

MANAGEMENT & COACHING

KYONGMIN LEE^{1(ABCFG)}, JOHN A. JOHNSON^{2(AEF)}

¹ Department of Sport Management, Dankook University, Cheonan, Korea (Republic of Korea)

² Department of Taekwondo, Keimyung University, Daegu (Republic of Korea)

Correspondence: John A. Johnson, Department of Taekwondo, Keimyung University, 1095, Dalgubeol-daero, Dalseo-gu, Daegu, Korea. Phone 82-53-580-5760; e-mail: beowulf600@gmail.com

Ambush Marketing in Sport Taekwondo and How to Prevent It

Submission: 22.11.2018; acceptance: 17.12.2019

Key words: parasite marketing, *taekwondo* industry, freeloading, ambush marketing by association, ambush marketing by intrusion

Abstract

Background. Corporations sign sponsorship contracts with sport organizations to promote sales, enhance awareness of their products, and improve their image. The threat of ambush marketing could reduce the number of potential sponsors and therefore limit the growth of Taekwondo as a spectator sport.

Problem and Aim. This study aims to clarify what ambush marketing is, and to provide solutions based on current US law that are applicable to international Taekwondo events.

Methods. A systematic literature review of ambush marketing, US law, and current Taekwondo events was performed. Established methods for ambush marketing prevention were determined and applied to Taekwondo-specific events.

Results. Organizers should first identify their competitors and think proactively about what ambush marketing tactics would be feasible. Second, onsite policing of ambush marketers whose companies may be harmful to the event's image is essential. Third, a cease and desist letter should be written if an ambush marketing scheme is detected. Finally, organizers should follow up such a letter with legal action with a lawsuit against the ambush marketers.

Conclusion. As ambush marketing may draw attention to Taekwondo events that otherwise would not have received attention outside of a narrow target market, ambush marketing may even facilitate Taekwondo's growth in popularity. The more attention is given to Taekwondo events that do not have large marketing budgets, the more the Taekwondo industry could see increases in revenue. While ambush marketing is roguish, it could provide wide-reaching positive effects for the Taekwondo industry as a whole.

Introduction

Corporations are willing to invest millions of dollars to sponsor or have advertising exclusivity at major sport events (e.g., the Summer and Winter Olympic Games, FIFA World Cup, and the Super Bowl). Major sports events provide sponsors with considerable commercial advantages [Payne 2005]. In return for their large investments, sponsors have the exclusive right to advertise their products in association with the sporting event or the use of the event logo. For example, official sponsors of the Olympic Games can use the five-ring logo to promote their products over the four-year period between the Olympic Games. Consumers exposed to these advertisements tend to have positive attitudes toward the sponsor's product [Ettorre 1993], which makes it possible for the sponsor to increase revenues.

The advantages of a sponsorship naturally cause many companies to compete for such exclusivity. This

competition leads to increasing levels of investment. For example, a global sponsorship for the 1992 Olympics was estimated at \$20 million (US), but four years later, an official sponsorship for the 1996 Olympic Games was anticipated to cost double that amount [Ettorre 1993]. By 2012, a tiered sponsorship system had been created and companies such as Coca Cola and McDonald's could become “worldwide sponsors” for \$100 million (US), while Olympic Partners like Adidas, Visa, BMW, and British Airways paid \$63 million (US) for a lower tiered sponsorship. The next tier was termed “Olympic Supporters” for which companies like UPS and Cisco Companies paid \$31 million, while the bottommost tier, “Olympic Providers and Supporters,” consisted of companies like Holiday Inn and Eurostar who paid \$15 million (US) for the right to be officially associated with the Olympics [Guardian 2012]. Due to the lack of positions or insufficient financial resources, not all companies can become official sponsors of major sport events. For this reason,

some spurious companies use ambush marketing to take part in the sporting event [Crow, Hoek 2003].

Taekwondo, the Korean martial art that has been an Olympic event since 1988, is quickly growing in global popularity. World Taekwondo (WT; formerly the World Taekwondo Federation [WTF]) is the international Taekwondo governing body recognized by the International Olympic Committee (IOC). WT competitions have increased in number and size in recent years. Currently, WT organizes nine international competitions annually or biannually: the Taekwondo World Championships (their flagship event), the Grand Prix series, the WT Grand Prix Final, Team Championships, Junior Championships, *Poomsae* (form) Championships, Cadet Championships, Para Taekwondo Championships, and Beach Championships. These events attract competitors and fans from around the world and have local and international sponsorships. Other Taekwondo organizations and companies that make products related to Taekwondo practice and competition (i.e., the Taekwondo industry) are equally interested in sponsoring Taekwondo events. International organizations like WT and companies such as Adidas, which makes Taekwondo uniforms and apparel, often sponsor other Taekwondo competitions and events that draw thousands of competitors.

"Given the chance of ambushing for nonsponsors," Ford [2018] states, "it is no wonder that organizers have found that protection is needed for official event sponsors against the efforts of nonsponsors looking to tie in with events through the practice of ambush marketing." As a consequence, this paper explores how actual sponsors or sport organizations in the United States can be safeguarded legally from ambush marketing with a special emphasis on Taekwondo. A systematic literature review of ambush marketing, US law, and current Taekwondo events was performed. Established methods for ambush marketing prevention were determined and applied to Taekwondo-specific events. To effectively protect or prevent actual sponsors or sport organizations from ambush marketing, one needs to know what kinds of techniques and tactics ambushers are using. Therefore, the current study explores ambush marketing in the United States and then investigates the legal means that sponsors or organizations of Taekwondo sports events may take against such illicit tactics.

Ambush Marketing

Then, what is ambush marketing precisely? According to Townley, Harrington, and Couchman, "ambush or parasite marketing is defined as the unauthorized association by businesses of their names, brands, products, or services with a sport event or competition through any one or more of a wide range of marketing activities" [Townley, Harrington, Couchman 1998]. McKelvey [1994], as cited

by Crompton [2004], expanded the ambush marketing concept to include "a company's intentional efforts to weaken—or ambush—its competitor's 'official' sponsorship by engaging in promotions and advertising that trade off the event or property's goodwill while seeking to confuse the buying public as to which company really holds official sponsorship."

Official sponsors "differentiate a company's association with a property from other companies" [Brownlee, Greenwell, Moorman 2018]. Being an official sponsor aligns the sponsor's brand image with the quality of the event or the images of the individual sport. Payne defines ambush marketing similarly as "a marketing communication that involves a company seeking to associate with an event without making payment to the event owner and often in direct conflict with a competitor who is a legitimate and paying sponsor" [Payne 2005]. Today, it "has evolved into a mainstream marketing-communications activity practiced by many of the world's largest brands" [Norton, Chadwick 2018]. For that reason, primary goal of ambush marketers is to associate their company or product nefariously with an event in which their rival is an official sponsor in order to weaken the impact of their competitor's participation [Crompton 2004; McKelvey 1994].

An example from the 2011 US Tennis Open illustrates the nefariousness of ambush marketers' tactics. Stella Artois advertisements were plastered across the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) platform closest to where the 2011 Open was held; in fact, the tennis center could be seen from train station with the naked eye. This gave the appearance that Stella Artois and Anheuser-Busch InBev, the company that owns the Stella Artois brand, were official sponsors of the US Tennis Open. Yet, the official beer sponsor for the event was Heineken, which had sponsored the event since 1992 and had exclusivity advertising rights for the tennis center and nearby areas. Heineken did not, however, have exclusivity rights for the LIRR station closest to the event. The slogans "Your Trophy Awaits" and "A Perfect Match" were used in the Stella Artois ads to solidify the idea that they were the 2011 Open's beer sponsor. The desired effect of connecting Stella Artois to that year's US Open and drawing attention away from Heineken was thusly achieved [Kaplan 2011; Schutte 2014].

As referenced by Grady [2016], Johnson [2011] further divides ambush marketing into two types. The most common type of ambush marketing is *ambush marketing by association*, which is "when advertisers attempt to create a link directly or indirectly that implies an association between the event and the brand" [Grady 2016]. The second type, *ambush marketing by intrusion*, occurs when "focuses on attracting additional publicity to the ambusher's brand beyond what ordinary promotional efforts would achieve" [Grady 2016]. Tactics used by these ambush marketers include giveaways at event

sites. Thus, this type of ambush marketing is easier to control as it can be mitigated with onsite brand enforcement [Grady 2016].

More recently, Burton and Chadwick [2018], as referenced by Ford [2018], claim ambush marketing has evolved into three types of activities. Burton and Chadwick [2018] identify *incursive ambushing* as “the aggressive, predatory, or invasive activities of a brand that has no official or legal right of association with an event, deliberately intending to threaten, undermine, or distract from an event or another brand’s official event sponsorship;” *obtrusive ambushing* as “the prominent or undesirably visible marketing activities of a brand that has no official or legal right of association with an event, which may either deliberately or accidentally undermine or distract from an official event sponsorship by another brand;” and *associative ambushing* as “the attempt by a brand that has no official or legal right of association with an event to imply or create an allusion that it has a connection with an event.” Although many cultures may see this type of marketing as unethical, it is actually legal in the US [McKelvey, 2003] and elsewhere.

As evident from these definitions, companies using ambush marketing may affect legitimate sponsors or sport organizations adversely. First, it is highly possible for consumers to think of ambushers as actual sponsors [McDaniel, Kinney 1998], because it is difficult for consumers to distinguish actual sponsors from ambushers [Shani, Sandler 1998]. Second, this tendency discourages actual sponsors to pay huge amounts of money for sponsorship [O’Sullivan, Murphy 1998]. Finally, the decreasing level of investment will lead to a loss of revenue to sport organizations or owners of major sport events [Townley, Harrington, Couchman 1998].

Outside of unethically profiting by piggybacking on the work of others, other problems can be incurred from ambush marketing. For instance, ambush marketing may devalue official sport sponsorships [Sandler, Shani 1989]. Ambush marketing can also confuse consumers about the rightful “official sponsors” of an event [Dickson, Naylor, Phelps 2015]. As consumers are more frequently spending their money to demonstrate brand loyalty so that their purchases reflect their personal values, confusion about which brands to buy may prevent them from making any purchases whatsoever. Moreover, confused customers “may not remember any of the sponsors or potentially only remember the ambusher due to the creative nature of its advertising communication” [Brownlee, Greenwell, Moorman 2018].

Even in interscholastic or intercollegiate sports, freeloading, which is similar to ambush marketing, is occurring. Freeloading is defined as “the activities of companies who attempt to gain the benefit of an association with a school’s athletic department without paying sponsorship fees, and school administrators’ willingness to tolerate these activities on the basis of the publicity

that these activities create” [Kent, Campbell 2007]. The ability of organizers to later “assert legal proprietorship” over their rights pertaining to the event and the overall image of the event would “suffer if it becomes widely perceived as a commercial free-for-all” [Townley, Harrington, Couchman 1998]. Consequently, sport organizations or owners of a sporting event could incur serious financial damage [Payne 2005].

In efforts to be perceived as an official sponsor of major sport events and compete with actual sponsors, some companies resort to using one of five ambush marketing tactics [Bean 1995]. First, ambush companies purchase substantial commercial time on major networks during or around the time of the sporting event. Exposure on major networks at these times makes it possible for these companies to be perceived as official sponsors, especially if the marketing scheme somehow relates to the event (i.e., a popular football player is used in a commercial during the FIFA World Cup or the aforementioned “Find your Greatness” Nike campaign). Similar to the first method, ambush companies do not directly sponsor a sporting event. Instead, as cited in Bean [1995], Bayless [1998] states ambush marketers sometimes sponsor major networks of the event. Third, ambushers use a sporting event’s site to implement promotional activities (e.g., flying a balloon or providing free giveaways) despite the fact that the site belongs to actual sponsors (i.e., ambush marketing by intrusion). Fourth, ambush companies sponsor individual teams or athletes rather than directly sponsoring a sport event. Finally, ambush companies have been known to use unauthorized tickets to promote their products.

These ambushing activities do not have a clear-cut legal remedy in the United States [Townley, Harrington, Couchman 1998]. That is, if ambush companies use official trademarks or event symbols to promote their products, actual sponsors or sport organizations may take legal action based upon their rights under copyright protection or trademark law. However, since ambush companies do not usually employ official emblems, logos, and mascots for a sporting event, their activities do not fall under US trademark infringement laws. Even with prevention methods in place, ambush marketing succeeds in the Olympic Games as well as all major sport events [Payne 2005]. The Olympic Games, where approximately 40% of the revenue incurred comes from corporate sponsorships [Longman 2012], extensive legal measures are taken to prevent ambush marketing.

The frequency of ambush marketing currently keeps increasing not only in the Olympic Games, but also in all major sport events [Payne 2005; Chanavat, Desbordes 2014]. More serious is that actual sponsors or sport organizations do not have systematic legal systems to prevent ambush marketing [Payne 2005]. For international sporting events where the laws protecting against ambush marketing will vary from host country to host country, event organ-

izers must "rely upon enacting event-specific legislation to close any newfound legal loopholes" each time an event is held [Grady 2016]. Indeed, each Olympics provides lessons for the next as the organizing committees learn from ambush marketer's tactics [Ellis, Scassa, Seguin 2011].

Similar to O'Sullivan and Murphy [1998] as well as Ettore [1993], Townley, Harrington, and Couchman [1998] argue that even though actual sponsors paid a large amount of money for a sponsorship, they were not being protected from ambushers' strategies. Furthermore, they contend that although both copyright protection and trademark law may be a good protection against ambush marketing, they are not always available under some circumstances (e.g., when ambushers do not directly use titles or words of a sporting event) [Townley, Harrington, Couchman 1998]. For instance, Nike's 2012 "Find your Greatness" campaign during the London Summer Olympics did not use the Olympic rings or imagery related to the Olympics Games, but did depict runners as well as basketball, tennis, and skateboarding athletes in outdoor, digital, and traditional print advertisements during the London Games [Sweney 2012].

Implications for Sport Taekwondo

Interest in Taekwondo as a combat sport is growing rapidly in the United States [Kim, Zhang 2009] with 380,000 children alone testing for Taekwondo black belts worldwide annually [Lee, Kim 2015]. As above, there are numerous large-scale international Taekwondo competitions every year that draw investment dollars from sponsors. Interestingly, Taekwondo has other non-athletic events that interest sponsors. For example, the International Academic Conference for Taekwondo (iACT), a North American academic conference dedicated solely to Taekwondo academics, has garnered sponsorships from expected organizations such as WT and America Taekwondo United (ATU), "a non-profit organization...formed in 2006 with the goal of contributing to the growth and development of Taekwondo in the United States" [ATU c2016]. In addition to national and international Taekwondo organizations [iACT 2015; iACT 2016], businesses such as local restaurants [iACT 2015] as well as city mayors and martial art supply retailers [iACT 2016] have also sponsored these events. Although no empirical data to date indicates ambush marketing has affected Taekwondo events, such tactics could detract potential sponsors from investing in future Taekwondo events mentioned previously. A lack of sponsorship would reduce the budget of these events and may as a consequence influence their size, financial outcomes, and popularity.

On the other hand, ambush marketing may be positive to some Taekwondo events. Farrelly, Quester, and Greyser claim that ambush marketing "is not necessar-

ily as dangerous to sponsors as it has been in the past" [2005]. Indeed, official sponsors "can use ambushers' attacks to their advantage by drawing attention to issues of legitimacy, by enhancing brand or corporate authenticity, and by appealing to consumers increasingly wary of disingenuous brands" [Farrelly, Quester, Greyser 2005]. For Taekwondo events, which do not receive the broad and costly sponsorships opportunities of events like the FIFA World Cup or the Olympics, this could be actually beneficial. Ambush marketing by local businesses may draw attention to the event outside of the intended events. The previously mentioned restaurant and mayoral support, for example, would draw attention to a Taekwondo event that otherwise would not have garnered interest outside of academic circles.

Preventing Ambush Marketing at Taekwondo Events

Pre-event Ambush Marketing Prevention Measures

Companies continue their ambush marketing tactics despite attempts to reinforce existing laws, and there is some evidence supporting that legal deterrents are not enough to prevent [Chanavat, Desbordes 2014]. Diversifying methods to combat ambush marketers may help sponsors from feeling helpless [Ellis et al., 2019]. Educating opinion leaders, the media, and consumers through public relations are some of the best ways to prevent ambush marketing [Payne 2005]. Schmitz [2005] likewise describes how the Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC) tried to educate the public to minimize ambush cases during the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. The SLOC provided the public with information about why some ambush cases fall under trademark infringement and what kinds of ambush claims there have been through its official website. The SLOC also sent information concerning trademark regulations to the general public, athlete agents, retailers, national organizing committees, Olympic sponsors, suppliers and licensees, and sponsored brand protection workshops [Schmitz 2005].

Additionally, O'Sullivan and Murphy [1998] emphasize that if networks and event organizers give official sponsors the first right for commercial time, it is difficult for ambushers to buy substantial broadcast time on major networks. Citing McKelvey [2004], Moorman and Greenwell [2005] state that the use of a cease and desist letter is an effective way to prevent ongoing ambush activities, asserting that "the letter is sent to ambush companies prior to the marketing campaign if possible or as soon as possible after the sports organization learns of the activities."

Post-event Legal Actions Against Ambush Marketers

Although most of the preventive measures taken before

each Olympic Games are rooted within the host country's legal system [Grady 2016], organizers of smaller events can learn from them. For Taekwondo events in the US, plaintiffs (i.e., actual sponsors or sport organizations) can take four legal options against ambush companies [Bean 1995; Moorman, Greenwell 2005]: 1) trademark infringement, 2) sections 32 and 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 3) the Amateur Sports Act of 1978, and 4) unfair competition. Trademark infringement, the first course of legal action, "occurs when people or agencies place or use a trademark or service mark owned and registered to someone else on their product or service and sell the product or service" [Clement 2004: 203]. When ambush companies commercially exploit a logo without their permission, plaintiffs can use trademark infringement to bring a lawsuit against ambush companies [Moorman, Greenwell 2005]. As mentioned however, it is not easy for plaintiffs to be protected under trademark infringement, because ambush companies do not directly use official trademarks or event symbols when implementing ambush marketing. Thus, additional remedies in law need to protect actual sponsors or sport organizations from ambush marketing.

Sections 32 and 43(a) of the Lanham Act are alternative means of protection for official sponsors or sport organizations against ambush companies [Moorman, Greenwell 2005]. The Lanham Act "prohibits the use in commerce of any registered mark which is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive without the consent of the registrant" under its 15 U.S.C. 1114(1)(a) and 1125(a) sections [Moorman, Greenwell 2005]. As cited in Moorman and Greenwell, plaintiffs must establish two elements to be protected under the Act [Moorman, Greenwell 2005]. First, plaintiffs must prove that ambush companies exploit a registered mark without their permission [Moorman, Greenwell 2005]. Second, plaintiffs must see if consumers' confusion is caused by the unauthorized use of ambusher companies (i.e., the likelihood of confusion analysis) [Cornell c2018].

Similar to trademark infringement cases, the Lanham Act does not seem to be an effective tool to prevent ambush marketing [Bean 1995; Moorman, Greenwell 2005; Schmitz 2005]. Bean [1995] and Schmitz [2005] both argue that, because consumers do not feel much confusion about who sponsors a sporting event, the likelihood of confusion analysis necessary for the Lanham Act would be difficult to apply to ambush cases. Moorman and Greenwell [2005] also mention that under the condition that ambush companies do not directly use official trademarks or event symbols, the Lanham Act does not seem to play a key role in protecting plaintiffs from ambush marketing [Moorman, Greenwell 2005].

According to White [2001] and McKelvey [2004], trademark infringement claims related to the Olympic Games fall under the Amateur Sports Act of 1978. The act provides the United States Olympic Committee

(USOC) with exclusive rights to control the sale of goods or services, the use of Olympic marks, symbols, and technology [McKelvey 2004; White 2001]. As compared to the Lanham Act, the Amateur Sports Act of 1978 provides more protection in that the USOC can apply it to ambush cases regardless of the likelihood of confusion analysis [McKelvey 2004; White 2001]. Nevertheless, similar to Moorman and Greenwell's [2005] discussion of the Lanham Act, the Amateur Sports Act of 1978 is also difficult to apply to ambush cases if ambushers do not directly use any trademarks or symbols [McKelvey 2004; White 2001].

Finally, plaintiffs can take legal action against ambushers using unfair competition that falls under state common law [Bean 1995; Moorman, Greenwell 2005]. This remedy enables plaintiffs to recover damages incurred by ambush companies who misappropriate goodwill and reputation of the actual sponsor or the sport organization [Bean 1995; Moorman, Greenwell 2005]. Plaintiffs must show 1) they have the sole right for a sporting event and 2) how the unauthorized ambushers' participation in the event damages their goodwill or reputation [Moorman, Greenwell 2005]. This remedy does not seem to protect against ambush marketing. Moorman and Greenwell assert that courts tend to prefer the Lanham Act and trademark infringement to unfair competition when courts deal with ambush cases [Moorman, Greenwell 2005].

In sum, there are four types of remedies that US sponsors or sport organizations can use when facing cases of ambush marketing. Yet, it is unlikely that plaintiffs can be completely protected from those remedies except when ambush companies directly use official trademarks or event symbols. The next section will therefore examine more effective ways to prevent ambush marketing before it occurs.

Conclusions

Ambush Marketing Points of Consideration

It is undeniable that the official sponsor spending millions of dollars on a sponsorship should be protected from ambush marketing. Thus, sport organizations or owners of a sporting event need effective tools to prevent an official sponsor from ambush marketing. If not so, they may sustain revenue losses and incur later difficulties in operating their organizations (i.e., sport organizations or owners of a sporting event depend financially on official sponsors to stay viable).

However, current legal actions against ambush marketing in the United States are unlikely to be helpful for actual sponsors or sport organizations, such as trademark infringement, sections 32 and 43(a) of the Lanham Act, the Amateur Sports Act of 1978, and unfair competition. Each of those four remedies has its own limitations

to ambush cases. First, trademark infringement is not a great threat to ambushers, because ambushers often do not exploit directly official emblems, logos, and mascots in association with a sporting event. Second, to establish the Lanham Act, a plaintiff must prove that consumers' confusion has been attributed to the authorized marketing tactics of an ambusher company. If consumers do not care about who sponsors a sporting event, the Lanham Act is difficult to apply to ambush cases (i.e., sometimes consumers prefer an ambush company to an official sponsor because the ambush company's product is cheaper). Third, trademark infringement claims concerning the Olympic Games fall under the Amateur Sports Act of 1978. As compared to the Lanham Act, a primary advantage of this remedy is that sport organizations can apply the Amateur Sports Act to ambush cases, regardless of the likelihood of confusion analysis. Similar to the limitation of trademark infringement, it is difficult to use the Amateur Sports Act as ambush companies do not directly exploit any trademarks or symbols. Finally, the primary limitation of unfair competition is that courts currently use this remedy less than trademark infringement and the Lanham Act when dealing with ambush cases. In addition to each remedy limitation, Moorman and Greenwell [2005] mentioned that official sponsors or sport organizations tend to avoid legal actions against ambush cases due to the lack of funding and time and "the potential to create legal precedents unfavorable to itself and other sport organizations" [Moorman, Greenwell 2005].

Keep in mind that a current legal approach does not provide actual US sponsors or sport organizations with satisfactory protection against ambush cases, one needs an alternative plan to prevent ambush marketing. Currently, education seems to be a proactive way to protect official sponsors or sport organizations from ambush marketing. Techniques and tactics used by ambushers are so subtle that opinion leaders, the media, and consumers find it difficult to determine if their practices are harmful to official sponsors or sport organizations. Both actual sponsors and sport organizations should educate target audiences on how ambushers promote their products in association with a sporting event, and what kinds of techniques ambushers are using.

Taekwondo Points of Consideration

Ambush marketing can likewise endanger the growth of emerging sports like Taekwondo. As Taekwondo events grow in popularity, funding outside of the sport's governing bodies will likely be needed. This is especially true considering the Taekwondo industry has the potential to branch into nonsporting events like academic conferences. Some protection against ambush marketing needs to be in place for sponsors to ensure a sound return on their investments.

The four abovementioned remedies may only be practical for Taekwondo organizations and events held

within the United States, but they do establish a groundwork for other Taekwondo event organizers outside of America. Taekwondo event organizers would be wise to first identify their competitors and think proactively about what ambush marketing tactics would be feasible for them. Special consideration should be placed on whether these events are at the local, state, or national level, since that will help determine the companies who would most benefit from ambush marketing. Yet, this can be balanced with the fact that ambush marketing at Taekwondo events will not have a multimillion dollar budget like those plaguing the Olympic Games. For this reason, onsite policing of ambush marketers whose companies or their products may be harmful to the event's image is essential. If an ambush marketing scheme is detected prior to an event, a cease and desist letter would be the best course of action. Yet, organizers should be ready to follow up such a letter with legal action by being able to sue the ambush marketers.

Two limitations exist within the current research. First, there is no data to support the idea that ambush marketing has occurred at Taekwondo events. Nevertheless, as Taekwondo events are becoming more popular and diverse, the sport's governing bodies need to be aware of these tactics to take preventive measures and to act accordingly if ambush marketing does occur. In connection with the first limitation, this research is also not supported by empirical evidence. As such, future researchers should investigate Taekwondo events to determine what types of ambush marketing tactics are committed.

As ambush marketing may draw attention to Taekwondo events that otherwise would not have received attention outside of a narrow target market, ambush marketing may even facilitate Taekwondo's growth in popularity. Obviously, an increase in popularity in Taekwondo would be financially advantageous for everyone involved in the sport and martial art. As an example, local business owners would see an increase in students. Companies specializing in Taekwondo products (e.g. uniforms, belts, kicking targets, and training manuals) would therefore see increased sales subsequently. Local and regional tournaments would also draw more spectators, which means advertisers would be more interested in promoting the events and/or advertising at them. Likewise, it is possible that Taekwondo organizations could see increases in major sponsors at their national and international tournaments. While it can be argued that ambush marketing is roguish, it could provide positive wide-reaching effects for the Taekwondo industry.

Sources

1. American Taekwondo Union (ATU). (c2016), *Our History*, <http://americantaekwondounited.com/about-us/>, accessed May 23, 2018.

2. Cornell Law School. (c2018), *15 U.S. Code § 1114 - Remedies; Infringement; Innocent Infringement by Printers and Publishers*, <https://help.law.cornell.edu/help>, accessed May 23, 2018.
3. Guardian, The. (July 19, 2012), *London 2012 Olympic Sponsors List: Who Are They and What Have They Paid?*, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/sport/datablog/2012/jul/19/london-2012-olympic-sponsors-list>, accessed June 04, 2018.
4. Kaplan D. September 5, 2011, *U.S. Open Mad as Ale over Ads*, "Sports Business Journal", <https://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2011/09/05/Marketing-and-Sponsorship/US-Open-ambush.aspx>, accessed December 12, 2019.
5. Longman J. (July 24, 2012), *Where even Sausage Rings Are Put On the Chopping Block*; "New York Times", https://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/25/sports/olympics/2012-london-games-even-sausage-rings-alarm-marketing-police.html?_r=0, accessed July 4, 2018.
6. Schutte S. (August 6, 2014), *8 great ambush marketing campaigns*, "Real Business", <https://realbusiness.co.uk/8-great-ambush-marketing-campaigns/>, accessed December 12, 2019.
7. Sweney M. (July 25, 2012), *Olympics 2012: Nike Plots Ambush Ad Campaign*, "The Guardian", <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2012/jul/25/olympics-2012-nike-ambush-ad>, accessed July 4, 2018.
9. Dickson G., Naylor M., Phelps S. (2015), *Consumer Attitudes towards Ambush Marketing*. "Sport Management Review", 18(2), pp. 280-290.
10. Ellis D., Scassa T., Seguin B. (2011), *Framing Ambush Marketing as a Legal Issue: An Olympic Perspective*, "Sport Management Review", 14(3), pp. 297-308.
11. Ellis D., Patry P., Seguin B., O'Reilly N. (2019), *Ambush Marketing and the Olympic and Paralympic Marks Act: A National Sponsor Perspective*, "International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing", 19(3/4), pp. 184. doi: 10.1504/IJSMM.2019.099783
12. Ettorre B. (1993), *Ambush Marketing: Heading Them off at the Pass*, "Management Review", 82(3), pp. 53-57.
13. Farrelly F., Quester P., Greysier S.A. (2005), *Defending the Co-branding Benefits of Sponsorship b2b Partnerships: The Case of Ambush Marketing*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 45(3), pp. 339-348.
14. Ford J.B. (2018), *What Do We Know About Sports Sponsorships?*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 58(3), pp. 257-258; doi:10.2501/JAR-2018-033.
15. Grady J. (2016), *Predicting the Future for Rio 2016: Legal Issues in Sponsorship, Ambush Marketing, and Social Media*, "Entertainment and Sports Law Journal", 14(2). Available at: <https://www.entsportslawjournal.com/articles/10.16997/eslj.199/>
16. International Academic Conference for Taekwondo (iACT), (2015), *Proceedings from WTF-iACT 2015: Taekwondo as a Martial Art & Martial Sport in 2015: A Collaboration of Physical Training & Academic Discourse for All*, New Mexico State University, Los Cruces, NM.

References

1. Bayless A. (1988 Feb 8), *Ambush Marketing Is Becoming a Popular Event at Olympic Games*, "The Wall Street Journal".
2. Bean L.L. (1995), *Note: Ambush Marketing: Sports Sponsorship Confusion and the Lanham Act*, "Boston University Law Review", 75, pp. 1-14.
3. Brownlee E., Greenwell T.C., Moorman A. (2018), *An Experimental Approach to Assessing the Effectiveness of Official Sponsor Designations in an Ambush Marketing Scenario*, "Sport Marketing Quarterly", 27, pp. 145-153.
4. Burton N., Chadwick S. (2018), *Ambush Marketing Is Dead, Long Live Ambush Marketing: A Redefinition and Typology of an Increasingly Prevalent Phenomenon*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 58(3), pp. 282-296; doi: 10.2501/JAR-2017-014.
5. Chanavat N, Desbordes M. (2014), *Towards the regulation and restriction of ambush marketing? The first truly social and digital mega sports event: Olympic Games, London 2012*, "International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship", 15(3), pp. 151-160. doi: 10.1108/IJSMS-15-03-2014-B002
6. Clement A. (2004), *Law in Sport and Physical Activity*, 3rd ed., Dania, FL: Sport and Law Press.
7. Crompton J.L. (2004), *Sponsorship Ambushing in Sport*, "Managing Leisure", 9(1), 1-12.
8. Crow D., Hoek J. (2003), *Ambush Marketing: A Critical Review and some Practical Advice*, "Marketing Bulletin", 14(1), pp. 1-14.
17. International Academic Conference for Taekwondo (iACT), (2016), *Proceedings from WTF-iACT 2016: Issues in Taekwondo History & Future Directions*, San Francisco, CA.
18. Johnson, P. (2011), *Ambush Marketing and Brand Protection: Law and Practice*, 2nd Ed., New York: Oxford University Press.
19. Kent A., Campbell Jr. R.M. (2007), *An Introduction to Free-loading: Campus-area Ambush Marketing*, "Sport Marketing Quarterly", 16(2), pp. 118-122.
20. Kim M.K., Zhang J.J., Ko Y.J. (2009), *Dimensions of Market Demand Associated with Taekwondo Schools in North America: Development of a Scale*, "Sport Management Review", 12(3), pp. 149-166.
21. Lee B., Kim K. (2015), *Effect of Taekwondo Training on Physical Fitness and Growth Index According to IGF-1 Gene Polymorphism in Children*. "Korean Journal of Physiology & Pharmacology", 19(4), pp. 341-347 [in Korean].
22. McDaniel S.R., Kinney L. (1998), *The Implications of Recency and Gender Effects in Consumer Response to Ambush Marketing*, "Psychology & Marketing", 15(4), pp. 385-403.
23. McKelvey S. (2004), *An Analysis of the Ongoing Global Efforts to Combat Ambush Marketing: Will Corporate Marketers Take the Gold in Greece?*, "Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport", 14, pp. 1-12.
24. McKelvey S. (1994), *Sans Legal Restraint, No Stopping Brash, Creative Ambush Marketers*, "Brandweek", 18, pp. 20.

25. McKelvey S. (2003), *Unauthorized use of event tickets in promotional campaign may create new legal strategies to combat ambush marketing: NCAA vs. Coors*, "Sport Marketing Quarterly", 12(2), pp. 117-118.
26. Moorman A.M., Greenwell T.C. (2005), *Consumer Attitudes of Deception and the Legality of Ambush Marketing Practices*, "Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport", 15, pp. 1-15.
27. O'Sullivan P., Murphy P. (1998), *Ambush Marketing: The Ethical Issues*, "Psychology & Marketing", 15(4), pp. 349-365.
28. Payne M. (2005), *Ambush Marketing: The Undeserved Advantage*, "Psychology & Marketing", 15(4), pp. 323-331.
29. Sandler D.M., Shani D. (1989), *Olympic Sponsorship vs. "Ambush" Marketing: Who Gets the Gold?*, "Journal of Advertising Research", 29(4), pp. 9-14.
30. Schmitz J.K. (2005), *Ambush Marketing: The Off-field Competition at the Olympic Games*, "Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property", 3, pp. 1-4.
31. Shani D., Sandler D.M. (1998), *Ambush Marketing: Is Confusion to Blame for the Flickering of the Flame?*, "Psychology & Marketing", 15(4), pp. 367-383.
32. Townley S., Harrington D., Couchman N. (1998), *The Legal and Practical Prevention of Ambush Marketing in Sports*, "Psychology & Marketing", 15(4), pp. 333-348.
33. White B. (2001), *Part Five: Trademark Litigation: Infringement: Review Essay: Who Are the Real Competitors in the Olympic Games?*, "Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues", 12, pp. 1-3.

Marketing z zasadzki (*ambush marketing*) w Taekwondo i sposoby zapobiegania mu

Słowa kluczowe: marketing pasożytniczy, branża taekwondo, *freeloading* (życie cudzym kosztem), marketing z zasadzki na zasadzie skojarzenia, marketing z zasadzki przez intruzję

Abstrakt

Tło. Korporacje podpisują umowy sponsorskie z organizacjami sportowymi w celu promowania sprzedaży, zwiększania świadomości na temat swoich produktów i poprawy wizerunku. Zagrożenie wynikające z *ambush marketing* (*marketingu z zasadzki*) może zniechęcić potencjalnych sponsorów, a tym samym ograniczyć rozwój Taekwondo jako sportu dla widzów. Problem i cel. Niniejsze badanie ma na celu wyjaśnienie zasad marketingu z zasadzki i dostarczenie rozwiązań opartych na obecnym prawie amerykańskim, które mają zastosowanie w czasie międzynarodowych imprez Taekwondo.

Metody. Przeprowadzono systematyczny przegląd literatury na temat *ambush marketing*, prawa amerykańskiego i aktualnych wydarzeń Taekwondo. Ustanowione metody zapobiegania praktykom *ambush marketing* zostały określone i zastosowane w odniesieniu do zdarzeń związanych z Taekwondo.

Wyniki. Organizatorzy powinni najpierw zidentyfikować swoich konkurentów i proaktywnie zastanowić się, jaka taktyka marketingowa byłaby wykonalna. Po drugie, niezbędne jest pilnowanie na miejscu firm, których działania marketingowe mogą być szkodliwe dla wizerunku imprezy. Po trzecie, w przypadku wykrycia nieprawidłowych działań marketingowych, należy napisać nakaz o zaprzestaniu działalności. W ostateczności, organizatorzy powinni podjąć kroki prawne i wytoczyć proces sądowy przeciwko firmom stosującym *ambush marketing*. Wniosek. Ponieważ *ambush marketing* może zwrócić uwagę na wydarzenia Taekwondo, które w przeciwnym razie nie zyskałyby uwagi poza wąskim rynkiem docelowym, ten rodzaj marketingu może nawet ułatwić wzrost popularności Taekwondo. Branża Taekwondo może zauważyć wzrost przychodów, im więcej uwagi poświęca się imprezom Taekwondo, które nie mają dużych budżetów marketingowych. Chociaż marketing z zasadzki jest podstępny działaniem, może jednak przynieść daleko idące, pozytywne efekty dla całej branży Taekwondo.