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Recently, number of companies and brands choose sports sponsorship as a marketing communication tool. In order to strengthen company’s existing brand or company image, companies are using sport sponsorship for positive positioning of their image. Sports sponsorship is one of the most important marketing communication strategies that has increased its influence power in the market therefore it is essential for companies and brands to involve in the sport sponsorship to increase its competitively strong marketing communication effects.
It is learnt from literature reviews that companies and brands need to aggressively review sports sponsorship activities for image strengthening. Sports sponsorship has specialized characters differentiated from ordinary commercials or advertisements and most of companies and brands are involved with sports sponsorships in order to strengthen its brand equity and increase sales revenue.
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I. Introduction

The two fundamental topics of modern sports industry focused on marketing can be Sports Sponsorship and Brand Equity. This paper studies these two topics with their interrelations in terms of cross cultural means. The introduction provides the overview of the paper’s purpose and research questions.

Sponsorships are preferred by increasing number of companies as a communication tool for strengthening the brand awareness as well as brand building. As such, sponsorship plays significantly important role in the marketing communication. The appeal of sponsorship to companies and its benefits, sponsorship is now considered as an important part of nowadays sports industry. The IEG’s Sponsorship report (2011) underlines this development. Accordingly, in 2007 USD 37.9bn 1996 (Cornwell and Maignan, 1998) and for 2011 total expenditures on sponsorships of US48.7bn were projected, displaying a global growth of 5.25% (IEG Report, 2011).

Dolphin (2003) mentioned that sport sponsorship offers the great potential for publicity as well as a tool to enhance corporate identity, brand awareness and brand image in the modern sport industry. Henseler (2011) stresses the importance of brand name awareness and brand loyalty and brand
associations in relation to effective sponsorships underlining the importance of adequate sponsorship evaluation.

1. Research Rationale

    Copeland, Frisby and Mccarville identified the sport sponsorship as an exchange of relationship between sport organizers, corporations and others in between (Copeland, Frisby, and Mccarville, 1996). Continuous rise of corporate spending can be found in the sport sponsorships in industrialized countries (Meenaghan, 1991; Scott and Suchard, 1992; Sleight, 1989; Stotlar, 1993). With its increase of popularity as well as expenditure in the industry, the sport sponsorship is existed in many different forms. The roots of what we nowadays regard as commercial sponsorship can be traced back to the late 19th century (Aaker and Joachimsthaler, 2000).

    Sponsorship spending reached $28 billion worldwide in 2004 (Cornwell, 2005) which represents an increase of 8.1% over 2003, more than 100% over the last ten years and 1300% over the last twenty years. North America, the United States and Canada, continue to dominate the world sponsorship market with $11.14 billion in 2004 accounting for 39% of sponsorship worldwide spending (IEG report, 2003). The top five US sponsors are PepsiCo, Anheuser Bush, General Motors, Coca-Cola and Nike spending from $160 million to $255 million. In comparison with the $141.1 billion
spent on advertising in 2004 in U.S. Market (Deeken, 2005), sponsorship expenditures may appear trivial.

IEG has conducted primary report on Sponsorships, based on annual sponsorships spending estimates and expenditures. Global expenditure estimates 46.3 billion USD in 2011, and North American companies accounting for 18.2 billion USD. After North American companies, Europe was counted as the second biggest sport sponsorship market followed by the Asia Pacific Region.

According to IEG Report, sport sponsorship investment from Asia is keep increasing in average by five percent through the contribution from Russian, Indian and Chinese companies to mega events such as Olympics and Asian games. Below table shows the increase of sponsorship spending by region with its increase rate.
Table 1 - Global sponsorship spending by region

($=Billion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2011 Spending</th>
<th>2012 Spending</th>
<th>Increase from 2011</th>
<th>2013 Spending (Projected)</th>
<th>Increase from 2012 (Projected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>$14.5</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA PACIFIC</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL/SOUTH AMERICA</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL OTHER COUNTRIES</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For understanding the value of sponsorship, it is important to understand how it can be estimated or calculated. Some of academic publications on various evaluation methods are available for example, Otker’s (1988) Exploitation: The key to sponsorship success, Miyazaki and Morgan’s (2001) Assessing Market value of event sponsorship, and Tuori’s (1995) “Sponsorin Käsikirja” (Sponsors Handbook).

Dophin (2003) has mentioned that more than 75% of total sponsorship value includes the sports sponsorship activities. Lough and Maxwell (2009) has said that Sport Sponsorship is considered as another alternative to the traditional advertising, in the current marketing environment of overwhelming amount of advertisements. Sport Sponsorship can differentiate itself to other existing marketing activities. Accordingly, sport sponsorship is
becoming more and more popular and now it is getting difficult to differentiate itself.

In fact, it is not a simple task to measure the actual benefits from the sport sponsorship (Stolar, 2004) as sport sponsorship creates the emotional bond with customers through shared values and passions through same sport and athlete. This is the greatest benefit of the sport sponsorship (Duffy, 2003).

This is the reason why the marketing activities in the modern society focuses the importance on how to encourage the customers to accept brand as part of their life, than maximizing the coverage. (Santomier, 2008). For example, Patrick Magyar, Chief Executive of FIFA Marketing AG has put it concerning FIFA World Cup; “the results that we have received from our consumer research shows a wish or a readiness amongst fans to change to our partners brands of over 16 per cent. In my knowledge, any other sponsorship never comes close to half of that” (Duffy, 2003).

The rapid growth of sponsorship as a marketing practice raised the need to understand how this technique really works. The need became more urgent during the last ten years as marketers became more accountable for their budgets, particularly the promotional ones. Till late nineties, sponsorship activities have attracted little academic interest (Cornwell and Maignan, 1998). However over the past ten years, there have been clear advances in understanding of sponsorship (Walliser, 2003).
Cornwell and Maignan (1998b) identified five research streams in sponsorship research namely; 1) nature of sponsorship, 2) managerial aspects of sponsorship, 3) measurement of sponsorship effects, 4) strategic use of sponsorship and 5) legal and ethical considerations. The first stream of research, nature of sponsorship, tried to propose a definition of sponsorship identifying its characteristics and its differences from other promotional tools. Most of the research on this stream was published from the eighties till early nineties (Walliser, 2003).

The second stream of research, managerial aspects of sponsorship, tried to identify the corporate motivations and objectives, the selection process and the implementation with respect to sponsorship. The third stream of research focused on sponsorship communication effectiveness by analyzing the intended and unintended effects of sponsorship. The sponsorship impact can be evaluated done by the area where research about sponsorship has progressed over past few years (Walliser, 2003).

In the past, sponsorship was defined as a cash or in-kind investment by companies in the form of activities, such as sporting event with exchange of exploitable features which may be used by the sponsor by gaining the commercial advantage (Meenaghan, 1991b).
The Olympic Games is considered as the biggest mega sport events. Following the Olympic Games, the Asian Games is the most prestigious event organized by the Olympic Council of Asia. Asian Games are held in every four years, similar to Olympic Games, with the 17th Asian Games held in Incheon, Korea in 2014.

The Sport programs of Asian Games follow the rules of Olympic Games with the core sports of swimming and athletics. Featuring disciplines reflect diverse sporting cultures of Asia, such as Southeast Asia, South Asia and East Asia.

The very first Asian Games were held in New Delhi, India in 1951 with 11 countries joined competing for 6 sports. The most recent Asian Games - 16th was held in Guangzhou, China in 2010 with 45 countries joined with 42 sports. This difference shows the growth of Asian Games with the Olympic Movement in Asia.
2. Research Objective

2-1. Purpose of Study

In the modern marketing strategies, the sponsorship has marked itself as the corporate strategic planning and is considered as the integrated marketing program. It has different advantages of emotional and experimental benefits through partnerships under the name of sports with bond tied with customers with entertainment and passion (IEG Report, 2013).

Figure 1 - Total global sponsorship spending (IEG Report, 2013)
The sponsorship pie is growing, but being cut into fewer pieces. The largest slices are reserved for properties that can meet the high standards required by a new breed of corporate partner. The winners are typically large rights holders that come with broadcast or other major media as part of the deal, a national footprint or an extremely high level of prestige.

North American trend is shown in the pie graph, with the breakdown of sponsorship spending by different categories. Sports and Entertainment grows at a higher rate than other partnerships. It seems that it will continue to grow in this trend in the future, as entertainment and sports mark up for 80% of sponsorship expenditures (IEG Report, 2013).
The purpose of this paper is to investigate the impact on brand equity depending on its sponsorship at Asian Games. A Chinese brand called 361° was used for the survey to investigate the result. The survey was given to two different consumer groups:

1) consumer group that has awareness on brand’s involvement as an official sponsorship of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014

2) consumer group that does not have awareness on brand’s involvement as an official sponsorship of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014

Instead of well-known brands in Asia such as Samsung, Hyundai, and TISSOT, 361° was used for this survey to accurately drive the change of brand equity depending on their sponsorship activities in Asian Games. The survey was given to consumers of different countries in four different languages, i.e., Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Russian to provide comparative analysis between the countries. This paper presents the first comparative analysis on brand equity through sponsorship by different countries. Also, this paper also investigates the impact of brand equity of 361° by performance of countries in 17th Incheon Asian Games. This data will provide helpful information when structuring marketing strategies for these countries.

This research will provide the theoretical evidences to maximize profits of the marketing strategy by sponsorship to international sports events.
2-2. Research Variable

Below research module is designed to investigate the impact on brand equity by two different consumer groups that aware and does not aware the official sponsorship activities of 361° brand on 17th Asian Games Incheon as an official sponsor partner.

Figure 3 - Research Model One

Below research module is design to investigate the brand equity of official sponsor partner, depending on country’s performance at 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014.
2-3. Research Questions

Studying the different theoretical concepts on sponsorship, it is found that it lacks the detailed measurements of sponsorships, especially both in terms of qualitative and quantities influences on brand level (Cornwell 2008; Dolphin 2003 and Henseler et al. 2011). The aim of this paper is to investigate and understand the interaction and relevance between the Sponsorship and Brand equity with analysis of its effect in cross-cultural terms. The research will focus on the impact of sponsorship and brand equity for 17th Asian Games Incheon Official Partner Sponsorships. The questionnaire will be given to different market countries, i.e., Korea, China, Japan and Kazakhstan.
In order to achieve the aim of this paper, the following research questions are set:

Q1. What is the gap on brand equity by the aware group and non aware group of brand’s involvement to 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 as an official partner sponsorship?

Q2. What are the impacts on brand equity of different countries depending on their participation at 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014?

Q3. What are the impacts on brand equity of different countries depending on performance level at 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014?

3. Research Limitation

1) This research does not consider other marketing activities of 361° other than 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014.

2) This research does not consider other initial company and brand awareness of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014.

3) This research is designed for customer-centered measurement of brand equity.
II. Literature Review

1. Sponsorship

1-1. Definition of Sponsorship

Numbers of studies are done on sponsorship and there are many different theories and definitions of sponsorship focusing on various aspects. This section of the study will discuss about different definitions of sponsorships in number of aspects.

Sleight (1989) defined sponsorship as the relationship between the fund, resources or service provider and an individual, event or organization offering rights and association that can be utilized for commercial advantage or benefits. Meenaghan (1991) classified “the commercial sponsorship as cash or equivalent investment in return to the exploitable commercial potential associated with that activity”.

Meenaghan’s (1983) definition of sponsorship is most widely used in the theory. Meenaghan defines the sponsorship as a provision of assistance or financial support or any kind of activity commercial organization to achieve the commercial objectives, producing benefits. Cornwell and Maignan (1998) proposed that sponsorship is involved with two main activities, i.e., 1) Exchange between sponsor and sponsee where sponsee receives a fee and sponsor receives the right to associate itself with the activity.
2) Marketing activities could be involved in this exchange to make the sponsorship fee meaningful.

Berrett (1993) has provided another definition on sponsorship emphasizing the commercial nature with the achievable objective in detail. Berrett mentioned that in expectation of achieving corporate or marketing objectives to produce profitable benefits, sponsorship contributes to an activity by a commercial organization in cash or equivalence.

Abratt and Grobler (1989) also define sponsorship in similar way but in more thorough explanation focusing on sponsorship targets. Sponsorship is made upon an agreement between two parties where sponsor provides funding or benefits to an association, a team or an individual to enable some activity obtain benefits to sponsoring organization meeting the marketing or business strategy.

Many sponsorship definitions focuses on exchange of relationships in derive of commercial benefits while Dolphin (2003) emphasizes the importance of goodwill and public relations in his definition of sponsorship.

d’Astous and Bitz (1995) focus on the effects of sponsorship on brand image and awareness. This can be considered as commercial benefits as well.

Scott and Scuhard (1992) has said that all investments on sponsorship including the costs of events or serious of events can be returned by the
acknowledgement by sponsored body - which can another way mean increase of company/organization or brand awareness and enhancing the brand image.

Sponsorship is an exchange of resources by two independent partners gaining benefits from each other. The mutual return distinguishes sponsorship from other forms of corporate support like philanthropy, charity and patronage, which do not involve the advancement of commercial objectives. McCarville and Copeland (1994) mentioned that sponsorship is undertaken so that both partners can benefit from each other.

It is true that achieving commercial and corporate objectives is important in definition of sponsorship. Meenaghan (1983) and Berrett (1993) regarded the sponsorship as having strategic significance in management.

Profitable benefits to the company is important it has strategic role in the management. Therefore, sponsorship takes place in form of cash payment, or cash equivalent products or services to and agreed individual or event to bring managerial and strategic benefit (Allen et al., 2002).

In modern marketing, especially in the sport industry, sponsorship becomes an essential tool for marketing strategies and targeting consumers. According to Thwates (1998), sponsorship takes 76% share of making marketing strategies. Sponsorship is now an effective and essential tool for obtaining the market share. Stipp (1998) said the main purpose of the sponsorship is 1) to grab and target consumers and 2) enhance brand equity.
through various marketing activities such as events, advertising, promotions and media exposures.

High development of communication technology worldwide enlarges the marketing targets into huge group - global sized. Therefore, companies put their efforts to capture the target group in short period of time. Sponsorship is effective in this process. Sponsorship captures huge consumers, communicates with consumers upon grand information and image, provides company offerings and build long term relationship with consumers upon trust (Simmons and L. Becker-Olsen, 2006). Meenaghan said, provision of assistance, whether in financial form or equivalent is done upon sponsorship in purpose of achieving commercially beneficial objectives.

According to Meenaghan, reaching the target groups through sport sponsorship is easier and cheaper and direct than ordinary advertising or promotions.

Also, Wilkinson (1993) has pointed out that brand image or product images can be overlapped with the positive characteristics of sport event or successful athletes. Sponsorship is different from advertising, arousing the involvement of second party during the activity being sponsored, thus bringing more effective (Speed and Thompson, 2000).

On the other hand, Abratt and Grobler (1989) was disagreed with Speed and Thopson. Abratt and Gobler argued that sponsorship is no different
to advertising, as all events and activities and strategically planned beforehand to place its effectiveness. It is just another form of advertising and promoting the company and brand.

Interestingly, none of the definitions cited explicitly stated that sponsorship is distinctly different from charity or philanthropy, despite this being a highly concurrent view within the reviewed literature (Copeland et al., 1996; Head, 1988; Irwin and Asimakopoulos, 1992).
Table 2 - Overview and critical review of sponsorship definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>UK Sports Council</td>
<td>“A gift or payment in return for some facility or privilege which aims to provide publicity for the donor.” (quoted according to Meenaghan 1983, p.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Acumen Marketing Group</td>
<td>“The provision of financial or material support for some independent activity which is not intrinsic to the furtherance of commercial aims, but from which the supporting company might reasonably expect to gain commercial benefit.” (quoted according to Meenaghan 1983, p.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Royal Philharmonic Orchestra</td>
<td>“Sponsorship is the donation or loan of resources (people, money, materials, etc.) by private individuals or organizations to other individuals or organizations engaged in the provision of those public goods and services designed to improve the quality of life.” (quoted according to Meenaghan 1983, p.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Meenaghan</td>
<td>“The provision of assistance either financial or in kind to an activity by a commercial organization for the purpose of achieving commercial objectives.” (Meenaghan 1983, p.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Gardner/Shuman</td>
<td>&quot;Investments in causes or events to support corporate objectives (e.g., enhance company image) or marketing objectives (e.g., increase brand awareness), and are usually not made through traditional media-buying channels.” (Gardner and Shuman 1987, p.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1-2. Sponsorship Objective

Sponsorship make objective achievement possible (Dolphin, 2003) with provision of distinguishing the company with competitors (Cornwell, 2008). Therefore organizations conduct sponsorships in the possibility to outperform advertising, as sponsorship activities enfolds more benefits the other marketing tools. Dolphin (2003) has stated that sponsorship is the most acknowledged theoretical approaches to achieve field of corporate and marketing objectives in contribution to the brand level.

Although companies use sponsorship routinely as a part of their promotional activities, their objectives tend to be vague (Dolphin, 2003). Sponsors’ objectives move overt ime from vague objectives for companies using sponsorship occasionally or as a new tool, to strictly stated objectives for companies that have integrated sponsorship in their promotional mix long time ago. Whether clearly stated or not, the objectives of sponsorship are as numerous as companies themselves. The nature of sponsorship objectives will vary from organization to organization according to the industry where they operate, the market they address and the size of the company. Nevertheless the wide range of sponsorship objectives can be divided into the two categories of corporate and marketing objectives.

Leveraging corporate image is the most cited corporate objective in research on sponsorship. Quoting Javalgi et al, Dolphin (2003) defined
corporate image as the impressions held by some segment of the people on a particular company. One of the corporate objectives of sponsorship is then to enhance corporate image among some segment of people (Cornwell and Maignan, 1998). Other authors expressed that objective of image differently: Raising the profile of the corporate brand (Walliser, 2003), raising corporate reputation (Dolphin, 2003), or enhancing corporate stature in the community (Quester and Thompson, 2001). Sponsorship activities engaged with the objective of leveraging corporate image seem to be intended to create an identity and to define the company in its broad environment. If sponsorship is used to define an identity with a broad environment, it can be used also to communicate with closer environment and especially with stakeholders (Dolphin, 2003).

Sponsorship is also used to boost community involvement, by fulfilling company’s societal obligation in a responsible manner, which is an excellent mechanism to give back to the community. Sponsorship helps gaining affinity with target markets significant to the organization, which publics can be external or internal to the company, as sponsorship is also used to boost morale’s staff (Tripodi, 2001) or for staff recruitment (Cornwell and Maignan, 1998).

Sponsorship has the ability to contribute to the fulfillment of a broad range of objectives at the corporate level, but also at the brand level.
Marketing objectives of sponsorship are different from corporate ones as they are more clearly stated, generally quantified and aimed for a narrower target composed by customers and or prospects. As presented earlier, one characteristic that distinguishes sponsorship from advertising is its subtlety.

Meenaghan (2001a, 2001b) suggests that sponsorship penetrates consumer’s perception filters in an indirect way. Sponsorship provides opportunities for companies to meet and reach the consumers on their hearts and minds but a prerequisite is to enhance brand awareness and brand equity.

Vanden Bergh and Katz (1999) has defined the brand awareness as the extent of a recognizable brand, which may affect in purchase consideration.

Sponsorship is intended to facilitate brand name recognition by image association (Easton and Mackie, 1998), an association with well received events (Hack et al, 1997). Cornwell (2001) considers that the use of association generates awareness naturally. Beside association, sponsorship also generates awareness through media coverage which is sometimes the only way to access the media for controversial products (Meenaghan, 1998).

Dolphin (2003) points out that sponsorship of an international event is capable of enhancing the awareness to target market in both local and distant market for multinationals selling products around the world.

Brand equity can be defined as “The net total of all assets and liabilities linked to a brand by consumers” (Vanden Bergh and Katz 1999).
Tripodi (2001) notes that sponsorship is a brand equity building strategy that enhances brand image over other brands. Many scholars think that sponsorship is a way to establish a relationship with customers and/or provide them with entertainment (Dolphin, 2003). At the level of marketing strategy, sponsorship is also used to position a brand on a market or alter its image (Meenaghan, 1998), to avoid cluttered media in a cost effective way or to boost though its effects are not always easy to isolate (Dolphin, 2003, Hansen and Scotwin, 1995). In England, marketing and communication objectives are adopted mainly by large corporations, whereas small and midsized businesses in small towns view sponsorship as a tool to support their community and establish relationship (Cornwell and Maignan, 1998).

1-3. Measuring Sponsorship Effectiveness

Measuring the benefits of sponsorship in return of the investment by the company is important. Many companies regard the sponsorship as ‘soft spending’, allocating funds from limited corporate community or philanthropic budgets. Sponsorship opportunities, especially in the field of sport sponsorship is rapidly increasing with the companies foreseeing its potential and start increasing the fund allocation. Now sport sponsorship funding is coming from marketing and public relation budgets, under the demand from management and stakeholders. Separate from former advertising and marketing promotions,
sponsorship benefits are now compared against competitive advertising costs and value. The amount of ‘free’ publicity received is measured and then ascribed a dollar value equivalent to paid advertising exposure - usually adjusted to 25-30 per cent of the full advertising rate card value (Ferkins and Garland, 2006). Many studies have proved that sponsorship has moved out from its early growth phase, entering into more mature stage – having sponsors questioning about its return.

Sponsorship evaluation research however has seen a “relentless reiteration of recognition and recall studies…[which]…are merely first-line measures of sponsorship impact and of themselves do not promote a real understanding of the nature of the consumer engagement with sponsorship” (Meenaghan and O’Sullivan, 2001, p.88). Pham (1991) has stated that differentiated from advertising, sponsorship’s effectiveness has been carefully researched by academics and it is still unexplored, due to its very close relation to advertising and promotions. Cornwell and Maignan (1998) noted that sponsorship effectiveness measurement is still in its early stages and no accurate theoretical framework has been constructed. Even until the recent research, sponsorship is still examined on case-by-case basis rather than systematical approach. Comprehensive model of its effectiveness still needs to be developed (Lee, Sandler, and Shani, 1997; Crowley, 1991).
Main goal of sponsorship by a sponsor is to support an event or an athlete to reach the specified target group to gain corporate and commercial benefits (Javalgi, Traylor, Gross and Lampman, 1994). Sponsorship audiences covers both existing and potential customers including general public, workforce, local and business community, suppliers and last but not least shareholders (Crowley, 1991). Sponsorship events may concern sports, arts or any similar activity that interests the general public. Through this event, sponsor seeks the positive image from the event is transferred into its brand or product, helping to form the brand equity (Gwinner, 1997; Gwinner and Eaton, 1999; Mcdonald 1991).

Due to such insufficient systematic approach measuring the sponsorship, Thjomoe, Olson and Bronn (2002) pointed out that sponsorship evaluation research is inadequate to accurately find out the consumer perception. The major problem measuring the effectiveness of sponsorship is lack of evaluation and measurement techniques. Measuring sponsorship is not easy as it is measure the intangible nature of sponsorship, difficult to evidence its numerical contribution to the sponsor (Thwaites, 1995; Bennet, 1999). In addition, it is difficult to separate the effects produced by the sponsorship, as the sponsorship is usually organized with other communication mix in conjunction with the promotional strategies by the firm (Meenaghan, 2001).
Lardinoit and Quester (2001) think that measuring sponsorship is difficult due to sponsors with the efforts of simultaneous investments in the communication activity. In order to understand the accurate sponsorship effects, Dolphin (2003) suggested to study the sponsorship process.

Sponsorship process includes the following steps: (1) Review of marketing objectives, (2) prioritization of specific objectives, (3) identify evaluation criteria, (4) screen proposals, (5) implement and control. The control step should be done in accordance with all the other steps of the process especially the marketing objectives that led to the choice of the activity to be sponsored. Setting objectives and evaluation criteria to any marketing activity from the outset will make easier the evaluation of this activity. Moreover, Meenaghan (1998) opines that the measurement process is greatly facilitated if undertaken at several key stages. Therefore a company should determine its present position on the variables sponsorship is supposed to leverage before engaging in the sponsorship activity. Interim tracking may be necessary in order to detect movement on the chosen variables. Finally the evaluation must take place after the sponsorship is completed in order to determine the output against the purpose/objectives.

Hansen and Scotwin (1995), suggest that the association between the company or product and the activity being sponsored is important for the kind of effects that can be obtained. Effects of sponsorship will vary depending on
how close is the association between the sponsor and the sponsored activity. Effects may be discussed at the following levels: Exposure, attention, cognition and behavior.

1-4. Sports Sponsorship

Sport sponsorship was existing from its history of sports. Sport sponsorship that has started to create the commercial benefits can be traced from the late 19th century (Aaker and Joachimsthaler, 2000). The idea of sponsorship starts in the long history of ancient Greece, where rich people started to support athletics and festivals as social standing. The modern sponsorship was started about 100 years ago, by advertisements in the mega-sport event - 1986 Olympic Games. The soft drink giant, Coca-Cola started its sport sponsorship by purchasing the product-sampling rights in 1928 Olympics (Pope, 1998). Since then, significant growth of sponsorship activities and investments started to boom between 1976 Montreal Olympics and the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics - mainly in an effort to circumvent losses the city of Montreal suffered in hosting the Games (Pope 1998).

IEG reported that the global sponsorship spending amounted to more than $46 billion in 2010. This figure was higher than the year before and IGE is foreseeing that it will continuous grow every year (IEG, 2011). The strong
advantage of the sport sponsorship is that it links the specific sports audiences under aspiration and passion for sports (Arun, 2004).

In order to evaluate the sponsorship, Pope (1998) says it is required to be more specific on what exactly is sponsored with the detailed objective. Thus, Pope defines the sponsorship as exchange of resources (including money, people, equipment) by an organization (the sponsor) directly to an individual, authority or body (the sponsee), to enable the latter to pursue some activity in return for benefits contemplated in terms of the sponsor’s promotion strategy, and which can be expressed in terms of corporate, marketing or media objectives.” In addition, Pope emphasizes that both the parties in the process of sponsorship should benefit the both the parties. The major purpose of the sport marketing should be based on the idea that both the parties should be under beneficial relationship. Number of researches on sport sponsorship started around 20 years ago since mid 1980s and it has met its significant growth as mid-1990s (Cornwell and Maignan, 1998).

Through literature studies, sponsorship enhances the brand awareness and brand image. Sport sponsorship in particular is the most popular mean of sponsorship that has high influence on brand image, identity and equity (Henseler et al., 2011).

Sport sponsorship is strongly accepted than other sponsorships, as it is the central component of social leisure behaviors (Ladegast and Rennhak,
Social interest, especially in the modern society is focused on health and leisure. Sport is associated with attributes of health, young, dynamic, team spirit, emotions and passions, which can reflect the healthy and enjoyable life which most of people are interested to join (Meenaghan, 1999). Therefore, sport sponsorship’s effectiveness is growing rapidly. Companies are turning into sponsors and its subjects are continuously developing its integrations to appropriately target the audiences maximizing the profits (Hermanns and Marwitz, 2008).

According to Henseler et al. (2011), apart from other marketing activities, sponsorship requires continuous engagements with the customers. It does not influence customer’s attitude towards the brand awareness and recall at one attempts. Scholars are still under study, however is more likely to be found that sponsorship creates strong bond between the sponsoring firm (or brand) to the customers under the name of interest. For example, sport sponsorship, the company or its product and customer are linked under strong emotional stimulation under the passion towards the sport. It is unconsciously created and therefore has a powerful potential for sustainable competitive advantage.

Although calculating the sponsorship effectiveness still requires more researches, many scholars argue that sport sponsorship is in fact the most
legitimate and effective way of influencing the customers than any other marketing activities (Kiely, 1993; Sandler and Shani, 1993; Sleight, 1989).

Marketing environment is highly competitive in the modern industry and customers are constantly exposed to different ways of advertising messages. It is increasingly difficult for firms to differentiate themselves from others (Maloney, 2002). Sport sponsorship is distinguished as a separate approach of marketing activity which has direct and effective way to target the market for influencing their brand equity (Meir, Arthur, Tobin, and Massingham, 2001).

Compared to advertising, sport sponsorship provides effective benefits towards to the brand equity, providing higher return on investment. Advertisings can be extremely expensive and time consuming while sport sponsorships are simple and inexpensive (Meir et al., 2001). Sleight (1989) has mentioned the other benefits of sport sponsorships such as brand awareness and image, hospitality opportunities, product promotions, and community exposure and influence (Sleight, 1989).

Many arguments support that sport sponsorship is more effective than ordinary TV commercials. Gupta and Lord (1998) proved on their research that product replacement was more effective at eliciting a consumer’s recall response that just simply watching from TV commercial, providing the same exposure in terms of length of time. Similarly, Levin, Joiner and Cameron
(2001) did research on NASCAR fans. This research proved that consumers’
ability of recalling the brands after viewing only the race cars than viewing TV
commercials. This research results also suggests that intrusive or persuasive
nature of TV commercials are becoming more ineffective. Consumers are
exposed many different kinds of commercials around them. It can directly or
indirectly absorbed, however sport sponsorship could be more effective, as
consumers are involved in the sport activity with interest.

Bennett (1999) stated in his study that sports sponsorship reaches a
large group of audience with diverse area which can positively influence the
brand awareness as well as the local community of the place where the event
is taking place. It is now clearly evidenced that sport sponsorship is practically
effective and potentially profitable approach of marketing, building strong
product and brand equity.

In order to determine the effectiveness of sport sponsorships and how
these response outputs are elicited, the five constructs of awareness, favorable
disposition, goodwill, image transfer, and fan involvement were analyzed.

To conclude, sport sponsorship is facing numerous opportunities to
achieve firm’s marketing objective differentiated from existing marketing
strategies. Sport Sponsorship allows emotional interaction with consumers,
simulates spectators interests in provision of brand exposure during the sports
enjoyment. Sports Sponsorship engages with consumers under the name of
sports sharing emotions and passions. It enhances the national as well as local awareness of the event and creates profitability in many different areas. During the sport engagement by consumers, they are exposed to the brand and products, which is more effective than ordinary TV commercials. More researches and studies are yet to be done for systematic calculation of its effectiveness, however many studies have proved that sports sponsorship is a unique way of marketing strategy from existing marketing activities.

Ladegast and Rennhak (2006) commented that nevertheless the initial euphoria toward sport sponsorships is gone, what remains is an intense professional planning and controlling to ensure most-efficient exploitation of sports as communication vehicle for brand-related objectives according to strategic approaches on return-on-investment.

2. Brand Equity

2-1. Definition of Brand Equity

A brand can be defined as “a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or combination of them which is intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors” (Kotler, 1991, p.442). The brand is an important tool for marketer to communicate with the consumer, as it can represent the product attributes. It creates the trust between marketer and the consumer.
Brand image has been defined as “perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in memory” (Keller, 1993, p.3). Leuthesser (1995) has defined brand as “a distinguishing name and/or symbol (such as a logo, trademark or package design) intended to identify the goods or services of either one seller or a group of sellers and to differentiate those goods or services from those of competitors. As above, there are many definitions about brand and brand image. Brand is consumer’s perception and knowledge that can govern purchase decision and how firms to manage in order to increase their revenue.

Aaker (1991) defined the brand equity in marketing industry as a value of of a brand name. The way consumers perceived the brand and how it can generate revenue affecting in the product sales.

Keller (1993) has said that brand equity is created through strategic investments by company’s marketing section in constant investments in research, study, communication channels. It is strategically measured and applied by economic growth in profit margin, market share, prestige value and critical associations.

Such strategic investments are generally appreciated over time to profit to the company, i.e., ROI (return on investment). In this way, brand equity is a highly invested part of the company strategically managed. (Lassar, 1995).
Brand equity is strategically important and crucially managed by the company, however is very difficult to be measured well.

There is separated brand equity called quantitative brand equity which can measure numerical values such as profit margins and market share. However it only includes the numbers but not qualitative elements such as consumer’s perception and interest associations, which is considered more important. Therefore, most of marketing experts consider measuring this qualitative approach to brand equity as a challenge. In general, there are direct and indirect measures of brand equity. In the direct approach, an attempt is made to assess the value added by the brand to the product (Farquhar, 1989). Aaker (1991) mentioned that the indirect approach of measuring brand equity focuses on identification of sources.

The purpose of measuring brand equity is to measure the value of brand, i.e., brand equity. A brand of a company can cover many elements of a brand including brand name, logo, image and perceptions by consumers about the product, service or provider. It is created by its approach to consumers in terms of advertising, packaging and various ways of marketing communication routes and binds relationship with consumers. During and process, the brand equity comes to create a promise with consumers - to provide promised level of quality on performance and service that provides
trust by consumers that can highly influence consumers purchase decision among competing products.

When trust bond of a brand with consumer is strongly created, consumers tend to select the trusted brand over competitors even at premium price. This trust can extend beyond certain products and the high value of brand equity is created, the company can leverage to extend into the new market. For all reasons, brand equity can hold enormous value to a company, even though it is difficult to be measured (Knapp, 2000).

Numerous studies have been done to measure the brand equity and emphasize the importance of brand equity of a company. Brand equity is extremely important in terms of management as it creates trust by consumers.

Keller has developed “brand associations” - the elements that can measure the brand equity. Keller stated that brand association includes experiences, attributes about product, price, product positioning in the market, packaging, user imagery and occasions. Kevin Lane Keller (1998) has developed the model called Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) to measure the brand equity. The concept of brand equity model is simple: in order to build a strong brand, it is required to shape how customers think and feel about the product. It is important that customers are exposed to have right type of experiences on product. And then the consumer experiences will lead to
specified and positive feelings, opinions, leading into belief on the product and the brand. With strongly perceived brand equity, consumers will be loyal to the brand, more likely to come back for purchase decisions, furthermore recommend and attract more number of consumers. Strong brand equity will make the firm competitive in the market.

Figure 5 - Brand Equity Model, Keller 1993

As above model illustrates, the brand equity starts with the identification, meaning to the customers, responding by the product or service and then followed by relationship for loyalty. A high brand equity are advantages to the company. Obvious advantages will be revenue increase, beneficial in the market share and in addition to these measurable benefits,
brand equity provides price premium, strong customer relationships. Revenue increase will automatically increase the producing extensions.

Table 3 - Definition of Brand Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Definition of Brand Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaker, 1991</td>
<td>“Brand equity in marketing industry describes the value of having well-known brand name, based on the idea that the owner of a well-known brand name can generate more money from products with that brand name than from products with a less well-known name.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farquhar, 1989</td>
<td>“There are two principal and distinct perspectives that have been taken by academics to study brand equity – financial and customer based. The first perspective of brand equity is from a financial market’s point of view where the asset value of a brand is appraised.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller, 1993</td>
<td>“Brand equity is created through strategic investments in communication channels and market education and appreciates through economic growth in profit margin, market share, prestige value, and critical associations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassar, 1995</td>
<td>“Brand equity can also appreciate without strategic direction.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2-2. Components of Brand Equity

As defined above, brand equity associates with different elements about brands. Brand equity value works in parallel line with the company benefits. Positive brand equity affects the company in many positive ways, where negative brand equity will affect the company in negative ways.

A typical benefit that a company may gain from the positive brand equity is the financial benefit, for example caused by increase in demand for products and its premium price and image. Increase in sales and production line will increase the revenue and decrease in cost.

In marketing point of view, strong brand equity will decrease the marketing budgets and allows strategic flexibility. Successful building of brand equity means stable positioning in the market and consumer connected with trusts and loyal on its brands. Modern marketing industry is very dynamic with very fast flow of information worldwide. Strong brand equity will allow companies to sustain. In this view, below are the discussions about components of brand equity.

2-2-1. Keller’s dimensions of brand knowledge

Keller (2008) states “customer-based brand equity occurs when the consumer has a high level of awareness and familiarity with the brand and holds some strong, favorable, and unique brand associations in memory” (Keller, 2008, p.53)
Brand distinguishes the products or services in the market. It represents the company in the competitive market and plays very important role in building relationship with consumers (Sherry, 2005, p.46).

Knowledge is an outcome of apprehension and information within a particular context. Knowledge, which enables and individual or organization to appraise and aggregate new ideas and information, is more than a collection of experiences and values (Davenport and Prusack, 1998). Knowledge can also be regarded as the accumulation and cultivation of information and data over time (Leonard-Barton, 1995).

Building brand knowledge means understanding and relating information and experiences with consumers. Consumer awareness, attributes, images and experiences towards a brand creates brand knowledge (Keller,
Consumers receive information through various marketing communications and knowledge is acquired in that way.

Keller (2003) defines consumer brand knowledge as all descriptive and evaluative brand-related information, which was individualistic inference about a brand store in consumer memory.

Aaker (1991) identifies five brand equity components: 1) brand loyalty, 2) brand awareness, 3) perceived quality, 4) brand associations and 5) other propriety assets.

According to Aaker’s model, brand equity consists of set of brand assets and liabilities related to the brand, which may add to or subtract from a product or service. As shown below, asset includes brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality and associations. However on the other hand, such asset defined elements can turn into liability if it subtracts the value from the brand equity at some point or event.
Figure 7 - Brand Equity Model (Aaker, 1991)

This model simply shows the components of brand equity and its relation each other, which may reflect in the future performance of the brand.

Four different components of brand equity create the value in different methods as above in order to create efficient way of maximizing the brand value. Also, brand creates the value that advantageous to both the company and the customer, in the win-win structure. Keller (1993) has mentioned in his widely used text book, “Strategic Brand Management” that “in order to build a strong brand, you must shape how customers think and feel about your product. You have to build the right type of experiences around your brand, so that customers have specific, positive thoughts, feelings, beliefs, opinions and perceptions about it”. Again, Keller and Aaker’s idea on brand equity overlaps
in terms of proper brand building, customer’s perception leading into brand loyalty. Once brand image is properly perceived to customers, customers likely create loyalty in the brand, and that creates the purchase intention in the future expanding into other products as well. When brand loyalty is set into the customers, it may be called as brand equity.

2-2-2. Brand Image

Kotler and Keller (2009) defined brand image as “the perceptions and beliefs held by consumers, as reflected in the associations held in consumer memory”. Aaker (1991) defined as “a set of associations, usually organized in some meaningful way and Sherry (2005) as “the external form and observable characteristics of the market’s offering”.

Brand image is the perception that remains in consumer’s mind that affects the purchase decision. It can or cannot be created by the company. Clear communication with target consumers regarding the brand image creates the consumer satisfaction towards their needs (Park, 1986). Clear set up of brand image distinguish the brand from its competitors (DiMingo, 1988) and it is a very important part in the marketing activity.

Roth (1995) suggested that marketing strategies focusing on brand image effects on revenue thus on production performances. Kaplan (2007) introduced the scale measuring the brand image as below (Figure 4).
First eight items of the brand image scale are cognitive brand associations, which evaluate the associations attached to the physical features and functions of each brand’s products, and the remaining 5 items are emotional brand associations, which measure attributions that each individual himself or herself attaches to a brand.

Table 4 - Brand Image Scale Items (Kaplan, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Association</th>
<th>Products of this brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cognitive Brand Associations | 1. Perform as expected  
2. Offer Value for price  
3. Are reliable  
4. Are functional  
5. Are usable  
6. Are durable  
7. Have technical sophistication  
8. Are expensive |
| Emotional Brand Associations | 1. Make a person feel good  
2. Target high-income level.  
3. Increase the respectability of its user.  
4. Are admired by my friends and relatives  
5. Express my personality |

2-3. Measuring Brand Equity

There are numerous ways defined to measure the brand equity. It is very important in the marketing strategy as well, therefore sometimes
considered as a tangible financial asset of the company. On the other hand, in marketing perspective, it is often considered as a concept - consumer’s understanding power regarding the products or services engaged with intellectual and emotional associations. However, it is true that it does have financial value that directly affecting the company revenue. Marketing researches are continuously in process to understand and measure brand equity for successful positioning and planning.

There are many research agencies developed their own systematic ways to understand and measure the brand equity.

Keller (1993) said, “although the details of different approaches to conceptualize brand equity differ, they tend to share a common core: All definitions typically either implicitly or explicitly rely on brand knowledge structures in the minds of consumers - individuals or organizations- as the source or foundation of brand equity”.

Aaker (1996) mentioned in his journal that if a company manages the brand equity well, company will start to have good financial measures. Financial measures mentioned in here are well developed and accepted numbers such as Profit, ROA, margins, sales etc.

Aaker has also pointed out that these measures last for short in terms of investment in brand building. Brand equity needs specified measures that accurately measures and evaluate the brand building activities in product
markets. Aaker (1996) recommended that companies should set the systematic structure to conceptualize and measure the brand equity. He mentioned about four needs for this measure. First, in order to find out its reflection as an asset value and focus on its advantage that should be overlap with the competitors. Second, brand equity value should foresee its achievements to future sales and profit. Third, the measure should be delicately accurate. When the value changes, its objectives should change. Lastly, measure value should cross linked to the brands, products and markets.

Ailawadi (2003) has defined the purpose of measuring the brand equity as 1) to guide marketing strategy and tactical decisions, 2) to assess the extendibility of a brand, 3) to evaluate the effectiveness of marketing decisions, 4) to track the brand’s health compared with that of competitors and over time, and 5) to assign a financial value to the brand in balance sheets and financial transactions. Ailwadi introduced various mathematical equations to derive measures of brand equity of three categories, i.e., 1) assessing consumer-based sources 2) product market and 3) financial market to focus on the outcomes or net benefit that a firm derives from the equity of its brands (Ailawadi, 2003).

Even though many scholars have different opinions in measuring the brand equity, whether be quantitative or qualitative, both the measurements are fundamental for measuring product premium to increase the brand equity.
Brand Equity was dealt as the major discussion in the sponsorship literatures, however sponsorship overlap with grand equity in many objectives.

This paper will further study about the sponsorship in relation to the brand equity and its affects.

2-4. Value of brand equity

Brand equity as a concept has been developed over the last decade (Aaker 1991; Keller 1998). Measuring the brand value is considered as one of the most critical issue that needs to be solved in the marketing research area. Malhotra (1999) mentioned in the journal that brand evaluation still needs research and measurements with the study of its construct. Malhotra’s research team argued that the generally agreed measure should start with the good understanding of the brand equity in a strategic way, with financial benefits to the firm. Financial statistics are available with the managers, therefore it should be analyzed in numbers, so that issues such as discount rate, growth rate or expected life of the brand or product can be predicted.

As capital becomes less of a constraint on businesses there will be far greater emphasis on how this capital is used to creatively differentiate the organization. The abundance of capital means that physical assets can be replicated with ease (Drucker, 1998). Once the company is stable with the
physical assets, the differentiation with other company will be focused on intangible assets. There are two trends that helps to understand the measure of brand equity. The first trend is how to measure the productivity of marketing spend, i.e., its productivity against the investment. The second trend accounting requirement that purchased brands are capitalized and amortized (Sheth and Sisoda, 2000).

The advantage of understanding the brand value is to correctly ensure to locate the resources at the greatest value point to the organization, maximizing the brand benefit.

Strong brand equity will simplify the decisions in the marketing strategies such as marketing investments. Another advantage of understanding the correct brand value helps in the merger and acquisition purposes. In the M&A process, both marketing profession and accounting profession should understand the value of each companies and choose which system needs to be adopted. Furthermore, an accurate brand equity valuation ensures that brand-licensing fees correctly reflect the benefits received (Keller, 1998).

2-5. Obstacles to Brand Valuation

It is important to understand and evaluate the company’s intangible assets. Careful and systematic process should be followed for determination of brand value as it may represent the market position of the company.
Reilly and Schweighs (1999) mentioned that there are many intangible assets of the company. It includes marketing related assets such as trademarks, logos and brand names, and corporate identity. Customer related intangible assets include customer lists and customer relationships.

Estimation and subjectivity are required to value the intangible assets as it usually arises as an obstacle for valuation.

2-6. Valuation Approaches

Understanding and measuring the value is one of the most difficult concept in marketing. Value has different perception and meanings to different people, therefore is not a simple way to determine.

There are number of valuation approaches to evaluate the brand value. The valuation approach is determined by its use and below are the five common valuation approaches.

1) Cost-based approaches - Cost-based approaches associate with the cost that creates the brand and the brand value. The cost may include the investment in the research and development process such as market testing and promotions (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1998).

2) Market-based approaches - Market-based approaches evaluates how the brand is sold in the market. The open market valuation is the highest value that a "willing buyer and willing seller" is prepared to
pay for the asset. This excludes a strategic buyer (Reilly and Schweihis, 1999).

3) Economic use or income-based approaches - Economic use approaches, also referred to as "in-use" or income-based approaches, that consider the future net earnings value from the brand, determining the value of the brand in the present (Keller, 1998; Reilly and Schweihis, 1999; Cravens and Guilding, 1999).

4) Formulary approaches - Formulary approaches consists of number of criteria to evaluate the brand. Many of approaches are systemized to calculate the numeric results based on profit on investments, this approach is included as a separate category due to their extensive commercial usage by consulting and other organizations.

5) Special situation approaches - Special situation approaches identify certain situations that may affect the valuation process and result under the belief that valuation may not be consistent with external and internal valuations (Bradley and Viswanathan, 2000).

It is important that company managements should understand the nature of the company’s intangible assets. Once the intangible assets are determined, the next step is to relate the asset to marketing activities and how it can derive the company profit. The main purpose of valuation is to understand the possible benefit that can brought to the company by that
intangible assets. Valuation method should be carefully set by the managements and then managements should appropriately ensure the discount rate, growth rate and its useful like that the last for. In the process of valuation, it is important to check the underlying assumptions as well.
III. Research Methodology

This chapter contains a basic presentation of the used research. According to Bryan and Bell (2007) quantitative research can be seen “as research strategy that emphasizes quantification in the collection and analysis of data” rather than words.

The aim of this study is to investigate the impact of brand equity of a sponsor depending on its activity as an official sponsor partner of Asian Games. The official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 - 361° is analyzed by two consumer groups, i.e., aware group and non aware group of brand’s involvement to 17th Asian Games Incheon as an official partner sponsorship with its differences in various factors.

This chapter introduces the research structure with research sample, tools with Data collection and analysis.
1. Research Sample

The research sample covers the spectators of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 on TV during the period of October 14th through 22nd in difference countries including Korea, China, Japan and Kazakhstan. The age group is between 10~50 years old, regardless of gender. 120 questionnaires were distributed to each countries via online and offline to four countries i.e., Korea, China, Japan and Kazakhstan. Out of 480 questionnaires, 324 were returned and 33 were not providing sufficient information therefore total of 291 questionnaires were used for analysis. Following table shows the demographic characteristics of survey target.
Table 5 - Demographic characteristics of Survey target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number (persons)</th>
<th>Percentile (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>10 ~ 20 years old</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 ~ 30 years old</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 ~ 40 years old</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 ~ 50 years old</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 ~ 60 years old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher than postgraduate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Worker</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Research Tools

The research tool used for this research is self-administration method. The questionnaire was structured based on former studies adjusted to drive accurate results to meet the purpose of the study. Each variables are designed by likert index by ‘Highly agreeable’ (5 points) to ‘Not agreeable’ (1 point) in 5 different levels.

Questionnaire is written to investigate the impact of brand equity by two groups, i.e., aware group and non aware group of brand’s involvement to 17th Asian Games Incheon as an official partner sponsorship with its differences in various factors. Questionnaire is formed by 3 divisions and questions are revised through initial research and analysis to drive validity.

Questionnaire consists of 50 questions including 17 questions to divide the survey targets into two groups - aware group and non aware group of brand’s involvement to 17th Asian Games Incheon as an official partner sponsorship. 8 questions on brand loyalty, 5 questions on brand awareness, 5 questions on brand image and another 5 questions and perceived quality.
Detailed structure of questions with research tools are as follows:

(1) Dividing the aware group and non aware group of brand’s involvement to 17th Asian Games Incheon as an official partner sponsorship.

In order divide the survey target into two groups, 17 questions were structured with 9 questions on official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 and 8 questions of IOC Global Partners or FIFA Partners.

(2) Brand Loyalty

8 questions were structured to measure the brand loyalty in reference to Aaker (1996), Tayler, Celuch and Goodwin (2004).

(3) Brand Awareness

5 questions were structured to measure brand awareness, based on research tools by Aaker (1996) and in reference to questionnaire developed by Yoo, Donthu and Lee (2000).

(4) Brand Image

5 questions were structured to measure Brand Image, based on research tools by Aaker (1996) and in reference to questionnaire developed by Yoo, Donthu and Lee (2000).
(5) Perceived Quality

10 questions were structured to measure Perceived Quality, based on research tools by Aaker (1996) and in reference to questionnaire developed by Yoo, Donthu and Lee (2000). & Kim, Hong Bin (2005).

Table 6 - Structure of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration index</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship Awareness</td>
<td>Awareness to sponsorship involvement to 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Image</td>
<td>Perceived Value, Characteristics, Organizational</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality</td>
<td>Leadership / Popularity, Perceived Quality</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Attitude, Behavioral</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Research Process

The research was done after the 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014, covering the period starting from October 14th – 22nd 2014. The survey was done both offline as well as online.
4. Data collection and Analysis

The collected data should be analyzed in two different ways. First, the data should be sorted by the primary socio demographic data. And then, the data on brand equity should be sorted, and all these data should be analyzed by different countries to clearly find out the sponsorship awareness on brand equity for 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by socio demographic levels in each of the countries. Secondary data for sponsorship Non-Awareness Group’s data should be collected to clarify the brand equity level after the information are given regarding the 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014.

The analysis is based on version 20.0 of the SPSS Statistics program.
IV. Research Results

1. Analysis on brand equity of Asian Games official sponsor partner based on demographic data.


Table 7 shows the difference on 361°s - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014, Brand Awareness by gender. Independent sample t-test was completed for validation and as shown on Table 7, there is no meaningful difference of brand awareness by gender (t=0.495, df=281.086, P>0.05).

Table 7 - Brand Awareness of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.5761</td>
<td>1.15679</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>281.086</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.5165</td>
<td>0.89206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the difference on 361°'s - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014, Brand Image by gender. Independent sample t-test was completed for validation and as shown on Table 8, there is no meaningful difference of brand awareness by gender ($t= -0.495$, $df=281.737$, $P>0.05$).

Table 8 - Brand Image of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Image</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.9068</td>
<td>1.05893</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>281.737</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.9496</td>
<td>.81082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 9 shows the difference on 361°'s - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014, Perceived quality by gender. Independent sample t-test was completed for validation and as shown on Table 9, there is no
meaningful difference of perceived quality by gender (t=0.199, df=271.498, P>0.05).

Table 9 - Perceived Quality of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.7313</td>
<td>0.88278</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>271.498</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.7122</td>
<td>0.74057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 10 shows the difference on 361°'s - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014, Brand Loyalty by gender. Independent sample t-test was completed for validation and as shown on Table 10, there is no meaningful difference of brand loyalty by gender (t=0.681, df=279, P>0.05).

Table 10 - Brand Loyalty of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.4671</td>
<td>0.95140</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.3989</td>
<td>0.74907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2-1. Analysis on Brand Awareness of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups.

Table 11 shows the analysis of brand awareness of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA analysis was completed. As shown on table 11, there is no meaningful difference on 361°’s brand awareness by age groups (f=5.332, df=4.286, P<0.05). Post analysis was completed to derive the analysis results by each age group. According to the result, there was no difference in 361°’s brand awareness by 30~39yrs group (Average=2.7367) and 40~49yrs group (Average=3.2400). However, there was significant difference between 10~19yrs group (Average=1.8000) and 40~49yrs group (Average=3.2400). In addition, there was distinctive difference of 361°’s Brand Awareness between 20~29yrs group (Average=2.4126) and 40~49yrs group (Average=3.2400). Therefore, it is found that 40~49yrs has higher level of brand awareness of 361° compared to younger group, i.e., 10~19yrs group and 20~29yrs group.
Table 11 - Analysis on Brand Awareness of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10~19 yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
<td>.40000</td>
<td>5.332</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>① 10 &amp; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20~29 yrs</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.4126</td>
<td>.98049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30~39 yrs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.7367</td>
<td>1.17976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40~49 yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.2400</td>
<td>.79895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50~59 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0500</td>
<td>.83865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.5526</td>
<td>1.05886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 12 shows the analysis of brand image of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 12, there is no meaningful difference on 361°’s brand image by age groups (f=1.676, df=4.286, P>0.05).
Table 12 - Analysis on Brand Image of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10–19 yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3600</td>
<td>1.12270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29 yrs</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.9371</td>
<td>.87530</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39 yrs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.9592</td>
<td>1.04889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49 yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.0800</td>
<td>1.13953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1500</td>
<td>.66081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.9237</td>
<td>.96723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-3. Analysis on Perceived Quality of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups.

Table 13 shows the analysis of perceived quality of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 13, there is a meaningful difference on perceived quality by different age groups (f=2.43, df=4.286, P<0.05). Post analysis was completed for each age groups and it is shown that there is significant difference on perceived quality by the age groups of 10–19yrs group (Average=2.2300) and 40–49yrs group(Average=3.1300). It is evidenced that 10–19yrs group has higher perceived quality on 361° brand than 40–49yrs group.
Table 13 - Analysis on Perceived Quality of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10~19 yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2300</td>
<td>.60009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20~29 yrs</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.7509</td>
<td>.79012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30~39 yrs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.6571</td>
<td>.88539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40~49 yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1300</td>
<td>.85600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50~59 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4750</td>
<td>.42720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.7237</td>
<td>.82822</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>① 10 &amp; 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-4. Analysis on brand loyalty of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups.

Table 14 shows the analysis of brand loyalty of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 14, there is no meaningful difference on brand loyalty by different age groups (f=1.328, df=4.285, P>0.05).
Table 14 - Analysis on brand loyalty of official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10–19 yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2750</td>
<td>.66091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29 yrs</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.4597</td>
<td>.83075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39 yrs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.3954</td>
<td>.92323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49 yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7250</td>
<td>1.08942</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
<td>.27003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2.4401</td>
<td>.87603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The brand equity value difference between the aware group and non aware group of Asian Games official sponsor partner

In order to analyze the correlation between Brand Equity and Official partnership of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014, independent sample t-test was completed. Test group was classified as aware and non aware group, i.e., the awareness meaning the group of people understanding the brands as an official sponsors partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014.

2-1. Brand Awareness by aware and non aware group of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 of Official Sponsor Partner

As shown on Table 15, there is a meaningful difference between the aware and non aware group on 361° brand awareness \( t=8.604, \ df=289, \ P<0.05 \). The average rate on brand awareness for aware group is 2.9697 while non aware group’s average rate is 2.0063. This means that the aware group has higher brand awareness on 361° brand than non aware group.
Table 15 - Brand Awareness by aware and non aware group of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 of Official Sponsor Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity</th>
<th>Official Sponsor Partner</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>Awareness Group</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.9697</td>
<td>1.02876</td>
<td>8.604</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-awareness Group</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.0063</td>
<td>.82595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-2. Brand Image by aware and non aware group of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 of Official Sponsor Partner

As shown on Table 16, there is a meaningful difference between the aware and non aware group on 361° brand images \( (t=3.437, \text{df}=289, P<0.05) \). The average rate on brand image for aware group is 3.0909 while non aware group’s average rate is 2.7048. This means that the aware group has higher brand image on 361° brand than non aware group.

Table 16 - Brand Image by aware and non aware group of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 of Official Sponsor Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity</th>
<th>Official Sponsor Partner</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Image</td>
<td>Awareness Group</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.0909</td>
<td>.96764</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-awareness Group</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.7048</td>
<td>.92562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2-3. Perceived Quality by aware and non aware group of 17th Asian Games

Incheon 2014 of Official Sponsor Partner

As shown on Table 17, there is a meaningful difference between the aware and non aware group on 361° perceived quality (t=2.447, df=289, P<0.05). The average rate on brand image for aware group is 2.8267 while non aware group’s average rate is 2.5889. This means that the aware group has higher perceived quality on 361° brand than non aware group.

Table 17 - Perceived Quality by aware and non aware group of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 of Official Sponsor Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity</th>
<th>Official Sponsor Partner</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality</td>
<td>Awareness Group</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.8267</td>
<td>.86582</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-awareness Group</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.5889</td>
<td>.75865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-4. Brand Loyalty by aware and non aware group of 17th Asian Games

Incheon 2014 of Official Sponsor Partner

As shown on Table 18, there is no meaningful difference between the aware and non aware group on 361° brand loyalty (t=1.638, df=288, P>0.05).
Table 18 - Brand Loyalty by aware and non aware group of 17th Asian Games
Incheon 2014 of Official Sponsor Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity</th>
<th>Official Sponsor Partner</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Awareness Group</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.5137</td>
<td>.93172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-awareness Group</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.3442</td>
<td>.79115</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Brand equity value analysis by different countries.

3-1. Brand awareness of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries.

Table 19 shows the analysis of brand awareness of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 19, there is a meaningful difference on brand awareness by 4 different countries (f=14.082, df=3.287, P<0.05). Post analysis was completed for each country and it is shown that there is significant difference on brand awareness. Between China (Average=3.0693) and Korea (Average=2.2439), China showed the higher brand awareness. China’s (Average=3.0693) rate was still higher than Japan (Average=2.2000). Between Korea (Average=2.2439) and Kazakhstan (Average=2.8480), Kazakhstan showed higher brand awareness. Between Japan (Average=2.2000) and Kazakhstan (Average=2.8480), Kazakhstan showed higher brand awareness. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between Korea (Average=2.2439) and Japan (Average=2.2000) on brand awareness.
Table 19 - Brand Awareness of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.0693</td>
<td>1.00673</td>
<td>14.082</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>① China &amp; Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.2439</td>
<td>1.05050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>② China &amp; Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
<td>.74413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>③ Korea &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.8480</td>
<td>1.06412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>④ Japan &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.5526</td>
<td>1.05886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-2. Brand Image of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries.

Table 20 shows the analysis of brand image of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 20, there is a meaningful difference on brand image by 4 different countries (f=10.887, df=3.287, P<0.05). Post analysis was completed for each country and it is shown that there is significant difference on brand awareness. Between China (Average=3.3333) and Korea (Average=2.6526), China showed the higher brand image. Between China (Average=3.3333) and Japan (Average=2.6731) China showed higher rate on brand image. Between Korea (Average=2.6526) and Kazakhstan (Average=3.1880), Kazakhstan showed higher brand image than Korea.
Between Japan (Average=2.6731) and Kazakhstan (Average=3.1880), Kazakhstan’s brand image was higher than Japan. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between Korea (Average=2.6526) and Japan (Average=2.6731) on brand image.

Table 20 - Brand Image of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>.90365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.6526</td>
<td>.85603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.6731</td>
<td>1.08828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.1880</td>
<td>.90297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.9237</td>
<td>.96723</td>
<td>10.887</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-3. Perceived Quality of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries.

Table 21 shows the analysis of Perceived Quality of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 21, there is a meaningful difference on brand image by 4 different countries (f=10.443, df=3.287, P<0.05). Post analysis was completed for each country and it is shown that there is significant difference...
on brand awareness. Between China (Average=2.9653) and (Average=2.5219), China showed the higher perceived quality. Between China (Average=2.9653) and Japan (Average=2.4596), China showed higher rate than Japan. Between Korea (Average=2.5219) and Kazakhstan (Average=3.0960), Kazakhstan showed higher perceived quality on 361° than Korea. Between Japan (Average=2.4596) and Kazakhstan (Average=3.0960), Kazakhstan showed higher perceived quality on 361° than Japan. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between Korea (Average=2.5219) and Japan (Average=2.4596) on perceived quality.

Table 21 - Perceived Quality of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.9653</td>
<td>.72717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>① China &amp; Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.5219</td>
<td>.78794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>② China &amp; Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.4596</td>
<td>.82468</td>
<td>10.443</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>③ Korea &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.0960</td>
<td>.84972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>④ Japan &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.7237</td>
<td>.82822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-4. Brand Loyalty of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries.
Table 22 shows the analysis of Brand Loyalty of 361° – the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 22, there is a meaningful difference on brand image by 4 different countries ($f=6.733$, $df=3.286$, $P<0.05$). Post analysis was completed for each country and it is shown that there is significant difference on brand awareness. Between Korea (Average=2.2083) and Kazakhstan (Average=2.8250), Kazakhstan showed higher brand loyalty on 361° than Korea. However no significant difference on 361° brand loyalty was found between China and (Average=2.5591) and Korea (Average=2.2083), China (Average=2.5591) and Japan (Average=2.4087), China (Average=2.5591) and Kazakhstan (Average=2.8250).

Table 22 - Brand Loyalty of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.5591</td>
<td>.83025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.2083</td>
<td>.89208</td>
<td>6.733</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>① Korea &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.4087</td>
<td>.81051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.8250</td>
<td>.82569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2.4401</td>
<td>.87603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Brand equity value analysis by final record on Asian Games.

4-1. Brand awareness of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games.

Table 23 shows the analysis of brand awareness of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 19, there is a meaningful difference on brand awareness by 4 different countries (f=14.082, df=3.287, P<0.05). Post analysis was completed for each country and it is shown that there is significant difference on brand awareness. Between China (Average=3.0693) and Korea (Average=2.2439), China showed the higher brand awareness. China’s (Average=3.0693) rate was still higher than Japan (Average=2.2000). Between Korea (Average=2.2439) and Kazakhstan (Average=2.8480), Kazakhstan showed higher brand awareness. Between Japan (Average=2.2000) and Kazakhstan (Average=2.8480), Kazakhstan showed higher brand awareness. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between Korea (Average=2.2439) and Japan (Average=2.2000) on brand awareness.
Table 23 - Brand Awareness of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.0693</td>
<td>1.00673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.2439</td>
<td>1.05050</td>
<td>14.082</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>① China &amp; Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
<td>0.74413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>② China &amp; Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.8480</td>
<td>1.06412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>③ Korea &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.5526</td>
<td>1.05886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>④ Japan &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-2. Brand Image of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games.

Table 24 shows the analysis of brand image of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian games. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 20, there is a meaningful difference on brand image by 4 different countries (f=10.887, df=3.287, P<0.05). Post analysis was completed for each country and it is shown that there is significant difference on brand awareness. Between China (Average=3.3333) and Korea (Average=2.6526), China showed the higher brand image. Between China (Average=3.3333) and Japan (Average=2.6731) China showed higher rate on brand image. Between Korea (Average=2.6526) and Kazakhstan (Average=3.1880), Kazakhstan showed higher brand image than Korea.
Between Japan (Average=2.6731) and Kazakhstan (Average=3.1880), Kazakhstan’s brand image was higher than Japan. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between Korea (Average=2.6526) and Japan (Average=2.6731) on brand image.

Table 24 - Brand Image of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>.90365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>① China &amp; Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.6526</td>
<td>.85603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>② China &amp; Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.6731</td>
<td>1.08828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>③ Korea &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.1880</td>
<td>.90297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>④ Japan &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.9237</td>
<td>.96723</td>
<td>10.887</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-3. Perceived Quality of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asia Games.

Table 25 shows the analysis of Perceived Quality of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 25, there is a meaningful difference on brand image by 4 different countries (f=10.443, df=3.287, P<0.05). Post analysis was completed for each country and it is shown that there is significant difference
on brand awareness. Between China (Average=2.9653) and (Average=2.5219), China showed the higher perceived quality. Between China (Average=2.9653) and Japan (Average=2.4596), China showed higher rate than Japan. Between Korea (Average=2.5219) and Kazakhstan (Average=3.0960), Kazakhstan showed higher perceived quality on 361° than Korea. Between Japan (Average=2.4596) and Kazakhstan (Average=3.0960), Kazakhstan showed higher perceived quality on 361° than Japan. On ther other hand, there was no significant difference between Korea (Average=2.5219) and Japan (Average=2.4596) on perceived quality.

Table 25 - Perceived Quality of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.9653</td>
<td>.72717</td>
<td>10.443</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>① China &amp; Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.5219</td>
<td>.78794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>② China &amp; Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.4596</td>
<td>.82468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>③ Korea &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.0960</td>
<td>.84972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>④ Japan &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.7237</td>
<td>.82822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4-4. Brand Loyalty of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games

Table 26 shows the analysis of Brand Loyalty of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games. In order to evidence the difference of the study, one-way ANOVA Analysis was completed. As shown on table 22, there is a meaningful difference on brand image by 4 different countries ($f=6.733$, $df=3.286$, $P<0.05$). Post analysis was completed for each country and it is shown that there is significant difference on brand awareness. Between Korea (Average=2.2083) and Kazakhstan (Average=2.8250), Kazakhstan showed higher brand loyalty on 361° than Korea. However no significant difference on 361° brand loyalty was found between China and (Average=2.5591) and Korea (Average=2.2083), China (Average=2.5591) and Japan (Average=2.4087), China (Average=2.5591) and Kazakhstan (Average=2.8250).
Table 26 - Brand Loyalty of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by final record on Asian Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.5591</td>
<td>.83025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.2083</td>
<td>.89208</td>
<td>6.733</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>① Korea &amp; Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.4087</td>
<td>.81051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.8250</td>
<td>.82569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2.4401</td>
<td>.87603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Discussion

1. Discussion

The aim of this study is to investigate the impact of brand equity of a sponsor depending on its activity as an official sponsor partner of Asian Games. This research was targeted for 4 countries participated in the 17th Asian Games Incheon. The official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 - 361° is analyzed by two consumer groups, i.e., aware group and non aware group of brand’s involvement to 17th Asian Games Incheon as an official partner sponsorship with its differences in various factors.

Survey was focused to find out about the effects of the sponsorship to Brand Awareness, Brand Image, Perceived Quality and Brand Loyalty. In order to achieve this objective, research content was set up and analyzed accordingly. Following are discussions about the results derived from the study.

1-1. Analysis on 361° Brand Equity as an official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 based on demographic groups.

There was a significant difference on 361° brand’s Brand Awareness, Brand Image, Perceived Quality and Brand Loyalty between the different demographic groups, according to the data by t-test and One-way ANOVA. According to the test result, there was no meaningful difference on 361° brand’s Brand Awareness, Brand Image, Perceived Quality and Brand Loyalty
by gender group. No meaningful difference were found on Brand Image and Brand Loyalty by different age groups while meaningful difference were found in the Brand Awareness and Perceived Quality. High brand awareness was rated by 40-49 years group than 10-19 years and 20-29 years group. In case of Perceived Quality, 40-49 years group rated higher than 10-19 years group. There were no significant results found on this result, which means not meaningful result was found for official sponsorship to Asian Games to effect on brand equity by different demographic groups.

1-2. The Brand Equity Value difference between the aware group and non aware group of 361° brand as an official sponsors partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014.

The analysis was made for aware and non aware group, depending on their awareness of 361° brand involvement as an official sponsor for 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. According to the analysis result, aware group has higher rate in brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality where no meaningful difference was found in the brand loyalty.
1-3. Brand Equity of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 different countries

Brand equity analysis of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 was made for the research group sorted by their nationalities, i.e., China, Korea, Japan and Kazakhstan. According to the analysis, there was meaningful difference in brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality between the countries, China and Korea, China and Japan, Kazakhstan and Korea, and Kazakhstan and Japan. There was no meaningful difference between Korea and Japan. However, there was a meaningful difference on brand loyalty between Korea and Kazakhstan.

1-4. Brand Equity of 361° brand - the official sponsor partner of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 by 4 countries’ final record on Asian Game.

Brand equity analysis of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 was conducted after the performance result was found after the completion of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. According to the analysis result, there were meaningful differences on brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality between the countries, China and Korea, China and Japan, Kazakhstan and Korea, and Kazakhstan and Japan. There was no meaningful difference between Korea and Japan. However, there was a meaningful difference on brand loyalty between Korea and Kazakhstan.
2. Finding

Through findings from this research, it is found that sport sponsorship covers relatively large scope of target group than other marketing strategies. Results on demographic group shows that interest on sport marketing is constantly increasing and there are no remarkable distinctions of demographic characteristics on sport marketing events. Sport sponsoring and event marketing are focusing on all different levels of consumers, regardless of gender, age and nationality. Targeted groups of sport sponsorship is wide and appropriate strategy should be developed. Even though targeted group size seems bigger than other existing marketing strategies, it is evidenced from this study that some sectors are in need to be developed. According to the results by 4 different countries participated in the 17th Incheon Asian Games, i.e., Korea, Japan, China and Kazakhstan, it is found that the official sponsoring effected with the highest rate at Kazakhstan, where the target market has relatively low exposure to the international sport brands and marketing promotions. In the flow of massive marketing activities, it is important that some markets are yet to be developed and those developing markets will bring higher success with same effort and amount of investments.
VI. Conclusion

1. Conclusion

Marketing activities utilizing the sport sponsorship is constantly increasing every year. It stimulates highly competitive marketing environment for companies and brands, enlarging its involvement in sports events and sponsorships. As a result, companies have expanded its target market size into international market. Existing advertisements, image marketing and other marketing activities will be more effective and companies are expecting higher volume of results over the world. All sports events provide sponsorship activities for sponsorships and companies expect enhancing the company image, create positive brand image, accelerating revenue through sport sponsorships.

Therefore, this research focuses on finding out the changes of brand equity of brand 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. In order to derive delicate results, the research was focused on three parts. First, the research group was divided into two: aware and non aware group, depending on their awareness of 361° brand involvement as an official sponsor for 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. Second, the research group was divided as their belonged country. Four countries were in the sample of the study, China, Korea, Japan and Kazakhstan. Third, research was done after the 17th
Asian Games Incheon 2014 was completed, to measure the difference after their belonged country’s performance in the Asian Games were resulted.

This research was focused on changes of perceived brand equity and its effectiveness before and after the Asian Games to find out the effectiveness of mega events sponsorship to be used as a marketing tool for companies in the future.

The research sample covers the spectators of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 on TV during the period of October 14th through 22nd in difference countries including Korea, China, Japan and Kazakhstan. The age group is between 10~50 years old, regardless of gender. 120 questionnaires were distributed to each countries via online and offline to four countries i.e., Korea, China, Japan and Kazakhstan. Out of 480 questionnaires, 324 were returned and 33 were not providing sufficient information therefore total of 291 questionnaires were used for analysis. Following table shows the demographic characteristics of survey target.

As mentioned above, research firstly focused on perceived brand equity of the brand 361 by different demographic level. And then, the research group was divided into aware and non aware group, depending on their awareness of 361° brand involvement as an official sponsor for 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. In addition to above, the research group was again sorted by their nationalities, i.e., China, Korea, Japan and Kazakhstan. Lastly,
research was again conducted after the performance result was found after the completion of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. In order to derive the accurate data, T-test and One-way ANOVA analysis was conducted.

First, there was no meaningful difference shown on 361° brand equity as an official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon in few demographic analysis in gender. In addition, there was no significant difference shown in brand image and brand loyalty by different age groups. However, noticeable difference was shown in brand awareness and perceived quality by different age groups. In case of brand awareness, the age group of 40~49 years were showing higher rate than younger groups, i.e., 10~19 years and 20~29 years old. Perceived quality as shown higher rate by 40~49 years age group as well, higher than younger group of 10~19years.

Secondly, the analysis was made for aware and non aware group, depending on their awareness of 361° brand involvement as an official sponsor for 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. According to the analysis result, aware group has higher rate in brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality where no meaningful difference was found in the brand loyalty.
Third, brand equity analysis of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 was made for the research group sorted by their nationalities, i.e., China, Korea, Japan and Kazakhstan. According to the analysis, there was meaningful difference in brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality between the countries, China and Korea, China and Japan, Kazakhstan and Korea, and Kazakhstan and Japan. There was no meaningful difference between Korea and Japan. However, there was a meaningful difference on brand loyalty between Korea and Kazakhstan.

Lastly, brand equity analysis of 361° - the official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014 was conducted after the performance result was found after the completion of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. According to the analysis result, there were meaningful differences on brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality between the countries, China and Korea, China and Japan, Kazakhstan and Korea, and Kazakhstan and Japan. There was no meaningful difference between Korea and Japan. However, there was a meaningful difference on brand loyalty between Korea and Kazakhstan.

Through this research and study, followings can be concluded:
1) Target market should be precisely studied for sport sponsorship.

It is found from this research that unlike other marketing activities, sport sponsorship especially in the mega sport events such as Olympics, World
Cup and Asian Games covers large scope of target group. Such target group cannot be simply divided by demographic characteristics or purchase patterns. Every sponsoring events should be thoroughly analyzed to specify the target groups and most effective way to reach the target market should be precisely studied and appropriately locate the investments.

2) Constant studies and researches should be done for high potential market for sport sponsorships.

According to the result, it is noticeable that Kazakhstan - the country where with relatively lower level of exposure to international sport brands, showed higher level of brand equity for 361° brand than other countries like Korea and Japan. Official sponsoring to mega event like Asian Game has great effect to Kazakhstan. This result provides an evidence to support that sport sponsorship has high potential for success in countries like Kazakhstan - with relatively low exposure to international sport brands. Current sport marketing environment provides massive flow of marketing activities and strategies. Many target markets like US, Korea, and Japan may not bring more effective as results than other potential markets. Continuous efforts are required to find out the potential market to bring the highest return on investment.
2. Limitation and Future Research

This research has following limitations and in order to maximize the effect of sport sponsorship, it is recommended that further studies can focus on further topics.

First, this research limited the survey to 4 countries out of 45 countries participated in the 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. Also, it has focused on one brand - 361°, out of numerous brands that sponsored the 17th Asian Games Incheon. Therefore, it is required to find out if this research result can represent the generalized idea of official sponsoring to Asian Games. It is required to expand the research countries as well as brands to provide different results for generalization. Such expansion on research to wider range of target group will provide detailed and specified data on country’s consumer characteristics and its potential for growth.

Second, development of measurement tools for fairness and depth of analysis is required for assumptions on different possible variables. Since this research provided the results that no meaningful difference was found by the demographic characteristics, further studies may focus on other variables to find out about the effective way to strengthen the brand equity.

Third, this research was focused on the sponsorship activity of 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014. Therefore, it may propose different results for
sponsorships to other sport events, professional sport leagues. Sponsorship effects may vary according to the characteristics of sponsoring partner.
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국문 초록

아시안 게임 공식 후원이 브랜드 자산에 미치는 영향:
제 17회 인천아시안게임 공식 후원을 중심으로

이 근호
서울대학교대학원
체육교육과

최근 많은 기업과 브랜드들이 자사의 기업 이미지나 브랜드 자산을 강화하기 위한 마케팅 및 홍보 전략 수단의 하나로서 스포츠 스폰서십을 활용하고 있다. 본 연구의 목적은 스포츠 스폰서십 활동을 하고 있는 브랜드의 스포츠 스폰서십 활동을 인지한 그룹과 비인지한 그룹간의 스포츠 스폰서십 활동을 하고 있는 브랜드의 브랜드 자산에 대한 차이를 알아보기 위함에 초점을 두었다.

본 연구를 위한 스포츠 스폰서십의 모델로는 2014년 인천에서 개최가 된 제 17회 인천아시안게임으로 설정을 하였다. 제 17회
인천아시안게임의 공식 후원사를 인지한 그룹과 비인지한 그룹간의 공식 후원사의 브랜드 자산에 대한 차이를 알아보기 위해서 제 17회 인천아시안게임의 공식 후원사인 361° 브랜드가 제 17회 인천아시안게임의 공식 후원사임을 인지한 그룹과 비인지한 그룹으로 나누어 361° 브랜드의 브랜드 자산에 차이가 있는지를 연구하였다. 또한, 제 17회 인천아시안게임에 참가한 국가 및 최종 성적에 따라 361° 브랜드의 브랜드 자산에 대해 각 나라별 차이가 있는지를 연구하였다. 본 연구의 설문지 조사 대상은 제 17회 인천아시안게임을 시청한 중국, 한국, 일본 그리고 카자흐스탄의 국민을 대상으로 진행하였다. 본 연구의 결과를 종합해 보면 스포츠 스폰서십을 인지한 그룹이 비인지한 그룹보다 스포츠 스폰서십 활동을 하고 있는 브랜드의 브랜드 자산에 대해서 높게 나왔고, 글로벌 스포츠 브랜드를 많이 접해본 국가보다는 많이 접해보지 않은 국가에서 스포츠 스폰서십 활동을 한 브랜드의 브랜드 자산에 대해서 더 높은 연구 결과가 나왔다.

주요어: 스포츠 스폰서십, 브랜드 자산, 브랜드 인지도,

브랜드 이미지, 지각된 품질, 브랜드 충성도

학번: 2013-23406
Dear whom may it concern,

First of all, I would sincerely like to thank you for your valuable time answering this questionnaire.

This survey researches about the effects to company’s brand equity as an official sponsor of 17th Asian Games Incheon.

All of your responses will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used as a research data. Your valued response will surely be an important supportive for this study as well as development of sport industry inside and outside Korea.

Moreover, please be reminded that there is no right or wrong answer in this questionnaire. Please mark whatever you have felt about the question. This survey will take approximately 15 minutes.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.
1. Do you think the following company (or brand) is an official sponsor of the 17th Asian Games Incheon 2014?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company/Brand</th>
<th>Option 1: Yes, it is an official sponsor</th>
<th>Option 2: No, it is not an official sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMSUNG</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Donald</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK Telecom</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adidas</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHINHAN BANK</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca Cola</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361°</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONY</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIA</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISA</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYUNDAI</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panasonic</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TISSOT</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIRATES</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POCARI SWEAT</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMEGA</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Air</td>
<td>① Yes, it is an official sponsor</td>
<td>② No, it is not an official sponsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
※ This is an explanation to 361° brand.
[Advertisement of 361° Brand]

361° is a representative sports brand in China, launched in 2003. 361° means the 1 degree added to the 360° - a full circle, expressing its strong will for presenting perfect quality products.

361° is a complex brand that covers development, design, production and sales focusing on sports items including apparels, shoes, equipment, kids and casual wears.
2. Below are questions about 361°

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreeable</th>
<th>←</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>Strongly Agreeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I like the brand 361°.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 361° suits my style.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 361° feels special for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I liked 361° for long time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I will come back for 361° brand even if it is more expensive than other products.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I will surely purchase 361° brand on my next purchase.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) If I have selection of similar products / service, I will choose 361° brand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I will recommend 361° to my friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreeable</th>
<th>←</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>Strongly Agreeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I am well aware of 361° brand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I have seen the logo or representations of 361° brand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 361° is a well-known brand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I can recall logo or representations of 361° brand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I have heard of 361° brand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Strongly Disagreeable</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Strongly Agreeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) 361° is valuable compared to other brand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 361° is a special brand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 361° is a unique brand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 361° is an attractive brand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) 361° is different from other brands.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) 361° is reliable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) 361° provides high quality product than other competing brands.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) 361° is keeping with high quality on its products.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) 361° is consistent with its product quality.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) 361° provides good quality.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) 361° is a leading brand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) 361° is a popular brand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) 361° is an innovative brand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) 361° provides high self-esteem by using its products.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) 361° is attractive and trendy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Demographic questions.

1) What is your gender?  ① Male  ② Female

2) Please mark your age group
   ① 10~19 years  ② 20~29 years  ③ 30~39 years
   ④ 40~49 years  ⑤ 50~59 years  ⑥ over 60 years

3) What is your nationality?  ① China  ② Korea  ③ Japan  ④ Kazakhstan

4) Please mark your academic background
   ① High School graduate  ② University student/graduate  ③ Post graduate
      student/graduate
   ④ Higher than Master’s degree  ⑤ Others (  )

5) Please mark your occupation
   ① Student  ② Profession  ③ Government official  ④ Entrepreneur
   ⑤ Businessman  ⑥ Others (  )

   Thank you for your time answering the above.