Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi – Journal of Social Sciences
ISSN: 1306-7877 e-ISSN: 2147-5644

**A Model for Measuring Sponsorship Impact: An Analysis of Beko’s Naming Rights
Sponsorship of Fenerbahçe Men’s Basketball Team**

**Sponsorluk Etkinliğini Ölçmeye Dair Bir Model: Beko’nun Fenerbahçe Erkek Basket
Takımına İsim Sponsorluğu Üzerine Bir Analiz**

Ayşe Simin KARA

Doç. Dr., İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi
İstanbul, Türkiye

Assoc. Prof. Dr., Istanbul Commerce University, Faculty of Communication
Istanbul, Turkey

aserdemir@ticaret.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5641-9738>

Makale Bilgisi / Article Information

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29238/tbd.2007.51333>

Makale Türü / Article Types: Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Geliş Tarihi / The Article Arrival Date: 08.05.2021

Yayımlanma Tarihi / Publication Date: 25 Haziran / June 2021

Yayımlanma Sezonu / Publication Season: Haziran / June 2021

Cilt / Volume: 30

Sayfa / Pages: 1-34

Copyright © Published by Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi – Journal of Social Sciences.
All rights reserved www.toplumbilimleri.com

ABSTRACT

Over the course of many years, sponsorships have proven to be a lucrative avenue in effectively delivering brand-related messages to hard-to-reach segments. However, when economic circumstances turned doom-and-gloom, professionals started to strive to make sponsorship expenditures more accountable as sponsorships often stand as the largest budgeted item in annual plans. Hence, a need is born to assess sponsorship results in different sport settings. There are studies that provide insight into the factors leading to purchase intentions by looking at different sport settings; however, a more attuned measurement of sponsorship effectiveness can be attained by way of integrating actual purchase behaviors into study design. The motive of this study is to assess consumer-based sponsorship outcomes at the cognitive, affective and conative level by looking at fans' conscious and explicit processing of Fenerbahçe's sponsorship deal with Beko. The results of this study provide evidence that the relationships among the analyzed sponsorship antecedent and outcome categories did have a significant effect on the two final variables crucial in assessing the success of a given sponsorship practice—intention to purchase and actual purchase behaviors—yet, the mediating effects are found to be impacted by age, gender, income, education, extent of involvement, past purchase and sponsorship fit.

Key words: Sponsorship, Sponsorship Impact, Sponsorship Outcomes, Naming Rights Sponsorship, Purchase Intent, Actual Purchase.

ÖZET

Uzun yıllar boyunca, sponsorluk uygulamaları ulaşılması zor tüketici segmentlerine erişim konusunda etkili bir yol olmuştur. Olumsuz ekonomik dalgalanmalar ve, sponsorlukların genellikle yıllık planlardaki en yüksek bütçeli faaliyet olmasından dolayı, profesyoneller sponsorluk harcamalarını daha yönetilebilir hale getirmek için gayret etmeye başlamışlardır. Bu nedenle, hem sektörde hem akademide farklı spor ortamlarında sponsorluk sonuçlarını değerlendirme ihtiyacı doğmuştur. Farklı spor ortamlarına bakarak satın alma niyetlerine ışık tutan çalışmalar vardır ancak, satın alma niyeti her zaman satın almaya dönüşmediği için gerçek satın alma davranışlarını araştırma tasarımı entegre etmek sponsorluk etkinliğinin ölçümü için önemlidir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Fenerbahçe'nin Beko ile yaptığı isim sponsorluk anlaşmasının taraftarlar üzerindeki özümseme sürecine bakarak, tüketici temelli sponsorluk sonuçlarının bilişsel, duyuşsal ve konatif (davranışsal) düzeyde etkisini değerlendirmektir. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları, sponsorluğun etkinliğini yansıtan sonuç kategorilerinin satın alma eğilimi ve gerçek satın alma üzerinde özellikle yaş, cinsiyet, gelir, eğitim, katılımın kapsamı, geçmiş satın alma ve sponsorluk uyumu bağlamında önemli ölçüde etki ettiğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Sponsorluk, Sponsorluğun Etkinliği, Sponsorluk Çıktıları, İsimhakları Sponsorluğu, Satınalma Niyeti, Gerçek Satınalma.

INTRODUCTION

In the face of the steady growth in sponsorship investments, business and academic circles direct attention to verifying the return on sponsorship investments. From the business perspective, despite the study growth in sponsorship investments, there is an increased need to make financial expenses more justifiable (Verhoef & Leeflang, 2009). Thereafter, it is of pivotal importance for managers to be able to legitimize their spendings, including proving the financial contribution of the sponsorships they activate. However, in practice, assessment of sponsorship impact is commonly limited to personal exposure reporting and brands tend to face challenges in evaluating the sponsorships they undertake. Moreover, professionals note that measuring the impact of a given sponsorship remains a perplexing issue, especially in the case of sport properties because the sports sponsoring market is becoming more competitive and sponsors have a variety of alternatives to invest in (ANA, 2018).

Literature reviewed shows that the lack of data on past and actual behavior makes sponsorship evaluations incomplete, and research that sheds light on behavioral responses and thus adds to current consumer behavior insight is of great importance for a comprehensive understanding of the relationships governing sponsorship evaluations. This fact suggests that certain study areas remain unstudied, and recommendations for future research are called for as further research seems to be needed in revealing how sponsorships work in the perception of audience populations. Therefore, trying to bridge the gap between what consumers say versus what do in reality and provide insight regarding how to overcome the possible discrepancies in the answers provided serve to be an important academic and managerial objective.

On the basis of above mentioned gaps in sponsorship research, the purpose of this study is to look at how antecedents and consumer-based outcomes influence intention to purchase as well as actual purchase behaviors and to reveal the mediating effects of variables on sponsorship effectiveness. In selecting variables, this study was inspired by Kim et al.'s (2015) research, which provides a meta-analytic summary for possible antecedents and consumer-based sponsorship outcomes. From the antecedent classification, only fit and past purchase were integrated as these variables are the only ones dyadic in nature (Biscaia et al., 2013) and from outcome categories; sponsor awareness, sponsor image, and attitude toward the sponsor were used to understand how these variables function in relation to purchase intent and actual purchase. These sponsorship variables are not only important in consumer behavior studies but are also stated to be some of the most crucial antecedent and outcome categories impacting sponsorship effectiveness (Biscaia et al., 2013; Scheinbaum & Lacey, 2013).

This paper addressed the research objective by surveying Fenerbahçe men's basketball fans across Turkey. Respondents were selected from a pool of members registered in the Fenerbahçe Members Club and Fenerbahçeliler Derneği. From the list of members, probability sampling was carried out, then the survey was forwarded to designated contacts.

INFLUENCE VARIABLES & HYPOTHESIS PRESENTATION

In formulating the hypothesis, the available literature was reviewed. To review the literature, computerized databases were searched using the following key words in various combinations: sponsor, sponsorship, sponsorship effect, public relations, advertising and marketing. Aside from running a search on computerized databases, the author also carried out a manual search by looking for journals with a specific focus on the above mentioned

key words. The following inclusion criteria were applied to studies: (1) the studies had to scientifically validate one or more correlations between the categories of analysis; (2) only texts written in English were chosen; (3) the search did not include unpublished studies such as dissertations, theses, conference papers and working papers; (4) only studies providing sufficient empirical data were considered for inclusion.

Sponsor Awareness: The literature reviewed presents sponsor awareness as the most important precursor of successful sponsorship, placing emphasis on its power in shaping purchase intent (Ko et al., 2008); however, little empirical evidence exists showing whether high brand awareness at an affective level leads to more desirable brand-related results. Literature states that the major motive behind investing in sponsorship is attaining sponsor awareness (Bennett, 1999). This is backed by Crompton (2004); he states that awareness is the first step to attaining success from a given sponsorship activation. Without an established awareness, intended messages simply cannot be delivered and brand-related outcomes cannot be achieved. The reasoning is that creating awareness is the starting point in the activation of a chain of favorable brand-related effects to be triggered; once awareness is achieved then interest can be built, and from that point a desire can be sparked in the mind of the spectator to try the sponsor's products or services. That single purchase can lead to multiple purchases or, more importantly, to recommendations to other consumer groups, which will result in the acquisition of new customers for the brand.

In line with the above arguments, recent research points out that sponsorship awareness is an important factor in shaping sponsor attitudes, which is claimed to positively impact spectators' purchase intentions (Ko et al., 2008; Schlesinger & Güngerich, 2011). Taking into consideration the fact that awareness denotes an audience's rate of success in accurately recalling or recognizing a brand name under different conditions, Grohs et al.'s (2004) study is vital; their study findings highlight that among the subjects tested, the ones who could recognize sponsor names held a more favorable stance toward the sponsors than those who could not remember the sponsors. There are also research findings stressing that awareness, particularly at the level of the sport club's support of the sponsor, positively impact spectators' attitudes toward sponsors and their subsequent purchase intentions (Ko et al., 2008; Schlesinger & Güngerich, 2011). The above mentioned arguments show the importance of sponsoring brands achieving sponsor awareness and lead to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Sponsorship awareness will have a positive effect on attitude toward the sponsor.

Hypothesis 2: Sponsorship awareness will have a positive effect on purchase intentions.

Hypothesis 3: Sponsorship awareness will have a positive effect on actual purchases.

Sponsor Image: Only a handful of studies research image's effects on sponsorship; nevertheless, there is strong evidence that sponsor image has a positive impact on purchase intention (Ko et al., 2008). Although several researchers have proved that image and purchase intentions are related (Pope, & Voges, 2000), no research was found on the effects of image on actual purchase. The power play of image transfer determines the image effects of sponsorships. Originally proposed by Gwinner (1997), image transfer theory is used in evaluating sponsorship effectiveness. According to this theory, parties engaging in a sponsorship deal have personality and attributes associated with their name (Meenaghan, 1983). Associations form at the cognitive level; thus, when an activity is sponsored, the associations triggered by the activity are transferred to the sponsor and, in a similar fashion, the associations activated by the sponsor are transferred to the event (Grohs et al., 2004; Meen-

aghan, 2001). In sporting events, this association takes place when audience members actively collect information on the event's attributes, benefits and attitudes available in their memories and transfer them to the sponsoring brand and vice versa (Keller, 1993; Lardinoit & Quester, 2001). In studying effects of image transfer, researchers suggest looking into purchase intent and the influence that attitude has on purchase intention in assessing sponsorship effectiveness (Pope & Voges, 2000; Quester & Farrelly, 1998). Taking the above mentioned arguments into consideration, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H4: The image of the sponsor impacts the intention to purchase the sponsor's products.

H5: The image of the sponsor impacts the actual purchase of the sponsor's products.

Sponsorship Fit: Image formation lies in spectators' extent of perceived fit between the event and the sponsor as well as the degree of involvement with the event, which in turn impacts attitude toward the sponsor followed by purchase intent and eventually actual purchase behavior (Gwinner & Bennett, 2008). Grohs (2015) argues that the perceived congruence between the event and the sponsor influences sponsor image. Several studies have proven that fit and attitude are related (Grohs et al., 2004; Koo et al., 2006; Gwinner & Bennett, 2008). In sponsorship literature, fit is linked to the perceived relatedness, similarity and relevance between the event and the sponsor.

Studies reveal that if the audience perceives the sponsor and sponsee to be closely related, and if they view the event in a positive light, then they become likely to hold positive attitudes toward the sponsor, which is crucial if the sponsorship execution is intended to positively impact purchase intentions (Dees et al., 2010; Becker-Olsen & Hill, 2006). In the sport sponsorship context, firms activating sponsorship deals hope to see positive image transfer; they desire to see fans foster favorable feelings toward the sponsor as they do toward the team they support, and literature reviewed suggests that fans tend to hold favorable attitudes toward the sponsor if they believe the sponsorship deal is in one way or another contributive to the team (Madrigal, 2001). When relatedness between the brand names in a sponsorship alliance is detected, then any favorable attitudes and behaviors toward the sponsee are transferred to the sponsor. Conversely, sponsorships with low fit are suggested to make negative associations more likely. By this logic, the negative effect will call forth other negative thoughts, resulting in an unfavorable attitude toward the brand's sponsorship. In line with this thinking, Becker-Olsen and Simmons (2002) say that a good fit between sponsor and event results in more positive attitudes toward the sponsee. As such, a sponsor and sponsee need to have a high degree of cohesiveness if the relationship is to be clearly understood and viewed as justifiable by consumers.

Studies also support the argument that the more relevant a sponsor is to spectators, the more likely they are to make purchases from that sponsor (Dees et al., 2010; Scheinbaum & Lacey, 2013). Moreover, research on mental processes showing how a given sponsor is associated with a property suggests that individuals hold a bias toward a sponsor that is perceived as related to the event (Speed & Thompson, 2000). In other words, spectators are more prone to recognizing a name as a sponsor of an event if a relationship is recognized between the sponsee and the sponsor than in a case where no relationship is recognized (Speed & Thompson, 2000). This fact is vital; identification is necessary because it serves as a precursor in shaping attitude. Similar in line, Speed and Thompson (2000) reported a positive correlation between the extent of fit and interest in the sponsor, sponsor attitude and purchase intent. To sum up, the studies reviewed assert that a more comprehensive sponsorship execution results in more successful sponsorships. Since fit serves to build on the sense of meaning and significance, it is vital to take the above mentioned research findings into consideration in generating hypotheses.

Hypothesis 6: Sponsorship fit impacts sponsor image.

Hypothesis 7: Sponsorship fit impacts attitude toward the sponsor.

Hypothesis 8: Transfer of image impacts perceived fit.

Hypothesis 9: Sponsorship fit impacts purchase intentions.

Hypothesis 10: Sponsorship fit impacts actual purchases.

Attitude Toward the Sponsor: Previous research points out that attitude toward the sponsor is an important parameter in determining purchase intent (Speed & Thompson, 2000; Alexandris et al, 2007). Study results show that the attitudes toward the sponsor, as well as sponsorship perceptions, have a strong positive impact on shaping the purchasing decisions of consumers, which paves the way for the creation of a loyal fan base as consumers (Madrigal, 2001). The main argument of the attitude-behavior correlation is that a favorable stance toward the sponsor results in an increase in consumption of the products and/or service offerings provided by the sponsor, and, in a similar fashion, a negative attitude or lack of any opinion about the sponsor results in a decrease in consumption or non-consumption of the products and/or service offerings presented by the sponsor.

Research reveals that establishing a positive stance toward the sponsor is vital to implementing effective sponsorship practices (Alexandris et al., 2007; Speed & Thompson, 2000). This is because positive attitudes toward sponsors are said to result in favorable behavioral intentions. In fact, Howard and Sheth (1969) proposed that attitude affects purchase only through purchase intention. On this basis, it would be fair to state that a given sponsorship practice can alter spectators' reactions to the sponsor, which is suggested to lead to the formation of positive attitudes toward the sponsor followed by an increase in spectators' intent to purchase the sponsor's products and/or service offerings. Several types of research proved that attitude and purchase intentions are related (Kim et al., 2010; Koo et al., 2006), and the following hypotheses are formulated on the basis of the propositions of this previous research.

Hypothesis 11: Attitude toward the sponsor impacts purchase intentions.

Hypothesis 12: Attitude toward the sponsor impacts actual purchases.

Past Purchase Behavior: The literature reviewed cites past behaviors as a predictor variable of future responses (Zaharia et al., 2016; Cornwell & Coote, 2005). There are research findings illustrating the effect of past behavior on both intention and behavior. Cornwell & Coote (2005) bring a behaviorist perspective to the theory of planned behavior, proposing that behavior is motivated by habit. Derived from studying the effects of past purchase behaviors on a variety of future purchase intentions, the literature reviewed provides evidence that past behavior serves as a predictor of intentions. The literature reviewed also cites past behavior as an important variable in understanding the intricacies involved in decision making and claims that it can be used to make speculations on purchase intentions and future behavior (Biscaia et al., 2013; Garland et al., 2008). Taking the above-mentioned findings into consideration, the following hypotheses are generated:

Hypothesis 13: Previous purchase behaviors will have a direct positive effect on purchase intentions.

Hypothesis 14: Previous purchase behaviors will have a direct positive effect on actual purchases.

Purchase Intentions: Given its typical impact on future sales, the purchase intention is stated to be a significant factor signaling sponsorship effectiveness (Choi et al., 2011).

This is backed by research findings that make reference to behavioral intentions as the final variable to look into in assessing the effectiveness of a given sponsorship (Alexandris et al., 2012; Biscaia et al., 2013). The literature states that purchase intentions denote a favorable intent toward actually purchasing products and service offerings from a given brand (Spears & Singh, 2004). It is widely acknowledged that purchase intent must arise prior to purchase; therefore, purchase intentions are commonly recognized as a precursor of actual purchase behaviors (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). Taking the above arguments into consideration, the following hypotheses is formulated:

Hypothesis 15: Purchase intentions impact actual purchases.

Actual Purchase Behaviors: Effective sponsorship should lead to a favorable alteration in behavior in order to be regarded as successful, and from a sponsor's standpoint the ultimate behavioral change is tantamount to seeing a positive impact on sales (O'Reilly & Madill, 2012). Findings point to a short-term influence of sport sponsorship on purchase behavior; yet, over the long term the actual influence of a sponsorship practice on sales is often complicated to assess and, thus, often scrutinized.

In the sponsorship framework, this is especially significant as in sponsorship literature a positive connection between intentions and actual purchase behaviors is often suggested while a gap exists in empirical research on the study of actual behaviors. Moreover, professionals have suggested that there is an incongruency between what people say and what they do. Apart from some study findings, there is a lack of scientific data to correlate what people state they are going to do and what they actually do. Thus, in order to correlate intentions with actual purchase behavior, when constructing the survey design past purchase was presented with time frames: before the sponsorship deal (purchase before December 2019) and after the sponsorship deal (purchase after December 2019–2020) by this way correlations could be made between past purchase and actual purchase even after subjects attended the sporting event.

METHODOLOGY

Survey respondents (N=2000) are found using a preliminary list of registered fans provided by Fenerbahçe Club and Fenerbahçeliler Association. The survey was distributed after the sponsorship deal was formed, ensuring the study implications would not be limited to a given time period when the given sponsorship practice was in activation. Measures that had previously been proved to have valid and reliable psychometric properties were selected the relevant literature, and some were modified to suit the context of the current study. All items were then reviewed by a panel of scholars with expertise in the conceptual and methodological issues of the present study.

The data were analyzed using the SPSS 25, AMOS 24 program, with a confidence level of 95 percent. For the analyses, valid data for 2000 people were used. Categorical (qualitative) variables were expressed as frequencies (n) and percentages (%), while numerical (quantitative) variables were expressed as mean (X), standard deviation (sd), and minimum and maximum statistics. A CFA was carried out to test the validity of the scales, and reliability coefficients were calculated.

Calculations of skewness were made and kurtosis values were applied to assess the suitability of scale scores to a normal distribution. Skewness and kurtosis values between +3 and -3 were deemed to indicate normal distribution (Groeneveld & Meeden, 1984; Moors, 1988; Hopkins & Weeks, 1990; DeCarlo, 1997). Accordingly, the scale scores were deemed to be normally distributed. Parametric methods were considered appropriate for the analyses.

Pearson correlation tests, independent samples t tests, ANOVAs (analyses of variance), and multiple/simple linear regressions were used in the study, and a path analysis was utilized to test the main model. A Pearson correlation test was used to define the direction and effect of the linear relationship between two independent quantitative variables. An independent samples t test was used to compare two independent samples in terms of a quantitative variable, while a one-way ANOVA was used to compare more than two independent samples ($k>2$) in terms of a quantitative variable. A multiple linear regression tests multiple independent variables that can have an impact on the dependent variable, while a simple linear regression defines the effect of only one independent variable on a dependent variable. A path analysis tests the main model in one phase.

RESULTS

Table 3. Distribution of Demographic Characteristics

		n	%
How many times did you attend a Fenerbahçe basketball game in the previous season?	Never	285	14.3
	1–5	512	25.6
	6–10	817	40.9
	>10	386	19.3
Did you buy any Beko products in the previous season?	Yes	409	20.5
	No	1,591	79.6
Did you buy any Beko products before 2019?	Yes	345	17.3
	No	1,655	82.8
Gender	Female	524	26.2
	Male	1,476	73.8
Age	≤30	478	23.9
	31–45	907	45.4
	≥46	615	30.8
Yearly income	<TRY 25,000	359	18.0
	TRY 25,000–50,000	469	23.5
	TRY 50,001–100,000	536	26.8
	TRY 100,001–200,000	306	15.3
	>TRY 200,000	330	16.5
Educational status	Primary school/Secondary school	236	11.8
	High school	338	16.9
	Associate degree	294	14.7
	Bachelor's degree	573	28.7
	Master's degree	338	16.9
	PhD	221	11.1

Among the respondents, 40.9 percent stated that they had attended a Fenerbahçe basketball game 6–10 times in the previous season, while the percentages of those who had bought a Beko product during the previous season and those who had bought a Beko product before 2019 were 20.5 percent and 17.3 percent, respectively. As can be seen from Table 3, 73.8 percent of the respondents were male, 45.4 percent were in the 31–45 age group, 26.8 percent had a yearly income of TRY 50,001–100,000, and 28.7 percent had a bachelor's degree.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis: A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) assesses the compatibility of real data and the factors (i.e., latent variables) analyzed based on several variables within the scope of a theoretical approach. In other words, a CFA aims to analyze to what extent a predefined or fictionalized structure is verified by the collected data. In an explanatory factor analysis, the factor structure of the data is identified based on factor loads, with no specific preliminary expectation or hypothesis; a CFA, on the other hand, tests the presumption that certain variables will affect the factors that were predefined based on a theoretical approach (Sümer, 2000).

Several fit indices were used to identify the adequacy of the model tested within the scope of the CFA. Since fit indices each have their own strengths and weaknesses in assessing the compliance between a theoretical model and real data, it was recommended that several fit index values be used to define the compliance of the model. The most common fit index values (Cole, 1987; Sümer, 2000) are the Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test, the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), the Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Normed Fit Index (NFI), the Square Root of Mean Errors (RMR or RMS) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA).

Table 4. Sponsor Awareness CFA Fit Indices

Index	Acceptable Fit	Sponsor Awareness
χ^2	x	0.159
sd	x	1
χ^2/sd	≤ 5	0.159
RMR	≤ 0.08	0.001
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.999
AGFI	≥ 0.85	0.999
NFI	≥ 0.90	0.998
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.998
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.999
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.001

According to the results of the CFA, the Sponsor Awareness scale has provided the fit indices.

Table 5. Sponsor Awareness CFA Results

Item	β	t	p
1. I know who the main sponsor of the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team is.	0.815		
2. I believe I can list the sponsors of the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team in general.	0.907	43.114	0.000
3. While watching a game, I notice the name of the sponsor of my team.	0.948	48.158	0.000
4. Beko's support of the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team has had a positive impact on my attitude toward Beko.	0.759	35.383	0.000
5. Beko's support of the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team has had a positive impact on my intention to buy Beko products.	0.740	28.896	0.000
6. Beko's support of the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team has encouraged me to buy Beko products.	0.697	31.797	0.000

The Sponsor Awareness scale factor loads, based on the CFA results, are presented in table 5. Based on the analysis results, no item was excluded.

Table 6. Sponsor Image CFA Fit Indices

Index	Acceptable Fit	Sponsor Image
X^2	x	29.880
sd	x	6
X^2/sd	≤ 5	4.880
RMR	≤ 0.08	0.016
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.996
AGFI	≥ 0.85	0.980
NFI	≥ 0.90	0.997
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.993
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.998
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.045

According to the results of the CFA, the Sponsor Image scale has provided the fit indices.

Table 7. Sponsor Image CFA Results

Item	β	t	p
1. Beko offers quality products/services.	0.417		
3. Beko provides societal support.	0.801	18.466	0.000
4. Beko seems like a good place to work.	0.856	18.794	0.000
5. Beko meets consumer needs.	0.891	19.002	0.000
6. Beko is managed well.	0.844	19.892	0.000
7. My perception of the company's image affects my intention to buy Beko products.	0.873	18.918	0.000
8. My perception of the company's image has encouraged me to buy Beko products.	0.819	19.049	0.000

The Sponsor Image scale factor loads based on the CFA results are presented in table 7. Following the analysis, item 2 ("Beko just wants to make money") was excluded due to its low factor load.

10

Table 8. Event-Sponsor Fit CFA Fit Indices

Index	Acceptable Fit	Event/Sponsor Fit
X^2	x	4.625
sd	x	2
X^2/sd	≤ 5	2.312
RMR	≤ 0.08	0.007
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.998
AGFI	≥ 0.85	0.992
NFI	≥ 0.90	0.999
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.997
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.998
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.026

According to the results of the CFA, the Event/Sponsor Fit scale has provided the fit indices.

Table 9. Event/Sponsor Fit CFA Results

Item	β	t	p
1. There is a close harmony between Beko and the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team.	0.761		
2. There are many similarities between Beko and the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team.	0.842	39.544	0.000
3. Considering their compatibility, Beko's sponsorship of the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team is logical.	0.705	25.607	0.000
4. For me, the Fenerbahçe men's basketball team and Beko share a similar image.	0.743	27.308	0.000
5. I can say that the sponsor fit has an impact on my intention to buy Beko products.	0.786	33.437	0.000
6. I can say that the sponsor fit has encouraged me to buy Beko products.	0.715	27.211	0.000

The Event/Sponsor Fit scale factor loads based on the CFA results are presented in table 9. Based on the analysis results, no item was excluded.

Table 10. Sponsor Attitude CFA Fit Indices

Index	Acceptable Fit	Attitude Toward the Sport
X^2	x	16.503
sd	x	4
X^2/sd	≤ 5	4.126
RMR	≤ 0.08	0.011
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.996
AGFI	≥ 0.85	0.976
NFI	≥ 0.90	0.998
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.999
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.999
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.040

According to the results of the CFA, the Sponsor Attitude scale has provided the fit indices.

Table 11. Sponsor Attitude CFA Results

Item	β	t	p
1. I love Beko.	0.668		
2. Beko is a very good brand.	0.720	34.077	0.000
3. I have a positive attitude toward Beko.	0.812	31.668	0.000
4. My opinions of the brands that are the sponsors of my favorite team are positive.	0.889	34.296	0.000
5. I can say that my attitude toward Beko will have an impact on my intention to buy Beko products.	0.899	33.157	0.000
6. My opinion of Beko has encouraged me to buy Beko products.	0.859	33.068	0.000

The Sponsor Attitude scale factor loads based on the CFA results are presented in table 11. Based on the analysis results, no item was excluded.

Table 12. Previous Purchase CFA Fit Indices

Index	Acceptable Fit	Previous Purchase
X ²	x	0.001
sd	x	1
X ² /sd	≤5	0.001
RMR	≤0.08	0.001
GFI	≥0.90	0.999
AGFI	≥0.85	0.999
NFI	≥0.90	0.998
TLI	≥0.90	0.998
CFI	≥0.90	0.999
RMSEA	≤0.08	0.001

According to the results of the CFA, the Previous Purchase scale has provided the fit indices.

Table 13. Previous Purchase CFA Results

Item	β	t	p
1. How often did you buy Beko products in the past?	0.813		0.000
2. How often did you buy Beko products between 2019 and 2020?	0.864	42.094	0.000
3. To what extent would a previous purchase experience affect a prospective purchase?	0.869	42.234	0.000

The Previous Purchase scale factor loads based on the CFA results are presented in table 13. Based on the analysis results, no item was excluded.

Table 14. Purchase Intention CFA Fit Indices

Index	Acceptable Fit	Purchase Intention
χ^2	x	8.944
sd	x	4
χ^2/sd	≤ 5	2.236
RMR	≤ 0.08	0.009
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.999
AGFI	≥ 0.85	0.992
NFI	≥ 0.90	0.998
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.997
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.999
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.025

According to the results of the CFA, the Purchase Intention scale has provided the fit indices.

Table 15. Purchase Intention CFA Results

Item	β	t	p
1. I would buy Beko products.	0.777		
2. When the need arises, I would consider purchasing a Beko product.	0.721	28.348	0.000
3. I can say that I would rather buy Beko products than the products of alternative brands.	0.628	22.247	0.000
4. When purchasing goods, the brand's (sport) sponsorship activities have an impact on whether or not I will buy that particular brand.	0.579	21.049	0.000
5. I would choose Beko, even if alternative brands were cheaper.	0.704	23.974	0.000
6. I can say that I would buy products from the sponsor of my favorite team rather than alternative brands.	0.635	21.971	0.000

The Purchase Intention factor loads based on the CFA results are presented in table 15. Based on the analysis results, no item was excluded.

Table 16. Normality of Scale Scores

	Skewness	Kurtosis
Sponsor Awareness	-0.296	-0.787
Sponsor Image	-0.367	-0.735
Event/Sponsor Fit	0.136	-0.991
Sponsor Attitude	0.553	-0.939
Previous Purchase	-0.260	-0.812
Purchase Intention	0.082	-0.952

The skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the scale scores indicate a normal distribution (-3:+3).

Table 17. Scale Scores' Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

	Min.	Max.	Mean	sd	Level (%)	Cronbach's Alpha	Item Number
Sponsor Awareness	6	30	21.33	6.08	71.11	0.925	6
Sponsor Image	7	35	23.12	6.90	66.07	0.921	7
Event/Sponsor Fit	6	30	18.77	6.23	62.57	0.892	6
Sponsor Attitude	8	30	17.30	6.27	57.66	0.915	6
Previous Purchase	3	15	10.18	3.13	67.84	0.883	3
Purchase Intention	7	29	18.48	5.40	63.74	0.858	6

It was stated that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was between 0 and 1; according to the assessment criteria, a value between 0.00 and 0.40 indicates a non-reliable scale, while the values of 0.40–0.60, 0.60–0.80 and 0.80–1.00 indicate low reliability, reliability and high reliability, respectively (Tavşancıl, 2005). Accordingly, the scales can be considered highly reliable.

Table 18. The Relationship of Scale Scores

		Sponsor Awareness	Sponsor Image	Event/Sponsor Fit	Sponsor Attitude	Previous Purchase	Purchase Intention
Sponsor Awareness	r	1	.448**	.479**	.568**	.310**	.467**
	p		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Sponsor Image	r		1	.758**	.593**	.749**	.681**
	p			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Event/Sponsor Fit	r			1	.734**	.656**	.782**
	p				0.000	0.000	0.000
Sponsor Attitude	r				1	.457**	.778**
	p					0.000	0.000
Previous Purchase	r					1	.657**
	p						0.000
Purchase Intention	r						1
	p						

****p<0.01, *p<0.05 = significant relationship; p>0.05 = no significant relationship; Correlation coefficient levels; 0<r<0.299 = poor, 0.300<r<0.599 = medium, 0.600<r<0.799 = strong, 0.800<r<0.999 = very strong; Pearson Correlation**

There is a positive and statistically significant relationship between Sponsor Awareness and Sponsor Image ($r=0.448$), Event/Sponsor Fit ($r=0.479$), Sponsor Attitude ($r=0.568$), Previous Purchase ($r=0.310$) and Purchase Intention ($r=0.467$) ($p<0.05$). There is a positive and statistically significant relationship between Sponsor Image and Event/Sponsor Fit ($r=0.758$), Sponsor Attitude ($r=0.593$), Previous Purchase ($r=0.749$) and Purchase Intention ($r=0.681$) ($p<0.05$). There is a positive and statistically significant relationship between Event/Sponsor Fit and Sponsor Attitude ($r=0.734$), Previous Purchase ($r=0.656$) and Purchase Intention ($r=0.782$) ($p<0.05$). There is a positive and statistically significant relationship between Sponsor Attitude and Previous Purchase ($r=0.457$) and Purchase Intention ($r=0.778$) ($p<0.05$). There is a positive and statistically significant relationship between Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention ($r=0.657$) ($p<0.05$).

Table 19. Comparison of Scale Scores Based on the Number of Times the Respondents Attended Fenerbahçe Basketball Games in the Previous Season

		n	Mean	sd	F	p
Sponsor Awareness	Never	285	21.44	6.11	1.319	0.266
	1-5	512	20.99	6.11		
	6-10	817	21.61	6.07		
	>10	386	21.11	6.03		
Sponsor Image	Never	285	23.20	7.01	0.353	0.787
	1-5	512	23.09	6.31		
	6-10	817	23.26	7.13		
	>10	386	22.83	7.09		
Event/Sponsor Fit	Never	285	19.26	6.40	1.790	0.147
	1-5	512	18.88	5.73		
	6-10	817	18.81	6.41		
	>10	386	18.18	6.30		
Sponsor Attitude	Never	285	18.30	6.40	3.240	0.021*
	1-5	512	17.26	6.04		
	6-10	817	17.20	6.35		
	>10	386	16.82	6.25		
Previous Purchase	Never	285	10.46	3.19	19.194	0.000*
	1-5	512	10.47	2.91		
	6-10	817	10.40	3.03		
	>10	386	9.11	3.36		
Purchase Intention	Never	285	19.67	5.26	10.876	0.000*
	1-5	512	18.65	5.05		
	6-10	817	18.51	5.61		
	>10	386	17.32	5.30		

* $p < 0.05$ = significant difference, $p > 0.05$ = no significant difference; ANOVA test

Statistically significant differences exist in the Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention scores of the respondents considering the number of times they attended Fenerbahçe basketball games ($p < 0.05$). The fewer games they attended, the higher their Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention levels. Other scores, on

the other hand, were unaffected by the number of times they attended Fenerbahçe basketball games (p>0.05).

Table 20. Comparison of Scale Scores Based on the Respondents' Purchase of Beko Products in the Previous Season

		n	Mean	sd	t	p
Sponsor Awareness	Yes	409	21.90	5.80	2.201	0.028*
	No	1.591	21.19	6.14		
Sponsor Image	Yes	409	24.03	6.69	2.983	0.003*
	No	1.591	22.89	6.94		
Event/Sponsor Fit	Yes	409	19.91	6.08	4.182	0.000*
	No	1.591	18.48	6.23		
Sponsor Attitude	Yes	409	18.29	6.45	3.501	0.000*
	No	1.591	17.04	6.20		
Previous Purchase	Yes	409	10.73	2.96	4.053	0.000*
	No	1.591	10.03	3.16		
Purchase Intention	Yes	409	19.21	5.51	3.068	0.002*
	No	1.591	18.30	5.36		

*p<0.05 = significant difference, p>0.05 = no significant difference; t test

There is a statistically significant difference between those who bought Beko products in the previous season and those who did not in terms of Sponsor Awareness, Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention scores (p<0.05). Those who bought Beko products in the previous season had higher levels of Sponsor Awareness, Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention.

Table 21. Comparison of Scale Scores Based on the Respondents' Purchase of Beko Products in 2019

		n	Mean	sd	t	p
Sponsor Awareness	Yes	345	21.53	6.12	0.657	0.512
	No	1.655	21.29	6.07		
Sponsor Image	Yes	345	23.44	6.61	0.948	0.343
	No	1.655	23.06	6.96		
Event/Sponsor Fit	Yes	345	19.53	5.97	2.494	0.013*
	No	1.655	18.61	6.27		
Sponsor Attitude	Yes	345	18.13	6.36	2.723	0.007*
	No	1.655	17.12	6.24		
Previous Purchase	Yes	345	10.54	3.02	2.390	0.017*
	No	1.655	10.10	3.15		
Purchase Intention	Yes	345	19.08	5.31	2.273	0.023*
	No	1.655	18.36	5.41		

* $p < 0.05$ = significant difference, $p > 0.05$ = no significant difference; t test

There is a statistically significant difference between those who bought Beko products in 2019 and those who did not in terms of their Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention scores ($p < 0.05$). Those who bought Beko products in 2019 had higher Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention levels. The other scores, on the other hand, were unaffected by their purchase of Beko products in 2019 ($p > 0.05$).

Table 22. Comparison of Scale Scores Based on Gender

		n	Mean	sd	t	p
Sponsor Awareness	Female	524	21.59	5.96	1.138	0.255
	Male	1.476	21.24	6.12		
Sponsor Image	Female	524	23.72	6.71	2.313	0.021*
	Male	1.476	22.91	6.96		
Event/Sponsor Fit	Female	524	19.68	6.18	3.919	0.000*
	Male	1.476	18.45	6.21		
Sponsor Attitude	Female	524	18.10	6.40	3.344	0.001*
	Male	1.476	17.02	6.20		
Previous Purchase	Female	524	10.58	2.95	3.465	0.001*
	Male	1.476	10.03	3.18		
Purchase Intention	Female	524	19.21	5.39	3.595	0.000*
	Male	1.476	18.23	5.38		

***p<0.05 = significant difference, p>0.05 = no significant difference; t test**

There is a statistically significant difference in the Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention scores of the female and male respondents ($p<0.05$). Women had higher Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention levels. Sponsor Awareness was unaffected by gender ($p>0.05$).

Table 23. Comparison of Scale Scores Based on Age

		n	Mean	sd	F	p
Sponsor Awareness	≤30	478	21.70	6.05	1.156	0.315
	31-45	907	21.21	6.15		
	≥46	615	21.21	5.99		
Sponsor Image	≤30	478	23.89	6.594	6.154	0.002*
	31-45	907	23.18	6.83		
	≥46	615	22.43	7.17		
Event/Sponsor Fit	≤30	478	19.42	6.24	5.479	0.004*
	31-45	907	18.82	6.24		
	≥46	615	18.18	6.13		
Sponsor Attitude	≤30	478	18.14	6.48	7.027	0.001*
	31-45	907	17.24	6.24		
	≥46	615	16.72	6.07		
Previous Purchase	≤30	478	10.46	3.17	4.877	0.008*
	31-45	907	10.22	3.09		
	≥46	615	9.88	3.12		
Purchase Intention	≤30	478	19.80	5.32	27.677	0.000*
	31-45	907	18.52	5.26		
	≥46	615	17.39	5.43		

* $p < 0.05$ = significant difference, $p > 0.05$ = no significant difference; ANOVA test

There is a statistically significant difference between the respondents of different age groups in terms of Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention scores ($p < 0.05$). The younger the respondent, the higher their Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention levels. Sponsor Awareness was unaffected by age ($p > 0.05$).

Table 24. Comparison of Scale Scores Based on Yearly Income

		n	Mean	sd	F	p
Sponsor Awareness	<TRY 25,000	359	21.69	5.95	18.567	0.000*
	TRY 25,000–50,000	469	22.35	5.72		
	TRY 50,001–100,000	536	21.79	6.19		
	TRY 100,001–200,000	306	18.78	5.89		
	>TRY 200,000	330	21.10	6.08		
Sponsor Image	<TRY 25,000	359	24.62	6.55	48.174	0.000*
	TRY 25,000–50,000	469	25.00	6.52		
	TRY 50,001–100,000	536	23.79	6.68		
	TRY 100,001–200,000	306	19.24	5.41		
	>TRY 200,000	330	21.32	7.56		
Event/Sponsor Fit	<TRY 25,000	359	20.42	5.95	76.863	0.000*
	TRY 25,000–50,000	469	20.81	5.81		
	TRY 50,001–100,000	536	19.29	6.34		
	TRY 100,001–200,000	306	14.05	3.26		
	>TRY 200,000	330	17.60	6.51		
Sponsor Attitude	<TRY 25,000	359	18.52	6.55	64.337	0.000*
	TRY 25,000–50,000	469	19.24	6.06		
	TRY 50,001–100,000	536	18.05	6.38		
	TRY 100,001–200,000	306	12.93	3.45		
	>TRY 200,000	330	17.60	6.51		

***p<0.05 = significant difference, p>0.05 = no significant difference; ANOVA test**

There is a statistically significant difference between respondents of various yearly incomes in terms of Sponsor Awareness, Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention scores ($p<0.05$). The lower the yearly income, the higher the Sponsor Awareness, Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention levels.

Table 25. Comparison of Scale Scores Based on Educational Background

		n	Mean	sd	F	p
Sponsor Awareness	Primary school/Secondary school	236	22.89	6.13	5.429	0.000*
	High school	338	21.37	6.04		
	Associate degree	294	21.70	5.80		
	Bachelor's degree	573	20.98	6.14		
	Master's degree	338	20.38	5.78		
	PhD	221	21.48	6.43		
Sponsor Image	Primary school/Secondary school	236	25.92	6.30	11.580	0.000*
	High school	338	23.75	6.66		
	Associate degree	294	22.55	7.17		
	Bachelor's degree	573	22.28	7.06		
	Master's degree	338	22.36	6.71		
	PhD	221	23.29	6.58		
Event/Sponsor Fit	Primary school/Secondary school	236	21.02	6.53	11.104	0.000*
	High school	338	19.69	6.25		
	Associate degree	294	18.36	6.35		
	Bachelor's degree	573	18.00	6.08		
	Master's degree	338	17.95	5.86		
	PhD	221	18.76	5.89		
Sponsor Attitude	Primary school/Secondary school	236	19.75	7.18	11.155	0.000*
	High school	338	17.96	6.62		
	Associate degree	294	16.70	6.14		
	Bachelor's degree	573	16.70	5.91		
	Master's degree	338	16.43	5.45		
	PhD	221	17.35	6.22		

Previous Purchase	Primary school/Secondary school	236	11.17	3.18	8.333	0.000*
	High school	338	10.49	3.13		
	Associate degree	294	10.08	3.18		
	Bachelor's degree	573	9.75	3.14		
	Master's degree	338	9.89	3.02		
	PhD	221	10.30	2.90		
Purchase Intention	Primary school/Secondary school	236	20.68	5.95	14.628	0.000*
	High school	338	19.40	5.50		
	Associate degree	294	18.18	5.23		
	Bachelor's degree	573	17.70	5.26		
	Master's degree	338	17.60	4.99		
	PhD	221	18.52	5.01		

* $p < 0.05$ = significant difference, $p > 0.05$ = no significant difference; ANOVA test

There is a statistically significant difference between the respondents with different educational backgrounds in terms of Sponsor Awareness, Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention scores ($p < 0.05$). The lower the education level, the higher their Sponsor Awareness, Sponsor Image, Event/Sponsor Fit, Sponsor Attitude, Previous Purchase and Purchase Intention levels.

Table 26. Direct Factors Affecting Purchase Intention

Independent Variable	β	t	p	F	R ²
Sponsor Awareness	0.467	23.579	0.000*	555.952*	0.218
Sponsor Image	0.681	41.580	0.000*	1728.900*	0.464
Event/Sponsor Fit	0.782	56.160*	0.000*	3153.759*	0.612
Sponsor Attitude	0.778	55.422	0.000*	3071.571*	0.606
Previous Purchase	0.657	38.929	0.000*	1515.471*	0.431

* $p < 0.05$ = significant impact, $p > 0.05$ = no significant impact; Simple linear regression

The Sponsor Awareness ($\beta=0.467$), Sponsor Image ($\beta=0.681$), Event/Sponsor Fit ($\beta=0.782$), Sponsor Attitude ($\beta=0.778$) and Previous Purchase ($\beta=0.657$) variables have a positive and statistically significant impact on Purchase Intention ($p<0.05$). Event/Sponsor Fit has the greatest impact.

Table 27. Direct Factors Affecting Sponsor Image

Independent Variable	β	t	p	F	R ²
Sponsor Awareness	0.448	22.386	0.000*	501.154*	0.201
Event/Sponsor Fit	0.758	52.013	0.000*	2705.330*	0.575
Sponsor Attitude	0.593	32.935	0.000*	1084.716*	0.352
Previous Purchase	0.749	50.596	0.000*	2559.949*	0.562

* $p<0.05$ = significant impact, $p>0.05$ = no significant impact; Simple linear regression

The Sponsor Awareness ($\beta=0.448$), Event/Sponsor Fit ($\beta=0.758$), Sponsor Attitude ($\beta=0.593$) and Previous Purchase ($\beta=0.749$) variables have a positive and statistically significant impact on Sponsor Image ($p<0.05$). Event/Sponsor Fit has the greatest impact.

Table 28. Direct Factors Affecting Sponsor Attitude

Independent Variable	β	t	p	F	R ²
Sponsor Awareness	0.568	30.819	0.000*	949.828*	0.322
Event/Sponsor Fit	0.734	48.322	0.000*	2334.975*	0.539
Previous Purchase	0.457	22.997	0.000*	528.883*	0.209

* $p<0.05$ = significant impact, $p>0.05$ = no significant impact; Simple linear regression

The Sponsor Awareness ($\beta=0.568$), Event/Sponsor Fit ($\beta=0.734$) and Previous Purchase ($\beta=0.457$) variables have a positive and statistically significant impact on Sponsor Attitude ($p<0.05$). Event/Sponsor Fit has the greatest impact.

Table 29. Factors Affecting Purchase Intention (Hierarchical Model)

	β	t	p	F	R ²
Sponsor Awareness	0.008	0.589	0.556		
Sponsor Attitude	0.600	38.919	0.000*	1712.981*	0.720
Previous Purchase	0.380	28.453	0.000*		
Sponsor Awareness	-0.008	-0.612	0.541		
Sponsor Attitude	0.461	25.721	0.000*	1451.700*	0.744
Previous Purchase	0.271	18.062	0.000*		
Event/Sponsor Fit	0.270	13.695	0.000*		
Sponsor Awareness	-0.010	-0.681	0.496		
Sponsor Attitude	0.460	25.626	0.000*		
Previous Purchase	0.266	15.136	0.000*	1160.998*	0.744
Event/Sponsor Fit	0.266	12.544	0.000*		
Sponsor Image	0.011	0.531	0.596		

*p<0.05 = significant impact, p>0.05 = no significant impact; Simple linear regression

In the first model, Sponsor Attitude ($\beta=0.600$) and Previous Purchase ($\beta=0.380$) had a positive impact on Purchase Intention ($p<0.05$), while Sponsor Awareness had no impact ($p>0.05$). In the second model, Event/Sponsor Fit was added to the first model. In the second model, Sponsor Attitude ($\beta=0.461$), Previous Purchase ($\beta=0.271$) and Event/Sponsor Fit ($\beta=0.270$) had a positive impact on Purchase Intention ($p<0.05$), while Sponsor Awareness had no impact ($p>0.05$). In the third model, Sponsor Image was added to the second model. In the third model, Sponsor Attitude ($\beta=0.460$), Previous Purchase ($\beta=0.266$) and Event/Sponsor Fit ($\beta=0.266$) had a positive impact on Purchase Intention ($p<0.05$), while Sponsor Awareness and Sponsor Image had no impact ($p>0.05$).

Table 30. R² Changes in the Hierarchical Model

Model	R ²	ΔR^2	ΔF	p
1	0.720	0.720	1712.981	0.000
2	0.744	0.024	187.554	0.000
3	0.744	0.000	0.282	0.596

Adding Event/Sponsor Fit to the hierarchical model led to a significant change ($p < 0.05$), while adding Sponsor Image caused no significant change ($p > 0.05$).

Table 31. Tolerance and VIF Statistics of the Variables of the Model

	Tolerance	VIF
Sponsor Awareness	0.675	1.482
Sponsor Attitude	0.590	1.695
Previous Purchase	0.787	1.271
Sponsor Awareness	0.669	1.494
Sponsor Attitude	0.400	2.502
Previous Purchase	0.568	1.760
Event/Sponsor Fit	0.329	3.042
Sponsor Awareness	0.656	1.525
Sponsor Attitude	0.398	2.513
Previous Purchase	0.414	2.416
Event/Sponsor Fit	0.285	3.514
Sponsor Image	0.302	3.307

For a VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) value of ≥ 10 and a Tolerance value of < 0.10 , it can be argued that there is a multiple connection problem. There are no problems with the variables in the hierarchical model.

Table 32. Results of the Path Analysis

Dependent Variable	Path	Independent Variable	β	t	p
Sponsor Image	<---	Event/Sponsor Fit	0.467	30.735	0.000*
Sponsor Image	<---	Previous Purchase	0.550	36.213	0.000*
Sponsor Image	<---	Sponsor Attitude	0.071	4.658	0.000*
Sponsor Image	<---	Sponsor Awareness	0.119	7.821	0.000*
Purchase Intention	<---	Sponsor Image	0.011	0.532	0.595
Purchase Intention	<---	Sponsor Awareness	-0.012	-0.829	0.407
Purchase Intention	<---	Event/Sponsor Fit	0.340	19.402	0.000*
Purchase Intention	<---	Previous Purchase	0.340	18.304	0.000*
Purchase Intention	<---	Sponsor Attitude	0.587	40.452	0.000*

***p<0.05 = significant impact, p>0.05 = no significant impact; Path Analysis**

The Event/Sponsor Fit ($\beta=0.340$), Sponsor Attitude ($\beta=0.587$) and Previous Purchase ($\beta=0.340$) variables have a positive and statistically significant impact on Purchase Intention ($p<0.05$), while Sponsor Image and Sponsor Awareness have no impact ($p>0.05$). The Sponsor Awareness ($\beta=0.119$), Event/Sponsor Fit ($\beta=0.467$), Sponsor Attitude ($\beta=0.071$) and Previous Purchase ($\beta=0.550$) variables have a positive and statistically significant impact on Sponsor Image ($p<0.05$). Since Sponsor Image has an insignificant impact, it has no mediating role.

On the basis of the findings, the following diagram is formulated:

Figure 1. Diagram of Sponsorship Impact through Dyadic Antecedents and Consumer-Based Outcomes.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study reveal the power of sponsorship fit and past purchase. To elaborate on the implications of results, it is necessary to highlight the major findings of this research:

1) The lower the level of attendance, the higher the scores are regarding attitude toward the sponsor, past purchase and purchase intent. With respect to the level of attendance, no statistically significant differences were found in sponsor awareness, sponsor image and sponsorship fit. If everything went right in a given sponsorship execution, one would expect results to show higher attendance leading to high scores on attitude toward the sponsor and purchase intent. The fact that no differences were found in sponsor awareness, sponsor image and event-sponsorship fit indicate that these variables had no correlation with the level of attendance. The respondents were indifferent to sponsorship messages because a high score on sponsorship outcomes should, according to the flow of logic, necessitate a high level of sponsorship exposure, which these respondents claimed to lack. If the respondents had no exposure through the event, then some other marketing-related communication or past purchase experience must be causing this positive outlook.

2) The answers of the subjects who claimed to have purchased a Beko product within the time frame of the previous season (when the sponsorship deal was not yet signed) reveal higher scores on sponsor awareness, sponsor image, sponsorship fit, attitude

toward the sponsor, past purchase and purchase intent compared to the answers of the respondents who made no purchase prior to the sponsorship deal. This finding suggests the power of past purchase in positively influencing sponsorship outcomes.

3) Similar to finding #2, respondents who stated having purchased a Beko product post sponsorship activation had higher scores on sponsorship fit, attitude toward the sponsor, past purchase and purchase intent. Other variables studied showed no scientifically significant correlation. This supports finding #2 and points to the power of past purchase positively influencing sponsorship outcomes ($p>0.05$).

4) Results show that female respondents scored higher on sponsor image, sponsorship fit, attitude toward the sponsor, past purchase and purchase intent, yet sponsor awareness did not show any significant differences between genders. This finding suggests that female fans are more open to sponsorship messages and/or marketing-related communication efforts.

5) One of the most important implications of this study can be found in the following findings: as age decreases, there is a corresponding increase in sponsor image, sponsorship fit, attitude toward the sponsor, past purchase and purchase intent. No sponsor awareness difference is noted with respect to respondent age.

6) As annual income decreases, there is a corresponding increase in sponsor awareness, sponsor image, sponsorship fit, attitude toward the sponsor, past purchase and purchase intent.

7) As level of education decreases, sponsor awareness, sponsor image, sponsorship fit, attitude toward the sponsor, past purchase and purchase intent increases.

Findings #5, #6 and #7 indicate that Beko is more appealing to young fans from lower income and education groups. Arçelik, which owns Beko, may be the number-one brand in Turkey, but it is not yet one of the most preferred or most reputable global brands. This is because: a) organic expansion is slower and even more costly than complex operations such as original equipment manufacturing, joint venturing or acquisitions; b) specifically in home appliances, brand loyalty is a very powerful competitive factor—a fact which is also supported by findings of this study highlighting the power of past purchase in influencing sponsorship outcomes; c) negative quality associations among potential clients due to the products' country of origin—negative country-of-origin effects lower consumer expectations of quality, and, as a result, consumers are not willing to pay as much for products from developing countries.

The findings of this study reveal that the factors that have a positive and statistically significant impact on purchase intent are: sponsor awareness ($\beta=0.467$), sponsor image ($\beta=0.681$), sponsorship fit ($\beta=0.782$), attitude toward sponsor ($\beta=0.778$) and past purchase ($\beta=0.657$), and sponsorship fit turned out to be the strongest statistically significant factor found to positively impact purchase intent. The variables that have a positive scientific significance on sponsor image ($p<0.05$) are: sponsor awareness ($\beta=0.448$), sponsorship fit ($\beta=0.758$), attitude toward the sponsor ($\beta=0.593$), and past purchase ($\beta=0.749$), and sponsorship fit was found to have the strongest impact on sponsor image.

In shedding light into the multidimensional extent of brand knowledge, it is necessary to highlight the importance of leveraging processes in creating, developing or sustain-

ing brand value. Knowing that brand X is a sponsor of event Y is simply not enough to generate favorable cognitive, conative and affective outcomes, and it certainly is not enough to motivate the consumer to make the purchase (Keller, 1993); therefore, in order for a sponsor to trigger favorable outcomes, complementary sponsorship-linked marketing communication practices need to be implemented. In order to achieve sponsorship goals, businesses should determine in what ways sponsorship can help them in achieving their objectives and research the types of activities necessary to carry out in relevant areas.

LIMITATIONS & FUTURE RESEARCH

The findings of this research reveal several points that would benefit from further investigation. The most striking point to stress is that the sponsorship context studied in this research involves action sports. One major implication of this limitation is that the findings may not be applicable to different sponsorship contexts involving less explicit and frequent exposures. On this basis, it can be suggested that research be expanded to study other sponsorship domains as well.

REFERENCES

Alexandris, Kostas vd. "Predicting Sponsorship Outcomes from Attitudinal Constructs: The Case of a Professional Basketball Event." *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 16/3 (2007), 130.

ANA, Association of National Advertisers. Improving Sponsorship Accountability Metrics. Retrieved on 4 December 2020 <https://www.ana.net/miccontent/show/id/rr-sponsorship-accountability-metrics>

Becker-Olsen, Karen L. & Carolyn J. Simmons. "When Do Social Sponsorships Enhance Or Dilute Equity? Fit, Message Source, and the Persistence of Effects" in *Advances in Consumer Research Volume 29*, eds. Susan M. Broniarczyk and Kent Nakamoto, 287-289. Valdosta, GA : Association for Consumer Research, 2002.

Becker-Olsen, Karen L. & Ronald Paul Hill. "The Impact of Sponsor Fit on Brand Equity: The Case of Nonprofit Service Providers." *Journal of service research*, 9/1 (2006), 73-83.

Bennett, Roger. "Sports Sponsorship, Spectator Recall and False Consensus." *European Journal of Marketing*, 33, 3/4, (1999), 291-313.

Biscaia, Rui vd. "Sport sponsorship: The relationship between team loyalty, sponsorship awareness, attitude toward the sponsor, and purchase intentions." *Journal of Sport Management*, 27/4, (2013), 288-302.

Cornwell, T. Bettina & Coote, Leonard V. "Corporate Sponsorship of a Cause: The Role of Identification in Purchase Intent." *Journal of Business Research*, 58/3, (2005), 268-276.

Crompton, John L. "Conceptualization and Alternate Operationalizations of the Measurement of Sponsorship Effectiveness in Sport." *Leisure studies*, 23/3, (2004), 267-281.

DeCarlo, Lawrence T. "On the Meaning and Use of Kurtosis." *Psychological Methods*, 2/3, (1997), 292-307.

Dees, Windy vd. "Congruence and Its Impact on Sponsorship Effectiveness Outcomes." *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 19/1, (2010), 25-35.

Fishbein, Martin & Ajzen, Icek. *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. Psychology Press, 2010.

Garland, Ron vd. "Measuring Sport Sponsorship Effectiveness: Links to Existing Behavior." *Innovative Marketing*, 4/1, (2008), 46-51.

Groeneveld, Richard A. & Meeden, Glen. "Measuring Skewness and Kurtosis." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, 33/4, (1984), 391-399.

Grohs, Reinhard & Reisinger, Heribert. "Sponsorship Effects on Brand Image: The Role of Exposure and Activity Involvement." *Journal of Business Research*, 67/5, (2014), 1018-1025.

Grohs, Reinhard vd. "Assessing the Effectiveness of Sport Sponsorships—An Empirical Examination." *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 56/2, (2004), 119-138.

Gwinner, Kevin. "A Model of Image Creation and Image Transfer in Event Sponsorship." *International marketing review*, 14/3, (1997), 145-158.

Gwinner, Kevin & Bennett, Gregg. "The Impact of Brand Cohesiveness and Sport Identification on Brand Fit in a Sponsorship Context." *Journal of Sport Management*, 22/4, (2008), 410-426.

Hopkins, Kenneth D. & Weeks, Douglas L. "Tests for Normality and Measures of Skewness and Kurtosis: Their Place in Research Reporting." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 50/4, (1990), 717-729.

Howard, John A. & Sheth, Jagdish N. *The Theory of Buyer Behavior*. New York: Wiley, 1969.

Keller, Kevin Lane. "Conceptualizing Measuring and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity." *Journal of Marketing*, 57, (1993), 1-22.

Kim, Yukyoum vd. "Factors Influencing Sponsorship Effectiveness: A Meta-Analytic Review and Research Synthesis." *Journal of Sport Management*, 29/4, (2015), 408-425.

Kim, Yu Kyoun vd. "The Role of Gratitude in Sponsorship: The Case of Participant Sports." *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 12/1, (2010), 48-70.

Ko, Yong Jae vd. "The Effects of Sport Involvement, Sponsor Awareness and Corporate Image on Intention to Purchase Sponsors' Products." *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 9/2, (2008), 79-94.

Koo, Gi-Yong vd. "Effect of Perceived Sport Event and Sponsor Image Fit on Consumers' Cognition, Affect, and Behavioral Intentions." *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 15/2, (2006), 80-90.

Lardinois, Thierry & Quester, Pascale, G. "Attitudinal Effects of Combined Sponsorship and Sponsor's Prominence on Basketball in Europe." *Journal of Advertising Research*, 41/1, (2001), 48-58.

Madrigal, Robert. "Social Identity Effects in a Belief-Attitude-Intentions Hierarchy: Implications for Corporate Sponsorship." *Psychology & Marketing*, 18/2, (2001), 145-165.

Meenaghan, John A. "Commercial Sponsorship." *European Journal of Marketing*, 17 (7), (1983), 1-73.

Meenaghan, Tony. "Understanding Sponsorship Effects." *Psychology & Marketing*, 18/2, (2001), 95-122.

Moors, Johannes Josephus Antonius. "A Quantile Alternative for Kurtosis." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, 37/1, (1988), 25-32.

O'Reilly, Norm & Madill, Judith. "The Development of a Process for Evaluating Marketing Sponsorships." *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 29/1, (2012), 50-66.

Pope, Nigel K., & Voges, Kevin E. "The Impact of Sport Sponsorship Activities, Corporate Image, and Prior Use on Consumer Purchase Intention." *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 9/2, (2000), 96 -102.

Quester, Pascal & Farrelly, Francis. "Association, Brand Memorisation and Decay: A Study of Sponsor's Impact." *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 7/6, (1998), 539-557.

Scheinbaum, Angelina, Close & Lacey, Russell. "Fit Matters? Asymmetrical Impact for Effectiveness on Sponsors and Event Marketers." *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 22/2, (2013), 71-82.

Schlesinger, Torsten & Güngerich, Mathias. "Analysing Sport Sponsorship Effectiveness—The Influence of Fan Identification, Credibility and Product-Involvement." *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 9/2, (2011), 54–74.

Spears, Nancy & Singh, Surendra N. "Measuring Attitude Toward the Brand and Purchase Intentions." *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 26/2, (2004), 53–66.

Speed, Richard & Thompson, Peter. "Determinants of Sports Sponsorship Response." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28/2, (2000), 226–238.

Sümer, Nebi. "Personality and Behavioral Predictors of Traffic Accidents: Testing a Contextual Mediated Model." *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 35/6, (2003), 949–964.

Tavşancıl, Ezel. *Tutumların Ölçülmesi ve Spss ile Veri Analizi*. Yargı yayınevi, 2005.

Verhoef, Peter C. & Leeflang, Peter S. "Understanding the Marketing Department's Influence within the Firm." *Journal of Marketing*, 73/1, (2009), 14–37.

Zaharia, Noni vd. "No More Good Intentions: Purchase Behaviors in Sponsorship." *Journal of Sport Management*, 30/2, (2016), 162–175.