

Evaluation The Communication Effectiveness At The Multiple Sponsorship: A Study On Fair Sponsorship

Hasan AKSOY* and Mahmut TEKİN**

* Cihanbeyli Vocational High School, Selcuk University ,Konya, Turkey
E-mail: hasanaksoy78@hotmail.com. Tel: 00905069733741. Fax: 09067340989

**Department of Economics, Selcuk University, Konya, 42151, Turkey

ABSTRACT

In this study, it is aimed to form a conceptual structure to a multiple activity sponsorship. Multiple sponsorship is the sponsorship of several brands for an event. This paper claims that multiple sponsorship affects the image of each sponsor brand. Also it claims that if more than one brand sponsors the same event, these brands are perceived as a single body. The examination of the questions about the intensity of the relation between sponsors and sponsored event, the facts that affects this relation and image transfer from one partner to another and from sponsor to event is the subject of this study. In multiple sponsorship, the image of the sponsor brands is affected in two ways: first, image transfer from sponsor brands to a sponsor brand and second, from sponsored event to sponsor brand. Also, factors like the intensity of the connection and harmony that affects image and information transfer from event and other sponsors will be examined.

Key words: Sponsorship, Brand image, Image transfer

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important thing in the twenty century is the globalisation. The economic chances that starts in the beginning of the eighties, the global competition enforce the companies to change (Tekin ,2009:1). Before that changes period the companies thought in the traditional media especially the television commercial the most efficient marketing tool for selling and presenting their goods.

But in many place of the world the commercials because it is seen harmful while presenting the goods so it is needed to be subjected in arrangements .Furthermore the increasing commercial mess made difficulties for companies to reach their target market (Godin ,2001:21). The companies who are prohibited to make commercial in some sectors , to present their goods they started to find out new adventures and brand image starting doing sponsorship agreement (Haris ,2005:488).

Meenaghan (1983) defines the sponsorship as a provision of public relief or financial support or in two ways by a commercial organization in order to realize the commercial objectives. Gardner and Shuman (1987) also define the sponsorship as an investment in an event to support the company targets. Cornwell *et al.* (2000) states that the sponsorship involves a source exchange between two parties. Rifon *et al.* (2004) describes the sponsorship as affecting the consumers by constructing a connections between a company (or an investor) and an event or a non-operating entity. Rifon *et al.* (2004) describes the sponsorship as affecting the consumers by constructing a connections between a company (or an investor) and an event or a

non-operating entity.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the effects of sponsorship on trademarks and sponsored events and to contribute into the current data and literature on the subject. Moreover;

- Measuring the image transfer in three levels, (Brand Image Transfer, the image transfer to realize among brands under the same concept. Event Image Transfer, the image transfer from the event to the sponsored brands. Brands Image Protection, the situation of protecting the brands without changing their images.)

It is targeted to investigate;

- The effects of efficiency and the perception of brands in a group form on image transfer,
- The effect of the harmony between brands and the event on image transfer.

SPONSORSHIP AND BRAND IMAGE

The brand image involves the perceptions on consumers about a brand name, reflected by the help of those characteristics of a brand kept in the minds of consumers (Keller, 1993). According to Keller, a positive brand image is only provided if there is a strong connection between the distinguishing and preferable associations in the minds of consumers. There are many reasons why the companies make such sponsorship agreements. The most important ones of these reasons are to increase the awareness of the brand and to change the brand image. (Gwinner, 1997).

According to Javalgi *et al.* (1994), the companies may share the image of the event by connecting the title of the event with themselves and by being a sponsor to such events. Furthermore, the main objective of companies to make sponsorship contracts is to provide a positive perception of brands' images and to provide affirmative consumer attitudes. If the target population is much interested in the event and if the event satisfies the audience on increasing levels; then, the positive effects of the sponsorship will also increase. (Harvey, 2001). Javalgi *et al.* (1994) reaches some conclusions in this sponsorship and company image investigations. These conclusions will be of use to correct the company image by sponsorship operations if it has a negative image. By the effect of brand image, consumers will remind the brand information without any help during their purchases.

The Group Effect on Brand Image Transfer

The multiple sponsorship agreements impact the communication process are discussed. In the multiple sponsorship agreements, more than one company may sponsor to an event or person. This study therefore investigated the effect in the communication group. The group; the integrity relation between the members and which are accepted as members of the group's assets and conscious group of icons, which is relative, and the continuity of a collection of individuals. (Koçel, 1999)

The humans perception the groups as an unified whole or a presence. The "Entitativity" named like a pure presence, is defined as a whole. (Ip vd.,2005). So

resist on that thing, a brand group and an event that is sponsored can be perception pure, homogen presence. (Brewer and Harasty,1996). Being created in a homogeneous group and the degree of purity, how the group will get information about the characteristics of a group member and each member of a group determines how they affect (Crawford vd., 2002). In the sponsor activity, the similarities between the sponsor and the event that has been sponsored is the brand that has been sponsored is more important for the consumer because of supporting the mind to remember. (Rifon vd., 2004)

METHODOLOGY

Sample description

A Total of 235 questionnaires were distributed in this study, 210 effective questionnaires were collected, and the effective return rate was 89% . Among the collected questionnaires, male subjects (54.77 %) accounted for most of the population than female subjects (45.23 %). The educational levels of participants of the fair are that 2.4 % of the participants had graduated from high school and 77.6 % of respondents had s bachelor's degree and 20 % of them had a master degree or higher. The occupation of the participants is that 24.7 % of respondents are bankers and 21.9 % of them are managers; 3.3% of them are insurers; 13.8 % of them are researchers; 15.7 % of them are students; 11.9% of them are consultants and finally 8.7 % of respondents are marketers.

Data collection procedure

This study is made in Cardist Fair and 6700 participants are involved. After the registry of participants for learning their brand image perceptions before the fair starts, the leaflets with the photos, logos and catch phrases of brands sponsored in the fair collected from websites, messages and titles, they are asked to define the images of “sincerity”, “excitement” and “sophisticated” before the multiple sponsorship events in the fair. The brands and image perceptions of the fair are defined in percentages.

After the fair, the same persons are asked to answer a questionnaire in other to compare them with pre-fair perceptions, to learn their brand perceptions on condition that they will stay in the fair at least for two hours. After the fair, Friedman test is applied among dependent groups in order to define the image perceptions of brands and event. A formulation is used to harmonize the pre-fair and post-fair data as they have different characteristics. For the dependency analysis among categorical variables, multiple tables with two variables are taken and Qi-Square test is applied. Multiple tables are formed in order to define the changes in image perceptions of the companies before and after the fair. T-test is used to test the rate of two independent groups when comparing the image transfer rates before and after the fair.

6 brands (Hurriyet, Cnbc-e, Visa, Master Card,Banksoft, BKM) sponsored the event. One sample T-test is applied to define the concept of each brand and the fair for showing the effect of the correspondence. The fair concept is defined as “informatics”. Participants perceived the 4 brands have informatics concept (Visa, MasterCard, Banksoft, BKM) and other two has the “no informatics concept” (Hurriyet newspaper, Cnbc-e). 3 brands (Chanel D, is bankasi, Sabah newspaper) did not sponsor the event but these brands included in the research to measure group effect on image transfer.

Hypotheses Development

The multiple sponsorship agreements impact the communication process are discussed. In the multiple sponsorship agreements, more than one company may sponsor to an event or a person. The group; the integrity relation between the members and which are accepted as members of the group's assets and conscious group of icons, which is relative, and the continuity of a collection of individuals.

The hypotheses developed in this context are as follows:

H₁: In the multiple sponsorship activity, when the brands being a sponsor to an event ,

these brands and events seen as a single group,

H₂: Brand image transfer in multiple sponsorship will be realized more successfully among the brands with different concepts from the event than the ones with the same concept,

H₃: The brand image transfer among the brands with the same concept will be realized more successfully than the brand image protection,

H₄: Multiple sponsorship, the sponsor took place between the non-brands Brand image protection status, the activity of different concepts (not computing) compared to brands with a sponsor, will be more successful,

H₅:In multiple sponsorship, event image transfer will be realized more successfully among the brands with the same concept in the event than the brand image transfer,

H₆: In multiple sponsorship, the Brand Image Protection will be realized more successfully among the brands with different concepts from the event than the ones with the same concept in the event.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Group perception of the participants

Value	n	min	m	max	mean	Std. Dev.
Group Perception	210	1	6	7	4.952	2.144

The t-test results of group perception of the participants is shown in Table 1. Run out of 4 evaluated the level of detection as a group, non-parametric test is applied (custom = 4) fair and brands sponsoring entity, was perceived as a group. ($z = -114.371$, $p < 0.001$). Participants in the study in the form of a group of brands, which sponsored the fair and exhibition, conceived as an entity. Therefore H_1 is supported.

Table 2. The comparison of image transfers of the group with the same concept and the one with the different concept from the event

BRAND IMAGE TRANSFER	BRAND IMAGE TRANSFER	t	P
Visa: Sophisticated –Exciting (60,9%)	Cnbc-e: Exciting –Sincerity (78,3%)	-3,157	<0,001

The t-test results of comparison of image transfer is shown in Table 2. Brand image transfer was found to be $t = -3,157$, $p < 0.001$, indicating statistical significance. The results show that 60.9% of the ones who perceived the VisaCard brand as “sophisticated” before the fair have perceived it as “exciting” after the fair. 78.3% of the ones who perceived the Cnbc-e brand as “exciting” before the fair have perceived it as “sincere” after the fair. The brand image transfers among the brands with different concept from the event are realized more successfully than the ones with the same concept. Therefore H_2 is supported.

Table 3. The comparison of brand image transfer and image protection among the brands with the same concept in the event

BRAND IMAGE PROTECTION	BRAND IMAGE TRANSFER	t	p
MasterCard: Exciting - Exciting (64,9 %)	Visa: Sophisticated - Exciting (60,9 %)	0,745	0,457

The t-test results of the comparison of brand image transfer and brand image protection are shown in Table 2. The results obtained with regard to comparison of brand image transfer and brand image protection among the brands with the same concept in the event were $t = 0,745$, $p = 0,457$, showing no statistical significance. The results show that 64.9% of the ones who found the image of MasterCard as “exciting” before the fair are again found the brand image as “exciting” after the fair. 60.9% of the ones who perceived the VisaCard brand as “sophisticated” before the fair have perceived it as “exciting” after the fair. As a result of the analysis conducted, no meaningful difference is observed when brand image transfer and brand image protection situations among the brands with the same concept are compared. Therefore H_3 is not supported.

Table 4. The comparison of image protection of the group with non-sponsor brands and the one with the different concept from the event.

BRAND IMAGE PROTECTION	BRAND IMAGE PROTECTION	T	p
Hurriyet: Exciting - Exciting (59,8%)	Kanal D: Sincerity- Sincerity (60,2%)	-0,87	0,931
Hurriyet: Exciting - Exciting (59,8%)	Sabah: Sincerity- Sincerity (46,5%)	2,536	<0,001
Hurriyet: Exciting - Exciting (59,8%)	Is Bank: Sincerity- Sincerity (%60,4)	0,835	0,918

The t-test results of comparison of image protection is shown in Table 4. 59,8% of the ones who perceived the Hurriyet brand as “exciting” before the fair have perceived it as “exciting” after the fair. 60.2 % of the ones who perceived the Chanel D as “sincerity” before the fair have perceived it as “sincerity” after the fair. Also 60.4 % of the ones who perceived Is Bank as “sincerity” before the fair have perceived it as “sincerity” after the fair. The results obtained with regard to comparison of brand image protection among the brands with the different image concept from the event and non-sponsor brands were for Chanel D; $t = -0.87$, $p = 0.931$, for Is Bank $t = 0.835$, $p = 0.918$ showing no statistical significance. Comparison of brand image protection between Hurriyet and Sabah was found to be $t = 2.536$, $p < 0.001$, indicating statistical significance. 46.5 % the ones who perceived Sabah as “sincerity” before the fair have perceived it as “sincerity” after the fair. Therefore H_4 is not supported.

Table 5. The comparison of brand image transfer and event image transfer among the brands with the same concept in the event

BRAND IMAGE TRANSFER	EVENT IMAGE TRANSFER	T	P
Visa: Sophisticated - Exciting (60,9%)	Banksoft: Exciting - Sophisticated (86,1%)	-13,316	<0,001
Visa: Sophisticated - Exciting (60,9%)	BKM: Exciting – Sophisticated (84,1%)	-12,025	<0,001

The t-test results of comparison of image transfer is shown in Table 5. Brand image transfer was found to be $t=-13,316$, $p<0,001$, $t=-12,025$, $p<0,001$, indicating statistical significance. The results show that 60.9% of the ones who perceived the VisaCard brand as “sophisticated” before the fair have perceived it as “exciting” after the fair. 86,1 % of the ones who perceived the Banksoft brand as “exciting” before the fair have perceived it as “sophisticated” after the fair. 84,1 % of the ones who perceived the BKM brand as “exciting” before the fair have perceived it as “sophisticated” after the fair. The event image transfer among the brands with same concept with the event are realized more successfully than The brand image transfers among the brands with same concept with the event. Therefore H_5 is supported.

Table 6. The comparison of image protection of the group with the same concept and the one with the different concept from the event.

BRAND IMAGE PROTECTION	BRAND IMAGE PROTECTION	T	p
MasterCard: Exciting - Exciting (64,9%)	Hurriyet: Exciting - Exciting (59,8%)	0,961	0,337

The t-test results of comparison of image protection is shown in Table 6. 64.9% of the ones who found the image of MasterCard as “exciting” before the fair are again found the brand image as “exciting” after the fair. 59,8% of the ones who perceived the Hurriyet brand as “exciting” before the fair have perceived it as “exciting” after the fair. As a result of the analysis conducted ($t=0,961$, $p=0,337$), no meaningful difference is observed when Brand Image Protection situations among the brands with the same concept and different concept from the event are compared. Therefore H_6 is not supported.

CONCLUSION

In the end of the study, it is concluded that there is an image transfer among the brands sponsored in the event (among the brands with the same concept and among the ones with different concept). Although the fair and brands are perceived as an entity and seen as a group form by consumers, image transfer is only made to the brands with the same concept with the event.

Brand image transfer is only made among the brands with different concept from the event. However, in image transfer among the brands, brand image transfer as the brands with different concept from the event are not affected from the image of the event is realized more successfully than the brand group with the same concept in the event. The event image transfer among the brands with the same concepts in the event is more successful than the brand image transfer. Image transfer is realized from the event to BKM and Banksoft brands, the main sponsors of the event. According to this study, if the companies to realize a fair sponsorship would like to make an image transfer from the event they sponsor, they need to have the same concept with the event.

References

- Cornwell, T., Bettina (2008). State of the art and the science in sponsorship-linked marketing. *Journal of Advertising*, 37(3), 41-55
- Crawford, Matthew T., Steven J. Sherman, and David L. Hamilton (2002), Perceived Entitativity, Stereotype Formation, and the Interchangeability of Group Members, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83 (5)
- Gardner, Merly, P., Shuman, Joel, P. (1987). Sponsorship: an Important Component of the Promotion Mix, *Journal of Advertising*, 16, 11-17
- Godin, Seth (2001). *Permission Marketing*. (Çeviren: Murat Ermert). İstanbul: Rota.
- Gwinner, Kevin (1997), A model of Image Creation and Image Transfer in Event Sponsorship, *International Marketing Review*, 14 (2/3): 145-158
- Haris, Rebecca (2005). When giving means taking: Public Relations, Sponsorship and Morally Marginal Donors. *Public Relations Review* (31)
- Harvey, Bill (2001). Measuring the Effects of Sponsorships. *Journal of Advertising Research*, Jan-Feb, (1)
- Ip, G.W., Chiu, C, Wan, C. (2005) Birds of feather and birds flocking together: Physical versus behavioral cues may lead to trait-versus goal-based group perception, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, (3)
- Javalgi, Geoffrey, R., Traylor, M.B., Gross, A.C., Lampman, E. (1994). Awareness of sponsorship and corporate image: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Advertising*, 23(4), 47-58.
- Keller, Kevin L. (1993) Conceptualizing, Measuring and Managing Customer Based Brand Equity, *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22
- Keller, L. Kevin, Heckler, Susan, Houston, Michael J., (1998), "The Effects of Brand Name Suggestiveness on Advertising Recall", *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (1), 48-57.
- Koçel, Tamer (1999). *İşletme Yöneticiliği*. (7. Baskı) İstanbul: Beta Yayınları
- Meenaghan, Tony (1983). *Commercial Sponsorship*, European journal of Tekin,
- Meenaghan, Tony (1991). Sponsorship- Legitimizing the medium. *European Journal of Marketing*, 25, 11,5-10
- Rifon, Nora J., Sejung Marina Choi, Carrie S. Trimblen ve Hairong Li (2004), "Congruence Effects in Sponsorship: The Mediating Role of Sponsor Credibility and Consumer Attribution of Sponsor Motive", *Journal of Advertising*, 33 (1): 29-42
- Rifon, Nora J., Sejung Marina Choi, Carrie S. Trimblen ve Hairong Li (2004), "Congruence Effects in Sponsorship: The Mediating Role of Sponsor Credibility and Consumer Attribution of Sponsor Motive", *Journal of Advertising*, 33 (1)
- Tekin, Mahmut (2009) Küresel rekabet ortamında Teknolojik İşbirliği ve otomotiv sektörü uygulamaları, Konya: Selçuk University

