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Abstract

The purpose of this research was: a. to explore whether jersey sponsorship in the National Basketball Association (NBA) was an effective medium for sponsors; and b. to examine further the effectiveness of NBA jersey sponsorship in relation to game quality (i.e., the performance of the game). To understand the effectiveness an experimental design was implemented. Participants were randomly assigned into three groups depending on game quality: the close game group, the blowout game group, and the control group. A survey that included four factors of sponsorship effectiveness – sponsor recognition, sponsor image, attitudes, and purchase intention toward a sponsor brand – was administrated before and after watching the fourth quarter of an NBA game. Results suggested that the interaction between game exposure and game quality existed for jersey sponsor recognition. However, the interactions between game exposure and game quality were not significant for jersey sponsor image change, attitudes, and purchase intention toward the sponsor. The findings have provided information for sports practitioners when can be an ideal situation for applying jersey sponsorship for their brand and has also contributed theoretically on how sport consumers' cognitive and emotional capacities can be affected in certain game situations. Future research is recommended to apply different mediating, moderating, or dependent variables that will enable to understand more diversified results.
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1. Introduction

Sponsorship a process in which a mutual benefit has been created and money or in-kind traits exchanged between the sponsor and the partners including events or organizations [1] has now become a prominent marketing strategy. Many empirical studies have proved that sponsorship is an effective marketing strategy [2][3] to increase sponsor brand recognition [4], positive images and attitudes for both the sponsor and the sponsored events and organizations [5][6][7] and a crucial income stream for the sponsored entities [8]. For instance, Irwin and Asimakopoulos [9] suggested that sponsors anticipated drawing more positive images from sports sponsorship due to the strong psychological connection between a sports team and its fans. Loyal fans tended to have favourable images or attitudes towards the team that could be transferred onto the sponsor's brand or products. From the anticipated benefits of sports sponsorship, multiple sponsorship practices have been applied in the sports
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business field in which sports managers consider which sponsorships could prove highly effective.

Jersey sponsorship (a.k.a., shirt sponsorship) is a sports sponsorship strategy in which the sponsor's brand logo appears on the jersey or game uniform of the sponsored team. It is currently one of the prominent sponsorship strategies in the European sports business field [10], where major European soccer teams such as Manchester United (England), FC Barcelona (Spain), AC Milan (Italy), and Bayern Munich (Germany) signed massive and lucrative jersey sponsorship contracts with multinational companies and nonprofit organizations and, in return, sponsor companies obtained publicity. For example, starting from the 2017-2018 season, FC Barcelona and Rakuten (a Japanese online firm) agreed to a jersey sponsorship deal worth £47 million ($58 million) a year, which at the time was the most expensive jersey sponsorship deal ever negotiated. However, in contrast to Europe, jersey sponsorship is not a common practice in the North America professional sports leagues. Only a few American professional sports leagues such as Major League Soccer (MLS) or the Women’s National Basketball League (WNBA) utilize this method, in part due to their low financial stability. Among the four major sports leagues in North America, the National Basketball Association (NBA) was the first league to precede with jersey sponsorship contracts with corporations through labeling brand logos on the top left corner of uniforms [11].

Empirical evidence related to jersey sponsorship in European sports leagues has discovered that jersey sponsorship is an effective marketing strategy for both the professional sports team and the sponsor [12][13][14]. However, this marketing strategy was uncommon and rather new to the North American professional sports leagues. Therefore, little is known about the effectiveness of jersey sponsorship in the NBA market. The main question was whether jersey sponsorship in the NBA is as effective as in European leagues where the culture and traditions differ and whether sports consumers in the NBA should have a similar or different response to the strategy. Moreover, past literature lacked empirical evidence for how sports consumers respond to jersey sponsorship in relation to the quality of the game (i.e., the outcome and/or performance of the game).

Therefore, the purposes of the current study were:

a. To explore whether jersey sponsorship in the NBA is an effective medium for sponsors in terms of sponsor brand recognition, sponsor brand image change, attitudes and purchase intention toward the jersey sponsor and its brand; and

b. To further examine how the effectiveness of NBA jersey sponsorship is influenced by game quality (i.e., the outcome and/or performance of the game).

2. Literature review

The literature review has examined the conceptual understandings of jersey sponsorship and has identified how we will define game quality in the context of our study. Additionally, we have reviewed sports sponsorship effectiveness factors—sponsor recognition, sponsor image, sponsor attitude, purchase intention—utilized to measure and determine the effectiveness of the jersey sponsor. Finally, we provided how fan involvement covariates in the sponsorship effectiveness in the following section.
2.1. Jersey sponsorship

Sport sponsorship, including title sponsorship and event/team sponsorship, has been extensively examined in the marketing literature. In general, sports sponsorship had a positive effect on fans, organizations, and events [15][16]. For example, it increased recognition of sponsor [17][18] and sponsored event [19][20]; enhanced the image of a sponsor [21][22] and the event entity [23]; positively changed attitudes toward the sponsor [24] and the event [25]; and increased purchase intention of sponsors' products [26] and to intention to attend the event.

While jersey sponsorship is a common marketing strategy in the European soccer leagues, Major League Soccer (MSL), and other leagues to secure additional income, the NBA, in 2017, was the first major professional sports league in North America to permit teams to add a label for their sponsor's logo to the top-left corner of the jersey. For instance, the Los Angeles Lakers signed a three-year, $14 million per year contract with 'Wish,' an e-commerce company, for labeling their logo on Lakers uniforms [27]. Thus, it was a relatively new sponsorship approach for the sports consumers and organizations in the NBA and it remained questionable for researchers whether jersey sponsorship in the NBA would demonstrate similar effectiveness to the sponsors and the sponsored entity compared to European soccer leagues and MLS.

Previous research on jersey sponsorship showed that jersey sponsorship increased sponsor recall and recognition [28]; positively changed an attitude [29] and psychological connection toward a sponsor [30]; and increased sponsor brand equity [31]. However, regarding the purchase intention to sponsor's products and services, the research findings provided mixed results. According to Jensen et al. [31], sports consumers in MLS did not strongly express their willingness to purchase the products of the sponsor while demonstrating a positive attitude toward the jersey sponsor. In addition, sports consumers in the Bundesliga (a German Soccer League) showed a positive attitude toward the rival team's jersey sponsor rather than to the team they supported with different attributions [32]. As such, no agreement on whether jersey sponsorship is an effective marketing practice for sports organizations and whether jersey sponsorship in the NBA would benefit the league and teams has been reached as fans in the U.S. have shown historical resistance toward commercial interference with team brands and toward sponsors' brands on uniforms or apparel.

2.2. Game quality

The authors classified game quality into four categories: a. extremely close game; b. rather close game; c. comfortable win; and d. a blowout game [33]. Specifically, a difference in score between zero to four was classified as an extremely close game, between five to nine was a rather close game, between ten to fourteen was considered a comfortable win, and fifteen points or more was a blowout game. Game quality was highly influenced by the suspense of the game (i.e., uncertainty about a game's outcome), arguing that the curiosity and unreliability of outcome increased excitement and enjoyment and lowered the boredom of consumers. That is, as uncertainty increased, suspense or closeness of the game increased, and game quality significantly affected consumers' psychological responses such as fan satisfaction [34][35], game consumption experience [36][37], game attendance [38] and TV ratings [39].

However, previous game quality literature mainly focused on the effect of game quality on media and game consumption outcomes [40]. In addition, even though game quality affected psychological responses, sports sponsorship literature lacked consideration of game quality,
the jersey sponsorship context in particular. From this perspective, the authors expected that game quality could affect consumers' cognitive and affective behaviors and therefore decided to adopt two extreme categories—extremely close games and blowout games—to examine the relationship between game quality and other sponsorship effectiveness variables.

2.3. Sports sponsorship effectiveness

Sponsorship is one of the effective marketing methods and its effectiveness has been assessed mainly using four factors [41][42][43][44][45]: sponsor recognition, sponsor image, sponsor attitude, and purchase intention.

2.3.1. Sponsor recognition

Sponsor recognition is one of the most frequently utilized factor in sport sponsorship effectiveness research [46][47][48][49]. Sponsor recognition (i.e., unaided sponsor awareness) is a process where the consumer can distinguish and understand the sponsor-related product and brand (logo) before a consumer encounters a sponsor-related activity (or cue). It has been used to evaluate sponsorship effectiveness not only in major sports events such as the World Cup [50] or the Olympics [51] but in minor sports events and professional sports leagues games as well. For instance, Alexandris et al. [52] and Maricic et al. [53] measured for sponsor recognition to assess sponsorship effectiveness in minor sport and leisure events and reported that sponsor recognition was significantly increased after an event, implying that sponsorship effectively worked in psychological and cognitive terms.

However, the previous literature mainly considered a consumer’s sponsor recognition after the exposure of the sponsor, which lacked consideration of any mediating or intervening factors such as the role of the quality of the game on consumer responses toward the sponsor. Considering that the quality of the game is influenced by the game experience, enjoyment, and excitement, in particular, the authors believed that consumers who watched an extremely close game had a higher level of excitement and enjoyment which, in turn, led to a more in-depth interpretation of a consumer’s sponsor recognition in a jersey sponsorship setting. Thus, the authors hypothesized that the exposure of the sponsor and game quality would interact and affect a consumer’s sponsor recognition.

2.3.2. Sponsor image

Sponsor image is described as the memories associated with the sponsor [54]. To be specific, this definition stressed the consumer's memory toward the association of the sponsor, known as the features of the sponsor's product or service, pricing, packaging, marketing strategies, and so on. Examination of change in sponsor image was a common evaluation measure to assess the effectiveness of sports sponsorship in previous research [55][56][57]. Especially, through the systematic meta-analytic review, [58] emphasized the role of sponsor image as a cognitive outcome to assess sponsorship effectiveness and explained that it was a widely discussed factor in the sponsorship literature. In general, consumers tended to create a positive and favourable schematic link between a sponsored entity and a sponsor and after multiple exposures to the sponsor at sporting events, anticipated the memory of the consumer's image towards the entity positively and favourably transferred it to the sponsor [59]. Thus, both sponsor [60][61] sponsoring entity, event, or organization [62] could obtain benefits and increase brand equity [63] through sponsorship activity.
However, it is still debatable whether the results could be applicable for jersey sponsorship depending on the quality of the game, that is, elaborating that game quality could moderate the creation of the consumer’s image towards the sponsor. Past literature related to game quality identified that the high suspense of a game affected consumer perceptions [64].

2.3.3. Sponsor attitude and purchase intention

In the sport sponsorship literature, sponsor attitude (i.e., a positive or negative emotion in the overall evaluation of the sponsor) and consumer's purchase intention toward the sponsor brand's products (i.e., the probability or likelihood of purchasing a sponsor-related product or service) has been used as key factors to assess sponsorship effectiveness [65][66][67]. For example, Pappu and Cornwell [68] suggested the consumers maintained a more positive attitude toward the sponsor and event or organization [69] and increased intentions to attend the event [70] and purchase the sponsor's goods and services [71][72].

Interestingly, in the jersey sponsorship context, sports consumers tended to have a favourable attitude toward the jersey sponsor but that did not develop further to purchase the products of the jersey sponsor [73]. That is, sports consumers would not bother with the jersey sponsor as long as it commercially supported their team and did not have strong opinions or preferences on the presence of jersey sponsorship. As a result, it would not affect consumer behaviour, in particular purchase intention. Because sponsorship is a complicated process in which sports consumers, organizations, events, and sponsors must operate together for their stakeholders [74], jersey sponsorship would be no exception.

From this perspective, the authors believed that game quality could magnify the attitude change towards the sponsor and the intention of purchasing sponsor-related products or services in the context of jersey sponsorship. Although evaluation of sponsorship effectiveness has been widely discussed in the previous empirical literature, little is known about how the sponsor attitude and purchase intention would be influenced by the game quality and game exposure.

2.3.4. Covariate: Fan involvement

Meenaghan [75] described fan involvement as the extent to which the consumer identified with or is motivated by certain sports activities. It consisted of three dimensions: attractiveness, centricity, and self-expression [76]. The interest and satisfaction of an individual led to positive attractiveness [77] which, in turn, shifted to actual activity, increasing fan involvement [78]. High involvement increased team-related media consumption, actual game/event attendance, team-related merchandise purchase, and an individual becoming highly knowledgeable about their favoured team [79].

Previous literature considered fan involvement as an important antecedent to positive marketing outcomes or benefits [80][81][82]. According to Schlesinger and Güngerich [83], fan involvement positively influenced attitude towards the team sponsor and strongly correlated with purchase intention. In line with this research, Biscia et al. [84] also discovered the relationship between fan involvement and sponsor attitude and purchase intention. The studies suggested that fan involvement had a significant effect on both attitude and purchase intention.

Due to the fans’ desire to achieve strong affiliation, consumers who had high involvement towards a team were unlikely to be viewed as subjects who have objective emotions towards the teams with which they are highly involved. The absence of restricting subjects who were highly involved with a team could influence other consumer responses more subjectively. For
instance, an individual who expressed a higher fan involvement with a specific sports team could be more tolerant and biased in understanding a team's negative circumstances. From this perspective, the authors believed that fan involvement was an important covariate in the study. Thus, for a more precise and accurate result for sponsorship effectiveness, fan involvement towards the team needed to be controlled [85].

Based on the literature review the authors have hypothesized four hypotheses for this study which were,

**H1.** The interaction between sponsor exposure and game quality will significantly affect sponsor recognition. More specifically, the consumer's jersey sponsor recognition will more positive change after watching a professional sports game in the close-game group than in the blowout game group.

**H2.** The interaction between sponsor exposure and game quality will significantly affect sponsor image. More specifically, the consumer's jersey sponsor image will more positive change after watching a professional sports game in the close-game group than in the blowout game group.

**H3.** The interaction between sponsor exposure and game quality will significantly affect consumer attitudes toward the sponsor. More specifically, the consumer's jersey sponsor attitude will more positive change after watching a professional sports game in the close-game group than in the blowout game group.

**H4.** The interaction between sponsor exposure and game quality will significantly affect purchase intention to the sponsor's products. More specifically, the consumer's purchase intention of the jersey sponsor will be higher after watching a professional sports game in the close-game group than in the blowout game group.

### 3. Materials and methods

In this chapter, we have addressed the research design and participants, the procedure of the experiment, measurement tools, and data analysis. This chapter has specific information on the demographics of the participants, research procedure, survey items and questions, and what data analytical tool was used for the study.

#### 3.1. Research design and participants

To assess the effectiveness of jersey sponsorship, a 2 (game exposure: pre- vs. post-game) x 3 (game quality: close game vs. blowout vs. control) within-between subject design was implemented. The estimated sample size required for Repeated Measures Analysis of Covariance (RMANCOVA) was 80 after running a power analysis in G*Power with a power of .95, an alpha level of .05; medium effect size \( (f=0.45) \); and one covariate [86]. A total of 96 data were collected from college students attending a mid-size university in northern Ohio and no exclusions were made. The demographic information was: gender (male: female = 6:4), age (21-25: 54%), and ethnicity (Caucasian: 52%, Asian/Pacific Islander: 34%). The participants were randomly assigned to experimental groups (close-game and blowout game groups) and a control group.

#### 3.2. Procedure

Treatment was game quality (the performance of the game): extremely close game and blowout game. Consequently, the close game group (n = 34) watched a game where the score
difference remained extremely close, less than 3 points difference, the blowout game group ($n = 30$) watched a one-sided game where the game score difference was 15 points or more throughout the last quarter of the game, and the control group ($n=32$) did not watch any particular game. The basketball game was selected from the 2018-19 NBA season and presented to the participants in the experimental setting. To reduce preexisting knowledge and bias towards the team, the authors selected the Sacramento Kings based on the preliminary examination of the geographical and psychological links of the participants. NBA teams in the Western Conference were screened in the extent to fan involvement and the team with the lowest fan involvement, the Kings, was chosen. Also, the Kings were geographically distant from the closest regional NBA team (i.e., the Cleveland Cavaliers).

The games that research participants watched were edited for experimental purposes. The authors tailored the video to only show the participants the fourth quarter of the game and excluded the commercial breaks to avoid any interference from other advertising and sponsorship elements. The total length of the video was approximately 15 minutes. Before the experiment, all of the participants were asked to fill out a survey that included information regarding their demographic information and fan involvement related to basketball and toward the Kings along with the sponsor's recognition, image, attitude, and purchase intention. After confirming the completion of the pre-test survey, the close-game group watched an NBA game in which the Kings faced the Oklahoma City Thunder and won 119 to 116 on February 23, 2019. On the other hand, the blowout game group watched a game in which the Kings beat the San Antonio Spurs 127 to 112 on February 4, 2019. After watching the game, a post-test survey was distributed to the participants that were identical to the pre-test survey to determine whether there were any significant changes before and after the treatment. The control group was asked to fill out the post-test survey approximately 15 minutes after they completed the pre-test survey.

3.3. Measurement

To measure the sponsor's recognition and whether the consumer can recognize the sponsor related product or logo, we adopted questions from Degaris et al. [87] for whether the participant could name the jersey sponsor of [the team] or recognize the jersey sponsor of [the team] due to the game. A higher number indicated that the participants were more likely to recognize the jersey sponsor whereas the lower number meant the participants were less likely to recognize the jersey sponsor. To assess memories towards sponsor association, the authors adopted five items of the sponsor image scale from Javalgi et al. [88] and asked questions such as ‘whether the sponsor company seems well managed,’ including a reverse question (e.g., [The sponsor company] only wants to make money.). A lower score implied consumers tended to have a less favourable image towards the sponsor company. To evaluate the sponsor's attitude and purchase intentions towards the sponsor's product or merchandise, four and three items respectively were adopted from Dees et al. [89]. To measure attitude toward the sponsor, four items such as ‘I think favourably of [the company] that sponsors this event and [the company] that sponsors this event is successful.’ were adopted. If the consumer specified a higher value, this indicated that the consumer had a more positive overall evaluation towards the sponsor, whereas a lower value indicated a more negative emotion towards the sponsor. For purchase intention, participants answered whether the individual had the intention of purchasing products and merchandise that the sponsor offered (e.g., ‘I would consider purchasing products/services from the [sponsor company] of this event.’). Consumers who expressed a higher purchase intention value towards the sponsor
indicated a higher chance to purchase the sponsor’s products. The survey questions were on a 7-point scale, with 1 indicating ‘Strongly Disagree’ and 7 indicating ‘Strongly Agree.’ A summary of the measurement items is shown in [Table 1].

Table 1. Summary of measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Research Construct</th>
<th>Measurement Item</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degaris et al.,</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>I can name the jersey sponsor of [the sports team]</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2017)</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>I can generally aware of which company is the jersey of the sponsor of [the sport team]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javalgi et al.,</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>[The sponsor company] has good products and services.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1994)</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>[The sponsor company] is well managed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The sponsor company] only want to make money(reverse question).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The sponsor company] is involved in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The sponsor company] response to consumer needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The sponsor company] is a good company to work for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dees et al.</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>I think favourably of [the company] that sponsors this event.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>[The company] that sponsor this event is successful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The company] that sponsor this event provides quality products/services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The company] that sponsors this event is professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dees et al.</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>I would consider purchasing products/services from the [sponsor company] of this event.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td>Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Data analysis

Repeated Measures Analysis of Covariance (RM ANCOVA) was performed by utilizing SPSS version 25 to discover the differences within (game exposure: pre- vs. post-) and between (game quality: close game vs. blowout game vs. control) subjects. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were conducted to determine whether there were any outliers, leverage points, or missing data. Additionally, Cronbach's alpha was analyzed and provided in Table 1. For the reverse question, we have reverse-scored in the scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) and sub-items of variables were averaged and used for data analyses.

4. Results

This chapter has presented statistical findings from the experiment. Evidence has shown that the interaction between game exposure and game quality existed for jersey sponsor recognition. Nevertheless, the interaction effect between game exposure and game quality was not significant for jersey sponsor image change, attitudes, and purchase intention toward the sponsor.

4.1. Test of H1: Jersey sponsor recognition

The results of the analysis showed that the interaction between game quality (close vs. blowout vs. control) and game exposure (pre- vs. post-test) was statistically significant for sponsor recognition while controlling for fan involvement, $F(2, 185) = 63.71, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .26$. It indicated that the combination of game quality and game exposure contributed to enhancing sponsor recognition. More precisely, the consumer's jersey sponsor recognition more positively changed after watching a professional sports game in the close-game group than in the blowout game group.
4.2. Test of H2: Jersey sponsor image change

We hypothesized that there is an interaction effect between game exposure (pre- vs. post-test) and game quality (close vs. blowout vs. control) on fans’ brand perception toward a jersey sponsor after controlling for fan involvement. The result indicated that there was no interaction between game quality and game exposure while controlling for fan involvement, $F(2, 185) = .43, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .005$. Rather, the results showed the image toward a jersey sponsor positively changed after the exposure of the sponsor, $F(1, 185) = 7.27, p < .05$; however, the difference between the close game and the blowout game groups on sponsor image did not exist, $F(2, 185) = 1.25, p > .05$. In sum, regardless of game quality, the sponsor image changed positively after watching a game.

4.3. Test of H3: An Attitude toward a Jersey Sponsor

In H3, we examined an interaction effect between game exposure (pre- vs. post-test) and game quality (close vs. blowout vs. control) on attitude toward a jersey sponsor after controlling for fan involvement. There was no interaction between game quality and game exposure for consumer attitude toward the jersey sponsor while controlling for fan involvement, $F(2, 185) = 2.63, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .028$. However, there was a statistically significant difference between before and after watching the game and exposing the sponsor, indicating that fans’ attitude toward a jersey sponsor positively changed, $F(1, 185) = 9.62, p < .05$. On the other hand, no difference existed between the close and blowout game groups on an attitude toward the jersey sponsor, $F(2, 185) = 1.49, p > .05$ suggesting that game quality showed no significant effect on attitude towards the jersey sponsor.

4.4. Test of H4: Purchase intention towards a jersey sponsor

The interaction between game quality (close vs. blowout vs. control) and game exposure (pre- vs. post-test) was not statistically significant for purchase intention, while controlling for fan involvement, $F(2, 185) = .64, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .007$. The results, indeed, showed no statistically significant difference between before and after watching the game and exposure to the jersey sponsor, $F(1, 185) = 2.52, p > .05$; however, the difference between the close and the blowout game groups existed, $F(2, 185) = 3.37, p < .05$. More specifically, the participants who watched a close game showed a higher purchase intention for a sponsor’s product than those who watched a blowout game. Table 2 summarized the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Factors</th>
<th>Close-game</th>
<th>Blow-out game</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>RM ANCOVA Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Recognition</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Image</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Attitude</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Discussion

The main purpose of the study was to discover the effectiveness of NBA jersey sponsorship in terms of sponsor recognition, sponsor image, sponsor attitude, and purchase intention toward the sponsor after exposure to the jersey sponsor. The results demonstrated the existence of an interaction effect between sponsor exposure and game quality on sponsor recognition while controlling for fan involvement. However, sponsor image and sponsor attitude positively changed regardless of game quality, and the game quality affected consumers’ purchase intention toward the sponsor’s products and services. From the results, the authors provide multiple theoretical and managerial implications.

5.1. Theoretical implications

Previous research on sponsor recognition, sponsor image, and sponsor attitude showed a significant positive change after the exposure of the sponsor. The results of this study supported the previous empirical literature [90][91][92][93][94]. Although the participants did not attend an actual NBA game, the clear visibility of the sponsor may have instigated their positive responses. Especially, in moments of the game when players shot free throws, the camera was positioned above the player's waist and, therefore, the sponsor logo on the left top corner of the jersey was visible. High sponsor visibility might have derived significant positive cognitive and emotional results.

Contrarily, purchase intention did not significantly increase after the exposure of the sponsor, which was inconsistent with a majority of previous sports sponsorship research [95][96][97]. The main reason might be the lack of fan involvement that research participants possess toward the research object. Meenaghan [98] explained that sports consumers who had a high level of involvement towards a team or an event showed a positive intention to purchase a sponsor's goods or services. Supporting Meenaghan's statement, Tsiotsu and Alexandris [99] also mentioned that fan involvement had a positive correlation with sponsor image and purchase intention. In this study, we have intentionally selected the team that has the lowest fan involvement among the Western Conference teams to avoid any geographical or psychological biases. For this reason, the participants' average fan involvement toward the research object was 1.98 out of 7, which was relatively low compared to the average. The low level of fan involvement could have been a crucial reason why purchase intention did not significantly increase after exposure to the sponsor multiple times.

Moreover, regarding the game quality, previous researchers reported that game quality affected positive marketing outcomes [100][101][102] and game consumption experience [103][104]. Our results showed that the game quality did not interact with game exposure on sponsor image, attitudes, and purchase intention toward the sponsor. One reason why there was no difference in sponsor image and attitude toward the sponsor was because of the duration of sponsor exposure. The participants in the study were only exposed to the sponsorship for the fourth quarter of the game. Considering that creating and managing sponsor brand image and attitudes toward the brand and sponsor is a long-term marketing activity the participants might not have much time to form certain images and attitudes toward the sponsor during one game.

Another reason might be participants' concentration during the game. Maxwell and Lough [105] and Pitts and Slattery [106] found that sports consumers screened out a large amount of the advertisements that they were exposed to during the high suspense of the game. Similarly, Lee and Faber [107] mentioned that gamers were less likely to pay attention to in-game advertisements due to their focus on the game. That is, high concentration on the game may
prevent consumers from paying attention to advertisements in the event. However, this may have caused participants to limit their cognitive and emotional capacity, which led to an insignificant effect on consumer sponsor image and attitudes toward the sponsors.

5.2. Managerial implications

There are multiple managerial implications for practitioners and managers based on the findings of the current study. The results indicated that the interaction of sponsor exposure and game quality contributed to a positive effect on sponsor recognition. That is, the combination of sponsor exposure and game quality enhanced the consumer's cognitive recognition of the sponsor company. Thus, during the regular season when sports practitioners from the company sponsoring the aforementioned teams could anticipate high suspense games such as the Boston Red Sox vs. the New York Yankees (Major League Baseball), Manchester United vs. Manchester City (English Premier League), and the Cleveland Browns vs. the Pittsburgh Steelers (National Football League), they can apply aggressive marketing tactics to enhance the exposure of the sponsor. For example, for those specific games, marketing strategies such as full-screen advertisements, pop-up banners, or additional sponsor exposure that can be viewed by consumers can enhance the recognition of the sponsor, especially in games anticipated to be intense.

The results indicated that sponsor image and attitude positively changed after watching the game. The clear visibility and exposure of the jersey sponsor in games gradually influenced sports consumers to view the overall images of sponsors and to form a favourable attitude toward the sponsor. Thus, sports practitioners who would like to create the company's positive image and attitudes toward the sponsor company could actively promote the games and increase viewership through multiple exposures. Sports practitioners should not only consider the exposure of the sponsor logo through television but other media communication platforms (e.g., social networks) could also be considered to increase the viewership of the sponsor. For instance, practitioners can upload highlights of the game on social media to increase viewership. Especially, including scenes where the jersey sponsor is visible or editing in-game advertisements to add to the video so the logo can be viewed. Pictures and videos posted on social networks can be viewed numerous times with the function to magnify pictures and replay highlights. Increasing multiple communication channels can increase the possibility that consumers will be exposed to the sponsor logo, which can lead to a positive formation of sponsor images and attitudes toward them.

In terms of game quality, the findings determined that participants who watched a close game had a higher purchase intention than those who watched a blowout game. Consumers who watched a blowout game may have limited attention to focus on the jersey sponsor except for the results of the game. Therefore, practitioners need to actively strive to increase the exposure of the sponsor logo in anticipated high suspense games. For instance, for games that are expected to be high suspense and have a close score, sports marketers can vigorously negotiate with broadcast companies to zoom in on the sponsor’s logo during the games or other shots between breaks to strongly persuade consumers to increase their purchase intention. Applying promotions for those specific games can further enhance the intention, which can produce beneficial marketing outcomes. Games that are rivalry games can be anticipated to be close games and, therefore, practitioners should approach them more aggressively and actively.
6. Conclusion

The current study has examined how consumers responded to a jersey sponsorship, a new marketing practice in the North American sports industry. However, some limitations warrant mention. First, the authors endeavoured to prevent bias by selecting a professional basketball team that was geographically remote from the location where research participants lived and that had the lowest fan involvement in another Conference. Although we screened the fan involvement of the research object, the Kings, and have statistically controlled for the fan involvement in the experiment, there might be some potential bias left for opponent teams that the Kings played against. For example, certain perceptions associated with the Kings and/or the Spurs and the Thunder might affect consumers' perceptions, attitudes, and purchase intentions in the study. Thus, in the future study, it would be beneficial to screen these potential biases in terms of participants' pre-existing cognition and affective elements in advance through multiple screening processes including statistics.

Second, the authors edited the video that participants watched to avoid bias related to other sponsors. The authors were aware that in a real-life scenario there would be other sponsors including in-game television advertisements, title sponsors, and others. That is, spectators would be exposed to multiple sponsors and it is theoretically impossible to separate the jersey sponsor from other sponsors of the team, the broadcasting company, and events. For example, during a timeout, the screen presented the brand logo for Mercedes-Benz, the German automobile company, which sponsors the broadcasting company. This may haveworked extraneously and may have confused consumers which could have affected the results. Therefore, in future research, it would be valuable to blur in-game advertisements to avoid distracting the participant's concentration, which will provide more accurate results.

Lastly, the experiment was conducted in a Midwest college with a minimum sample size of participants. Although the authors met the minimum required sample size, to accurately portray consumer behaviour before and after exposure to the game and different game quality, it would be helpful to have enlarged the sample along with random sampling. Future research can be conducted by random sampling in a community where basketball is popular with large sample size and a wide range of diverse participants, which can lead to more significant results.

This study has identified the cognitive and emotional effects of an NBA jersey sponsorship and has demonstrated that it provides positive benefits in return when exposing this marketing tactic to sports consumers. The findings show that after the exposure of the jersey sponsor the recognition, image, and attitude of the jersey sponsor has positively changed before the exposure. The study has also extended the sport sponsorship literature in consideration of understanding the interaction between game quality (i.e., the uncertainty of the game) and the exposure of the sponsor in an experimental setting. Although, only the interaction effect between sponsor recognition and game quality has been identified the results proposed that the consumer's cognitive state can be affected by the uncertainty of the game. Future research can try to understand more about this interaction effect by adding more mediating, moderating, and dependent variables in different experimental settings for diverse results.
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