

https://dspace.org/

The influence of sport sponsorship on brand equity

Maanda, Penelope Maserame

2019
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/32834

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Does not open

The influence of Sport Sponsorship on Brand Equity

Penelope Maserame Maanda

Professor Russell Abratt

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management specialising in Entrepreneurship and New Venture Creation

Johannesburg, 2019

ABSTRACT

Sport sponsorship has become a strategic tool used globally with the objective of enhancing consumer-based equity elements. Many South Africa companies like Standard Bank are making substantial investment in sport sponsorship, however there is limited academic research assessing the ability of sponsorship to fulfil brand related objectives, particularly those relating to influence on brand equity elements.

The specific aims of the study were therefore to assess whether the sport sponsorship has a positive contribution to brand equity dimension through enhanced brand awareness, brand image, brand loyalty and perceived quality. Understand the influence of sponsorship fit between event and sponsor on recall, attitudes towards the sponsor, brand loyalty and perceived quality.

The research was quantitatively undertaken, using Computer Assisted Telephonic Interviews (CATI). A total of 200 respondents were interviewed for this study with 100 respondents not being aware of the abovementioned sponsor and 100 being aware of the said sponsor.

The findings of the study reveal that sponsorship plays a significant and positive role in influencing on brand awareness and image, however there is no influence on brand loyalty and perceived service quality. surprisingly, the study shows that the perceived appropriate fit between the sponsor and the sport event has a negative influence on brand awareness and brand image. The implications of the results are that investment in sport sponsorship to build and enhance brand awareness and image can be a worthwhile investment. On the contrary marketers should not engage in sport sponsorship with the expectation to positively influence brand loyalty and service quality.

This study makes a significant contribution in adding to the limited body of literature on this topic in South Africa and provides guidance on the effectiveness of sport sponsorship as an effective tool for building or enhancing brand equity elements.

DECLARATION

I, Penelope Maserame Maanda, declare that this research report is my own work except as indicated in the references and acknowledgements. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in this or any other university.



Penelope Maserame Maanda

Signed at 30 Baker street Rosebank.....

On the 30 day of February 2019

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation, to my beloved father, the late John Shimi Lebereko, thank you for encouraging me to get an education and for being proud. My late friend, Kopano Mwali, you inspired me to pursue this journey and I know you were always with me in spirit.

Most importantly, to the Almighty, my helper and my strength. I sing praises to you for granting me the courage and tenacity to complete this degree.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to several people who supported, contributed and enabled me to complete this degree. They are:

- My Supervisor, Professor Russell Abratt, a special thank you for agreeing to be my supervisor, it was an honour. I thank you for your time, valuable support, admirable expertise and encouraging me to do more. I appreciate that you were always available and returned my work promptly, with valuable thoughts and comments.

- My Husband, Seth Maanda, and Daughter, Zwi Maanda, for your understanding, patience, love and unfailing support while I spent hours on end in the study. And, for cheering me up with special meals.

- To my mother, Alice Lebereko, and Aunt, Ausi Flora, your encouragement and prayers kept me going when I wanted to surrender. I love you and I am truly blessed to have you in my life.

- Elvis Nyovani, my boss and mentor, thank you for your unwavering support, understanding, invaluable assistance and guidance throughout my studies. My sincere gratitude for sharing your vast knowledge, encouragement and always believing in me.

- To my family and friends, especially my cousins, Dintle, Caro and Tumi, for supporting and encouraging me, my friend, Zimasa Dlepu, always willing to assist with a smile and for your encouragement during difficult times.

- Syndicate members, Pearl Seopela & Lawrence Dube, for your constant support, helping hand and encouragement on this journey.

- My statisticians, you know who you are. A special tribute to you, for patiently sharing your expertise, holding my hand and guiding me. I am truly grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT II

DECLARATION III

DEDICATION IV

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS V

LIST OF TABLES X

LIST OF FIGURES XI

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 1
1.2 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY 2
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT 5
1.3.1 MAIN PROBLEM 5
1.3.2 SUB-PROBLEMS 5
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 5
1.5 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 7
1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS 7
1.7 ASSUMPTIONS 8

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 9

2.1. INTRODUCTION 9
2.2. DEFINITION OF TOPIC AND BACKGROUND DISCUSSION. 9
2.3. SPONSORSHIP 10
2.3.1 THE HISTORY OF SPONSORSHIP AND DEFINITION OF SPONSORSHIP 10
2.3.2 SPONSORSHIP OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES 12
2.4. BRAND EQUITY 14
2.5. BRAND AWARENESS 19
2.5.1 BRAND RECOGNITION 20
2.5.2 BRAND RECALL 21
2.5.3 ADVANTAGES OF BRAND AWARENESS 22
2.5.4 BRAND AWARENESS AND SPORT SPONSORSHIP 23
2.6. BRAND IMAGE 23
2.6.1 ADVANTAGES OF POSITIVE OR ENHANCED BRAND IMAGE 25
2.6.2 BRAND IMAGE AND SPORT SPONSORSHIP 26
2.7. BRAND LOYALTY 28
2.7.1 BEHAVIOURAL LOYALTY 29

2.7.2 ATTITUDINAL LOYALTY 30
2.8. PERCEIVED QUALITY 31
2.9. SPONSORSHIP MODERATING FACTORS 33
2.9.1 IMAGE CONGRUENCE BETWEEN SPONSOR AND EVENT 33
2.10. CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT 37
2.10.1 BRAND AWARENESS AND SPORT SPONSORSHIP 38
2.10.2 BRAND IMAGE AND SPORT SPONSORSHIP 38
2.10.3 BRAND LOYALTY AND SPORT SPONSORSHIP 39
2.10.4 PERCEIVED SERVICE QUALITY AND SPORT SPONSORSHIP 40
2.10.6 SPONSORSHIP FIT BETWEEN SPONSOR AND EVENT 40
2.11. CONCLUSION OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW 41

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 42

3.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY /PARADIGM 42
3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN 44
3.3 POPULATION AND SAMPLE 45
3.3.1 POPULATION 45
3.3.2 SAMPLE AND SAMPLING METHOD 45
3.4 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 48
3.5 PROCEDURE FOR DATA COLLECTION 50
3.6 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION 52
3.6.1 VALIDITY TEST OF MEASUREMENT SCALE USING SPSS 53
3.6.2 RELIABILITY TEST OF MEASUREMENT SCALE USING SPSS 55
3.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 59
3.8 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE RESEARCH 59
3.8.1 EXTERNAL VALIDITY 59
3.8.2 INTERNAL VALIDITY 59
3.8.3 RELIABILITY 60

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 61

4.1 INTRODUCTION 61
4.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS 61
4.3 VALIDITY 63
4.3.1 KAISER-MEYER-OLKIN MEASURE OF SAMPLING ADEQUACY (KMO) AND BARTLETT'S TEST OF SPHERICITY 63
4.3.2 CONSTRUCT VALIDITY 65
4.4 RELIABILITY 66
4.4.1 RELIABILITY OF THE SCALE 67
4.4.2 ADVANTAGES OF BRAND AWARENESS 67
4.5 PATH MODELLING 68
4.6 RESULTS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 1: SPORT SPONSORSHIP HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON BRAND AWARENESS 70
4.7 RESULTS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 2: SPORT SPONSORSHIP HAS A POSITIVE IMPACT ON BRAND IMAGE 71
4.8 RESULTS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 3: SPORT SPONSORSHIP HAS A

POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON ATTITUDINAL LOYALTY 71
4.9 RESULTS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 4: SPORT SPONSORSHIP HAS A POSITIVE EFFECT ON PERCEIVED SERVICE QUALITY 72
4.10 RESULTS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 5: SPONSORSHIP FIT HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPORT SPONSORSHIP AND BRAND AWARENESS 72
4.10.1 SPONSORSHIP FIT AND BRAND RECALL 73
4.10.2 SPONSORSHIP FIT AND BRAND RECOGNITION 75
4.11 RESULTS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 6: SPONSORSHIP FIT HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPORT SPONSORSHIP AND BRAND IMAGE 76
4.12 SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS 78

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS 80

5.1 INTRODUCTION 80
5.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS 80
5.3 DISCUSSION PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 1: SPORT SPONSORSHIP HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON BRAND AWARENESS 80
5.4 DISCUSSION PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 2: SPORT SPONSORSHIP HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON BRAND IMAGE 81
5.5 DISCUSSION PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 3: SPORT SPONSORSHIP HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON BRAND LOYALTY 82
5.6 DISCUSSION PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 4: SPORT SPONSORSHIP HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON PERCEIVED SERVICE QUALITY 82
5.7 DISCUSSION PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 5 AND HYPOTHESIS 6: SPONSORSHIP FIT HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPORT SPONSORSHIP AND BRAND AWARENESS (H5) AND BRAND IMAGE (H6) 83
5.7.1 SPONSORSHIP FIT AND BRAND AWARENESS 83
5.7.2 SPONSORSHIP FIT AND BRAND IMAGE 84
5.8 CONCLUSION 84

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 86

6.1 INTRODUCTION 86
6.2 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY 86
6.3 IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 88
6.3.1 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH 89
6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 90

REFERENCES 92

APPENDIX A 101

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 101

APPENDIX B 109

CONSISTENCY MATRIX 109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Profile of consumer panel.....46

Table 2: Profile of respondents.....47

Table 3: Survey Methods comparison.....50

Table 4: Coefficient Alpha Acceptance Ranges.....54

Table 5: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy KMO and Bartlett's Test.....63

Table 6: Factor Loading and Total Variance Explained.....64

Table 7: Scale Accuracy.....66

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics.....67

Table 9: Regression Weights.....68

Table 10: Squared Multiple Correlations.....69

Table 11: Hierarchical Regression – brand recall.....72

Table 12: Hierarchical Regression – brand recognition.....74

Table 13: Hierarchical Regression – brand image.....76

Table 14: Summary of Hypotheses.....78

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Aaker's Conceptual Model of Consumer Based Brand Equity.....18

Figure 2: The Influence of Sport sponsorship on elements of brand equity.....37

Figure 3: Diagrammatic representation of data analysis approach.....57

Figure 4: Respondents Gender.....60

Figure 5: Respondents Ethnicity.....61

Figure 6: Age Profile.....61

Figure 7: Respondents awareness of Standard bank's sponsorship of South African National Cricket Team.....62

Figure 8: Path Modelling.....68

Figure 9: Moderation effect of sponsorship fit on relationship between sport sponsorship and brand recall.....73

Figure 10: Moderation effect of sponsorship fit on relationship between sport sponsorship and brand recognition.....75

Figure 11: Moderation effect of sponsorship fit on relationship between sport sponsorship and brand image.....77

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of sport sponsorship on brand equity, i.e. the influence of the dimensions of brand awareness, brand image, brand loyalty and perceived service quality.

While substantial academic research on understanding the influence of sport sponsorship on brand equity elements has been documented and undertaken in the US, Europe and Asia, a literature review revealed that very limited research has been undertaken in this regard for South Africa (Biscaia et al., 2016; Chebli & Gharbi, 2013; Choi et al., 2015; Cliffe & Motion, 2005; Cornwell et al., 2001; Grohs & Reisinger, 2014; Henseler et al., 2011; Ireland et al., 2016; Gwinner, Larson & Swanson, 2009; Pope & Westberg, 2014;).

While many South African companies in sectors such as the liquor industry, banking, retail and telecommunications are making significant investments in sport sponsorships, academic research in South Africa assessing the ability of sponsorship to fulfil brand related objectives, particularly those relating to influence on brand equity elements, is limited. The central research question in this study thus focused on examining the impact and contribution of brand awareness, brand image, brand loyalty and perceived quality resulting from sports sponsorship. Any business entity that continues to invest in brand sponsorship and that does not have an appreciation of how or whether the brand is benefiting from that sponsorship, particularly in terms of image and awareness, brand loyalty and perceived quality, risks investing money in a marketing communication tool that might not enhance the value of their brand.

The broad aim of the study was therefore to assess the contribution to brand equity derived from sports sponsorship by focusing on the four dimensions of brand equity as proposed by Aaker (1991): awareness, image, brand loyalty and perceived quality. The specific aims of the study were to assess whether the sport sponsorship has a positive contribution to brand equity dimension

through enhanced brand awareness, brand image, brand loyalty and perceived quality. Understand the influence of sponsorship fit between event and sponsor on recall, attitudes towards the sponsor, brand loyalty and perceived quality.

1.2 Context of the Study

One of the most commonly used definitions of sponsorship is explained by Cheah and Gordon (2017)) who define sponsorship as "an exchange between sponsor and sponsored and pursues marketing (communication) objectives by exploiting the association between the two". Sponsorship typically involves sports, entertainment, non-profit event or organization. Although sponsorship in its purest form can be traced back to more than one hundred years ago, sponsorship linked marketing only gained momentum in the late 1980's and 1990's (Abratt, Clayton, & Pitt, 1987; Grohs & Reisinger, 2014) and continues to gain prominence as a global marketing medium. The reason for this growth is because it provides a versatile platform that enables communication with a wide range of stakeholder groups and achieves a variety of corporate and brand objectives (Mcloughlin, Meenaghan & McCormack, 2013).

The effectiveness of sponsorship as a marketing communication tool has increased the scale of investment (Alexandris & Tsiotsou, 2012). Consequently, global expenditure on sponsorship has increased significantly while the traditional methods of advertising have declined. One of the major factors driving the development of sponsorship as a marketing tool is that it provides a relatively clutter-free environment, particularly compared to traditional media advertising (Fin 24, 2001; Huang & Sarigöllü, 2013).

Sponsorship is a marketing communication tool that can be used in many forms and for many activities. Sport sponsorship, in particular, has become a popular instrument for the management of brand awareness, brand image, brand personality, and other dimensions of brand equity across a wide range of industries (Choi, Kim, Kim, Liu & Peng, 2015). It has emerged as an effective mechanism for, as mentioned, cutting through the clutter in the marketing environment, its' capacity to appeal to all classes as well as for its ability to

reach a target market while they are watching their favourite sport (*Fin 24*, 2001).

The global sport sponsorship spending was estimated to be around USD60.1billion in 2016 (Statistica.com, n.d.). This figure supports the importance of sponsorship as a marketing communication tool (Biscaia, Gray, Stotlar & Zaharia, 2016)

Companies, according to Choi et al., (2015) enter into sport sponsorships for a variety of reasons. However, the most common and predominant reasons are to influence brand awareness, brand associations, brand loyalty and perceived quality, which are the key dimensions of brand equity (Bhattacharya & Sen 2003; Ireland, Kelly, Mangan & Williamson, 2016). Marketing managers therefore enter into or continue with sport sponsorship agreements with the expectation of a positive impact on brand equity (Chebli & Gharbi 2014; Choi, et al., 2015; Henseler, Westberg & Wilson, 2011).

Brand equity is a multidimensional construct which has been conceptualised in many different forms. The abovementioned authors, Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) are the two most influential and commonly cited authors regarding conceptualisations of brand equity (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014). Aaker (1991, p.15) defined brand equity as "a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name and symbol, that add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service to a firm and/or to that firm's consumers". According to Keller (1993, p.2) "consumer brand equity occurs when the consumer is familiar with the brand and holds some favourable, strong, and unique brand associations in memory".

Keller's (1993) definition of brand equity consists of two dimensions: brand awareness and brand image, while Aaker's (1991) definition is more comprehensive, encompassing five dimensions of brand equity: brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and brand loyalty and other proprietary. Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) both defined brand equity from a consumer perspective, which, according to Sasirekha and Sathish (2017, p. 1048) defines brand equity as "the value of the brand to the consumer".

This study set out to measure consumer-based brand equity based on the conceptualisations of Aaker and Keller, using the four dimensions proposed by both authors: brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and brand loyalty.

After many years of isolation since 1994 South Africa re-entered the international sporting stage, which resulted in significant growth in sport sponsorship. South Africa's sports sponsorships were worth R7.5 billion in 2013 (Nevillon, 2014), and, according to Koppehel (2016), were due to reach an estimated R9 billion in 2016. Major local companies invested millions into popular team sports such as soccer, rugby and cricket. There are generally different types of sponsorship in SA, first is title sponsor where the name of sponsor or team is linked with sponsors, examples are Nashua Rugby Currie Cup, Absa Premier Soccer league and Standard Bank's National Cricket Team sponsorship, second involves sponsors being an integral part of the sport for example Nike sponsoring the Springbok's kit, third sponsors being indirectly associated with the sport e.g. Vodacom as the official cellular supplier of Chiefs, and finally sponsors image or target market profile is linked to the followers of sports, e.g. Nedbank Golf Challenge (Themarketingsite.com, n.d.).

Sponsorship brings with it a set of rights and obligations relating to usage of the name of a sponsored team or event, branding, leveraging and future rights, dependent on the category of sponsorship (Themarketingsite.com, n.d.).

Standard Bank's National Cricket Team sponsorship is the focus of this study. South African cricket has a history of fanship and support deeply rooted in income profiles, which could impact the findings and perceptions explored in this study, and which may be not be aligned to findings of other countries.

1.3 Problem Statement

1.3.1 Main problem

To identify whether sport sponsorship as an element of marketing communication has a positive influence on the most critical elements of brand equity: brand awareness, image, loyalty and perceived quality. The intention of this research was to demonstrate the impact of how the brand image is shaped by sponsorship, how sponsorship drives awareness and how brand loyalty and perceived quality are influenced by sport sponsorship.

1.3.2 Sub-problems

The first sub-problem was to determine whether the fit between the event and the sponsor has any influence on sponsor recall, recognition, positive associations, loyalty and perceived quality of the sponsor in South Africa.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Sport sponsorship in particular has become a strategic marketing tool used worldwide by big corporations as well as in South Africa, where, in 2016, an estimated R9 billion was invested this type of sponsorship (Koppel, 2016). Many marketing managers enter sport sponsorship agreements with the objective of enhancing consumer-based brand equity. Despite the growth and usage of sponsorship as one of the integrated marketing tools employed by big corporations in the banking, retail, telecommunications and the liquor industries, as mentioned earlier, little research has been undertaken to measure the role and effectiveness of sport sponsorship on the attainment of these objectives in South Africa.

The aim of this study is to contribute to research in the following ways:

- There is quite extensive literature on sport sponsorship; however, most of the literature in this area is concerned with just two dimensions of brand equity: awareness and association (Choi et al, 2015; Biascia et al., 2016; Donlan, 2013; Grohs & Reisinger, 2014). While just a few if any studies measure the influence of sport sponsorship on all four dimensions of brand equity in the same investigation, there are very few that have produced empirical results supporting the influence of higher order dimensions of brand equity, brand loyalty and perceived quality (Sözer & Vardar, 2009). This study is therefore significant in terms of theory because it attempts to address this gap and add to the existing body of literature.

- As said, very few, if any, studies in South Africa have investigated sponsorship effectiveness with specific regard to the impact on brand equity elements and the influence of fit between the sponsor and sponsored event on awareness and image. Studies on sponsorship in South Africa have focused mainly on the setting and achieving of objectives from a company perspective (Abratt & Grobler, 1989; Abratt, Mattheus, & Spence, 1995; Du Plessis & Van Heerden, 2004). The findings of this study provide guidance on the effectiveness of sport sponsorship as an effective tool for building or enhancing brand equity elements.

- The substantial amount of investment in sponsorship by companies in South Africa, such as Standard Bank, makes the significance of this study obvious as companies are interested in whether this money is well spent compared to using it for alternative marketing communication tools.

- The study furthermore aims to answer the question of whether sport sponsorship is an effective tool in the attainment of the specific brand objectives.

In summary, ultimately, the aim of this research is to contribute to marketing managers' understanding of the influence of sport sponsorship on brand equity dimensions and provide value to academics and research in South Africa.

1.5 Delimitations of the study

The following delimitations of the study have been applied:

- The study focusses on a particular sport: cricket, in South Africa
- The study is limited to one moderating factor, sponsorship fit between event sponsor and event.
- The study addresses just one industry, financial services, within a single organisation in South Africa and not any other industries. Therefore, findings cannot necessarily be generalised to other industries in South Africa.

1.6 Definition of terms

Consumer Based Brand Equity is "defined as the differential effect that knowledge about the brand has on consumer response to marketing activity for the brand" (Keller, 1993, p.8).

Brand Image is "a set of beliefs held about a particular brand" or 'a set of associations usually organised in a meaningful way" (Choi et al, 2015, p.310). Brand associations can be attributes, benefits and attitudes.

Brand awareness is the consumer's capability to recognise the brand under different conditions (Biascia et al., 2016, p.163; Keller, 1993). It can be measured through brand recognition and recall.

Brand loyalty Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta &Schivinski (2017, p.200) define brand loyalty as "a favourable attitude towards a brand that results in intentions to repurchase and recommend."

Perceived service quality "Farjam & Hongyi, (2015, p.18) defined perceived quality as "the consumer's judgment about a product's overall excellence or superiority"

Congruence/Sponsorship Fit indicates the "relatedness, similarity, relevance, or congruence of event and sponsor relationships" (Dos Santos & Moreno, 2017; Kim, Kwon & Ratneshwar, 2016).

1.7 Assumptions

- Respondents are honest, and their answers are representative of the truth
- Respondents might be biased in their responses considering that they are answering questions about their favourite sports and team
- Respondents exposure to the sponsorship may have an impact on the results. Respondents who are aware of Standard Banks sponsorship of the cricket team might have more positive responses that those who are not aware
- The level of involvement with cricket might have an impact on the results. In that respondents who are highly involved with cricket might have more positive responses than those who are not involved.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to articulate the relevance of this research by reviewing the literature that informs the topic. The review examined key concepts related to sponsorship and elements of brand equity. The first section presents the history, definition and the objectives of sponsorship. Secondly, an empirical review of brand equity theories is offered, followed by a discussion on the brand equity elements: awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived quality, which are the core of this study. Thereafter the moderating factors of sponsorship fit, and the underlying theories are discussed and in concluding, the conceptual framework and hypotheses are provided.

This review investigates the impact of sports sponsorship on brand equity dimensions and factors influencing sports sponsorship and elements of brand equity. It also explains the different theories and concepts used by researchers, such as Keller's Brand Equity Theory and Aaker's Brand Equity Model. In addition, to these, the review also assists by providing a conceptual framework which was used in analysing the impact of sports sponsorship on brand equity dimensions.

2.2. Definition of topic and background discussion.

As explained, the aim of this study was to research the effect of sponsorship on brand equity elements. A brand can be leveraged using different strategies and techniques like sponsorship, brand campaigns, social and community-based causes. This study investigated sponsorship specifically as it relates to sport.

Sport sponsorship has become an established part of the integrated marketing tools used to build brand equity elements such as brand awareness (recall and recognition), brand loyalty, perceived quality and brand image (Henseler, Westberg & Wilson, 2011). Over time, the phenomenon of sports sponsorship has become a marketing communication tool for brands and organisations and

is being used to analyse the critical attitude of consumers towards a brand and its products.

Sports sponsorship has evolved over time from being a philanthropic activity to becoming a popular marketing tool. As has been mentioned, the global sport sponsorship spending was estimated to be around USD60.1 billion in 2016 (Statistica.com, n.d) with South Africa estimated to have reached R9 billion in 2016 (Nevillon, 2014).

Researchers Ailawadi, Datta and Van Heerde (2017) explain that consumer-based brand equity measures what consumers feel or think about the brand. Sport sponsorship assists in influencing brand equity by building and enhancing brand awareness and image/associations, perceiving quality and creating brand loyalty among consumers. Moreover, sports sponsorship affects brand value and equity as it influences the return on the share price of companies and their ability to reach their target audience.

The theoretical framework used in the research was based on different concepts and theories which are discussed in the sections that follow.

2.3. Sponsorship

2.3.1 The history of sponsorship and definition of sponsorship

The origins and history of sponsorship in its purest form can be traced back thousands of years. The first "sponsorships" date back to the 5th century BC in Ancient Greece and took form of a tax paid by affluent citizens to finance major competitions and public festivities. Later, in 264 Before Common Era, the first gladiator fights took place in Ancient Rome; these were sponsored by the wealthy with the objective of demonstrating their [the wealthy] greatness and influence in the community. The Renaissance period saw wealthy families in Europe sponsoring artists and scientists to help them spread their art or knowledge (Elevent.com, 2017).

Sponsorship in its various forms is an age-old tool that has evolved from its first use in ancient Greece to being used for philanthropic objectives during the Renaissance period. The notion of sponsorship gradually modified further in relatively modern times and companies started using it for commercial reasons (Cheah & Gordon, 2017). According to Meenaghan (1998) sponsorship motivated by commercial interests became evident over a hundred years ago in England and France and in the early decades of this century in the US.

The term sponsorship emerged during the 1990's when the concept experienced a sudden upsurge in Western countries (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014). Sponsorship linked marketing was coined by Cornwell, Weeks and Roy (2005) and gained momentum in the late 1990 (Abratt, Clayton, & Pitt, 1987; Grohs & Reisinger, 2014) and continues to gain prominence as a global marketing medium, because it provides a versatile platform that enables communication with wide range of stakeholder groups and achieves a variety of corporate and brand objectives (Meenaghan, McCormack & McLoughlin , 2013).

Sponsorship is financial support provided by the sponsor. The sponsors can be of various kinds like financial sponsors who provide support in monetary terms that is promoting the brands in official programs or releasing newsletters and press releases. Another form of sponsorship is in-kind sponsors that donate goods and services related to sports rather than money. In addition to these, the other sponsors include media sponsors that finance media coverage for sports companies and organization (Agrell, Reddy & Stam, 2015).

Sports sponsorship management factors include exposure that influences sponsorship awareness among consumers (Lawley, Raciti & Vance, 2016; Henseler, Westberg & Wilson, 2011). Sports sponsorship exposures ensure that more sponsors are exposed to consumers the more the sponsorships events will be encoded in the memory of consumers. Another management factor that influence sponsorship impact on brand equity dimensions is size of the audience and duration of sponsorship that is the more and bigger the events are of sponsorship the more are the chances that consumers are likely to remember the events of sports (Bijmolt, Koning & Walvaren, 2014).

Sponsorship is a marketing communication tool that can be used for many different activities. These activities primarily include musical events, festivals, arts and sports. Sport sponsorship dominates sponsorship activities and attracts the greatest proportion of investment in sponsorship. It is the most popular form of sponsorship by far, accounting for 68% - 84% of global sponsorship revenue (Ireland, Kelly, & Williamson, 2016), largely because it appeals to all classes as well as for its ability to reach active participants, spectators at the event and on TV, while they are watching their favourite sport (Fin 24, 2001), and large numbers in different geographies at the same time.

Sports sponsorship is also affected by different individual factors that influenced brand equity dimensions such as involvement that is the extent to which an individual is interested in particular sports or events (Kim, Kim Lee & Magnusen, 2015). The involvement is related to a number of hours viewing sports on television, reading and attending sports events and attending sports events. Another individual factor is perceiving of sponsors that is a sponsor and sponsored object must be deemed to match in the eyes of consumers or else they may not be interested in events. Moreover perceptions of sponsorship fit between the sponsor and event helps in increasing chances of enhanced awareness and image of the sponsor brand (Chang, Jae Ko, Herbst, Park, 2017).

2.3.2 Sponsorship objectives and outcomes

The sponsorship domain has been extensively researched, which has resulted in several attempts to define exactly what sponsorship is. While there is no generally accepted definition, the most widely quoted definition in literature was proposed by Meenaghan (1993, p.9) who defines sponsorship as "the provision of assistance either financial or in-kind to an activity by a commercial organization for the purpose of achieving commercial objectives". Cornwell (2012, p.15) furthermore defines sponsorship linked marketing as 'the sponsor leveraging the association by developing marketing activities to communicate the sponsorship ".

Both definitions highlight the two important activities with which sponsorship is concerned: first, an exchange between sponsor and sponsee whereby the sponsee receives payment and the sponsor obtains the right to associate itself with the event and second, the marketing of the association by the sponsor in order to achieve marketing and commercial purposes (Cheach & Gordon, 2017; Chao, 2011). As stated earlier, although there is no widely universally accepted definition of sponsorship, generally there is consensus that these two activities are important factors that define sponsorship.

Sponsorship linked marketing encompasses the ultimate goal of most corporate sponsorship activities, particularly those involving sports (Cheach & Gordon, 2017). Sponsorship is used by companies to satisfy various objectives such as staff motivation, stakeholder entertainment (consumers, suppliers), relationship building and building various elements of brand equity (Henseler, Westberg & Wilson, 2011). Numerous studies have confirmed that the primary reasons firms engage in sport sponsorship linked marketing is to fulfil marketing and commercial objectives (Cho, 2011; Donlan, 2013; Cheach & Gordon, 2017; Quester & Thompson, 2001).

According to Choi et al (2015, p.308) brand managers engage in sponsorship activities in the hope that these activities will build elements of equity such as brand awareness, enhance brand image and increase loyalty by causing sports fans to emotionally and cognitively link the sponsored events with the sponsor. Sport sponsorship in particular has become a popular instrument for management of brand equity dimensions across a wide range of industries (Clopton, Heere & Wear, 2016). Author Keller (1993) and other academics confirm the role that sponsorship plays in building components of brand equity. As mentioned, there are a variety of motives for engaging in sponsorship; however, enhancing the sponsors' dimensions of brand equity is the most important sponsorship goal for brand managers (Chang, et al., 2017).

Authors Chebli and Gharbi (2014, p. 916) suggest that sponsorship is "one of the most effective marketing tools to increase the value of the company's image, awareness, and its impact on the visibility and location of the event".

This view is further supported by numerous other researchers (Alexandris, James & Tsiotsou, 2012; Biscaia, 2016; Biscaia, Correia, Rosado, Ross & Maroco, 2013), who have consistently found that through its ability to build consumer factors, such as emotional attachment to the sport, psychological and behavioural commitment and loyalty to a specific sports team or event, sport sponsorship plays a critical role as a tool to deliver sponsors' messages to consumers.

Sport sponsorship provides a brand with exposure by using elements like the brand name and logo on a variety of objects, such as the club jersey, the scoreboard and billboards or banners around the venue, during the sponsored event. Exposure of the brand name and logo during an event results in the brand being seen multiple times on each occasion, making the brand more accessible and therefore, more likely to be recalled and recognised (Cheah & Gordon, 2014). Viewers exposed to brand names may demonstrate an increased accessibility of the brand name in their memory, increased attitudes towards the brand, positive brand loyalty and perceived quality (Bijmolt, Koning & Walraven, 2014).

2.4. Brand Equity

As discussed earlier, the concept of brand equity was first introduced by Aaker during the 1980's and both academia and practise have since come to regard it as an essential marketing tool (Baalbaki & Guzmán, 2016; Lodhi & Tanveer, 2016). The construct, "brand equity" refers to the value added to a product or service by its brand name (Donlan, 2013). It is based on the idea that a product or service with a well-known brand name can generate more value than one with an unknown name (Lodhi & Tanveer, 2016). Brand equity can increase the financial value of the firm; hence brands are the most valuable intangible assets of an organisation

To be more specific, it can be said that the term brand equity refers to the value of a particular brand. However, as stated by Tsordia, Papadimitriou and

Parganas (2016), brand value can be determined or set by the experiences and perception of consumers regarding a brand. For example, when consumers value a brand highly then it is obvious that the brand has a positive level of brand equity. Contrastingly, a view held by Dens, De Pelsmacker and Verhellen (2018) suggests that if a brand is responsible for continuously disappointing its' consumers, then it can be said that the brand carries a negative brand equity. A brand with a positive brand equity can make more money through boosting the stock price of an organisation based on the popularity of a brand name and positive brand image. In the opinion of Chang, Chang and Lu (2014), brand equity develops as an outcome of associations and experiences consumers have with that brand. The process of retaining brand equity involves a series of steps, such as brand awareness, brand recognition, brand trial, brand image and brand loyalty.

Brand equity can create value for both the consumer and the firm. Academics and researchers have found that strong consumer-based brand equity can add value to the firm by enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of marketing programmes, improving licensing opportunities and that consumers' responsiveness to brand extensions increases the probability of brand choice, leading to greater revenue and lower costs and allowing higher margins by permitting premium pricing and reducing reliance on promotions. Finally, it provides a competitive advantage that often presents a real barrier to competitors (Baalbaki & Guzmán, 2016; Gordon, 2017). Strong brands also benefit consumers as well by reducing the risk and search cost for products, act as a signal for differentiation and strengthen social identity (Gordon, 2017). Aaker (1991, p.15) additionally states that strong brand equity can help "consumers access information about a brand, affect their confidence in purchase decision and enhance consumer satisfaction with the brand through perceived quality and brand associations". In summary, strong brand equity provides a brand with a sustainable competitive advantage.

For brand equity to add value to the firm and to consumers, a strong brand has to be built first. The power of a strong brand depends on consumer awareness of the brand, associations formed whenever a consumer thinks of the brand, as

well as perceived quality relative to that of the brand competitors and loyalty to the brand (Adam & Akber, 2016).

Although there is no common viewpoint on defining components of brand equity, there are two distinctive view points on measuring brand equity (Huang & Sarigöllü, 2014): the financial perspective and the consumer-based perspective.

From the financial perspective, brand equity is defined as the total value of the brand, which is a separate asset when sold or included in a balance sheet (Hawley, 2009). An alternative definition is proposed by Akinci (2005) who defines brand equity as the incremental cash flows which accrue to branded products over unbranded. Additionally, Simon and Sullivan (1993) cited in Baalbaki and Guzmán (2016, p. 231) define it as a financial measure of the market value minus its tangible asset value. Baalbaki and Guzmán, 2016 who adopts the same perspective further confirms that brand equity creates a financial asset value for the brand and adds that the financial perspective measures the outcome of consumer-based brand equity. Essentially, the financial perspective stressed the value of the brand to the firm, rather than to the consumer (Baalbaki & Guzmán, 2016)

The consumer perspective of brand equity takes the consumers' point of view into account, whether it's an individual or an organisation (Lodhi & Tanveer, 2016). Brand equity from the consumer perspective is referred to as consumer-based brand equity and defines brand equity as the value of the brand to the consumer (Baalbaki & Guzmán, 2016). Although Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) use the term 'consumer-based brand equity', and both authors contend that for a brand to have value it must be valued by consumers, they conceptualise it differently. Keller (1993, p.8) describes consumer-based brand equity as "the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand". His definition is built on the principle that the power of a brand therefore lies in what consumers have learned, heard, seen and felt about the brand as a result of their experiences over time (Keller, 1993). Keller's definition emphasises two dimensions to measuring consumer-based brand

equity: brand awareness and brand image. These two dimensions comprise brand knowledge in the consumers mind.

Aaker (1991) however, describes consumer-based brand equity as a "set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name and symbol that add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service" (Aaker, 1991, p.15). According to him, attaching a set of brand assets and liabilities to a brand name or symbol creates value for the brand and provides a sustainable competitive advantage. Aaker refers to these assets (or liabilities) as dimensions of brand equity. Aaker's definition is more comprehensive, compared to Keller, and he proposes five assets (dimensions) that underlie brand equity: brand name, brand associations, perceived quality, brand loyalty and other proprietary brand assets, such as patents, trademarks and so on (Aaker, 1991, p.15).

Brand Equity is the brand value a brand creates in the eyes of consumers. The different steps in creating brand equity are: firstly, a brand awareness that helps consumers know about the brand that exists in the market, which can be done through various marketing tools such as advertising, sponsorship, promotions and so on. According to Chatzipanagiotou, Birkbeck and Veloutsou (2016), the second step in creating brand equity is communicating with the target audience regarding the meaning of brand and what it stands for. The third step is analysing consumer response, that is, analysing consumers' attitude and feelings towards a brand. The last step is building a relationship with the consumers; building deeper bonds and stronger connections with consumers to help in gaining more brand recognition, thereby increasing and enhancing the brand value and brand equity of companies.

Since this study focussed on the first four of these dimensions from the consumer perspective, they are thus important in the measurement of consumer-based brand equity. Brand equity can be created, strengthened and maintained through strategic investments in marketing communication tools. The source of brand equity is consumer perceptions of the four dimensions, which represent consumers' evaluations and reactions to the brand (Huang & Sarigöllü, 2014). Brand equity can therefore be strengthened and maintained by enhancing awareness, image perception, brand loyalty and perceived quality of

the brand (Huang & Sarigöllü, 2014) through marketing tools, such as sport sponsorship. Author Donlan (2013, p. 244) posits that "elements of consumer-based brand equity are closely aligned to the commonly pursued goals of sponsorship, making it an appropriate theoretical framework within which to assess the effectiveness of sponsorship". This research therefore investigated the relationship between sport sponsorship as a marketing tool and the creation and enhancement of the four brand equity dimensions identified.

The financial value of brand equity is ultimately an outcome of consumer response to a brand name and the value placed on the brand. Therefore, this study measured consumer-based brand equity based on Aaker's (1991) conceptualisation. Aaker's conceptual model of brand equity, which was used for this study, is presented below as Figure 2.1.




Figure 2.1: Aaker's Conceptual Model of Consumer-Based Brand Equity. Source (Aaker, 1991)

According to Donlan (2013, p.244) "the elements of consumer-based brand equity therefore are common to the objectives pursued by engaging in sponsorship, making it an appropriate theoretical framework within which to assess the effectiveness of sponsorship". This study evaluated the ability of sport sponsorship to advance the four dimensions of brand equity, brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and brand loyalty.

2.5. Brand Awareness

According to Biascia (2016) one of the major aims of marketing is to generate and maintain brand awareness. Building strong brands begins with creating awareness, therefore brand awareness is often used as a key outcome when evaluating brand building marketing initiatives, such as sponsorship (Biascia, 2016).

According to Cobbs, Jensen, Wakefield and Turner (2016), awareness of a brand drives the decisions of consumers while they are choosing products among competing brands. One of the advantages of this aspect of brand equity is that it helps to convince consumers to make repeat purchases that directly influence a hike in incremental sales and market share. According to Lodhi and Tanveer (2016), purchasing decisions of consumers are based on subconscious assumptions. This is so because consumers use some subconscious shortcuts to avoid being confused by the range of available options from which they must choose. Thus, marketing initiatives based on brand awareness can assist consumers in narrowing down their choice of brands.

Authors Lodhi and Tanveer (2016, p. 45) state that brand awareness is a key determinant of the brand equity model.

Brand awareness is "consumers ability to the brand under different conditions" (Biascia, 2016, p.163). Biscaia, Correia, Rosado, Ross, and Maroco, (2013, p. 291), state that the concept of brand equity refers to "a consumer's ability to identify a brand under different conditions". Although both authors phrase brand

awareness slightly differently, they both have the same underlying message: for awareness to occur, the consumer needs to have had exposure to the brand.

Farjam and Hongyi (2015) suggest that brand awareness refers to the strength of the brand's presence in the consumer's mind; it means consumers know about the brand and can recall the brand. As stated earlier, awareness of a brand is particularly important as it plays a major role in consumer decision-making in that consumers think of a brand or brands when purchasing a product.

Consumers generally proceed with purchasing once they are aware of the product category and a brand in that category, and mostly adopt a decision rule to purchase brands they have heard of or are familiar with, it is for this reason that brand awareness plays such a critical role in brand equity (Lodhi & Tanveer, 2016).

Aaker (1991) further describes brand awareness as being represented by a continuum of brand knowledge represented by three different levels. The first level is when consumers are unaware of a brand, second level is brand recognition where consumers can correctly identify a brand through for example logos, advertising or even sponsorship, the third level is brand recall, at this stage consumers can correctly elicit a brand name from memory and finally top of mind, which is when consumers have a specific brand in mind when thinking of a specific category. These levels assist in evaluating how much a person is aware of a brand, which implies that brand awareness depends on consumers' ability to recognise and recall a brand (Gordon & James, 2017). These three levels can be used to measure brand awareness in the context of sponsorship.

2.5.1 Brand Recognition

Brand recognition is the extent to which a consumer can recognise a particular brand, given a set of brands in a certain product category (Gordon & James, 2017). Keller (1991) further states that brand recognition requires a consumer to correctly identify those brands that they have previously seen or heard of

before and refers to the ability of the consumer to remember and identify a brand through its attributes such as logos, slogans or colours among similar brands.

According to Biascia et al (2013), this aspect of brand equity demands prior knowledge recall on part of consumers. A company needs to provide continuous visual experiences to consumers in order to build recognition of a brand. Brand recognition can be best identified when it is seen that consumers are naming the brand without being exposed explicitly to the brand name via attributes like slogans, jingles and more.

Brand recognition is the lowest level of awareness that is measured using aided recall. In measuring brand recognition, consumers are given a set of brand names, logos or slogans in a given category and asked to identify brands that they have seen, heard before or experienced (Aaker, 1991). Recognition prompts such as brand name, logos or symbols play a crucial role in identifying the brand at the point of purchase (Adam & Akber, 2016) as brand recognition becomes important inside the store where consumers select brands to purchase.

2.5.2 Brand Recall

Brand recall is the second level of brand awareness. According to Keller (1991, p. 4), brand recall is the "consumers' ability to retrieve the brand when given the product category, the needs fulfilled by the category, or some other probe as a cue". This measure indicates the degree of the brand's presence in the mind of the consumer. Brand recall is crucial outside the store as a decision to purchase is made even before reaching the purchase destination (Keller, 2016).

Brand recall is measured by the concept of unaided recall and aided recall. Unaided recall determines consumers who can spontaneously name the brand without any assistance in the form of brand cues (Adam & Akber, 2016). Unaided recall is a more difficult task than aided recall as consumers are not provided with names of brands in the product class. It represents a more effect

of awareness and is associated with a stronger brand position than aided recall (Adam & Akber, 2016).

The final level is top of mind awareness. Top of mind awareness is achieved when a brand is the first to be mentioned spontaneously (Choi, 2011).

2.5.3 Advantages of Brand Awareness

As mentioned earlier, building a strong brand starts with awareness. Building brand awareness creates the following benefits:

- The brand is top of mind for consumers, which is the first step in building consumer-based brand equity
- A brand becomes part of the consideration set; brand awareness plays a crucial role in being part of brands that consumers consider. Brands that come to mind when making a purchase decision will have an advantage (Otunbanjo, 2018, p.30)
- An anchor to which other associations can be attached; a brand name allows consumers to link associated attributes, facts and feelings to it (Farjam & Hongyi, 2015, p.18)
- Familiarity/liking – recognising or recalling a brand name provides a sense of familiarity and can affect choices among brands (Aaker, 1991, p.63-66)
- Substance/commitment – name awareness signals substance and commitment which are important indicators of a brand presence which can make a difference in purchase decisions (Aaker, 1991, p.63-66).

The literature review on brand awareness illustrates that consumers' ability to recognise and recall a brand can contribute to improvements in brand equity. Increased awareness of a brand among consumers determines the value of the brand, which, as previously mentioned, is known as brand equity.

2.5.4 Brand Awareness and Sport Sponsorship

Lawley, Raciti and Vance (2016), postulates that sponsorship of sporting events is one of several elements that contributes to achieve, maintain and improve brand awareness. The primary goal for sponsoring events is to create, enhance and maintain awareness by generating exposure of the brand to spectators in the stadium and those viewing the event on television (Ireland et al., 2016).

The literature supports and highlights that companies engage in sponsorship to increase brand awareness by linking the sponsored event with the brand name (Biascia, 2016; Choi et al., 2015; Bijmolt, Koning & Walraven, 2014; Till & Zdravkovic, 2012). Sponsorship exposes audiences to the sponsors' brand; therefore, it should result in consumers being able to recognise and recall the brand and consequently have a positive impact on brand equity (Biascia, 2016). Consumers' ability to correctly recognise and recall the brand is indicative of a successful sponsorship (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014).

2.6. Brand Image

Brand image refers to perceptions and views that consumers have regarding a particular brand. This can be further described as set of specific image associations invoked in the consumer's mind by the brand. Brand image manifests itself in the beliefs and impressions the consumer may hold strongly about the brand (Grohs, 2016). Through these beliefs and impressions, consumers are then able develop either a positive or negative disposition towards the brand. Brands with a positive image disposition inspire confidence among consumers while those with a negative association are likely to have very little endorsement by consumers.

According to Keller (1993, p.3) brand image is defined as "consumer perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumers' memory". Brand associations are believed to contain "the meaning of the brand for consumers". They are the consumers' mental picture of the

brand and include symbolic meanings about the brand that consumers associate with specific attributes of the product or service (Choi et al, 2015).

A contrasting view of brand image is proposed by Holmgren and Widmark (2018), who state that brand image is the perception by consumers about a service or product and nothing else; implying that brand image is a bundle of beliefs that are held about a brand by consumers. On the other hand, brand image is responsible for conveying an emotional value that extends far beyond a mere mental image.

Brand associations are seen as the heart and core of the brand; they result in enhanced brand awareness, which is positively related to brand equity because these can help a consumer consider the brand and represent the basis for loyalty, and also create value the firm and its consumers (Till & Zdravkovic 2012). Author Till and Zdravkovic (2012, p.116) concurs that brand associations are "core assets of building a strong brand equity or the heart and soul of the brand".

In addition, brand image assists a company to make a positive impression in the mind of consumers; these impressions are formed from a variety of sources. Brand image or associations can be built from a variety of sources, such as experience with the brand, product function, user and usage imagery and can also be influenced through sponsorship activities and celebrity endorsements (Choi, et al., 2015).

Building a strong brand is reliant on a firm's image. Thus, a strong image has become an imperative for companies as it has been shown that strong brands yield advantages such as established market identity and higher consumer preferences, which ultimately impacts brand equity favourably (Till & Zdravkovic, 2012).

Keller (1991), refers to three types of brand associations that may exist in a consumers' memory. First are its attributes, which are characteristics of the product or service (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014). Second, are its benefits. These are

personal or cultural values that a consumer attaches to the attributes of a product or service (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014). Adam & Akber (2016, p. 71), on the other hand suggests that brand associations benefits are the personal needs that consumers attach to the product or service. Lastly, its attitudes, which Keller (1991, p.3) defines brand attitudes as "consumers' summary evaluation of a brand". Brand attitudes are the basis for consumer behaviour as they often form the basis for brand choice (Till & Zdravkovic, 2012). They are symbolic of all the associated attributes and benefits that are salient for the brand (Grohs & Reisinger, 2014). Brand attitudes are associated with non-product related attributes which express a value that reflects a consumers' self-image.

According to Keller (1993) posit that understanding brand equity involves identifying strong favourable distinct brand associations within a consumer mind. Brand associations make up a brand's image, its identity, uniqueness and a brand's value to the consumer (Till & Zdravkovic, 2012). A marketing initiative, such as a sponsorship goal would therefore involve communicating positive and or favourable brand associations to a consumer, to persuade the consumer of the attributes and benefits they desire from a brand.

2.6.1 Advantages of positive or enhanced brand image

As mentioned earlier, a brand can have a positive or negative image character. A positive brand image is capable of supporting a brand to be successful over the course of time. Thus, a positive brand image has its own set of advantages as highlighted below:

- It can help the consumers to decide easily on whether to choose the brand or not. It implies that consumers can be convinced to purchase repeatedly from a particular brand and new consumer can be convinced to purchase primarily from that brand too (Farjam & Hongyi, 2015, p.18)
- According to Huang and Sarigöllü (2014), consumers perceive a brand through its image and thus a positive brand image helps in enhancing brand perception as well

- It is a signal of superior brand quality relative to competitors (Sallam, 2016)
- It creates value for the firm and its customers by helping to process and retrieve information, differentiate the brand, create positive attitudes or feelings, provides a reason to buy and provides a basis for extensions (Farjam & Hongyi, 2015, p.18)

2.6.2 Brand image and sport sponsorship

Firms have a variety of motives for entering sponsorships. One such motive is to enhance or build brand image amongst spectators at the stadium and those viewing a sports event on TV (Grohs, 2016). Sponsorship is expected to play a key role, especially in industries such as banking, where it is difficult to differentiate between products or services based on tangible qualities (Choi et al., 2015). Authors Ireland et al (2016, p.241) suggests that "sport sponsorship has become popular because of its capacity to influence brand awareness and positive brand associations". These positive or favourable associations towards a brand determines the value of the brand to the consumer (Ireland et al, 2016).

Many surveys have explored the relationship between sponsorship and brand image and have demonstrated that sponsorship can be successful in achieving this goal (Ireland et al., 2016; Grohs, 2016). Grohs (2016) attributes the success of sponsorship to improving the sponsor image to regard to factors related to the sponsor type, sponsorship relationship and the individual consumer demographic characteristics and the sponsor. According to Grohs and Reisinger (2014, p.1019) "professional sport sponsorship primarily strengthens brand image by providing links to specific brand benefits and attributes".

The role of image transference between event image and sponsor image must be considered when analysing the role of image in sponsorship (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014). The term "image transfer, defines the transfer of event associations to the brand or company to sponsor" (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014, p. 916).

Grohs (2016) suggests that companies try to transfer image dimensions associated with the event to the sponsor brand, particularly with sport sponsorship. Through sponsorship of an event, the sponsor hopes to create an event image transfer to its brand in the minds of the target consumers (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014).

Consumers hold associations, particularly concerning sport properties, athletes and teams and these associations can become linked in consumer memory with the sponsor brand, which enables the transfer of specific image dimensions between the event and the sponsor (Grohs & Reisinger 2014). According to Chebli and Gharbi (2014) the image of an event is based on three characteristics: the type of event, e.g. sports, arts, culture and so on; the event characteristics, such as size, e.g. number of participants, their status and location and so forth as well as individual factors, such as personal experience and personal perceptions of the image of the event.

The sponsors' image can be enhanced through image transfer between the event and the sponsor (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014). To facilitate the transfer of favourable image associations an appropriate event, a team or league deemed suitable to achieve the desired improvements in brand image must be selected Grohs and Reisinger (2014). The event must be a close representation of the image desired by the consumer, be credible and have a personality close to the one desired by the brand.

There are four conditions under which the transfer of the image to the brand of the sponsor can be achieved these are: the perceived similarity or fit between the event and the sponsor (congruence or sponsorship fit), the sponsor's involvement, the frequency of the event, and the nature of the product (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014, p.916).

Sponsorship can assist a brand to enhance its image through association with a specific event that would be a valuable means of for the development and enhancement of brand equity (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014, p.916).

In this research, the fit of the sponsee with the sponsor, as perceived by consumers, was tested as a moderating variable. A review of literature on this topic is discussed under section 2.9.

2.7. Brand Loyalty

Brand loyalty is one of the most important elements of brand equity and a well-recognised dimension of brand equity as proposed by Aaker (1991). According to Keller (1991), brand equity exists when there is loyalty to a brand name. Geçti and Zengin (2013), contend that the value of a brand increases as much as the customer loyalty to the brand. These authors further suggest that the goal of creating brand value is to ensure continuity brand loyal consumers (Geçti & Zengin, 2013). Loyal consumers show more favourable responses to a brand and continue to purchase the brand even in the face of competition by other brands. This implies that there is substantial value in the brand and that the brand equity is high (Geçti & Zengin, 2013).

Brand loyalty is the only dimension of brand equity that can be directly linked to consumer behaviour and because it is a major driver of sales and profits, the sponsoring firms understand the value of loyalty (Donlan, 2013).

According to Aaker (1991, p. 39), brand loyalty is "the attachment that a customer has to a brand". Oliver (1999), cited in Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski (2017, p.200) defines loyalty as "a favourable attitude towards a brand that results in intentions to repurchase and recommend". The literature indicates that Oliver's (1999) definition of brand loyalty is the most widely used definition. The definitions of brand loyalty cited from Aaker (1999) and, Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski (2017) highlight that brand loyal consumers hold a favourable attitude and commitment towards a brand, demonstrated by the intention to mandatorily repurchase the same brand. These consumers resist switching, despite the marketing efforts of competing brands.

Authors Choi et al. (2015, p.311) contend that for brand loyalty to exist, it must be: "1) biased (i.e., nonrandom), (2) a behavioural response (i.e., purchase), (3) expressed over time, (4) by a decision-maker, (5) with respect to one or more alternative brands as (6) and a function of psychological processes". The source of true brand loyalty is previous positive experiences with the brand (Upmannyu & Rajput, 2017).

The literature reviewed with regard to brand loyalty reveals it is widely acknowledged that loyalty has both attitudinal and behavioural components.

2.7.1 Behavioural loyalty

Geçti and Zengin (2013, p.113), defined behavioural loyalty as "behavior that is shown by a consumer to a brand within the form of repeated purchases". Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski (2017), further add that it is recognised as a consumer's intent and action of repurchasing the same product or service over again. The behavioural viewpoint emphasises a consumer's loyalty to a brand as revealed in their purchase choices.

The benefit of behavioural loyalty most commonly identified by scholars is that of repeat purchase actions, which ultimately benefits the sponsoring firm financially. Hence, marketers are more interested in behavioural loyalty it as it results in higher sales and profits for the organisation (Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski, 2017).

Consumers are motivated by factors such as such as high switching costs, lack of alternatives, price promotions, demographics and individual collectivist values to remain loyal to a brand Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski (2017).

2.7.2 Attitudinal loyalty

Attitudinal loyalty is defined by Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski (2017, p.203) as the "consumers' devotion and attachment towards, and closeness with a brand", while Choi et al. (2015), describe attitudinal loyalty as indicating commitment and favourable attitudes towards the brand as well as the intention to repurchase the brand. According to Biascia (2013), attitudinal loyalty reflects consumers' commitment and their attitude toward purchasing the brand.

Brand loyalty translates into marketing benefits such as:

- Reduced marketing costs – it costs less to retain consumers than to get new ones (Keller, 2001, p. 46)
- Greater trade leverage– ensures preferred shelf space as consumers will insist on the brand when in store (Keller, 2001, p.47)
- Favourable word-of-mouth (Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski, 2017)
- Attracts new consumers – a brand with satisfied consumers that like the brand provides reassurance to prospective consumers (Keller, p., 47)
- Provides time to respond to competitive threats – loyal consumers will provide a firm with time needed to respond by making product improvements to neutralise the competition (Keller, 2001, p.48)
- Perceptions of higher value for consumers (Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski, 2017).

Although one of the key communication objectives of sponsorship is to favour brand loyalty, this relationship has not been solidly established in the available literature (Mazodier & Merunka, 2012). Sponsorship and brand loyalty are two concepts that have been extensively studied, yet there are not many studies demonstrating a relationship between the two concepts. Donlan (2013), further suggests that brand loyalty and sponsorship have received little attention, possibly because it is difficult to attribute consumer purchasing behaviour to a single marketing communication tool.

Notwithstanding the above, Donlan (2013) indicates that Beasley, Levin, and Gamble (2004) found evidence that sponsorship can build brand loyalty. This is further supported by Biascia et al. (2013, p. 288) who, in their study, found that attitudinal loyalty impacts consumer attitude toward both sponsors and purchase intentions and that behavioural loyalty influences sponsorship awareness and influences the attitude and purchase intentions towards each sponsor differently. Furthermore, Choi et al. (2015) posit that sponsorship may also generate brand loyalty as consumers are likely to develop brand loyalty to the brand sponsor of the event.

The other dimensions of brand equity have been found to contribute and have a positive impact on loyalty are enhanced brand recall and recognition. Strengthening the brand image increases the brand's value in the eyes of the consumer and perceptions of increased product quality all have a significant influence on brand loyalty (Berbić, Puška & Stojanović, 2018).

2.8. Perceived Quality

Perceived quality is another important dimension of brand equity. It is positively related to brand equity and is identified as one of its core dimensions (Sasirekha & Sathish, 2017). Zeithaml (1988) recognises perceived quality as an element of brand value, therefore consumer perceptions of high quality would drive a consumer to choose the brand rather than other competing brands, which will ultimately result in increased brand equity.

Perceived quality can be related to the product or service offered by a business; hence we refer to perceived product quality or perceived service quality (Aaker, 1991). This study focused on perceived service quality.

Perceived service quality is a key driver of business performance as it can give a firm a competitive advantage, increased financial performance and customer satisfaction as well as customer retention (Markovic, Iglesias, Singh & Sierra, 2018).

While Farjam and Hongyi, (2015, p. 18) defined perceived quality as "the consumer's judgment about a product's overall excellence or superiority", Aaker (1991, p. 84) on the other hand defined perceived quality as "consumer's perception of the overall quality or superiority of a product or service with respect to its intended purpose, relative to alternatives." Although both authors define perceived quality differently, they both articulate it as being about consumer perceptions regarding the superiority or excellence of a product. It is based on consumers' subjective evaluations of a product or service and it therefore cannot be objectively determined (Donthu & Yoo, 2001). Perceived quality describes consumer perceptions of a brand in terms of its quality, consistency, performance, reliability, functionality and service (Baalbaki & Guzmán, 2016). The customer perceptions alluded to are likely to be influenced by personal product or service experiences, unique needs and consumption situations.

Perceived quality generates value for a brand in the following ways:

- Reason to buy – it provides a pivotal reason to buy a particular brand, influencing which brands are included or excluded from consideration and purchase decision (Farjam & Hongyi, 2015, p.18)
- Differentiate/position – a principal positioning of a brand is its' perceived position on the perceived quality dimension (Farjam & Hongyi, 2015, p. 18)
- A price premium – provides the option of charging a premium price, which can increase profits and provide resources to invest in brand building activities such as enhancing awareness or associations, and R&D activities to improve the product. A price premium can also reinforce the perceived quality (Aaker, 1991, p.86 - 88),
- Channel member interest – it can be meaningful to retailers, distributors and other channel members and thus aid in gaining distribution
- Brand extensions – the brand name can be used to enter new product categories. (Farjam & Hongyi, 2015, p.18)

Aaker (1991) suggests that there are dimensions that underlie perceived quality. There are dimensions specifically related to the product context and ones in the service context. The service specific dimensions are competence of service, reliability of service, responsiveness, empathy, credibility, trustworthiness and courtesy Aaker (1991).

2.9. Sponsorship moderating factors

2.9.1 Image congruence between sponsor and event

Much of the literature on sponsorship research reveals that there are a variety of factors that are thought to influence the propensity of sponsorship to enhance brand recall, associations and the transference of image from the event to the brand of the sponsor. Certain conditions must exist to maximise the impact of sponsorship programmes on brand equity dimensions. Scholars have identified the perceptions of fit as moderating influences on consumers' evaluations of sponsorship (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014, p.916; Mazodier, 2013).

Henseler, Gotz, Hautvast and Wilson (2007), describes a moderator as a variable that affects the direction and/or strength of the relationship between two variables: a predictor variable and a criterion variable. This implies that the effectiveness of sport sponsorship and the perceived change in brand equity dimensions will be moderated by the perceived fit between the event and sponsor (Henseler et al, 2007). Dos Santos and Moreno (2017), reinforce this and state that the level of congruence between partners plays an important role in achieving important sponsorship outcomes.

Although the concept of 'similarity' between the sponsor and event has been studied in sponsorship literature under many different designations such as 'similarity', 'fit' or 'match', most of the reviewed literature refers to 'congruence'. Congruence is broadly defined as the relatedness, fit, similarity or relevant link between the sponsored event and sponsor (Biscaia et al., 2016; Grohs & Reisinger, 2014).

The two kinds of congruence most frequently mentioned in the literature are: functional congruence or image congruence (Kim et al, 2015). Functional congruence refers to the usefulness of the sponsors' products within the event (Drengner, 2011) while image congruence refers to the relationship between the image of the brand to that of the event (Kim et al, 2015). Drengner (2011) suggests that there is a third type of congruence: user-based congruence, in which case both the event users (spectators at the event) and the brand users (consumers of the brand) are the same person. These different types of congruence exist between the event and brand.

There is a substantial amount of literature on sponsorship indicating that a level of congruence between the sponsored event and the sponsoring brand facilitates memorising of the sponsorship and enhances brand associations (Cobbs, 2012; Choi et al, 2015; Ratnershwar, 2016; Speed & Thompson, 2000). This is further supported by Choi et al. (2015); in their article where they mention that empirical studies by numerous researchers have demonstrated that fit between brand sponsors and sporting events facilitates correct recall of the names of the sponsors and a positive attitude towards the sponsorship and sponsor.

Contrasting with these findings, there is some evidence that incongruent sponsorship facilitates recall and enhances sponsors' brand image more than congruent relationships. Jagre, Watson and Watson (2001) indicated that less congruent relationships attract spectators' attention because people find some degree of incongruence interesting, which facilitates a higher recall rate. This hypothesis is supported through research by Olson and Thjømøe (2009), who observed a higher recall rate for an incongruent sponsorship.

Although there is some evidence that incongruence can result in higher sponsor recall and recognition and positive associations due to increased attention and elaboration, the majority of the body of research has found that higher congruence results in higher sponsor awareness and enhanced image (Cornwell et al., 2005; Olson & Thjømøe, 2011). Drengner (2011) explains that incongruent relationships between the sponsor and brand have weaker links

than congruent relationships, whereas congruent relationships tend to have stronger links, which results in superior memory. The stronger links in memory are the reason congruent relationships positively influence brand awareness and make image transfer easier between the event and the sponsor as associative connections exist between the two partners (Kim et al, 2015).

There are various theoretical perspectives that have been applied in evaluating the concept of congruence. Schema congruence has been used to explain how consumers use schemas or preconceived ideas about brands and events to assess the fit between the two partners (Dos Santos & Moreno, 2017). Drengner (2011, p. 27) defines a schema as a "cognitive structure that represents knowledge about a concept or type of stimulus including its attributes and relations among those attributes". Consumers have preconceived ideas or expectations of the brand sponsoring the event based on prior experience, communication from the brand or word of mouth. Geue (2010, p. 231) uses the term "expectancy theory" to describe schema congruence, which is defined as "the degree to which an item or information falls into a predetermined schema or a structure evoked by the theme". In this theory, congruence exits if a partnership or association between the event and sponsor is expected and highly relevant (Mazodier & Quester, 2013).

Conversely, Cobbs (2012), states that schema theory explains the reason individuals respond negatively to incongruent sponsorship. According to the theory, "incongruity is difficult to cognitively reconcile, which leads to frustration and negative affect, and ultimately results in negative evaluations" (Cobbs, 2012, p.66).

The balance theory has also been used to explain how individuals seek a balance and harmonious relationships between the brand and the event as they strive to maintain a sense of consistence in their judgements about brand images (Dos Santos & Moreno, 2017; Johnston, 2011).

Drengner (2011, p.26-27) refers to the associative network theory as one of the two theories behind the importance of congruence. According to Drengner,

(2011, p.26-27) with this theory "memory consists of individual pieces of information called nodes. Information is recalled from memory when a node is activated". One set of nodes, for example, memory about an event, prompts thinking about other "linked" nodes, for example, the sponsor of the event, is known as "spreading activation" (Drengner, 2011). Therefore, the more shared links that exist between brand and event and the stronger those associations are, the greater the perceived congruence between objects. This implies that "incongruent brand and event relationships have weaker links than congruent relationships and, hence, memory for congruent relationships tends to be superior" (Cornwell et al, 2006, p.27)

When fit is high, consumers experience cognitive consistency and generally respond favourably (Dos Santos & Moreno, 2017). When fit is low, consumers experience cognitive inconsistency, which negatively influences their responses (Dos Santos & Moreno, 2017). These outcomes emerge because consumers value consistency in their thoughts (Johnston, 2011) and report negative reactions to their disruption violation. Furthermore, information that is inconsistent with prior knowledge causes consumers to question underlying motives for the pairing (Grohs & Wagner, 2004). Thus, low-fit sponsorships spark negative attributions and negative affect toward both partners.

The review of the literature revealed several approaches to measuring congruence. This study used the global approach, which measures an overall congruence using either a single indicator of multiple items (Drengner, 2011). This meant that in this study we considered congruence between the brand and the sponsored event from a more global perspective, as the degree to which the sponsor and the sponsored entity fit well together (Dos Santos & Moreno, 2017). This study used multiple items formulated as statements (Grohs & Wagner, 2004). This method, according to Speed and Thompson (2000, p.230), assesses respondents' attitude towards the pairing of an event with a sponsor, and the degree to which the pairing is perceived as well matched or a good fit, without any restriction on the basis used to establish fit.

Sponsorships that exhibit high levels of congruence between the sponsor brand and event which is consistent with consumer expectation of the brand, will have a positive influence on sponsor brand recall and recognition and encourage positive brand attribute, which will consequently favourably impact brand equity (Mazodier, 2013)

2.10. Conceptual Model and Hypothesis Development

Aaker's consumer-based brand equity model was the foundation for the modelling of the hypothesis for this study (Aaker, 1991). The empirical test to determine the influence of sport sponsorship on brand equity through its dimensions which are, brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived quality originates from the literature review on brand equity and sponsorship. Literature on sponsorship influenced expansion of the model to include image congruence as a moderating factor.

The figure below illustrates the conceptual model




Figure 2.2: The influence of Sport Sponsorship on Elements of Brand Equity (Source: Aaker, 1991)

2.10.1 Brand Awareness and Sport Sponsorship

As noted in the literature review, brand awareness is particularly important as it plays a major role in assisting consumer identify a brand among other brands. Authors suggest that strong brand awareness favourably impacts brand equity. As discussed, sponsorship is an efficient means to enhance brand awareness and enhanced brand awareness among consumers determines the value of the brand, which is known as brand equity (Maignan, 2016).

Marketing programmes like sponsorships are therefore designed to enhance brand awareness and establish a favourable, strong and unique brand association in consumers memory. Sport sponsorship in particular is an attractive media platform to reach their target consumers and foster an increase in brand awareness (Biscaia et al., 2016). The role of sponsorship in increasing and or building awareness as an outcome has been accepted by academic and practitioners (Biscaia, Correia, Rosado, Ross, & Maroco, 2013; Henseler et al., 2011; Maignan, 2016; Bijmolt, Koning & Walraven, 2014). It is therefore generally accepted that sponsorship is a very effective method for building and increasing brand recognition and recall and it is also a key measure of sponsor performance. Sponsorship is a driver of positive brand awareness, which prompted the following hypothesis:

H1: Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand awareness.

H0: Sport sponsorship has no positive influence on brand awareness

2.10.2 Brand Image and Sport Sponsorship

Brand image refers to consumer perceptions about a brand as reflected by the associations held in the consumer's memory. It indicates that the true potential value of a brand is its meaning in consumers' minds, which is related to brand equity.

According to Keller (1993), understanding brand equity involves identifying strong favourable distinct brand associations within a consumer's mind. A marketing initiative, such as a sponsorship, would therefore involve

communicating favourable brand associations to a consumer, to persuade the consumer of the attributes and benefits they desire from a brand. Grohs & Reisinger (2013, p.1019) argue that sport sponsorship strengthens brand image by providing specific brand benefits and attributes. It communicates the desired image to the target market through the emotions and feelings evoked by the event and conveys benefits such as prestige and status inherent in some sport events.

Companies enter into sponsorships with the aim of enhancing or building their brand image through the transfer of image dimensions associated with the event to the sponsor brand Grohs (2016). This led to the development of the hypothesis below:

H2: Sport sponsorship has a positive impact on brand image.
H0: Sport sponsorship has no positive impact on brand image.

2.10.3 *Brand Loyalty and Sport Sponsorship*

Brand loyalty is a well-recognised dimension of brand equity as proposed by Aaker (1991). According to Aaker (1991, p. 39), brand loyalty is "the attachment that a customer has to a brand". Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski (2017) postulate that brand loyal consumers hold a favourable attitude and commitment towards a brand, demonstrated by the intention to mandatorily repurchase the same brand. Scholars agree that there are two dimensions to loyalty, behavioural and attitudinal loyalty. Behavioural loyalty refers to the tendency to repurchase a brand, revealed through brand sales and attitudinal loyalty indicates favourable attitudes toward brand and the intention to repurchase, as well as brand commitment. Scholars Biascia et al. (2013, p. 288) and Beasley, Levin, and Gamble (2004) and found evidence that sponsorship can build brand loyalty and that attitudinal and behavioural loyalty impacts and influences the consumers' attitude toward both sponsors and their own purchase intentions. It was determined that this study should focus on attitudinal loyalty towards the sponsor and not directly measure actual brand loyalty behaviour. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed the following:

H3: Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on attitudinal loyalty.
H0: Sport sponsorship has no positive influence on altitudinal loyalty.

2.10.4 Perceived Service Quality and Sport Sponsorship

Perceived service quality is about consumer perceptions regarding the superiority or excellence of a product. As it concerns consumer perception it cannot therefore be objectively determined (Donthu & Yoo, 2001). Zeithaml (1988) recognises perceived quality as an element of brand value, therefore consumer perceptions of high quality would drive a consumer to choose that brand, rather than the competing brands, which will ultimately result in increased brand equity for the high-quality brand. The following was therefore hypothesised:

H4: Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on perceived service quality.
H0: Sport sponsorship has no positive influence on perceived service quality.

2.10.6 Sponsorship fit between sponsor and event

Sponsorship fit, also commonly referred to as congruence is the most widely accepted concept relating to sponsorship effectiveness. It is defined as the perceived fit or relevance between the sponsoring brand and the event. Research has confirmed that congruence plays a critical role and influences sponsorship outcomes, such as the ability to recognise/remember the sponsor and/or have a positive attitude towards the sponsorship and sponsor (Cornwell et al., 2006; Ratnershwar, 2016). Based on the entire literature review, it was therefore expected that the fit between the sponsor and the sponsored object would have a positive impact on brand awareness and image of the sponsor. It is therefore proposed that congruence (Sponsorship Fit) is a moderating factor that enhances sponsor recall, image and positive attitude towards the sponsor brand. Accordingly, the following is hypothesised:
H5a: Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sponsorship and brand awareness.

H0: Sponsorship fit has no positive influence on the relationship between sponsorship and brand awareness.

H5b: Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on relationship between sponsorship and brand image.
H0: Sponsorship fit has no positive influence on the relationship between sponsorship and brand image.

2.11. Conclusion of the Literature Review

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand equity dimensions. The literature review has established that sport sponsorship seems to have a positive influence brand equity through its dimensions of brand awareness, brand associations, brand loyalty and perceived quality. This relationship is moderated by factors such as sponsorship fit between the sponsee and sponsor.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter identifies, defines and outlines the method by which this research was designed, gathered and analysed. Saunders, Thornhill and Lewis (2016, p.720) define methodology as "the theory of how research should be undertaken, including the theoretical and philosophical assumptions upon which research is based and the implications of these for the method or methods to be adopted".

The objectives of this chapter are: firstly, identifying and describing the research approach that the study used and secondly, outlining the research design and finally, defining and describing the procedure and methods used. The validity and reliability measures employed are also addressed in this chapter.

3.1 Research Methodology /Paradigm

Research is influenced by philosophical worldviews that provide direction concerning the most suitable method of research when undertaking a study (Creswell, 2014). These worldviews are also referred to as research paradigms. Creswell (2014, p. 35) describes a research paradigm as "a basic set of beliefs that guide action". These common beliefs and agreements about how problems should be addressed are influenced by discipline orientations, inclinations and past research experiences (Creswell, 2014). There are five types of philosophies most frequently widely discussed in research literature: interpretivism, positivism, critical realism, postmodernism and pragmatism.

According to Saunders et al., (2016, p.135), positivism is "the philosophical stance of the natural sciences entailing working with an observable social reality to produce law like generalisations". This refers to the belief that there is a single reality "out there" that can be measured and known. The emphasis is on a scientific method designed to produce pure data and facts influenced by human interpretation and bias (Saunders et al., 2016). Positivist researchers use existing theory to develop a hypothesis that is tested to confirm or refute the hypothesis (Saunders et al., 2016). The positivism paradigm is best suited to

quantitative research (Creswell, 2014). This study therefore applied a positivist paradigm.

There are three main approaches to research: qualitative research, quantitative research and mixed methods research (Creswell, 2014; Saunders et al., 2016; Bryman, 2016).

A quantitative research approach was used to "test objective theories by examining the relationships between variables" Creswell (2014, p.4). The variables referred to are typically measured using instruments such as questionnaires and the data from these are analysed using statistical techniques (Creswell, 2014). The main purpose of quantitative research is to investigate and explain the phenomenon using numbers to obtain the result. Quantitative is a structured and formal as well as stringent and disciplined process, usage of statistical information is followed with this approach (Saunders et al., 2016). According to Creswell, quantitative relies on numbers to determine the nature of relationships through identifying cause and effect, thus it is more about theory testing than theory emergence (Creswell, 2014).

The quantitative method is usually associated with a deductive approach, which is concerned with using data to test a theory (Saunders et al., 2016). According to them (Saunders et al., 2016), a researcher employs a deductive approach when the researcher develops a theory and a hypothesis and tests the theory through the collection of data.

The aim of this study was to test hypotheses developed based on the reviewed literature in relation to the impact of sport sponsorship on brand equity elements; therefore, the quantitative method was selected as appropriate. A quantitative approach allows the researcher to apply certain statistical analysis tools, such as structural equation modelling, to determine the impact of sport sponsorship on each dimension of brand equity; in this instance, brand awareness, image, loyalty and perceived service quality attributes.

As may be deduced from the above discussion, a positivist paradigm was applied in this study: existing theories on brand equity dimensions and sport sponsorship were used to develop hypotheses around the influence of sport

sponsorship on brand equity elements, which was then tested to confirm or refute the hypotheses (Saunders et al., 2016).

As mentioned, this was achieved using a quantitative approach, allowing the researcher to apply statistical analysis tools to answer the research questions and verify or disprove the said hypotheses.

3.2 Research Design

The research design is the blueprint that is followed in conducting the research. Creswell (2014, p.12) describes it as "types of inquiries within qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches that provide specific directions for procedures in a research". It is the strategy for a study and the plan by which the strategy can be carried out. Essentially, it is the way that a researcher collects data.

There are five different types of research designs: experimental, cross sectional, longitudinal, case study and comparative design (Bryman, 2016). Cross sectional design is defined by Bryman (2016, p.53) "as a research design that entails the collection of data on a sample of cases and at a single point in time in order to collect a body of quantitative or quantifiable data in connection with two or more variables, which are then examined to detect patterns of associations". Cross sectional design often employs survey research (Saunders et al., 2016). Survey research generally use questionnaires as this allows for the collection of standardised data.

A cross sectional research design was employed for this study. Specifically, the multiple cross-sectional design was used, which refers to the use of more than one sample drawn from a target population (Malhotra, 2010). The study examined cases of those who were aware of who the sponsor of the national cricket team was/ is and those who were not aware. In addition, data on the variables was simultaneously collected from each group: the two cases supplied answers at the same time by (each group) completing identical questionnaires. Moreover, the study sought to examine relationships between the variables of

sport sponsorship and brand equity elements. Hence, a cross sectional design was deemed appropriate.

A survey research method was employed in this study using a structured questionnaire. A multiple cross-sectional design technique was applied in the study by using two cases which were those aware of the sponsor of the national cricket team and those not aware. Data was collected using a consumer panel of about 76 000 consumers to whom the researcher had access. These respondents were questioned about their awareness (or not) of the sponsor to classify them in the relevant case.

3.3 Population and Sample

3.3.1 Population

Population is defined by Creswell (2014) as "the universe of units from which a sample is to be selected". Saunders et al. describe it as "the complete set of cases or group members (Saunders et al., 2016, p.724). Fundamentally, it is all inhabitants of a specific place.

According to the research conducted by Nielsen (2018), 96% of the South African population over the age of 18 is aware of sports. The population targeted for this study was therefore all South African citizens between the ages of 18 to 60, with no geographical limitation. This criterion limited the population to adults between the ages of 18 to 60, as conducting research with people under the age of 16 requires parental consent and therefore could not be included due to this legal requirement and because of time constraints.

3.3.2 Sample and sampling method

According to Bryman (2016, p174) a sample is "the segment of the population that is selected for investigation. It is a subset of the population". The collection and analysis of data from an entire population is referred to as a census,

whereas from a subgroup or part of a larger population is a sample, which represents features of the entire population (Saunders et al., 2016).

The sampling method refers to the way in which the sample is selected from the population for collection of data. There are two types of sampling methods: probability and non-probability sampling (Bryman, 2016).

Non-probability sampling is the "selection of sampling techniques in which the chance or probability of each case being selected is known" (Saunders et al., 2016, p.722). In non-probability sampling, a sample is selected without using a random selection approach. This implies that some members in the population are more likely to be selected than others (Bryman, 2016).

There are seven forms of non-probability sampling: convenience sampling, quota sampling, purposive sampling, dimensional sampling, snowball sampling, volunteer sampling and theoretical sampling.

The convenience form of non-probability sampling was used for this study. Convenience sampling, according to Bryman (2016, p.689) is "a sample that is selected because of its availability to the researcher". The sampling method chosen was selected because of its convenience, affordability and due to time limitations. Convenience sampling significantly increases the researcher's chances of finding the right respondent where a random approach would take much longer and is expensive.

An independent consumer panel from a reputable research house in South Africa was used. Respondents on the panel are continuously recruited through other surveys where respondents opt in to participate in future research, via social media platforms such as Facebook and personal contact where respondents are invited to participate in research. The consumer panel of respondents is one that is generally used in research studies of diverse topics and is not a specialist panel; any company, academic or individual can access the panel at a cost.

The consumer panel consisting of 76 340 consumers, and to which the researcher had access, was used as the sampling frame. The demographic profile of the consumer panel is depicted below in Table 3.1:

Table 3.1. Demographic profile of consumer panel

Gender		Race		Age	
Male	21%	Black	8%	18 – 24 years	2%
Female	28%	White	6%	25 – 34 years	7%
Unknown	51%	Indian/Asian	0.1%	35 – 44 years	7%
		Unknown	86%	45 – 55 years	2%
				55 years +	4%
				Unknown	78%

Due to the majority of demographic profiles being unclassified, the panel is suitable for use in simple surveys with no strict demographic requirements and is best suited for smaller type quotas of between 1000 and 5000 participants. Since the panel includes consumers throughout the country there was no geographic limitation of the sample. Strict panel rules are applied to avoid interviewing the same people too often, preventing them from becoming too accustomed to a particular type of survey or product category. Respondents are thus only allowed to participate every three months. Respondents were not offered any incentives to participate in the survey.

The panel was deemed suitable for this study as its large size favours attaining the target sample and it offers a quick and cost-effective means to gather data. Anyone that met the qualifying criteria and was willing to participate was invited to do so.

A sample size pertains to the number of observations or replicas to be included in a sample. According to James (2011), when utilising statistical tools such as structural equation modelling, generally the recommended minimum sample size is 200 participants. This study consisted of a sample size of 200 respondents as recorded in Table 3.2, below. Sampling quotas were set as: those aware of sponsorship vs those not aware of sponsorship (of Standard Bank SA Cricket Team sponsorship) and gender, to ensure that a good spread

in these demographic profiles was achieved. Gender was sampled at a 50/50 split.

Table 3.2: Profile of respondents

Profile of respondents

Respondent Types	Total
Aware of brand that sponsors cricket	100
Not aware of brand that sponsors cricket	100
TOTAL	**200**

As mentioned, the target population for this study was all South African citizens between the ages of 18 to 60 across all provinces. As explained above, the convenience sampling method involved using a consumer panel to which the researcher had access. This was used as the sampling frame and the sample achieved was 200 with 100 respondents not being aware of the abovementioned sponsor and 100 being aware of the said sponsor.

3.4 The Research Instrument

The term 'research instrument' refers to the devices used to collect data, such as structured interviews and self-administered questionnaires (Bryman, 2016; Bryman, 2014), while 'questionnaire' is defined as "a collection of questions administered to respondents" Bryman (2016, p.695).

A fully structured questionnaire is rigid. The possible responses are 'yes' or 'no' or are selected from a prescribed list of options; for example, when using the Likert scale, and are limited just to what is given on the questionnaire (Saunders et al., 2016). Structured interviews were utilised for the purposes of this survey using a fully structured questionnaire.

Existing validated measures and scales from previous studies conducted in the brand equity and sport sponsorship context, and as identified in the literature review, were utilised. The measures used were carefully selected based on

relevance and for their suitability in measuring brand equity dimensions and sport sponsorship (Donlan, 2013). Minor modifications were made to some of the measurement items in the questionnaire to fit the current research context, purpose and industry.

The questionnaire for this study comprised seven sections: Sections A to G. The questionnaire was structured as follows:

1. **Section A:** This section asked respondents about their background information, such as age, gender and race. Age was used as a qualifying question to identify those respondents younger than 18 years.

2. **Section B: Sponsorship:** consisted of just one question to classify respondents into one of the two groups: those who were aware vs those who were not aware of the SA National Cricket team sponsor

3. **Section C: Brand Awareness:** consisted of six questions, which measured brand recall and recognition

4. **Section D: Brand Image**: consisted of 9 questions

5. **Section E: Brand Loyalty:** consisted of 8 questions

6. **Section F: Perceived Quality**: consisted of 8 questions

7. **Section G: Sponsorship Fit:** consisted of 6 questions

Questions two to seven were adopted and adapted from the following authors, respectively: (Bijmolt, Koning & Walraven, 2014; Dean et al., 2004; Donthu et al., 2000; Donlan, 2013; Lodhi & Tanveer 2016; Donlan, 2013; Donthu et al., 2000; Biascia, 2016; Choi et al, 2016)

A sample of the instruments has been included in Appendix B.

The questionnaire was pretested using a pilot study to ensure that the items measured were relevant and easy for respondents to comprehend and to ensure that the instrument as a whole functioned well (Bryman, 2016). A pilot sample of 10 respondents was chosen to determine potential challenges in the

design and administration of the research instrument. Modifications based on pre-test were implemented prior to commencement of the full survey.

One of the most common methods used to collect data is the Likert scale (Bryman, 2012). According to Bryman (2012, p.166) "the Likert scale is essentially a multiple-indicator or multiple-item measure of a set of attitudes relating to a particular area". This scale is commonly used to measure feelings, attitudes, knowledge and perceptions about specific areas. A five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree" was utilised for this study.

3.5 Procedure for Data Collection

Data collection is the process of gathering of information to assist the researcher to answer the research objectives and questions (Bryman 2012; Saunders et al., 2016). There are considerations that need to be taken into account when determining which data selection method to use, such as time and costs, the degree of access to the sample, response rate and types of questions the research is trying to answer (Bryman, 2016).

The main modes of administration of a structured interview are: face-to-face, telephonic and internet based (Bryman, 2012; Bryman, 2016). The table below, Table 3.3, outlines and compares the three survey methods across factors deemed important for this study.

Table 3.3: Survey methods comparison. Sources: Malhotra (2014, p.220), Bryman (2016)

Criteria	Telephone (CATI)	Face to Face	Online
Response rate	Moderate	High	Very low
Speed (potential time to complete)	High	Moderate	Very high
Cost	Moderate	High	Low
Control of data collection environment	Moderate	Moderate	Low
Potential for interview bias	Moderate	High	Low

Traditional telephone interviews involve calling respondents, asking them questions and then recording the responses using paper and pencil. Advances in technology allow interviews to be conducted using a computer from a central location (Malhotra, 2014). With Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) the interviewer conducts the interview over the phone while following a script and capturing the responses on the computer.

A review of the literature indicates that it still far more common to use face-to-face interviews in academic social research than telephonic interviews (Bryman, 2012). While telephonic interviews are generally not frequently used in academic research, it was the option chosen to collect data for this study. The research was quantitatively undertaken, using Computer Assisted Telephonic Interviews (CATI). According to Bryman (2012, p.591) one of the major advantages of using computer aided software tools is that "most of the clerical tasks associated with the manual coding and retrieving of data are eliminated"

The questionnaire was pre-programmed using the NIPO software system. NIPO software is a global, major market research software provider (Nipo.com). The software applies relevant skips and quality checks automatically, thereby minimising potential interviewer mistakes. Some of the advantages of using the CATI software includes the following (NIPO.com):

- The program checks for inadmissible or inconsistent responses
- Errors from separate data entries are eliminated.

- There is no need for capturing, resulting in speedier data processing
- Data can be downloaded quickly and analysed at any time before finalising interviewing
- All interviews can be recorded and used for quality control
- Allows randomised selection of respondents.

The rationale for choosing the telephonic technique including, amongst others, the following points made by Bryman (2012) and Malhotra (2014): this method is far cheaper than face-to-face interviews; the interviewing period is quick; quality of data collected is enhanced and it is easier to supervise the interviewers. The length of the interview and complexity of the questionnaire was also taken into consideration. The disadvantages of telephonic interviewing, according to Bryman (2012), include the following: the response rate is not as high as face-to-face; however, this is still unclear as there is no consistent evidence on this; it is not conducive for complex and lengthy questionnaires and visual aids such as show cards cannot be utilised.

The consumer panel database was uploaded onto the CATI (NIPO) software and potential respondents were contacted to participate in the survey. Interviewers then conducted interviews with 200 respondents that opted in using the telephone while capturing responses onto the NIPO software.

3.6 Data Analysis and Interpretation

Data collected for this study was gathered in an electronic format using computer assisted telephone interviewing software (NIPO). As explained, one of the key advantages of using a software tool to collect data is that there is no need for capturing and coding data after the interview, hence results can be processed more rapidly. The software known as Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilised to conduct descriptive statistics analysis. Collected data was extracted from NIPO and imported into the SPSS software package for analysis.

Once data was in SPSS software, the first step involved data preparation whereby data was checked and cleaned for accuracy. Frequencies and percentages were used to display the number and/or percentage of respondents in different categories such as age group and gender.

There are two types of descriptive statistics: measures of central tendency and measures of dispersion. Measures of central tendency summarises a distribution of values (Bryman, 2016; Saunders et al., 2016). Measure of central tendency has three types: mean, mode and median. The mean was utilised for items that measure the key constructs indicated in the instrument; for example, awareness, image, and perceptions and attributes in each construct. The mean was chosen over the mode and the median because the variables were normally distributed.

According to Bryman (2016, p.692), measures of dispersion "summarizes the amount of variation in a distribution of values". Common examples are range, variance and standard deviation (Bryman, 2016; Saunders et al., 2016). The standard deviation, which is the average amount of variation around the mean, was utilised to measure dispersion. The choice to use the standard deviation was obvious as the mean had been used to measure central tendency.

Once the generation of descriptive statistics of the data was completed, assessment for reliability and validity of measurement scales was undertaken.

3.6.1 Validity test of measurement scale using SPSS

Validity is defined as the degree to which the results of any given study precisely reflect the concept being measured (Malhotra, 2010). A construct is valid when the generated items measure the dimension it is intended to measure. There are different types of validity; this study focused specifically on construct validity.

According to DeVellis (2003, p.53) "construct validity is the extent to which a measure "behaves", the way that the construct it purports to measure should

behave with regards to established measures of other constructs". A construct is valid when the generated items measure the dimensions it is intended to measure (Nunnally, 1967). Evidence of construct validity can be examined using factor analysis, internal consistency and test-retest methods (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). In this study factor analysis was used to test construct validity.

There are two types of factory analysis, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). EFA, which was used in this study allows the researcher to explore the main constructs to generate a theory or model from a relatively large set of latent constructs (Brown, Onsman & Williams, 2010).

Prior to conducting exploratory factor analysis, the Bartlett's test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) tests were used to assess the suitability of conducting factor analysis. Bartlett's test of Sphericity is a statistic test used to examine the hypothesis that the variables are uncorrelated in the population (Malhotra, 2010, p.638). The population correlation matrix is an independent matrix, where each variable correlate perfectly with itself and has no correlation with other correlation with other variables (Brown, Onsman, Williams, 2010)

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) is a measure of sampling adequacy. It is an index used to examine the appropriateness of factor analysis by computing the proportion of variance in the variables that may be due to underlying factors. Values between 0.5 and 1.0 indicate that factor analysis is appropriate, while values below 0.5 imply that factor analysis may not be appropriate (Malhotra, 2010, p.638).

The recommended threshold for factor loadings is above 0.5. Higher loadings indicate evidence of construct validity in the measurement. (Malhotra, 2010). The Total variance explained indicates the amount of variation in the initial items that is explained by the retained factors.

3.6.2 Reliability test of measurement scale using SPSS

First the assessment of the reliability constructs in the measurement model was undertaken. Reliability is the degree to which all the individual items measure the same unidimensional construct (Netemeyer et al., 2003). The most commonly used measure of reliability is internal consistency reliability; this is estimated by determining the degree to which each item in a scale correlates with each other item. The Cronbach's coefficient alpha was specifically used in this study to assess internal reliability (Malhotra, 2010). The Cronbach's coefficient alpha ranges from 0 – 1; a coefficient alpha score of 0.7 is widely accepted and recommended by many researchers and scholars as the minimum standard for internal consistency (Malhotra, 2010). A coefficient score above 0.7 indicates that there is a strong item covariance, suggesting that the sample domain has been sufficiently captured (Malhotra, 2010). In the event that the reliability is inadequate and below the acceptable minimum, it is acceptable to eliminate one or more items to improve the reliability of the scale (Malhotra, 2010). Table 3.4 outlines Coefficient Alpha interpretation ranges.

Table 3.4: Coefficient Alpha Acceptance Ranges, Source: DeVellis (2003)

Coefficient Alpha Range	**Decision**
Less than 0.60	Unacceptable
0.60 – 0.65	Undesirable
0.65 – 0.70	Minimally acceptable
0.70 – 0.80	Respectable
0.80 – 0.90	Very good
More than 0.90	Consider shortening the scale

Structural equation modelling (SEM)

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) is a statistical technique that is used to test relationships between one or more independent variables and one or more dependent variables. Malhotra (2010, p.723) defines SEM as "a procedure for estimating a series of dependent relationships among a set of concepts and constructs represented by multiple measured variables and incorporated into an integrated model".

SEM is often used to study relationships between latent constructs and observable constructs that constitute a model (Malhotra, 2010). Latent variables also known as unobserved variables are not directly measured but are inferred from other variables that are observed (directly measured), while observed variables are directly measured through the research: they are variables that exist in the database and comprise scores from survey items or interview questions (Malhotra, 2010).

This method was preferred as it tested proposed theoretical relationships in a single analysis. SEM is a powerful multivariate technique that includes specialised versions of other analysis methods as special cases, such as confirmatory factor analysis, analysis of variance, path analysis, analysis covariance, multiple linear regression, canonical correlation and exploratory factor analysis (Malhotra, 2010). In this study, all the variables were observed and therefore a special type of SEM model, known as path analysis, was conducted using AMOS, which stands for Analysis of a Moment Structures, which is an added SPSS module and is especially used for Structural Equation Modelling, path analysis and confirmatory factor analysis (*Statisticssolutions*.com).

The section below illustrates the application of SEM in this study. The steps followed in conducting the SEM are outlined in detail below:

1. Defining the Individual constructs:

The individual constructs were defined, measurements were specified and the interrelationship among constructs were also defined based on theory addressed in the literature review.

2. Path Analysis specified:

The next step involved specifying the path analysis. The measurement model also known as a path analysis was represented in a diagram. A single headed arrow between two boxes represents a causal relation (Malhotra, 2010). The measurement model was defined after the literature review in Chapter 2, Figure 1.

3. Specifying the structural model

Path analysis was the next step. Path analysis is a special case of SEM. Path analysis contains just observed variables and has a more restrictive set of assumptions than SEM (Lleras, 2005). The main difference between the two types of models is that path analysis assumes that all variables are measured without error, while SEM uses latent variables to account for measurement error (Lleras, 2005).

The structural paths were drawn between the constructs with the emphasis on the nature and magnitude of the relationship between constructs (Bowen & Guo, 2011, p.7). A single-headed arrow represents a hypothesised structural relationship between one construct and another, indicating the cause and effect relationship (Bowen & Guo, 2011, p.7). The structural model within this study was achieved by assessing the p-values, including the standardised regression coefficients (Malhotra, 2010).

Hierarchical Regression

Hierarchical regression is a statistical method of exploring the relationships among, and testing hypotheses about a dependent variable and several

independent variables (Malhotra, 2010). It is a way to determine whether variables of interest explain a statistically significant amount of variance in the Dependent Variable (DV) after accounting for all other variables (Malhotra, 2010). In many cases, the interest is to determine whether newly added variables demonstrate a significant improvement in R-Squared. Hierarchical regression is therefore a practice of building successive linear regression models, each adding more predictors (Malhotra, 2010). Essentially it is a series of regular old Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models. Hierarchical regression was used to predict the influence of our moderating factor, congruence on brand awareness and image in this study.

Statistical Analysis System (SAS), a software system used for data analysis and report writing, created by Anthony James Barr at North Carolina State University in 1966 (SAS.com) was used to conduct Hierarchical regression.

Illustration of data analysis approach




Figure 3.1: Diagrammatic representation of data analysis approach

3.7 Limitations of the study

The following limitations were identified for this study:

- Due to time and resource constraints, non-probability sampling using convenience sampling, was adopted. The sample was chosen because it was easily accessible to the researcher, which poses a limitation as the results cannot be generalised on statistical grounds to the entire population.

- Just one type of sport sponsorship (for cricket) was tested. Therefore, the results cannot be generalised to other types of sports.

- Quota controls were not implemented on most demographics to reflect the profile of the population; therefore, inferences about the population cannot be made. In addition, a sample size of 200 is relatively small in relation to the size of the population.

3.8 Validity and reliability of the research

3.8.1 External validity

External validity is the extent to which the results of a study can be generalised to other situations and to other people (Saunders et al., 2016). While Bryman (2012, p.390) defined external validity as "the degree to which findings can be generalized across social settings", this study did not meet the external validity criteria because the results cannot be generalised to other sporting categories. Furthermore, convenience sampling was used; therefore, results cannot be generalised on statistical grounds either.

3.8.2 Internal validity

Internal validity is the extent to which findings can be attributed to interventions rather than any flaws in the research design (Saunders et al., 2016). Bryman (2012, p.47) describes it as "a concern with the question of whether a finding

that incorporates a causal relationship between two or more variables is sound". This study meets the internal validity criteria; respondents were classified into those aware vs those not aware of sport sponsorship. Therefore, results were attributable to these classifications that were introduced as an intervention.

3.8.3 Reliability

According to Creswell (2014, p.152) reliability is "the dependability of a measurement instrument, that is, the extent to which the instrument yields the same results on repeated trials". It was anticipated that it would likely be difficult to establish the reliability of this study as testing reliability requires administering the same instrument at two different times. However, due to time limitations this study could not be repeated (Malhotra, 2010; Saunders et al., 2016). Nevertheless, it is expected that the instrument should yield similar results with different respondents when the study is replicated. Reliability was assessed using the Cronbach's coefficient alpha with score ranges of between 0 and 1. The coefficient alpha is utilised to assess internal consistency of the measure (Malhotra, 2010) and composite reliability, which was obtained using SEM, is commonly used as an alternative to the coefficient alpha (Malhotra, 2010).

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on presenting the results obtained from the research. SPSS, AMOS and SAS statistical software tools were utilised to analyse the data. The results in this chapter will prove or disprove the proposed hypotheses based on the conceptual model designed for this study. The chapter commences with descriptive statistics based on the demographic profile of the sample. This is followed by a presentation of the results from the validity and reliability tests conducted. Following this, results of the path analysis to test the proposed hypotheses are presented. Finally, results from the hierarchical regression to test the influence of our moderating factors are presented.

4.2 Demographic profile of respondents

Figure 4.1 below show the gender profile of the sample




Figure 4.1: Respondents' Gender

The sample was split equally as per quota that was set, half the respondents were male, and the other half were female.

Figure 4.2. illustrates the Ethnic profile of respondents




Figure 4.2: Respondents' Ethnicity

Most respondents were Black at 81%, followed by Coloureds at 9%, with White 7% and Indian/Asian 4%.

Figure 4.3. illustrates respondents Age profile




Figure 4.3: Respondents' Age

The majority of the respondents were between the ages of 25-34 years, closely followed by respondents between the ages of 35 – 49 who represented 34% of the sample, while those aged 50+ represented 21% of the sample and those aged from 18-24 were in the minority at 7%.

Figure 4.4. illustrates respondent's awareness of Standard Bank cricket sponsorship




Figure 4.4: Respondents' Awareness of Standard Bank's Sponsorship of the South African National Cricket Team

A sampling quota was set at 50/50 split for those aware of sponsorship vs those not aware of sponsorship (of Standard Bank SA Cricket Team sponsorship), and this was achieved as represented in Figure 4.4 above.

4.3 Validity

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to assess the validity of constructs.

4.3.1 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) test and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were undertaken prior to the extraction of the factors, to assess the suitability of the respondent data for factor analysis

(Brown, Onsman & Williams, 2010). A KMO index of 0.50 is considered suitable for factor analysis and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity should be p<.05 for factor analysis to be suitable (Brown, Onsman & Williams, 2010). The results are presented in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy KMO and Bartlett's Test

Brand Recognition		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.800
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	333.262
	df	10
	Sig.	.000
Brand Image		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.884
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	907.047
	df	36
	Sig.	.000
Brand Loyalty		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.935
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	974.730
	df	28
	Sig.	.000
Perceived Quality		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.903
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	920.751
	df	28
	Sig.	.000
Sponsorship Fit		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.851
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	487.827
	df	15
	Sig.	.000

These results prove that all the KMO values were greater than the minimum required value of at least 0.5. This implies that the sample was adequate to conduct exploratory factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity had significant p-values (p-values < 0.05), which also implies that the items within each construct were correlated as required for factor analysis.

4.3.2 Construct Validity

Factor loadings and variance extracted were tested to determine the construct validity of measurement items. The recommended threshold for factor loading is above 0.5. Higher loadings indicate evidence of construct validity (Brown et al., 2010). The Total Variance indicates the amount of variation in the initial items that is explained by the retained factors.

The results are depicted in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Factor Loading and Total Variance Explained

Construct	Items	Factor Loading	Total Variance Explained
Brand Recognition	Standard Bank is a financial services brand that you are very familiar with	.813	0.59
	You can recognise Standard Bank among other competing brands	.791	
	Standard Bank is a brand that you are very aware of	.786	
	You know Standard Bank very well	.735	
	You can quickly recall the symbol or logo of Standard Bank	.694	
Brand Recall	When you think of financial services, Standard Bank is always the first brand you think of	-	-
Brand Image	Standard Bank is a bank that has a very good reputation.	.820	0.56
	Standard Bank is a financially stable bank	.762	
	Standard Bank is long-term oriented	.759	
	Some characteristics of Standard Bank come to your mind quickly	.759	
	You trust Standard Bank	.756	
	Standard Bank is well established.	.738	
	Standard Bank is unique from other brands of financial services.	.717	
	The Standard Bank brand has a distinct personality	.707	
	You have a clear image of the type of person who would use Standard Bank's products/services	.688	
Brand Loyalty	You would recommend Standard Bank to your friends and family	.866	0.65
	When you are looking for a financial services provider, you will always consider Standard Bank	.826	
	You say positive things about this brand to other people	.810	
	You are always satisfied with Standard Bank products/services that you purchase from them	.807	
	You intend to purchase products/services from Standard Bank in the future	.807	
	You feel committed to Standard Bank	.800	

	You will always choose to use Standard Bank even if there are other choices (loyalty)	.798	
	You would be willing to pay a higher price for Standard Bank products/services over other competing brands	.702	
Perceived Service Quality	The likelihood that Standard Bank is reliable is very high.	.838	0.62
	Standard Bank offers innovative products and services	.828	
	The likelihood that Standard Banks service is excellent is very high.	.811	
	Standard Bank is a brand you respect	.784	
	Compared to other brands of financial services Standard Bank has the best product and services	.772	
	Standard Bank is a leader in financial services	.770	
	Standard Bank is a brand that keeps growing in popularity	.742	
	Standard Bank products and services are of high quality	.736	
Sponsorship Fit	Standard Bank and the South African cricket team have many similarities	.838	0.58
	It makes sense that Standard Bank sponsors the South African cricket team	.801	
	One would expect Standard Bank to sponsor the SA National Cricket Team.	.794	
	Your image of the South African cricket team is consistent with how you perceive Standard Bank	.774	
	You can see a direct link between the Standard Bank and the SA National Cricket Team.	.690	
	You understand why the Standard bank is involved in cricket.	.672	

The factor loadings ranged from 0.672 to 0.932. All the items for this study had high loading onto their respective constructs indicating acceptable construct validity. These were all above the minimum required factor loading of at least 0.5. This implies that all the constructs were valid.

Factor analysis results reveals that all the constructs retained one factor. The retained factor for brand recognition explained 59% of variance in the initial items that were in the hypothesised construct. Brand Image construct explained 55%, Brand Loyalty (65%), Perceived Quality (62%) and Sponsorship Fit (58%).

4.4 Reliability

Internal reliability for each construct was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha (Cronbach α) (Malhotra, 2010). A coeffient alpha of 0.7 is accepted as the minimum standard for internal consistency. The results of scale reliability are presented in Table 4.3 below.

4.4.1 Reliability of the scale

Table 4.3: Scale Accuracy

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability Level
Brand Loyalty	8	.917	Excellent
Perceived Quality	8	.911	Excellent
Brand Image	9	.897	Good
Sponsorship Fit	6	.852	Good
Brand Recognition	5	.813	Good

Cronbach's coefficient alpha values for this study ranged from 0.813 to 0.917 exceeding the recommended threshold. All constructs were therefore considered internally consistent and reliable. The results revealed that there was an excellent level of reliability for Brand Loyalty (8 items, α = 0.917) and Perceived quality (8 items, α = 0.911) scales since Cronbach's Alpha was greater than 0.9. There was a good reliability level for Brand Image (9 items, α = 0.897) and Sponsorship Fit (6 items, α =0.852), and Recognition (5 items, α =0.813) since the Cronbach's Alpha values were between 0.8 and 0.9. This confirms that all constructs used for this study are reliable.

4.4.2 Advantages of Brand awareness

As indicated in Table 4.3, all constructs had a Cronbach's Alpha greater than 0.7, therefore items within each construct could be combined together to form a summated scale. The summated scale was computed by calculating the average of the items within that scale.

The descriptive statistics for all the constructs are summarised in Table 4.4 below:

Table 4.4: Descriptive statistics

	Descriptive Statistics		Pearson's Correlations						
	Mean	**SD**	**1.**	**2.**	**3.**	**4.**	**5.**	**6.**	**7.**
1.Sport Sponsorship	0.50	0.50	1						
2.Brand Recognition	4.38	.69	.390**	1					
3.Brand Recall	3.62	1.21	.141*	.408**	1				
4.Brand Image	4.12	.68	.171*	.600**	.579**	1			
5.Brand Loyalty	3.82	.86	.061	.375**	.588**	.761**	1		
6.Perceived Quality	4.05	.69	.063	.492**	.525**	.832**	.832**	1	
7.Sponsorship Fit	3.98	.72	.114	.353**	.319**	.566**	.534**	.604**	1

For Sport Sponsorship, the variable was coded as 1 if a respondent was aware that Standard Bank was the sponsor of the South African National Cricket team and 0 if they were not aware, hence a mean of 0.5 which indicates that half of the respondents were aware of the sponsorship.

Brand Recognition (mean = 4.38) was the highest rated construct followed by Brand Image (mean = 4.12) while Recall (mean = 3.62) was the least rated construct.

4.5 Path Modelling

Path analysis was conducted to assess the hypothesised relationships among the constructs. The results of the path analysis are represented in Figure 4.5. below.




Figure 4.5: Path Analysis

The results of regression weights are presented in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.5 Regression Weights

			Estimate	Standardised Estimates	S.E.	C.R.	P
Brand Recall	<---	Sport Sponsorship	,340	,141	,169	2,008	,045
Brand Recognition	<---	Sport Sponsorship	,538	,390	,090	5,982	***
Brand Image	<---	Sport Sponsorship	,232	,171	,095	2,455	,014
Brand Loyalty	<---	Sport Sponsorship	,105	,061	,121	,867	,386
Perceived Quality	<---	Sport Sponsorship	,087	,063	,098	,896	,370

The Squared Multiple Correlations results are represented in table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6 Squared Multiple Correlations

	Estimate
Perceived Quality	,004
Brand Loyalty	,004
Brand Image	,029
Brand Recognition	,152
Brand Recall	,020

The squared multiple correlations in table 4.6. indicate that sport sponsorship explains 15,2% of Brand Recognition, 2.9% of Brand Image, 2% of Brand Recall and 0.4% of perceived quality and brand loyalty.

4.6 Results pertaining to Hypothesis 1: Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand awareness

Brand awareness was measured through brand recall and recognition; hence splitting the hypothesis into H1a: sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand recall and H1b: sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand recognition.

H0: There is no relationship between brand sponsorship of sports and brand awareness.

H1a: There is a positive relationship between sport sponsorship and brand awareness – **brand recall.**

The results reported in Table 4.5 demonstrate that the coefficient score is greater than zero and the p value is less than 0.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between sport sponsorship (B = 0.340, β = 0.141, t-value = 2.008, p-value = 0.045) and brand recall. H0 is therefore rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis (H1a). H1a is supported, sport sponsorship has a positive and significant relationship with brand recall.

H1b: There is a positive relationship between sport sponsorship and brand awareness – **brand recognition.**

As recorded in Table 4.5, the coeffient score for H1b is also greater than zero and the p-value less than 0.05, indicating a positive and significant relationship between sport sponsorship (B = 0.538, β = 0.390, t-value = 5.982, p-value < 0.01) and brand recognition. Thus, H0 is rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis (H1b). It is therefore concluded that brand sponsorship of sports makes a positive and significant contribution to brand recognition.

To conclude, Hypothesis 1 (H1), which posited that sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand awareness is accepted. This is based on the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand recall and recognition being positive and significant.

4.7 Results pertaining to Hypothesis 2: Sport sponsorship has a positive impact on brand image

H0: There is no relationship between brand sponsorships of sports and brand image.

H2: sport sponsorship has a positive impact on brand image

When examining the regression weights listed in Table 4.5, it may be noted that the coefficient score for H2 was greater than zero and the p-value was less than 0.05. This proves that there is a positive and significant relationship between sport sponsorship (B = 0.232, β = 0.171, t-value = 2.455, p-value = 0.014) and brand image. Thus, H0 is rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis (H2). It is therefore concluded that brand sponsorships of sports contribute positively towards brand equity through enhanced brand image.

4.8 Results pertaining to Hypothesis 3: Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on attitudinal loyalty

H0: There is no relationship between brand sponsorships of sports and attitudinal loyalty.

H3: Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on attitudinal loyalty.

The results in Table 4.5 illustrate that there is no relationship between sport sponsorship (B = 0.105, β = 0.061, t-value = 0.867, p-value = 0.386).and brand loyalty, since the p-value was greater than 0.05. The results indicate that there is no positive relationship between sport sponsorship and attitudinal loyalty, thus Hypothesis 3 (H3) is not supported. It is concluded that sport sponsorship does not have a positive influence on brand loyalty.

4.9 Results pertaining to Hypothesis 4: Sport sponsorship has a positive effect on perceived service quality

H0: There is no relationship between brand sponsorships of sports and perceived service quality.

H4: Sponsorship has a positive effect on perceived service quality.

The results indicate that there is no relationship between sport sponsorship (B = 0.087, β = 0.063, t-value = 0.896, p-value = 0.370) and brand perceived service quality. The p-value was greater than 0.05, thus Hypothesis 4 (H4) is not supported. To conclude, sport sponsorship has no positive influence on perceived service quality of the sponsor brand.

4.10 Results pertaining to Hypothesis 5: Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand awareness

Brand awareness was measured through brand recall and brand recognition; hence the alternative hypothesis was split into H5a and H5b. **H5a:** Sponsorship fit moderates the relationship between brand sponsorships of sports and brand

awareness - brand recall. **H5b:** Sponsorship fit moderates the relationship between brand sponsorships of sports and brand awareness - brand recognition

4.10.1 Sponsorship fit and brand recall

H0: Sponsorship fit does not moderate the relationship between brand sponsorships of sports and brand awareness.

H5a: Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sponsorship and brand awareness - **brand recall**.

A hierarchical regression model was fitted with brand recall as dependent variable, sport sponsorship as the independent variable and sponsorship fit as the moderating variable. The results are shown below in Table 4.7:

Table 4.7 Hierarchical Regression – brand recall

Moderation Regressions						
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
	3.62***	0	3.62***	0	3.64***	0
	0.17**	0.14	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.11
			0.52***	0.31	0.52***	0.31
					-0.25**	-0.15
	0.02		0.11		0.14	

*** = p < .01, ** = p < .05, * = p < .10

The results in Mode 1 indicate that sport sponsorship has a positive effect on brand recall (H1a), supporting the results presented in Table 4.5 (B = 0.17, β = 0.14, p-value <0.001).

Model 2 illustrates that sponsorship fit has a positive impact on brand recall since the coefficient was positive and the p-value was less than 0.05 (B = 0.52, β = 0.31, p-value < 0.001).

Model 3 shows that the addition of the interaction variable (Sport Sponsorship x Sponsorship Fit) onto the model increased the r-square from 0.11 in model 2 to

0.14 in model 3. The coefficient for the interaction variable is significantly different from Zero (B = -0.25, β = -0.15, p-value < 0.05). The coefficient for the interaction item is negative (-0.25), this means that sponsorship fit has a negative influence recall. H5a which posits that sponsorship fit between the sponsor and event has a positive influence the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand recall is not supported.

These results are also illustrated in the chart below represented by Figure 4.6.




Figure 4.6: Moderation effect of Sponsorship fit on the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand recall

The results in chart above show that when perceptions on sponsorship fit are low, the relationship between sponsorship and brand recall is strong and positive, whereas when perceptions of fit are high, the relationship between sponsorship and brand recall are weak and negative.

4.10.2 Sponsorship fit and brand recognition

H0: Sponsorship fit does not moderate the relationship between brand sponsorships of sports and brand awareness.

H5b: Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sponsorship and brand awareness - **brand recognition.**

A hierarchical regression model was fitted with brand recognition as dependent variable, Sport Sponsorship as the independent variable and sponsorship fit as the moderating variable. The results are shown below:

Table 4.8 Hierarchical Regression – brand recognition

Moderation Regressions						
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
[illegible]	4.38***	0	4.38***	0	4.39***	0
[illegible]	0.27***	0.39	0.24***	0.35	0.24***	0.35
[illegible]			0.3***	0.31	0.3***	0.31
[illegible]					-0.22***	-0.22
[illegible]	0.15		0.25		0.3	

*** = p < .01, ** = p < .05, * = p < .10

The results in Mode 1 shows that sport sponsorship (B = 0.27, β = 0.39 p-value <0.001) has a positive effect on brand recognition as was shown in H1b.

Model 2 shows that sponsorship Fit (B = 0.3, β = 0.31, p-value < 0.001) also has a positive impact on brand recall since the coefficient for sport sponsorship was positive and the p-value was less than 0.05.

Model 3 shows that the addition of the interaction variable (Sport Sponsorship x Sponsorship Fit) on to the model increased the r-square from 0.25 in model 2 to 0.3 in model 3. The coefficient for the interaction variable (B = -0.22, β = 0.22, p-value < 0.05) is significantly different from Zero. The coefficient for the interaction term is negative (-0.22) which implies that sponsorship fit has a negative influence on the relationship between Sponsorship and recognition. Thus, H5b is not supported.

These results are also illustrated in the chart below, represented by Figure 4.7.




Figure 4.7: Moderation effect of Sponsorship fit on the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand recognition

It can be noted from the chart that at low sponsorship fit, the relationship between sponsorship and recognition is strong but is weaker at high sponsorship fit as shown by the steepness on the regression lines

4.11 Results pertaining to Hypothesis 6: Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand image

Table 4.9 Hierarchical Regression – brand image

	B	β	B	β	B	β
	4.12***	0	4.12***	0	4.14***	0
	0.12**	0.17	0.07*	0.11	0.07*	0.11
			0.52***	0.55	0.53***	0.56
					-0.21***	-0.22
	0.03		0.33		0.38	

*** = p < .01, ** = p < .05, * = p < .10

The results in Mode 1 shows that sport sponsorship has a positive effect on brand image as was illustrated in Table 4.5: H2. (B = 0.12, β = 0.17 p-value <0.01)

Model 2 shows that Sponsorship Fit also has a positive impact on brand image since the coefficient was positive and the p-value was less than 0.05 (B = 0.52, β = 0.55, p-value < 0.01).

Model 3 shows that the addition of the interaction variable (Sport Sponsorship x Sponsorship Fit) on to the model increased the r-square from 0.33 in model 2 to 0.38 in model 3. The coefficient for the interaction variable (B = -0.21, β = 0.22, p-value < 0.05) is significantly different from Zero. The coefficient for the interaction term is negative (-0.21) which implies that sponsorship fit has a negative influence on the relationship between sponsorship and brand image. Hence, H6 is not supported.

These results are also illustrated in the chart below, represented by Figure 4.8.




Figure 4.8: Moderation effect of Sponsorship fit on the relationship between Sport Sponsorship and Brand Image

The chart above indicates that at low sponsorship fit, the relationship between sponsorship and brand image is positive, however at high sponsorship fit the relationship is negative as shown by the gradient of the regression lines.

4.12 Summary of the results

The results presented in this chapter indicate that not all proposed hypotheses have been supported by the statistical analysis. The table below, Table 4.10 is a summary of the hypothesised relationships.

Table 4.10 Summary of Hypotheses

Hypotheses		Outcome
H1	Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand awareness	Supported
H2	Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand image	Supported
H3	Sport sponsorship has a positive impact on attitudinal loyalty	Not supported
H4	Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on perceived quality	Not supported
H5	Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand awareness	Not supported
H6	Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand image	Not supported

According to the results, Hypotheses 1 and 2 (H1 and H2) which posited that sport sponsorship has a positive influence on consumers' awareness of a brand image, have been supported. This indicates that sport sponsorship has a positive and significant influence on consumers being aware of a brand and its image.

The third hypothesis (H3), which postulates that sport sponsorship has a positive impact on consumers' attitudinal loyalty was not supported. This implies that involvement in sport sponsorship has no positive relationship or influence on consumers' attitudinal loyalty towards a brand. The results also revealed that Hypothesis 4 (H4) has not been supported. There is no positive relationship between sport sponsorship and consumers perceived quality of a brand.

Finally, Hypotheses 5 and 6 (H5 and H6) which posit that sponsorship fit has a positive influence on consumers' brand awareness and image has been not been supported. Consumers' perception of fit between the sponsor and event has a negative impact on consumers' awareness of a brand and its image.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results presented in Chapter 4 with reference to the literature review in Chapter 2. The demographic profile of the sample is first reviewed, followed by the results on the proposed hypotheses. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary.

5.2 Demographic profile of respondents

A 50/50 sampling quota was placed on gender to ensure that a good spread would be achieved.

The majority of respondents were African (81%), followed by Coloured (9%), Whites (7%) and Indian/Asian (4%). According to StatsSA, Africans make up the majority of the SA population at 79.2%, followed by Whites (8.9%), coloured (8.9%) and Indian/Asian (2.5%). Therefore, our representation of the African population is aligned to the SA population, however there is a slight underrepresentation of the white population and an overrepresentation of the Indian/Asian community.

The research was dominated by respondents between the ages of 25-34, representing 39% of the cohort, followed by those between 35-49 at 34%. The youth (18-24) were the minority at 7%.

5.3 Discussion pertaining to Hypothesis 1: Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand awareness

Brand awareness was measured through brand recall and recognition; the findings revealed a p-value = 0.045 for brand recall and p-value < 0.01 for brand recognition. This implies that sport sponsorship has a positive and significant influence on brand awareness, by having a positive effect on brand recall and recognition. It can therefore be confirmed that sport sponsorship can create,

maintain and enhance brand awareness, which is one of the key objectives for companies engaging in sport sponsorship as a marketing communication tool.

This finding is in line with previous research conducted by Choi et al (2015) and Biascia (2014, 2016), who found that sponsorship can be effective in developing and building brand awareness among consumers. This study substantiates theories surrounding sponsorship as being a driver of brand awareness.

5.4 Discussion pertaining to Hypothesis 2: Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand image

Sport sponsorship is perceived as an effective tool to increase the value of the company's image (Chebli & Gharbi, 2014; Choi et al., 2015) hence, one of the key goals for brand managers engaging in sport sponsorship is to enhance brand image (Grohs, 2016). Findings in this study have revealed that the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand image is positive and significant at p-value =0.014. The results indicate that sport sponsorship has a strong and positive effect on brand image, providing support for Hypothesis 2. The premise in literature that sponsorship has the capacity to positively influence and strengthen brand image is supported by the findings in this study.

The findings in this study are in line with studies by Chebli and Gharbi, 2014 and Ireland et al., 2016, which proved that sponsorship has the capacity to influence positive brand association.

In conclusion, the notion that sponsorship is an effective communication tool in driving brand image has been validated in this study. This implies that Standard Bank's sponsorship of the SA National Cricket Team has had a positive influence on the Bank's image and was successful in achieving this goal.

5.5 Discussion pertaining to Hypothesis 3: Sport Sponsorship has a positive influence on brand loyalty

The research revealed that there was no positive relationship between sport sponsorship and brand loyalty at p-value = 0.386. The p-value was higher than the recommended threshold of 0.05, indicating that sport sponsorship does not drive brand loyalty. The effect of sport sponsorship on brand loyalty was not significant and consequently, H3 was not supported.

Although one of the key objectives of sponsorship is to favour brand loyalty, the relationship between the two has not been solidly established in academic studies or in literature (Mazodier & Merunka, 2012). A review of literature on sponsorship and brand loyalty revealed just one study by Donlan (2013), who found evidence that sponsorship can build brand loyalty. Donlan's finding is contrary to the finding of this study where evidence of sponsorship having a positive effect on brand loyalty was not proven.

This study, therefore validates the view presented by Henseler (2011) that sponsorship is perceived to contribute more to building brand equity through awareness and image than through brand loyalty.

5.6 Discussion pertaining to Hypothesis 4: Sport Sponsorship has a positive influence on perceived service quality

Findings in this research revealed that there is no relationship between sport sponsorship and perceived service quality. The p-value = 0.370, hence Hypothesis 4 (H4) could not be supported. This study has not found evidence that sport sponsorship plays a positive and significant role in the perception of service quality.

Evidence of the existence of this relationship and the impact of sponsorship on perceived quality was also not found in the literature review on sponsorship. This implies that companies should not engage in sport sponsorship with the

expectation that consumers' perception of quality will be developed or enhanced.

5.7 Discussion pertaining to Hypothesis 5 and Hypothesis 6: Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sport sponsorship and brand awareness (H5) and brand image (H6)

5.7.1 Sponsorship fit and brand awareness

Findings in this study indicate that sponsorship plays a role in moderating the relationship between the sponsor's fit and brand awareness. Surprisingly however, this moderation is negative and not positive as is prevalent in the descriptions within the literature. The results show that the perceived appropriate fit between the sponsor and the sport event has a negative influence on brand awareness, as the coefficient for both recall and recognition is negative -0.25 and 0.22, respectively. This implies that perceived sponsorship fit does not enhance brand awareness through brand recall and recognition.

This finding is contrary to findings from the research conducted by, Grohs and Reisinger (2014), Choi et al., (2015) and Till and Zdravkovic (2012) where sponsorship fit contributes positively to brand recall and recognition. Results from this study are contrary to the idea that the fit between the sponsor and event is a condition that maximises the impact of sponsorship on recall and recognition, which ultimately impacts brand awareness.

This study indicates that low sponsorship fit results in high brand recall and recognition, while high fit results in low brand recall and recognition. This suggests that sponsorships fit does not necessarily play a critical role in

influencing sponsorship outcomes related to awareness as suggested by authors such as Ratnershwar (2016).

5.7.2 Sponsorship fit and brand image

Finally, the results in this study do not support Hypothesis 6 (H6) which posits that sponsorship fit has a positive influence on brand image. The coefficient for the interaction term is negative (-0.21). Similar to sponsorship fit and brand awareness, the results also show that sponsorship fit does not have a positive influence on brand image.

Studies by authors such as Cobbs (2012), Choi et al., (2015) and Ratnershwar, (2016) indicate that fit between sponsor and event has a positive influence on brand image. The results in this contradict the abovementioned authors' studies as they indicate that low sponsorship fit results in a positive influence, whereas in our study, high fit results in a negative influence.

This implies that choosing to sponsor events which share similarities with the brand will not necessarily have a positive impact on brand image.

5.8 Conclusion

The results of the research indicate that not all theoretical propositions are supported and accepted, therefore this study has not confirmed all the hypotheses put forward in Chapter 2. It is evident from the findings that while sponsorship has a positive influence on brand awareness and image, however there is no influence on brand loyalty and perceived service quality. Studies conducted by authors Biascia (2014, 2016) and Grohs (2016) found that sponsorship plays a significant role in enhancing brand awareness and image, supporting findings from this study. Finally, the results were not in line with prior studies that sponsorship fit has a positive influence brand awareness and

image. On the contrary, high sponsorship fit resulted in negative brand awareness and image.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

The aim of this study was to assess whether sport sponsorship makes a positive contribution to the four brand equity dimensions: brand awareness, brand image, brand loyalty and perceived service quality. Sport sponsorship has become one of the key marketing communication tools and brand managers choose to sponsor sport with the objective of enhancing brand equity dimensions. It was anticipated that through conducting this study, brand and marketing managers would be assisted in assessing the effectiveness of this communication tool in achieving these objectives in South Africa. The Standard Bank sponsorship of the South African National Cricket Team was identified as a suitable undertaking for this study.

This chapter first summarises the findings of this study and then draws conclusions with regard to these findings. Thereafter, the implications and recommendations to key stakeholders are discussed. The chapter concludes with suggestions for further research to develop and expand the theory regarding the influence of sport sponsorship on brand equity elements.

6.2 Conclusions of the study

In concluding this study, the aims of this study stated earlier are re-stated, followed by a discussion on whether these have been confirmed as well as examining the contribution of this study to existing theory.

The main aim of this study was to assess whether sport sponsorship has a positive influence on the abovementioned key elements of brand equity: brand awareness, image, loyalty and perceived quality. The second aim was to understand the influence of sponsorship fit between event and sponsor on brand awareness and brand image.

The research outcomes indicate a positive influence of sponsorship on brand awareness, which was measured through brand recall and recognition. This study proves the generally accepted theory that brand recognition and recall are key measures of sponsorship performance as evidenced by the strong relationship between the two constructs. The reviewed literature (Lawley, Raciti & Vance, 2016; Grohs, 2016) and the research findings from this study have together confirmed that sport sponsorship is successful in influencing brand image. The results also substantiate theories by authors such as Chebli and Gharbi (2014) and Biscaia, 2016, who argue that sponsorship is a driver of brand awareness and brand image.

The study demonstrated that sport sponsorship has no positive influence on brand loyalty and perceived service quality. These findings are in contrast with studies by Biascia et al. (2013, p.288) who found evidence that sponsorship can build brand loyalty. The results furthermore do not support the notion by Choi et al. (2015) who posit that sport sponsorship generates brand loyalty through consumers being loyal to the sponsor brand. Sponsorship was found to play no role in favouring brand loyalty and perceived service quality, supporting the proposition by Sözer (2009) that brand loyalty and perceived quality are higher order dimensions of brand equity, hence there are few studies that have produced empirical results supporting the relationship between sport sponsorship and the two dimensions (brand loyalty and perceived quality).

The demonstrated negative relationship between sponsorship fit and brand awareness and between sponsorship and image, was an unexpected result. Although sponsorship fit plays a role in moderating the relationship between the above-mentioned constructs, this relationship is negative and not positive as was expected.

There is a substantial amount of literature by authors such as Choi et al (2015), Cobbs, (2012) and Ratnershwar (2016) arguing that when sponsorship fit is high, consumers respond favourably and when fit is low, consumers respond negatively. These outcomes are in contrast to the findings of this study, which found that low sponsorship fit resulted in both positive brand awareness and enhanced brand image. These results are consistent with a study by Olson &

Thjømøe (2011) in which it was discovered that incongruence can result in higher sponsor recall and recognition and positive associations due to increased attention and elaboration.

In conclusion, evidence in this study indicates that sport sponsorship is an effective instrument for the management of brand awareness and the brand image dimension of brand equity; however, the same cannot be said for brand loyalty and perceived service quality as this study showed that sport sponsorship has no positive influence on these two dimensions. Brand managers and marketing managers should therefore not engage in sport sponsorship with the expectation that it will favour brand loyalty and perceived quality.

6.3 Implications and Recommendations

The findings in this study have implications and recommendations that need to be taken into consideration, by marketers and by academia.

As stated earlier, the study and literature review revealed that sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand awareness and on brand image. Firstly, this implies that sport sponsorship is an effective marketing communication tool in achieving objectives related to brand awareness and brand image enhancement. Secondly, this signifies that brand awareness and image are key measures that brand managers can use to measure the success of their sponsorship investments. Lastly, these findings indicate that linking the brand name to the sport event through sponsorship, generates exposure for the brand to spectators and those watching on television, subsequently resulting in enhanced recognition and recall of the brand at point of purchase (Lawley, Raciti & Vance, 2016). It can therefore be concluded that investment in sport sponsorship to build and enhance brand awareness and image can be a worthwhile investment.

This study has demonstrated that sport sponsorship has no influence on brand loyalty and perceived quality. Marketers therefore should not engage in sport sponsorship with the expectation to positively influence spectator's attitudes

towards their brand in terms of devotion, closeness to the brand and service quality. Perhaps this also validates the suggestion by Donlan (2013) that it is difficult to attribute consumer brand loyalty and perceived service quality to a single marketing communication tool; hence, the relationship between sport sponsorship and loyalty has received very little attention.

Results of this study demonstrate somewhat surprising results, as the relationship of sponsorship fit between the event and sponsor was found to be negative. This suggests that while sponsoring an event that was deemed to, in the eyes of the consumer, connect with the brand, this will not in itself result in enhanced brand awareness and image. The research can at this stage speculate that this outcome can be attributed to the theory proposed by Jagre, Watson and Watson (2001) who suggest that less congruent relationships attract spectator attention, which results in positive brand awareness and image.

6.3.1 Significance of the research

The findings provide marketers with an understanding of whether the brand benefits from investing in sport sponsorship, particularly in relation to those objectives which can be achieved by engaging in sport sponsorship. The results are beneficial to marketers as they have revealed which brand equity elements can be developed, built and enhanced by sport sponsorship. In this way, the results provide guidelines concerning which brand related objectives should be set for engaging sponsorship.

There is clear evidence from the study that sport sponsorship is beneficial in achieving brand awareness and image related objectives. It is therefore recommended that marketers engage in sport sponsorship with the aim of developing, building and enhancing brand awareness and brand image. Marketers should invest time and money in leveraging sport sponsorship to ensure maximum exposure of their brand name and logo on a variety of objects during the event, such as the Standard Bank logo on the players' jerseys to achieve brand recall, recognition and brand attitude objectives.

Sport sponsorship on the other hand, has no influence on brand loyalty and perceived service quality as indicated by the findings. Meenaghan (2012) argues that the leveraging of sponsorship activities is the key to achieving sponsorship objectives. Hence, it is recommended that the sponsor must leverage activities around the sponsored event to enhance loyalty. An example could be offering price concessions on ticket prices and food at the event to spectators who use Standard Bank cards for their purchases, which could drive loyalty with existing customers and may encourage others to also become Standard Bank customers. Brand activations at the sport event can also be used to create an interaction between the spectators and the sponsors' brand and /or products; this could drive the perceived service quality of the brand.

Furthermore, marketers should employ an integrated marketing communication strategy whereby other marketing communication tools are used to achieve brand loyalty and perceived service quality related objectives in order to enhance the value of the brand. It is evident that sport sponsorship cannot be used in isolation to achieved brand related objectives; it should be used as part of the integrated marketing tools.

A great deal of emphasis should not be placed on finding an event that fits or have similarities with the sponsor brand, as the study suggests that sponsorship fit does not impact awareness or image.

In conclusion, marketers should focus on building brand awareness and image when engaging in sport sponsorship and use other marketing communication tools to achieve brand loyalty and perceived service quality.

6.4 Suggestions for further research

A review of the related literature revealed that very limited research has been undertaken in this regard for South Africa, particularly concerning employing Aaker's concept of consumer-based brand equity. This study adds to the limited body of research from an academic perspective in South Africa. Therefore, further studies or a replication of this study, employing all four dimensions of

brand equity as proposed by Aaker, are needed to substantiate the results presented in this study.

Furthermore, these (proposed) studies should consider other moderating factors, such as involvement: that is, the extent to which an individual is interested in particular sports or events, as scholars have identified these as conditions that must exist to maximise the impact of sponsorship on brand equity elements. It is hoped that these studies will offer insights which will be valuable in guiding marketers on moderating factors they can leverage in order to enhance brand equity elements through sponsorship.

Finally, it would also be interesting to duplicate this study in other industries that engage in sport sponsorship such as liquor or retail.

REFERENCES

Aaker, J. L. (1997, August). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Market Research, XXXiV*, 347-356.

Abratt, R., & Grobler, P. S. (1989). The Evaluation of Sports. *International Journal of Advertising, 8*, 351-362.

Abratt, R., Clayton, B. C., & Pitt, L. F. (1987). Corporate Objectives in Sport Sponsorship. *International Journal of Advertising, 6*, 299-311.

Adam, M. A. (August 2016). The impact of brand equity on consumer purchase decision of cellphones. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research, 4*, 60-133.

Agrell, P. R. (205). Brand Equity, efficiency and valuation of professional sports francises: the case of major league baseball. *Internal Journal of Business and Social Research, 5*(1), 63-89.

Ailawadi, K. D. (2017). How well does consumer based brand equity aligh with sales based brand equity and marketing mix response? *Journal of Marketing, 81*(3), 1-20.

Alexandris, K. T. (2007). Predicting sponsorship outcomes from attitudinal constructs: The case of a professional basketball team. *Sport Marketing Quarterly 16*, no.3: 130.

Baalbaki, S. G. (2016). A consumer perceived consumer based brand equity scale. *Journal of Brand Management, 23*, 229-251.

Bearden, W., Hunter, G., & Tian, K. (2001). Consumers need for uniqueness: scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Research, 28*, 50-66.

Berbic, S. S. (2018, June). The impact of chocholate brand image, satisfaction, and value on brand loyalty. *Economy and Marketing Communication Review, 8*(1), 37-54.

Berndt, A. D., & Koekemoer, C. (2001). Sponsorship Evaluation in South Africa. *Acta Commercii, 1*.

Biscaia, R., Correia, A., Rosado, A. F., Ross, S. D., & Maroco, J. (2013). Sport Sponsorship: The Relationship Between Team Loyaity, Sponsorship Awareness, Attitude Toward the Sponsor, and Purchase Intentions. *Journal of Sport Management, 27*, 288-302.

Biscaia, R., Gray, D., Stotlar, D., & Zaharia, N. (2016). No More "Good" Intentions: Purchase Behaviors in Sponsorship. *Journal of Sport Management, 30*, 162-175.

Boshoff, C., & Gerber, C. (2008). Sponsorship recall and recognition: The case of the 2007 Cricket World. *South African Journal of Business Management, 39(2)*.

Bowen, N. G. (n.d.). Structural Equation Modeling. *Oxford University Press*.

Breuer, C., & Rumpf, C. (2011). Which Value Do Different Sport Sponsorship Tactics Deliver. *American Marketing Association*.

Bronn, P. S., Olson, E. L., & Thjomoe, H. M. (2002, December). Decision-making Processes Surrounding Sponsorsiiip Activities. *Journal of Advertising Research*.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. (4th edition ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods* (5th edition. ed.). Oxford University Press, New York.

Brzozowska-Wos, M., Gupta, S., & Schivinski, B. (2017). Antecedents and consequences of brand loyalty. *Institute for Market, Consumption and Business Cycle Research, 5*, 200-212.

Cameron, G., Joiner, C., & Levin, A. M. (2001). The Impact of Sports Sponsorship on Consumers Brand Attitude and Recall: The case of Nascar Fans. *Journal of current issues and Research in Advertising, 23*(2).

Chang, H., Chang, W., & Lu, L. (2018). Consumers attitudes toward bloggers sponsored recommendations and purchase intentions: The effect of sponsorship type, product type and brand awareness. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 34*(1), 258-266.

Chang, Y., Herbst, F., & KO, Y. J. (2017). Determinants of consumer attitude toward corporate sponsors: A comparison between a profit and nonprofit sport event. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*(16), 176-186.

Chatzipanagiotou, K. C. (2016). Decoding the complexity of the consumer based brand equity process. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(11), 5479-5486.

Cheah, S., & Gordon, C. (2017). Sports sponsorship 'success': moving beyond evaluating transactions to understanding relationships. *e-Journal of Social & Behavioural Research in Business, 8*(1), pp: 1-14.

Chebli, L., & Gharbi, A. (2014). The impact of the effectiveness of sponsorship on image and memorizing: Role of congruence and relational proximity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 109*, 913 – 924.

Chien, P. M., Cornwell, T. B., & Pappu, Ravi. (2011, January 1). Sponsorship portfolio as a brand-image creation strategy. *Journal of Business Research, 64*, 142–149.

Choi, K. Y., Kim, H. K., Kim, J. S., & Liu, H. (2015). Sports sponsorship effects on customer equity: an Asian market application. *International Journal of Advertising, 34*(2).

Cliffe, Simon J., & Motion, Judy. (2005). Building contemporary brands: a sponsorship-based strategy. *Journal of Business Research, 58*, 1068– 1077.

Cooksey, R. W. (2005). Consumer-based brand equity: improving the measurement-empirical evidence. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 14*(3), 143-154.

Cornwell, B. T., & Maignan, I. (1998, Spring). An Intemational Review of Sponsorship Research. *The Journal of Advertisijig, XXVII.*

Cornwell, T. B., Roy, D. P., & Steinard II, E. A. (2001, Summer). Exploring Managers' Perceptions of the Impact of Sponsorship on Brand Equity. *Journal of Advertising, 30*(2), pp. 41-51.

Cornwell, T. B., Weeks, C. S., & Roy, D. P. (2005, Summer). Sponsorship Linked Marketing: Opening the Black Box. *Journal of Advertising, Volume 34, No 2*, pp. 21-42.

Cornwell, T. B. (2008). State of the art and science in sponsorship. *Journal of Advertising, 37*(3), pp. 41-55.

Cornwell, T. B., Weeks, C. S., & Roy, D. P. (2005). Sponsorship linked-marketing: Opening the black box. *Journal of Advertising, 34*(2), pp. 21-42.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th edition ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Dens, N., De Pelsmacker, P., & Verhellen, Y. (2018). Better together? Harnessing the power of brand placement through program sponsorship message. *Journal of Business Research, 83*(1), 151-159.

Dean, D., Krishnan, B., Netemeyer, R., Pulling, C., Ricks, J., Yagci, M., Wang, G., Wirth, F. (2004). Developing and validating measures of facets of consumer-based brand equity. Journal of Business Research,57, 209-224.

Donlan, L. K. (2013). The Role of Brand Knowledge in Determining Sponsorship Effectiveness. *Journal of Promotion Management, 19*, 241–264.

Dos-Santos, M., Vveinhardt, J., Calabuig-Moreno, F., & Montoro-Rios, F. J. (2016). Involvement and Image Transfer in Sports Sponsorship. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics, 27(1)*, 78–89.

Elevent. (2017, June 15). Retrieved from Elevent: https:/en.elevent.co/blogs/sponsorship/sponsorship-early days

Farjam, S., & Hongyi, X. (2015). Reviewing the concept of brand equity and evaluating consumer-based brand equity (CBBE) models. *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Administration, 1*(8), 14-29.

Fin 24. (2001, February 01). Retrieved from Sport Sponsorship as a Communication Tool: http://www.fin24.com/Finweek/Companies/Sport-sponsorship-as-a-communication-tool-20090117-2

Flynn, L., Koo, G.Y. & Quarterman, J. (2006). Effect of Perceived Sport Event and Sponsor Image Fit on Consumers' Cognition, Affect, and Behavioural Intentions. *Sport Management Quarterly, 15 (2)*, 80-90.

Gecti, F. Z. (2013, February). The Relationship between brand trust, brand affect, attitudinal and behavioural loyalty: A field study toward sport shoe consumers in Turkey. *International Journal of Marketing Studies, 6*(2), 111-118.

Gill, M. S., & Dawra, J. (2010). Evaluating Aaker's sources of brand equity and the mediating role of brand image. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing, 18*(3), 189–198.

Gordon, B. S., & James, J. D. (2017, May). The impact of brand equity drivers on consumer based brand equity in the sport service settings. *International Journal of Business Administration, 8*, 55-65.

Grohs, R., & Reisinger, H. (2014). Sponsorship effects on brand image: The role of exposure and activity involvement. *Journal of Business Research, 67*, 1018-1025.

Gwinner, K. P., & Eaton, J. (1999). Building Brand Image Through Event Sponsorship. *Joumal of Advertising, XXVIII*(4).

Gwinner, K. P.; Larson, B. V., & Swanson, S. R. (2009). Image Transfer in Corporate Event-sponsorship: Assessing the impact of Team identification and Event-Sponsor Fit. *International Journal of Management and Market Research, 2*(1).

Gwinner, K., & Bennett, G. (2008). The Impact of Brand Cohesiveness and Sport Identification on Brand Fit. *Journal of Sport Management, 22*, 410-426.

Henseler, J., W, B., Gotz, O., & Hautvast, C. (2007, July 1). Investigating the moderating role of fit on sports sponsorship and brand equity. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship, 8*(4).

Henseler, J., & Wilson, B., Westberg, K. (2011). Managers' Perceptions of the Impact of Sport Sponsorship on Brand Equity: Which Aspects of the Sponsorship. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 20* (1), 7-21.

Holgrem, J., & Widmark, E. (2018). The impact of internal values on the sports sponsorship market: a qualitative study of how large companies work on their internal values and motivate their sponsor programs. *Planning, 2*(1), 20-40.

Huang, R., & Sarigollu, E. (2013, July). Assessment o f brand equity measures. *International Journal of Market Research, 6.*

Ireland, M., Kelly, S. J., Magnan, J., & Williamson, H. (2016). It Works Two Ways: Impacts of Sponsorship Alliance upon Sport and Sponsor Image. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 25*, 241-259.

Jagre, E., Watson, J., & Watson, J. (2001). Sponsorship and congruity theory: a theoritical framework for explaning consumer attitude and recall of event sponsorship. *Advances in Consumer Research, 28*, 439-444.

Keller, K. L. (1991). Conceptualizing, Measuring and Managing Consumer-Based Brand Equity. *1140.*

Keller, K. L. (1993, January). Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand. *Journal of Marketing, 57*, 1-22.

Kelly, S. J., Ireland, M., Mangan, J., & Williamson, H. (2016). It Works Two Ways: Impacts of Sponsorship Alliance upon Sport and Sponsor Image. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 241-259.

Kim, M., Kim, Y., Lee, H., & Magnusen, M. (2015). Factors influencing sponsorship effectiveness: A meta-analytic review and research synthesis. *Journal of Sport Management, 29*, 408-425.

Kim, E (Anna)., Kwon, E. (Penny)., & Ratneshwar, S. (2016). Brand Image Congruence Through Sponsorship of Sporting Events: A Reinquiry of Gwinner and Eaton (1999). *Journal of Advertising, 45*(1), 130–138.

Koekemoer, L. (2014). *Marketing Communication An integrated approach.* Juta.

Koi, Y. J. (2017). Determinants of consumer attitude toward corporate sponsors: A comparison between a profit and nonprofit sport event sponsorship. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 176-186.

Koppehel, C. (2016). *Brandinc.* Retrieved from creative group.co.za; Unpredictable SA sports sponsorship market full of opportunities: https://www.brandinc.co.za/unpredictable-sa-sports-sponsorship-market-full-opportunities/

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th Edition ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Lawley, M., Raciti, M., & Vance, L. (2016). Beyond brand exposure:measuring the sponsorship halo effect. *Emerald Inisghts, 20*, 1-14.

Lodhi, R. N., & Tanveer, Z. (2016). The Effect of Brand Equity on Customer Satisfaction: An Empirical Study Based on David Aaker's Brand Equity Model. *Journal of Brand Management, XIII*(3).

Malhotra, N. (2010). *Marketing Research, An Applied Orientation* (6th edition. ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Meenaghan, T. (2015). Current developments & future directions in sponsorship. *International Journal of Advertising*, pp. 3-28.

Meenaghan, T., McLoughlin, D., & McCormack, A. (2013, May). New Challenges in Sponsorship Evaluation Actors, New Media, and the Context of Praxis. *Psychology and Marketing, Vol. 30(5)*, 444–460.

Meenaghan, T. (2001, February). Understanding Sponsorship. *Psychology & Marketing, Vol. 18(2)*, 95–122.

Meenaghan, T. (2015). Current developments & future directions in sponsorship. *International Journal of Advertising*, pp. 3-28.

Nevillon, G. (2014, April 16). *The Media Magazine*. Retrieved from http://themediaonline.co.za/2014/04/weighing-in-on-sports-sponsorship/

Otubanjo, O. (2018). Building powerful entrepreneurial brand: The role of critical success factors and their impact on competitive advantage. *Journal of Brand Management, XV*(1), 26-40.

Palmatier, R. W., & Sridhar, S. (2017). *Marketing Strategy Based on First Principles and Data Analytics*. Palgrave.

Papadimitiou, D., & Tsordia, C. (2016). Understanding how sponsorship leads to purchase behavior for the sponsor products. *International Conference on Contemporary Marketing Issues, 20*(1), 263-265.

Pope, N., & Westberg, K. (2014). Building brand equity with cause-related marketing: A comparison with sponsorship and sales promotion. *20*(6).

Prendegrast, G., & Paliwal, A. (2016, June). The Hidden Factors Behind Sponsorship and Image Transfer Considerations for Bilateral Image TransferAmong Sponsors and Events. *Journal of Advertising Research*.

Rajput, S., & Upmannyu, N. (2017). An assessment of the relationship among bran trust, perceived value and brand loyalty. *PRiMa: Practices and Research in Marketing, 8*(1), 10-21.

Sallam, M. (2016). The impact of brand image and corporate branding on consumers choice: The role of brand equity. *International Journal of Marketing Studies, 8*(1), 98-104.

SAS. (n.d.). Retrieved from SAS: https://www.sas.com/en za/company-infornation/profile.html

Sasirekha, K., & Sathish, A. (2017). The effect of consumer based brand equity (CBBE) on purchase intention of private label brands and national label brands. *International Business Management, 11*(5), 1048-1057.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research Methods for Business Students* (7th edition. ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Sözer, E. G., & Vardar, N. (2009). How does event sponsorship help in leveraging brand equity? *Journal of Sponsorship, 3*(1), 35–42.

Spence, J., Abratt, R., & Mattheus, D. (1997, September). Corporate Sponsorship of the Rugby World Cup 1995: An Analysis of Sponsors and Spectators. *South African Journal of Business Management, 28*(3).

Statistica.com . (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/196864/global-sponsorship-spending-since-2007/

Statistics Solutions. (n.d.). Retrieved from Statistics Solutions: https://www.statisticssolutions.com/amos

Till, B. D., & Zdravkovic, S. (2012). Enhancing brand image via sponsorship strength of association effects. *International Journal of Advertising, 31(1)*, pp. 113–132.

Walraven, M., Bijmolt, T. H., & Koning, R. H. (2014). Dynamic Effects of Sponsoring: How Sponsorship Awareness Develops Over Time. *Journal of Advertising, 43(2)*, 142–154.

Wang, M. C.H., Cheng, J. M.S., Purwanto, B. M., & Erimurti, K. (2011). The determinants of the sports team sponsor's brand equity A cross-country comparison in Asia. *International Journal of Market Research, 53*(6), 811-829.

Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value. A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing, 52*, 2-22.

APPENDIX A

Research Instrument

Wits Business School

Sculpting global leaders

Department of Strategic Marketing

Understanding the Influence of Sport Sponsorship on Brand Equity

Research conducted by:

Ms. Penelope. Maanda
Student No: 1755207
Cell: 082 905 7337

Dear Participant

You are invited to participate in an academic research study conducted by Penelope (Penny) Maanda, master's Student in Strategic Marketing from the **Department Marketing Management**, at Wits Business School, University of Witwatersrand.

The purpose of the study is to understand the influence of sports sponsorship on brand equity

Please note the following:

- This is an anonymous survey, as your name will not appear on the questionnaire. The answers you give will be treated as strictly confidential as you cannot be identified in person based upon the answers you give.
- Your participation in this study is very important to us. You may, however, choose not to participate and you may stop participating at any time without any negative consequences.

- Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. This should not take more than 10-15 minutes of your time.
- The results of the study will be used for academic purposes only and may be published in an academic journal.
- If you agree to participate in the academic research study, the fieldworker will conduct the interview with you at this time.

- Do you voluntarily agree to participate in this study?

Yes	1	Continue
No	2	Close interview

SECTION A:

GENERAL QUESTIONS

A1. Record respondent gender

(Single mention only)

Male	1	**Check Quota and Continue**
Female	2	

A.2 For statistical purposes, may I please confirm your ethnic group, are you...?

(Single mention only)

Black	1	**Continue**
Coloured	2	
Indian/Asian	3	
White	4	

A3. Please indicate your age group? Are you...? READ OUT OPTIONS

(Single mention only)

< 18 years	1	**Thank respondent and end interview**
18 – 24	2	
25 – 34	3	
35 – 49	4	

50 +	5	

A4. Can you name a sponsor of the South African National Cricket Team?

Check quota for those aware (correct mention of sponsor) vs those not aware

---

SECTION C:

BRAND AWARENESS:

Below are statements about brand awareness. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement using a 5-point scale where;

1= Strongly Disagree **2=** Disagree **3=** Neutral **4=** Agree **5=** Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Recognition

C1.	Standard bank is a brand that you are very much aware of	1	2	3	4	5
C2.	You can quickly recall the symbol or logo of Standard Bank	1	2	3	4	5
C3.	You can recognise Standard Bank among other competing brands	1	2	3	4	5
C4.	You know Standard Bank very well	1	2	3	4	5
C5.	Standard Bank is a financial services brand that you are very familiar with	1	2	3	4	5

Recall

C6.	When you think of financial services, Standard Bank is always the first brand you think of	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION D:

BRAND IMAGE:

Below are statements about brand association. You may agree or disagree with each statement using a 5-point Likert scale where:

1= Strongly Disagree **2=** Disagree **3=** Neutral **4=** Agree **5=** Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

D1.	You trust Standard Bank	1	2	3	4	5
D2.	Standard Bank is unique from other brands of financial services.	1	2	3	4	5
D3.	The Standard Bank brand has a distinct personality	1	2	3	4	5
D4.	You have a clear image of the type of person who would use Standard Bank's products/services	1	2	3	4	5
D5.	Standard Bank is a financially stable bank	1	2	3	4	5
D6.	Standard Bank is a bank that has a very good reputation.	1	2	3	4	5
D7.	Standard Bank is well established.	1	2	3	4	5
D8.	Some characteristics of Standard Bank come to your mind quickly	1	2	3	4	5
D9.	Standard Bank is long-term oriented	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION E:

BRAND LOYALTY:

Below are statements about brand loyalty. You may agree or disagree with each statement using a 5-point Likert scale where:

1= Strongly Disagree **2=** Disagree **3=** Neutral **4=** Agree **5=** Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

E1.	You will always choose to use standard bank even if there are other choices (loyalty)	1	2	3	4	5
E2.	You are always satisfied with Standard Bank products/services that you purchase from them	1	2	3	4	5
E3.	You intend to purchase products/services from Standard Bank in the future	1	2	3	4	5
E4.	You would recommend Standard Bank to your friends and family	1	2	3	4	5
E5.	When you are looking for a financial services provider, you will always consider Standard Bank	1	2	3	4	5
E6.	You would be willing to pay a higher price for Standard Bank products/services over other competing brands	1	2	3	4	5
E7.	You say positive things about this brand to other people	1	2	3	4	5
E8.	You feel committed to Standard Bank	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION F:

PERCEIVED SERVICE QUALITY:

Below are statements about perceived quality. You may agree or disagree with each statement using a 5-point Likert scale where:

1= Strongly Disagree **2=** Disagree **3=** Neutral **4=** Agree **5=** Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

F1.	Standard Bank products and services are of high quality	1	2	3	4	5
F2.	Standard Bank offers innovative products and services	1	2	3	4	5
F3.	Standard Bank is a brand that keeps growing in popularity	1	2	3	4	5
F4.	Standard Bank is a leader in financial services	1	2	3	4	5
F5.	Standard Bank is a brand you respect	1	2	3	4	5
F6.	Compared to other brands of financial services Standard bank has the best product and services	1	2	3	4	5
F7.	The likelihood that Standard Banks service is excellent is very high.	1	2	3	4	5
F8.	The likelihood that Standard Bank is reliable is very high.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION G:

SPONSORSHIP FIT:

Below are statements about sponsorship fit. You may agree or disagree with each statement using a 5-point Likert scale where:

1= Strongly Disagree **2=** Disagree **3=** Neutral **4=** Agree **5=** Strongly Agree

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

G1.	Standard Bank and the South African cricket team have many similarities	1	2	3	4	5
G2.	It makes sense that Standard Bank sponsors the South African cricket team	1	2	3	4	5
G3.	Your image of the South African cricket team is consistent with how you perceive Standard Bank	1	2	3	4	5
G4.	You can see a direct link between the Standard Bank and the SA National Cricket Team.	1	2	3	4	5
G5.	You understand why the Standard bank is involved in cricket.	1	2	3	4	5
G6.	One would expect Standard Bank to sponsor the SA National Cricket Team.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

CONSISTENCY MATRIX

Research problem stated here					
Sub-problem	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Understand if there is a positive contribution to brand awareness, measured through recall and recognition as a result of sport sponsorship	Aaker (1991) Adam and Akber (2016 Biascia (2016) Biascia et al (2013) Bijmolt, Koning and Walraven, (2014) Chebli and Gharbi (2014) Cobbs, Jensen, Wakefield and Turner (2016) Choi et al. (2015) Keller (1991) Lawley, Raciti and Vance (2016) Lodhi and Tanveer (2016) Till and Zdravkovic (2012)	Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on brand awareness	Assessing the relationship between brand awareness, measured through recall and recognition and a brand's sport sponsorship	Nominal Data	• Validity test • Reliability test • Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)

Research problem stated here					
Sub-problem	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Assess the influence of sport sponsorship on brand image	Adam and Akber (2016) Chebli and Gharbi (2014) Choi et al (2015) Grohs (2016) Grohs and Reisinger (2014) Holmgren and Widmark (2018) Ireland et al. (2016) Kelly, Mangan and Williamson (2016) Keller (1993 Zdravkovic and Till (2012)	Sport sponsorship has a positive impact on brand image	Assessing the relationship between a brand's image and a brand's sport sponsorship	Nominal Data	• Validity test • Reliability test • Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)

Research problem stated here					
Sub-problem	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Understand the influence of sport sponsorship on attitudinal loyalty	Aaker (1991) Beasley, Levin, and Gamble (2004) Berbić, Puška and Stojanović and (2018) Biascia (2013) Brzozowska-Woś, Gupta and Schivinski (2017) Choi et al (2015) Donlan (2013) Geçti and Zengin (2013), Keller (1991) Mazodier and Merunka (2012) Rajput and Upmannyu (2017)	Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on attitudinal loyalty.	Assessing the relationship between a brand's attitudinal loyalty and a brand's sport sponsorship	Nominal Data	• Validity test • Reliability test • Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)

Research problem stated here					
Sub-problem	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Understand if sport sponsorship has a positive contribution to perceived service quality	Aaker (1991) Baalbaki and Guzmán (2016) Donthu and Yoo (2001) Farjam and Hongyi, (2015) Markovic, Iglesias, Singh and Sierra (2018) Sasirekha and Sathish (2017) Zeithaml (1988)	Sport sponsorship has a positive influence on perceived service quality.	Assessing the relationship between perceived service quality of a brand and a brand's sport sponsorship	Nominal Data	• Validity test • Reliability test • Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)

Research problem stated here					
Sub-problem	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Understand the influence of sponsorship fit between the sponsor and event sponsored on brand awareness, measured through brand recall and recognition	Biscaia et al (2016) Chebli & Gharbi (2014) Choi et al (2015) Cobbs (2012) Cornwell et al. (2005) Cornwell et al (2006) Dos Santos and Moreno (2017) Drengner (2011) Grohs and Reisinger (2014) Grohs and Wagner (2004) Geue (2010) Jagre, Watson and Watson (2001) Johnston (2011) Kim (2015) Mazodier (2013). Nijmegen (2017) Olson and Thjømøe (2009) Ratnershwar (2016)	Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on the relationship between sponsorship and brand awareness.	Assessing the relationship between sponsorship fit between the event sponsor and event, and brand awareness through recall and recognition	Nominal Data	• Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Research problem stated here					
Sub-problem	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Understand the influence of sponsorship fit between the sponsor and event sponsored on brand awareness, measured through brand recall and recognition	Biscaia et al (2016) Chebli and Gharbi (2014) Choi et al (2015) Cobbs (2012) Cornwell et al. (2005) Cornwell et al (2006) Dos Santos & Moreno (2017) Drengner (2011) Grohs & Reisinger (2014) Grohs & Wagner (2004) Geue (2010) Henseler et al (2007) Jagre, Watson and Watson (2001) Johnston (2011) Kim (2015) Mazodier, 2013). Olson and Thjømøe (2009) Ratnershwar (2016)	Sponsorship fit has a positive influence on relationship between brand image.	Assessing the relationship between sponsorship fit between the event sponsor and event, and brand image	Nominal Data	• Hierarchical Regression Analysis