteristics
Page two introduces the topic of the brand, and asks whether it is a factor in consumers’ purchase decisions. This establishes whether or not consumers have knowledge of the
brand, and what characteristics they associate with it. Also, the question where consumers are asked to rank Nike and competitor brands in order of preference can be compared to secondary research about these brands. This would allow for comparing brand identities and see where Nike’s brand identity is on the consumers’ ranking.

An important question on this page refers to the brand characteristics, or personality traits. These have been selected using Jennifer Aaker’s research on personality dimensions, and will – when compared to secondary research on Nike – show whether the image perceived by the customers is the same as Nike’s desired image.

### 3.3.3 Page 3: Tiger Woods, Personality, Personal Life’s Impact on Perception, and Changes in Attitude

Firstly, in order to establish the level of awareness of Tiger Woods, a question is asked about that – as stated earlier in this paper it is difficult to have an opinion about something unless one is aware of it, especially a well-grounded opinion. This is followed by a question regarding Woods’ characteristics, the aim to see whether they are concurrent with the characteristics that respondents had indicated for Nike on the previous page. This provides information regarding whether or not Woods’ characteristics are in line with Nike’s. The subsequent questions revolve around the respondents’ opinions about Tiger Woods and his association to Nike, and how these opinions impact the brand.

The questions posed in the questionnaire should be able to clarify if the association to Tiger Woods impact how consumers view Nike, or if only the right or desired associations are transferred from the endorsed star to the sponsor.

### 3.4 Limitations – Translating Text to Numbers

In answering the research question a comparison between Nike’s identity and image is required. However, no corresponding (numerical) data has been found in previous research that characterizes Nike’s identity in accordance to the personality traits used in this investigation, but a broader number of personality traits have been described to characterize Nike. Furthermore, Nike outspokenly values some characteristics more than others. In order to make a comparison, these descriptions regarding Nike’s identity have been translated to numbers in the personality traits investigation in this study. The author is aware that this could be done very crudely and that the risk of oversimplification is great,
however, care has been taken in making this judgement. People uninvolved with the result of this investigation have been consulted and have together with the author, through a discussion based on the collected data, agreed on numbers befitting of the strength of each personality trait regarding Nike.

3.5 Sample

3.5.1 Sample Selection

As this study is conducted under a limited period of time and operates under financial restrictions there is a need to use sampling. A sample is a part of the total population, and can be selected either representative of the entire population or based on judgement. (Saunders et al., 2009, pp.210-12) This investigation investigates a number of different attributes, as explained in section 6.3, which makes it important to get a response from such consumer groups, and to generate a high response rate. While a number of different ways of sampling were considered, the chosen method was judgemental sampling, as it was deemed the most probable to yield the greatest number of responses. Judgemental sampling is a form of haphazard sampling in which the researcher is at liberty to select a sample based on the different population elements. Thus, the selected individuals were chosen based on the researcher’s knowledge of their attributes. It is a subjective form of sampling and could impact the objectivity of the results, however, it was deemed that a relatively even spread of respondents from different categories would yield the most representative result. Judgemental was the method most likely to attain the goal during the time span of the investigation.

The questionnaire provides an indication of people’s attitudes. In order to cover all the attributes the questionnaire was directed to people of all ages. Focusing on age seemed the best alternative to cover the other variables investigated, as it encompasses them all (age, gender, exercise habits etc.). However, the people whose opinion matters most to Nike are obviously their potential customers, that is, either ‘ultimate athlete’, ‘athletics participant’ or ‘consumer who is influenced by sports culture’ (Malhotra & Peterson, 2006, p.385). Research and observation shows that ‘ultimate athletes’ reach their peak and are at their best in between the ages 20-30 years old (Ericsson, 1993, pp.170-79).
Therefore, an over proportion of respondents from this segment will not impede the study but perhaps provide more support for the results.

The questionnaire will predominately be distributed through online media to controlled participants, in line with the criteria for conducting research in a judgemental sample. Computer-facilitated distribution is appropriate when operating under a tight time frame (Malhotra & Peterson, 2006, p.341), which is why it was chosen as the dominant means of collecting data. However, this means that there will be a bias in the results to the population that have access to computers and the internet, which is something that could influence the level of awareness and will be taken into account during the discussion.

### 3.5.2 Sample Size

Saunders et al. (2009, p. 218) state that deciding on a suitable number of participants is almost always a matter of judgement. The more participants a study has, the more accurate the results will be. However, statisticians have shown that a sample size of 30 will usually elicit a distribution for the mean equal to that of larger samples, and advice that at least 30 participants should be attained in the categories investigated. (Saunders et al., 2009, p.218) This investigation will thus follow the rule of thumb of at least thirty participants in each investigated category, giving a minimum of 150 participants (going by the largest number of categories, age, and multiplying with the number of participants needed for each). The actual number of completed surveys was 195, however, with people leaving some questions unanswered. This is mirrored in the crosstabs conducted for the analysis.

### 3.6 Validity and Reliability

Validity refers to whether the findings generated by the method accurately answer the research question; and reliability refers to the extent which the investigation will yield similar results on other occasions (Saunders et al., 2009, pp.156-57). The method used as described above should present essential data upon which a discussion can be conducted regarding the research question. However, a limitation with the method is that the personality characteristics investigated are subjectively selected by the researcher, to incorporate the essential data but not frighten off respondents through constructing a too extensive and time consuming survey. Using all of the characteristics described in Table 1 would produce a too extensive study and would lead to a very high number of people taking
one look at the questionnaire before abandoning it. Therefore, the five main personality characteristics, as well as some sub-categories within these are incorporated in this study.

With reference to the reliability of the investigation, the results will be highly dependent on the time of the study. Tiger Woods’ indiscretions are still fairly recent and fresh in people’s memories – one of the reasons this particular case was selected to study – which makes it questionable whether the same result will emerge in later studies. Also, it will depend on how Nike decides to use Tiger Woods in the future. In other words, the relationship is dynamic and opinions are likely to shift. However, this study focuses on the current opinion and Nike’s decision to stay with Woods, and would be comparable to other studies conducted during the same period of time regarding Nike, and a corresponding period of time for other brands in a similar situation.
4. Data Collection

4.1 Nike

Nike has, since its establishment in 1971, grown from only selling shoes to encompassing the entire category of sportswear. It was founded by track and field coach Bill Bowerman and runner Phil Knight as Blue Ribbon Sports in 1964 in Oregon, USA, as a provider of sports shoes that would help improve athletes’ performances, before changing the name to Nike in 1971 (Superbrands Organisation, 2002). It is now one of the world’s most recognisable brands, symbolised by the ubiquitous ‘swoosh’ and slogan ‘Just do it’. (Nike, Inc., 2010)

Operations are run on the principle to ‘help athletes perform’, creating gear that will help improve results (Gregory & Wiechmann, 1999, p.27). The company has a mantra that governs everything they do; all their actions should be aligned with the words ‘authentic athletic performance’. (Keller et al., 2008, p.121) This holds true for their promotional activities as well, where their advertisements build on honesty and authenticity (Goldman & Papson, 2000, p.3).

4.1.1 Identity and Personality – Just Do It!

The identity of the company is found in its heritage, in the way that the company is run and what it hopes to achieve. Nike’s mission is to bring ‘inspiration and innovation to every athlete’ in the world, defining athlete as: ‘if you have a body, you’re an athlete’ (Nike, Inc., 2010). This is signalled by the slogan, which is a way to introduce people to the Nike lifestyle – Just do it. Goldman & Papson (2000, pp. 19-20) state that the slogan plays on self-empowerment, that everyone can overcome barriers or problems if they set their mind to it, and that it describes Nike’s philosophy of passion, determination and grit.

The core identity revolves around sports, fitness and performance, and producing shoes based on technological innovation. Nike is ‘perfect for those who are serious about sports’ – top athletes or sports enthusiasts. The personality is aggressive, provocative, spirited, cool and masculine, and also builds on the American origin in countries outside of the United States. (Aaker & Joachimsthaler, 2000, p.173)

Nike has always been a keen user of celebrity endorsers. Nike’s first athlete endorser was runner Steve Prefontaine in the 1970s, followed by a string of world renowned sports personalities such as John McEnroe, Michael Jordan, Eric Cantona, Ronaldo and Tiger
Woods. The company does not simply use its athletes as posters, but ‘they are the brand’ just as much as product, advertising or the people who work at Nike’. This leads to a multifaceted brand personality, however, consistently valuing qualities such as risk-taking, competitiveness, irreverence and live-and-breathe sport. (Superbrands Organisation, 2002) As the ‘athletes are the brand’, Goldman and Papson (2000, pp. 1, 17) state that the brand imagery of the athletes thus is used explicitly to contribute to Nike’s brand image and is seen as an investment in the brand identity, asserting that Nike intentionally acquires meaning from association with its athletes.

4.1.2 Nike’s market and competitors
In 2008, the global sports equipment market generated total revenues of $73.8 billion, and is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 2% per year until 2013. Nike is one of the biggest players on the market, with total revenues of up $18.6 billion in 2008, while biggest competitor Adidas made $15.8 billion the same year. While the market is populated by smaller and specialised retailers, large corporations such as Nike or Adidas can operate with the benefit of mass production in outsourced production plants, and thus also have low fixed costs. This leads to greater margins of revenue. (Datamonitor, 2009)

4.2 Consumers, Tiger and Nike
The questionnaire was sent out and available for two weeks between April 22\textsuperscript{nd} and May 6\textsuperscript{th}, when a total of 195 completed surveys were collected. Moreover, 95 surveys were abandoned without being properly filled in, and are excluded from the leading to a response rate of 75%. The following section will present the results of people’s answers to the questionnaire.

4.2.1 Respondent Characteristics
The respondents were fairly evenly distributed with reference to gender, with 52% being women and the remaining 48% men. The five age segments determined the minimum number of participants, 150, and aside from the expected over proportion of respondents in the age group 20-29 year olds there was a comparatively even level of responses from each age group. When asked about their relationship status, the results indicate that while 35% of the respondents were single, the others were either in a committed relationship or married.
The majority of the respondents were interested in sports in some capacity, with almost half of them stating that they are interested plus an additional 40% admitting to be a little interested. Thus, very few of the respondents said that they had no interest at all. This is mirrored by the response to the question of whether the respondents partake in sports or exercising activities regularly, with most of the sample stating that they exercised more than once a week, complemented by a further substantial portion of the respondents stating that they exercised more seldom. Only 14% indicated that they did not exercise at all.

4.2.2 Attitudes toward Nike
When it comes to the answers to whether the brand is a factor when people buy exercise clothing, the outcome is a little more evenly distributed. However, more than half of the respondents stated that they do consider the brand in making their purchase decision, followed by an uncertain group who may or may not factor in the brand. Out of the people that do factor in the brand in their decision, almost 50% place Nike in as their preferred brand, followed by main competitor Adidas who earned the top spot in the opinion of 37% of the respondents. These two brands are favoured by the stark majority of the participants in the study, with 80% (Nike-Adidas) respectively 70% (Adidas-Nike) placing them in their top two.

The preference for Nike is displayed by the fact that 69% of the respondents state that they own Nike items, many stating superior quality and the fact that ‘you know what you get’ as major reasons for why they chose Nike. Others emphasize style, design and image, the good fit and the fact that ‘wearing Nike signals that you are into sports and serious about it’ for why they own Nike products. A significant number of the respondents state that the brand and logo play a major role in the purchase decision, however, one respondent explicitly stated that the look and feel of the item was decisive and that the brand did not matter.

4.2.3 Nike’s Perceived Brand Personality
The respondents were asked about how strong they perceived certain characteristics to be in relation to Nike. The results are displayed in the following table. Total response to question: 190.
As can be deduced from the table and the subsequent graph, Nike scores highly in the three sports related categories: success, activeness and athleticism. The characteristics earning the lowest average are honesty, sincerity and down to earth. According to respondents Nike is a moderately exciting brand that consumers find competent and reliable; however, it does not distinguish itself as a sophisticated nor remarkably tough or rugged brand. Respondents stated that they associate Nike with fun, being cool, having a winning mentality, good quality and superior performance. It is connected to motivation and drive, which in the words of one respondent is characterised by the slogan. A few people associated Nike with sponsorships of teams and individuals, and many mentioned both Michael Jordan and Tiger
Woods by name. Also, Nike was linked to Apple through the iPod plus running shoes. Several people also mentioned child labour as a prime association to the brand.

4.2.4 Tiger Woods’ Perceived Image and Personality

Awareness of the person Tiger Woods was almost complete, except for a lone 1% who stated that they did not know of him. The same questions regarding personality as previously described about Nike were asked with reference to Tiger Woods, and the results are shown in the table on the following page. Total response to question: 187.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athleticism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down to earth</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Tiger Woods - Strength of Brand Personality Traits

![Tiger Woods Personality Scores](image-url)
Tiger Woods’ personality characteristics are polarised. While people find him very successful, active and athletic, as well as competent at what he does; people also believe that he is dishonest and insincere. Comments in the complementary open question imply that several people have comments on the personal side of Tiger Woods, stating that he is a cheater and a liar with questionable morals. However, people also distinguished between his career persona and private life person, commenting things such as ‘very competent golfer, but awful person’, ‘good golfer, bad temper, liar’ and ‘very good golfer, dishonest person’. Some associated him with his endorsements, by for example EA Sports and Gillette, and the substantial amount of money he is paid for his ‘hobby’.

Three quarters of the respondents state that their opinion of Tiger Woods has changed after the recent events in his private life, and nearly all of them said that they now think less of him than before. 25% of the respondents were unaffected by those events. The people who stated that their opinion had changed were asked to elaborate as to how their opinions had changed. Common views were that they have lost trust in him, ‘lost respect in his moral fibre’, that they ‘don’t consider him being an honest person’ and that he ‘just seems like a fraud’. However, while a lot of people are questioning his moral character and saying that he went from being ‘reliable to unreliable’, some people separate their feelings for the person Tiger and the athlete Tiger. The comments ‘I lost respect for the person Tiger, however, not the athlete’ and ‘as a golfer, he is still probably the best in the world – it is the image of him as a family man, created by sponsors and people around him, that has cracked’ characterise that sentiment amongst the participants. On the following page is a sample of comments representative of the total response.
The slim group of people who think better of Tiger Woods now, state that they believe it made him more human, not the perfect, unattainable man that he was once believed to be.

### 4.2.5 Tiger Woods and Nike

When asked about whether they thought that the personality of Nike and that of Tiger Woods matched, only nearly 9% believed it was a perfect match, whereas the majority, 61%, thought they only partly were a good fit. 30% stated that they did not believe Nike’s characteristics were compatible with Tiger’s.

Regarding the question about how Nike’s continued endorsement of Tiger Woods affected how consumers viewed Nike, 66% claimed that their opinion of Nike had not changed, a little more than 17% said that they were more negative to the brand and almost 17% stated that they think it is positive that Nike decided to back Tiger. Comments range from ‘Nike should not support people who do morally reprehensible things’ and that staying with Woods ‘gives the feeling that they are supporting his behaviour’, to ‘his personal life should not make a difference career-wise’ and ‘his personal life has little to do with his achievements in golf, and I like the fact that Nike acknowledges that fact’. While some think more negatively of Nike, as exemplified by the comments in Box 2 below, in general people seem to think that Tiger’s private life should not affect his endorsements (Box 3)

---

**BOX 1 – Comments Regarding Tiger Woods**

‘He lost is perfect untouchable image. He seemed to be a real sportsman, down to earth, decent and self-critical. Meanwhile he lost that with his actions.’

‘Before the events I think most people had a picture of Tiger and his family being the “ideal” family and person. However, since then, I think most people have changed their minds about him. Nowadays he feels like a not reliable person.’

‘I don’t consider him being an honest person’ and ‘He is not as trustworthy’

‘He went from a sincere, honest man to the complete opposite’

‘The view of a family man has completely been replaced by that of a lying cheater, now characterised by dishonesty’

‘No change as a golfer, but as a person he’s not the “good guy” that was once perceived.’

‘His infidelity caused me to see him as more greedy, selfish and hurtful.’

‘I’ll always view him as a dishonest man now.’

---
11% of the participants state that they have started to consider other brands in favour of Nike, whereas the remaining 89% state that Nike remaining committed to Tiger Woods does not make a difference to their opinion of the brand. As for the recent Nike commercial featuring Tiger Woods with a voice-over by his deceased father, the majority of the people who have seen it find it strange and in bad taste.
5. Tiger Woods and Nike – Analysis and Discussion

5.1 Nike’s Identity – Does It Match Its Perceived Image?

Firstly, does Nike’s perceived image match its identity or is there an image gap? From the company information, one can see that Nike wants to build on ‘authentic athletic performance’; they want everybody to be able to overcome barriers, and they value risk-taking, competitiveness, and they ‘live-and-breathe sport’. This, compared to the five dimensions of brand personality as displayed in Table 1 and translated to the brand personality framework used in this paper, would elicit high results in the categories competence, success, activeness, athleticism, and honesty. The grit, passion and determination in conjunction with the aggressive, provocative, spirited, cool and masculine traits would also involve rather high scores in the categories ruggedness and toughness, and a relatively high average in excitement. Thus, interpreting the secondary data in relation to the brand personality dimensions might project a Nike desired image something like described in the table below (see 3.4 Limitations – Translating Text to Numbers for explanation on how the approximation was done).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nike Desired Image</th>
<th>Nike Perceived Average</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Deviation from Desired Image (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athleticism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down to earth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Nike’s Approximated Desired Image Compared to the Perceived Image

The first column of the table displays an approximation of the characteristics valued by Nike by their importance to the brand composition. The second, however, describes the average rating of how the respondents appreciated Nike’s performance in each of the characteristics. One can see that the scores are consistently lower in the
perceived column than the approximated desired image column, sometimes marginally and at other times quite substantially (see column number 4 – Deviation from Desired Image in Table 4). The largest differences from projected desired image and perceived image are found in ruggedness and honesty, with high deviations also found in several other categories. Thus, there is not a complete match between the desired and perceived image, implying that Nike’s identity message is not received in the form they want it to (as per Figure 4). In other words, there is an image gap. Could it be due to the association with Tiger Woods?

5.2 Tiger Woods’ Personality – A Perfect Match to Nike?

As discussed in earlier parts of this investigation, the brand knowledge of the endorser is central for the success of the endorsement, as is the fit between them in order to prevent an image gap from occurring. Therefore, what do people know about Tiger Woods? As is shown by the collected data, awareness of the sports star is almost absolute. An overwhelming majority knows who he is, which means that he also has a wide reach, since awareness spans equally among the sports interested respondents and the participants who stated that they do not like sports. (While Tiger Woods’ fame is already very high, it must be acknowledged that a contributing factor to this high level of awareness may be that the respondents all were computer literate, and that Tiger has figured heavily online during the past few months.)
The brand personality test conducted in this investigation shows that Tiger Woods scores highly in the categories most relevant to his athletic career. He is seen as very competent, successful, athletic and active; all congruent with his profession, indicating that he is a very skilled athlete. These are categories in which Nike also wants to excel, so there would seem as though they are a good match. As the literature states, it is imperative that there is a fit between the brand and the endorser for the alliance to be successful, so it would seem as though they are a good fit with each other in these particular personality traits. However, Tiger Woods scores poorly in other categories, resulting in a greater gap between Nike’s identity and his image. Through studying Table 5 (above) and Figure 8 on the following page one can deduce that there is a gap not only between Nike’s ideal image and the actual image, but also at places an even greater gap from these to Tiger’s image. Studying the graph one can see that the biggest gaps exist between Nike’s desired and Woods’ perceived honesty traits, with Nike’s perceived honesty lying somewhere in the middle. Also, Nike’s desired ruggedness is significantly higher than the one indicated by the respondents. Tiger’s image is more closely linked to the actual perceived image of Nike, which implies that the connection between them is relatively strong. Thus, they seem to be perceived relatively similar in many categories, indicating a fit, however, perhaps not always where Nike is seeking one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nike Desired Image</th>
<th>Nike Perceived Average</th>
<th>Tiger Perceived Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athleticism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down to earth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – Brand Personality Comparison
Granted, the projected desired image is an approximation, however, it is based on data regarding Nike’s identity traits and personality, and the differences are sometimes so significant that one can assume the premise outlined in Figure 4, that Nike’s identity, or desired image, does not equal Tiger Woods’, therefore resulting in a mediated perception of Nike’s image. This is also supported by the views of the respondents who, to the question of whether they believed that the personality characteristics that they selected for Nike correspond to the selected traits for Tiger Woods, stated that they do not think (30%) or only partly believe (61%) that the traits did. Revisiting Figure 5 (right) one can therefore, based on these observations, pose the question of whether the message conveyed through having Tiger Woods as a spokesperson strengthens the positive traits, the ones that Nike values, or if it is more of a disturbance. Could it be that the association to Tiger Woods emphasizes the differences?
5.3 Does the Image Transfer from Tiger to Nike?

The personality is part of the image. When it comes to Tiger Woods’ image it has undergone severe changes as a result of his indiscretions becoming public knowledge. Hence, what are people’s attitudes towards Tiger Woods and, more importantly, do these attitudes affect how people view Nike? As the data shows, the majority of the respondents claimed that their opinion of Woods has changed *negatively* after the revelation, which confirms a less favourable image compared to the one they held of him earlier. A full 80% of the respondents over 50 stated that they thought less of Tiger; whereas the corresponding percentage for the 20-29 year olds – who were the most lenient – was 59% (see Appendix III for crosstabs, Crosstab Table 1). Singles, it seems, are more compassionate towards Tiger Woods than married people, with 63% and 80% respectively holding more negative attitudes towards Tiger (Crosstab Table 2). This pervasive and increasingly negative view of Tiger Woods is also evident in the nature of the comments made about him; he has lost the draw he had as a positive, grounded and reliable role model (traits that many of his former endorsers value), and it means that one of endorsement’s main tasks – identification between the consumer and the endorser – is seriously damaged. Who wants to ‘be’ Tiger Woods right now? Can Tiger Woods, with this negative baggage, bring positive attitudes to Nike?

Despite holding negative feelings toward Tiger Woods on the whole, however, people seem to distinguish between Tiger the golfer and Tiger the person. Thus, while not wanting to be like the person, they are still in awe of his success. His personal life, they say, does not affect his competence as an athlete. In general people’s opinions toward Tiger have shifted; however, the negative feelings of the entire sample do not seem to transfer to the brand. 75% of the respondents state that the events in Tiger Woods’ private life have changed their opinion of him. Out of them, 33% said that it had affected how they look at Nike, with 70% of them thinking it is negative – corresponding to 17% of the total sample, in contrast to nearly 8% of the total who held Nike to a higher esteem (Crosstab Table 5). Thus, a quarter of the total respondents have had their views of Nike altered as a result of the change in Tiger’s image, but considering the negative press and the large number of people who stated that they have changed their attitude toward Tiger, the change is actually quite small. 17% of the total (where 70% thought less of Tiger), in the midst of the media
storm and after the recent reveal (which means that it can be expected to diminish the more time that passes) find that the newly acquired associations to Tiger transfer to Nike. So, while the nature and content of the message has changed, most of the receivers interpret it in the same way that they did before. Therefore, the majority of the existing image gap cannot be blamed on the association to Tiger Woods, but attributed to other kinds of ‘noise’. (Honesty might be low, for example, due to allegations of child labour in Nike factories.)

5.4 Why?
What are the possible reasons for some respondents remaining unaffected and others changing their minds about Nike? The way in which people view an event, a person or a brand is very subjective, as is how strong these feelings are. This makes it difficult to know which associations will transfer and which will not, and reinforces the uncontrollability of which characteristics or traits can be acquired from other entities. However, there are some issues that have been central in the fallout of how people see Nike as a result of their decision to stay allied with Tiger Woods, and these will be described below.

5.4.1 The Brand and Endorser Fit
Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, the fit between Nike and Tiger Woods has been great in the categories from which Nike wants to borrow Tiger’s image. Nike has continuously worked with building their brand personality around their endorsed stars, effectively adopting McCracken’s theory view that using famous spokespeople is the most effective way of bringing life to a brand, generating strong, unique and favourable associations to it. The brand’s identity centres on sport, winning and achieving goals, and not entirely fitting into the mould. The fit between Nike and Tiger Woods has previously been determined to be good in these relevant categories, the ones pertaining to sport.

Many question the relevance of Tiger Woods’ private life to the Nike brand, and the separation between ‘the person’ and ‘the golfer’ may also have contributed to the relatively low rate of association transfer. Nike is connected to the golfing side of Tiger, which means that the associations regarding his private life are not relevant to transfer to the brand – they are not related to his success on the golf course. Since the fit between the brand and the endorser was very great in the most pertinent areas – competence, success, athleticism and activeness – the focal point of interest in Tiger Woods for Nike was not his
personal life or integrity, but his athletic results. He is an expert golfer (as is shown by his scores in the sport related characteristics) so his credibility when it comes to sporting equipment and gear should not be affected, despite his inability to be honest and trustworthy outside of his career. *Golf* is the source of Tiger Woods’ celebrity and why Nike decided to sponsor him. In contrast to other sponsors who decided to drop Tiger Woods as their spokesperson, Nike and Tiger always had the common ground of sport. Tag Heuer, Gillette and Accenture amongst his other sponsors were not directly connected to Tiger Woods’ success on the golf course, which is why they have had to reconsider their deals and use the withdrawal clause that brands are becoming increasingly dependent on to cover their backs when tying themselves to a secondary entity.

### 5.4.2 Respondent Attributes and Background

Another determinant in how people view the brand is their attributes and background – essentially who they are. Though it is difficult to pinpoint who-thinks-what, it can be seen that some groups are more sensitive to Nike retaining Tiger Woods after his actions than others.

Differences arise between age segments, relationship status and gender. Older respondents, married people and women seem to be the ones who are the harshest both on Tiger Woods and on Nike. The vast majority of the respondents who are positive to Nike keeping Tiger Woods as a spokesperson are under the age of 30 – 24% of the 20-29 year olds, as opposed to a mere 3% of the respondents over 50 (Crosstab Table 4). The highest number of the respondents negatively inclined towards Nike are found in the over 50 segment, where 33% have changed their opinion of Nike to the negative, high compared to the overall result of 17% (Crosstab Table 4). The same number for the married respondents is 26%, and for women 24% – contra men’s 10% negative, and 20% believing it is positive (Crosstab Table 7 and 9 respectively). For older respondents it is understandable that they would be harsher in their attitude since their value grounds and perceptions of what is a role model could be rather unambiguous – there are things one does and there are things that one does not do; either black or white, right or wrong with no grey zone. They, in contrast to maybe younger respondents, take Nike’s continued sponsorship of Tiger more seriously, whereas the younger segments may see this ordeal more as entertainment and separate between his accomplishments on the golf course and who he is as a person, as is indicated
by the fact that 68% of respondents under 30 say that Nike sponsoring Tiger has no effect on their opinion of the brand – positive or negative (Crosstab Table 4).

Married people and women have another view on the situation that is relatively easy to understand. The married respondents have taken vows to stay true to each other, as Tiger Woods had with his wife, whereas women might find it easy to emotionally relate to the situation Woods’ wife is in and identify with her, thus seeing Nike’s continued support for him as a way of condoning his actions. Interestingly, twice the number of men who think negatively of Nike believe it is positive that Nike is sticking with him. While few probably would say that Tiger was the embodiment of their ideal self-image, certain segments of respondents may be inclined to not fully discard all of his qualities.

5.4.3 Strength of Associations, Feelings and Judgements

Another decisive factor for whether or not the association would transfer is the strength of it. Whereas a lot of people had negative opinions of Tiger Woods as a result, on the whole these did not transfer to Nike. As has been mentioned earlier with reference to the fit between the brand and the athlete, a lot of people did not believe that what happened in Tiger’s private life mattered when it came to his Nike endorsement. This lack of strength in the association made it more difficult for it to transfer to the brand. The stronger the judgement or feeling the harder it is to suppress, but since people largely did not think that Woods’ private life was related to Nike the overwhelmingly negative thoughts regarding Tiger did not transfer to and affect consumers’ attitudes towards the brand. Further, as stated earlier some traits may be too connected to the person to transfer to the brand; perhaps the more lenient respondents find the ‘adulterer’ and ‘dishonest’ connotations too embedded with and specific to Tiger’s personality, and that they therefore are difficult to move from him to Nike.

5.4.4 Attachment to Nike

Lastly, an issue that may have proved influential in how people reacted to Nike is their attachment to the brand. Most of the respondents rated it as one of their top two favourite brands, and nearly 70% own something with the ‘swoosh’ on it. Nike obviously has an allure to it that makes people want to own something with the Nike brand. There are various reasons for this, out of which the brand itself was a commonly cited motive. Out of the people that exercise 11% say that they would now consider other brands in favour of Nike,
but the number is 10% for the people who exercise more frequently (Crosstab Table 10). It is a slim difference, but one might summarise that the majority of people who are ‘serious about sport’ essentially care more about the functionality of the items rather than the image of the endorser. Results show that the more attached respondents were to the brand, the less they felt that Tiger Woods’ newly acquired associations impacted it.

87% out of the people that own Nike products stated that Tiger Woods’ continued association had not changed their will to buy Nike items (Crosstab Table 3), implying that although some of the customer base would change their purchasing pattern, the majority of the people do not let their feelings and judgements about Tiger Woods affect their feelings toward Nike (neither positively nor negatively). In the segment of under-30-year-olds, 86% own Nike items, compared to the respondents over 50 where the rate is 38% (Crosstab Table 6). The younger respondents are thus more invested in the brand – the brand does not fall with one endorser, but is built on the ‘Just do it’ mentality and other factors – and are therefore more reluctant to judge it than the respondents who are not as invested in it. The question of loyalty comes to play here and is stronger than the association to Tiger.
6. Conclusion

This paper has aimed to investigate how consumers reacted to Nike after they decided to stay committed to Tiger Woods following the recent controversy surrounding his character. Firstly, to see whether Nike’s perceived image matched their approximated desired image. The perceived image was consistently lower than the desired identity, which led to the follow up question of whether this image gap could be caused by the association with Tiger Woods. While respondents to the questionnaire overwhelmingly expressed negative views towards the athlete, those associations largely did not transfer from him to Nike despite the strong bond between them. Three quarters of the respondents remained unmoved in their perception of Nike’s image, whilst only 17% of the people stated that their opinion of Nike had been altered negatively because of the decision.

Associations are very subjective, and reasons for this relatively low number were discussed and it was found that there were a variety of different factors that were influential for the newly acquired negative associations not transferring from Tiger Woods to Nike. These were, firstly, the nature of the fit between the brand and the endorser; the respondent attributes and backgrounds; the strength of the associations; and the attachment respondents had to Nike. Because of the relatively low percentage that have been affected negatively it seems unreasonable that the differences found between Nike’s desired and perceived images can be attributable to Tiger Woods. Therefore, it can also be concluded that Nike’s brand equity has not been overly affected by this controversy, and that the strong and unique associations are sustained, while the favourable associations have suffered a minor blow. Whether Phil Knight’s prediction in saying that this will be a minor blip in Tiger’s career is true or not, at least it seems as though it is a minor incident for Nike.
7. Suggestions for Future Research

As this investigation has taken place during the height of the interest for this subject as it is very current. Thus, everything is fresh in the respondents’ minds. Because of this it would be interesting to perform a comparative study in the future to see if attitudes have changed, and whether ‘Tigergate’ has had any lasting influence on their attitude toward Nike. Also, it would be interesting to measure attitudes of people in other countries, to see how they compare to the attitudes in Sweden.

Further, as the practice of celebrity endorsements is widely spread and a great part of athletes’ salaries come from promoting brands, an interesting issue to explore would be to match celebrities with companies with the same characteristics. This would require extensive resources but it would be exciting to see what celebrity would be a suitable match for a certain company.
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Appendix I - The Questionnaire

ATHLETE ENDORSEMENTS AND BRAND IMAGE

Many brands use celebrities in their advertising – amongst them sportswear company Nike. Nike has during the course of many years used famous individuals to build their brand. Recently there has been some controversy regarding the brand’s endorsement of a specific person - Tiger Woods. It has become widely known through media that Woods has engaged in some morally dubitable behaviour in his personal life. This questionnaire is intended to provide information as to how consumers regard Nike in light of the brand’s continued support for the golfer. YOUR opinion is valuable, and will be vital for the result of this study! The survey will only take a few minutes to complete, and the answers collected are confidential and for research purposes only. Thank you for sharing your views and helping me investigate this topic!
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1.) Please state your gender.
   ( ) Male
   ( ) Female

2.) How old are you?
   ( ) <20
   ( ) 20-29
   ( ) 30-39
   ( ) 40-49
   ( ) 50-59
   ( ) 60>

3.) What is your relationship status?
   ( ) Single
   ( ) In a relationship
   ( ) Married

4.) Are you interested in sports?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) A little

5.) Do you practice sports or exercise regularly?
   ( ) Yes, more than once a week
   ( ) Yes, less than once a week
   ( ) No

6.) Is the brand a factor for you when purchasing exercise clothing?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Don't know

7.) If you replied yes to the previous question, please rank the following sportswear brands in order of preference.
   _______Adidas
   _______Nike
   _______Puma
   _______Reebok
   _______Other

8.) Do you own any Nike items?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) I don’t know

9.) If yes, what made you choose Nike?

__________________________________________________________________________

10.) Below is a list of characteristics. Please state how strong you feel that these characteristics are in relation to the brand Nike.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down to earth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.) Please state any eventual other associations to Nike.

__________________________________________________________________________
12.) Do you know who Tiger Woods is?
( ) Yes
( ) No

13.) What characteristics do you associate with Tiger Woods? Please state how strong you feel that these characteristics are in relation to Tiger Woods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down to earth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.) Please state any eventual other associations to Tiger Woods.

____________________________________________

15.) Do you feel that Tiger Woods accurately represents the characteristics that you selected for Nike?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) Partly

16.) Have the events covered in the media regarding Tiger Woods' personal life changed your opinion of him?
( ) Yes, positively
( ) Yes, negatively
( ) No
17.) If yes, please state how your opinion changed.

____________________________________________

18.) After Tiger Woods’ personal problems, several sponsors decided to end their contracts. Nike decided to continue their work with Tiger. Has this impacted your view of Nike?
( ) Yes, positively
( ) Yes, negatively
( ) No
19.) If yes to the previous question, please indicate how.

____________________________________________

20.) Has Tiger Woods’ commitment caused you to consider other brands in favour of Nike?
( ) Yes
( ) No
( ) No difference to before

21.) Have you seen the new (as of April 2010) Nike advertisement featuring Tiger Woods? If so, how does it impact your perception of Nike?

____________________________________________

22.) Please write any additional comments regarding Nike’s sponsorship of Tiger Woods below (about, e.g. Nike’s or Tiger Woods’ respective images).

____________________________________________

Thank You!
Thank you very much for taking this survey - your response means a lot!
Appendix II – Response to the Questionnaire

**What is your gender?**
- Male: 52%
- Female: 48%

**How old are you?**
- <20: 17%
- 20-29: 16%
- 30-39: 15%
- 40-49: 17%
- 50+: 35%

**What is your relationship status?**
- Single: 30%
- In a relationship: 35%
- Married: 35%

**Are you interested in sports?**
- Yes: 69%
- A little: 19%
- No: 12%

**Is the brand a factor for you when purchasing exercise clothing?**
- Yes, more than once a week: 47%
- Yes, less than once a week: 39%
- No: 14%

**Do you own and Nike items?**
- Yes: 12%
- No: 19%
- I don't know: 69%
Do you know who Tiger Woods is?
- Yes: 99%
- No: 1%

Do you feel that Tiger Woods accurately represents the characteristics that you selected for Nike?
- Partly: 9%
- Yes: 30%
- No: 61%

Have the events covered in the media regarding Tiger Woods' personal life changed your opinion of him?
- Yes, negatively: 25%
- Yes, positively: 5%
- No: 70%

Has Tiger Woods' commitment caused you to consider other brands in favour of Nike?
- Yes: 11%
- No: 33%
- No difference to before: 56%

After Tiger Woods' personal problems, several sponsors decided to end their contracts. Nike decided to continue their work with Tiger. Has this impacted your view of Nike?
- Yes, positively: 17%
- Yes, negatively: 17%
- No: 66%
**Appendix III - Crosstabs**

### Have the events covered in the media regarding Tiger Woods’ personal life changed your opinion of him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How old are you?</th>
<th>Yes, positively</th>
<th>Yes, negatively</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Crosstab Table 1 - Age and Opinion of Tiger Woods*

### Have the events covered in the media regarding Tiger Woods’ personal life changed your opinion of him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your relationship status?</th>
<th>Yes, positively</th>
<th>Yes, negatively</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Crosstab Table 2 - Relationship Status and Opinion of Tiger Woods*

### Has Tiger Woods’ commitment caused you to consider other brands in favour of Nike?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you own any Nike items?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No difference to before</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Crosstab Table 3 - Nike Customer and Change in Opinion to the Brand as a Result of Its Commitment to Tiger Woods
After Tiger Woods' personal problems, several sponsors decided to end their contracts. Nike decided to continue their work with Tiger. Has this impacted your view of Nike?

Crosstab Table 4 - Age and Attitude to Nike After the Decision to Stay with Tiger Woods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How old are you?</th>
<th>Yes, positively</th>
<th>Yes, negatively</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crosstab Table 5 - Opinion of Tiger Woods and Influence on Nike

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have the events covered in the media regarding Tiger Woods' personal life changed your opinion of him?</th>
<th>Yes, positively</th>
<th>Yes, negatively</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, positively</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, negatively</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crosstab Table 6 - Age and Nike

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How old are you?</th>
<th>Do you own any Nike items?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50&gt;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After Tiger Woods’ personal problems, several sponsors decided to end their contracts. Nike decided to continue their work with Tiger. Has this impacted your view of Nike?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your relationship status?</th>
<th>Yes, positively</th>
<th>Yes, negatively</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crosstab Table 7** - Relationship Status and Attitude Towards Nike

Do you feel that Tiger Woods accurately represents the characteristics that you selected for Nike?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your relationship status?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crosstab Table 8** - Relationship Status and Fit between Nike and Tiger Woods

After Tiger Woods’ personal problems, several sponsors decided to end their contracts. Nike decided to continue their work with Tiger. Has this impacted your view of Nike?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please state your gender.</th>
<th>Yes, positively</th>
<th>Yes, negatively</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crosstab Table 9** - Gender and Attitude Towards Nike
Has Tiger Woods’ commitment caused you to consider other brands in favour of Nike?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you practice sports or exercise regularly?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No difference to before</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, more than once a week</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, less than once a week</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crosstab Table 10 - Exercise Habits and Loyalty to Nike
Just Do It!