

e-ISSN:2587-2168



Year: 2022  
Vol: 8 Issue: 45  
pp 599-611

Article ID  
64155  
Arrival  
17 July 2022  
Published  
30 September 2022

## DOI NUMBER

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/ideas.64155>

## How to Cite This Article

Sarioğlu, C. İ. (2022). "In Terms of Demographics, The Purchasing Tendencies of Supporters of Turkey's Big Three Teams", International Journal of Disciplines Economics & Administrative Sciences Studies, (e-ISSN:2587-2168), Vol:8, Issue:45; pp: 599-611



International Journal of Disciplines Economics & Administrative Sciences Studies is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

## In Terms of Demographics, The Purchasing Tendencies of Supporters of Turkey's Big Three Teams

Cüneyd İkbal Sarioğlu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assist. Prof. Dr., Kocaeli University, Hereke Ömer İsmet Uzunyol Vocational School, Department of Foreign Trade, Kocaeli, Turkey

### ABSTRACT

It is seen that sports teams make a significant profit from licensed products. The purchase of these products by the fans is vital for the financial situation of the teams. It is observed that the fans of sports teams tend to buy the licensed products of their teams for various reasons. Determining these trends is important in terms of directing the marketing strategies of sports teams. For this reason, it can be stated that the factors affecting team fans' purchasing intentions from sports stores stand out as an important research area. In this context, this study, the perceptions of the fans of the big three teams in Turkey about the factors affecting their purchasing intentions from the sports stores were examined by analyzing the answers of the fans of the 461 big three teams' fans living in Istanbul. The results obtained from the one-way ANOVA and independent samples t-tests reveal that; there are significant differences in the dimension of commitment according to gender; in the dimensions of commitment and the product tangibles according to age; in the dimensions of management/technical staff/players and sportive success according to education level; in the dimensions of commitment, social environment, economic reasons and the product tangibles according to purchasing frequency and in the dimensions of management/technical staff/players and economic reasons according to the supported team.

**Keywords:** Sports Club Stores, Commitment, Purchase Intention, Sporting Success

## 1. INTRODUCTION

While sports enable the formation of large consumer groups and their coming together, they also provide significant income to sports clubs with licenced products sold. For this reason, sports have entered the field of interest of many companies and have started to be used as a marketing tool in many areas. Thus, it gained a commercial dimension with the growth of consumer groups. Today, sports have become a large industry and are developing gradually. Today, interest in every branch of sports is increasing, but the most interest is undoubtedly directed at football. It is undeniable that the primary focus of the media and other mass media is on football and that it has an important role in making football the centre of attention. The consumer has an important place in the general understanding of marketing. The consumer also maintains this feature in sports marketing. When the concepts of consumption and sports are brought together, the first thing that comes to mind is the phenomenon of fans. "Fan" is a concept that is known and accepted as an indispensable part of sports. Fan support has an important place in every field of sport. However, it is an accepted fact that it takes place more often in football. The best example of this is that football clubs constantly ask for support from their fans and state this in every statement.

It is common today that sports teams make significant gains on licenced products. The fans' loyalty and passion for their team and their identification with their team motivate them to do more for their team. However, it is thought that there may be many factors that can be effective in the decision of fans to purchase licenced sports products. For this reason, it can be stated that the factors affecting fans' purchasing intentions from sports stores stand out as an important research area. In this context, in this study, it is aimed to examine the perceptions of the supporters of the three big teams in Turkey about the factors affecting their purchasing intentions from the sports stores within the scope of the fans of the three big teams who live in Istanbul.

## 2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1. Purchase Intention

Purchasing intention is defined as the consumer's plans to purchase a certain amount of a certain brand or product in a certain time period. Purchasing intention refers to the consumer's thoughts about purchasing a particular product or service (Chen et al., 2013). Purchasing intention means that a customer prefers to buy a product or service because he or she realises that he or she needs a certain product or service, as well as his or her attitude towards the product and product perception. In other words, it means that the customer will buy it after evaluating the product and discovering that it is worth buying (Madahi and Sukati, 2012).

Consumers' intention to purchase is based on product, service or brand selection and information about the time and amount to be purchased. For marketers, knowing the consumer's purchasing intention is a way of predicting what they will buy. For this reason, marketers often conduct research to measure consumer intentions. In addition, since the cost of retaining an existing customer is less than acquiring new customers when evaluated in the context of relationship marketing, purchase intention is an issue that businesses care about (Spreng et al., 1995). Purchase intention shows the predictable behaviour of the consumer. In other words, it can be used to predict which products or brands consumers will buy next time they shop (Fandos and Flavian, 2006).

### 2.2. Factors Affecting the Fans' Product Purchase Intention From The Club Sports Stores

Fans prefer licenced products from their favourite sports teams for a variety of reasons. While some supporters buy these things during moments of tremendous team success, others buy them when star players join the squad. Other factors, however, influence purchase intent. The elements influencing fan purchases of licenced products are discussed briefly below.

#### 2.2.1. Commitment

Customer loyalty is defined as a positive attitude and consistent purchasing behaviour towards a particular brand. Customer loyalty is the loyalty that a customer feels towards a particular product or service in an environment where other alternatives are available. Customer loyalty is not only an accidental purchase tendency but also an intentional desire (Bayuk and Küçük, 2007). In the context of sports, team loyalty represents the psychological connection with a team that results in consistent and lasting positive behaviours and attitudes towards a team (Funk and James, 2001). Researchers state that the loyalty structure should include both attitudinal and behavioural dimensions (Bauer et al., 2008; Bee and Havitz, 2010; Bodet and Bernache-Assollant, 2011). Behavioural loyalty expresses the actual purchasing behaviour towards the team (Stevens & Rosenberger, 2012). It can include factors such as the frequency of participation in the game in a season or over time, the regularity of following the team through the media, and the money spent (Bodet and Bernache, 2011). Alternatively, attitude loyalty is expressed as a function of psychological processes that include a person's commitment to the team and attitude preference (Bauer et al., 2008).

In a study examining the effect of team fans' motivation factors on behavioural loyalty, it is stated that identification with the team and psychological commitment have a positive effect on behavioural loyalty. It is stated that the most effective dimension of behavioural loyalty is loyalty to club products (Giray and Girişken, 2015). As a result, it can be claimed that increased loyalty to the team will favourably effect consumers' purchase behaviour of the team's licenced products.

#### 2.2.2. Social Environment

Individuals acquire a social environment from the sports activities they participate in and develop their social capital. (Sweeney and Soutar, 2001). Fans who are interested in products for sports team games gain opportunities to connect with relevant social groups. Therefore, socialisation is a basic motive that explains why fans follow sports teams. Socialisation in sports can be defined as a brand relationship between consumers and sports teams. In addition, it has been revealed that the social value that consumers provide to sports teams increase their commitment to the team and game consumption. The acceptance of the individual in the social environment acquired through sports shows the social value of sports products (Bauer et al., 2008; Katz and Heere, 2013; Lock et al., 2011; Lock et al., 2012; Kunkel et al., 2017).

Kwon and Armstrong (2006) and Apostolopoulou, Papadimitriou, and Damtsiou (2010) revealed in their studies that consumers' purchases of licenced sports products are associated with symbolic meanings rather than functional or experiential meanings. In this respect, the positive or negative reactions of the fans when they use the product are important in terms of the value of the licenced team product in the eyes of the fans. In other

words, it demonstrates that not only the functional benefit but also the social approval dimension influence product perceived value (Lee and Trail., 2011).

### **2.2.3. Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players**

The management, technical team, and players, which are the basic members of a sports club, can be effective in gaining the loyalty of the fans to the team. In particular, the fact that these people are famous stars gives the opportunity for large crowds to show interest in the team. In Madrigal's (2001) study, it was investigated whether the attitude towards purchasing behaviour had a mediating effect on the relationship between identification with the team and purchase intention. Fan identification with the team drives the purchase of licenced products. Because one of the reasons sports fans prefer licenced products is to support their favourite team or player. On the other hand, Susiva (2019) revealed that having star players in a team has a positive effect on consumers' intention to purchase sponsored products.

### **2.2.4. Sporting Success**

Fans see their team as a part of themselves, and their success becomes a source of confidence and pride for them. Conversely, fans feel a sense of personal loss when the teams they support fail. This situation shows how important the sport's success is to the fans and that it can affect the behaviour of the fans to buy their licenced products. In this context, Susiva (2019) found that team success has a large positive effect on consumers' intention to purchase sponsored products. Ngan et al. (2011) found that successful results, especially in a team with star players, make the strongest contribution to consumers' purchase intention. However, it has been determined that unsuccessful results, even with star players, have a negative effect on purchasing behaviour. This shows that sportive success is one of the most important factors in the purchase of licenced products by fans. As a result, it can be claimed that sporting success influences the intention to purchase licenced team products.

### **2.2.5. Economic Reasons**

It can be stated that economic factors are also effective in licenced sports products. However, it is seen that licenced sports products are expensive. Even so, it can be observed that the fans do not hesitate to spend money on their favourite teams. Fans who want to pay less economically have the risk of turning to unlicensed products. It has been determined that product prices have an effect on purchase intention, especially for fans who identify less with their teams (Hedlund and Naylor, 2020). Kwon and Armstrong (2002) found that fans who identify with the team have an effect on spending more money.

### **2.2.6. Product Tangibles**

Although fans like purchasing things from their favourite clubs, the basic tangible features of the products are equally crucial. Because the durability, appearance, size, and quality of the products influence fans' decisions to acquire the licenced products. Failure to achieve these tangible standards may also lead to fans turning to cheaper unlicensed products. In this regard, Kwon et al. (2007) discovered that perceived quality explains sports goods purchase intention. Similarly, Kwak and Kang (2009) discovered that product quality perception is effective in purchasing licenced sports products. According to Torlak et al. (2014), quality perceptions have a crucial role in fan purchases of licenced products. For this reason, it can be stated that the tangible features of the products also affect the purchasing behaviour.

## **3. METHODOLOGY**

In this study, the level of perceptions of the fans regarding the factors affecting their intention to purchase products from sports stores and whether there is a significant difference in the perceptions of the fans according to various demographic characteristics were examined. For this purpose, research was conducted with a sample formed with the participation of 461 Turkey's three big teams' (Fenerbahçe, Galatasaray and Beşiktaş) fans in Istanbul.

### **3.1 Development of the Hypothesis**

The literature on the factors affecting the buying behaviour of football fans for licenced products of clubs is given above. These factors are; commitment, social environment, club administration, technical staff, players, sporting success, economic reasons and product tangibles. The effect of these variables on the purchase intention may differ according to the demographic characteristics of the fans. According to Tsiotsou (2014) and Yun et al. (2021), demographic characteristics of fans have different effects. According to the researchers, the effects of these traits can shape fan behaviour regardless of whether the team wins or loses. According to the

qualitative model created by Khorshidi et al. (2022), the demographics of the fans affect their perceptions of the club, such as their loyalty to the club. According to Smith et al. (2008), fans' purchasing intentions and perceptions of their teams differ according to demographic characteristics such as gender and income. When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that there is very little research on some of the variables used in this study in terms of demographic variables. For this reason, the hypotheses were developed to examine whether the demographic characteristics of the supporters regarding the relationship between perceptions of commitment, social environment, club administration, technical staff, players, sporting success, economic reasons, and product tangibles and purchase intention differ.

The hypotheses determined for the research are given below.

H<sub>1</sub>: The fans' perceptions of the "Commitment" differ significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H<sub>2</sub>: The fans' perceptions of the "Social environment" differ significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H<sub>3</sub>: The fans' perceptions of the "Club administration, technical staff, players" differ significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H<sub>4</sub>: The fans' perceptions of the "Sporting success" differ significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H<sub>5</sub>: The fans' perceptions of the "Economic reasons" differ significantly according to demographic characteristics.

H<sub>6</sub>: The fans' perceptions of the "Product tangibles" differ significantly according to demographic characteristics.

For this research, the ethics committee approval decision was taken by Kocaeli University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee 23.01.2022 and numbered 175832.

### 3.2. Questionnaire Form

The items of the "Commitment" and "Social environment" dimensions were quoted from Kunkel, Doyle and Berlin (2017)'s; the items of the "Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players" and "Sporting success" dimensions were quoted from Mahony, Madrigal and Howard (2000)'s; items of the "Economical reasons" dimension were quoted from Fotopoulos, Krystallis, Vassallo and Pagiaslis (2009)'s and the items of the "Product tangibles" dimension were quoted from Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985)'s studies in the questionnaire form. All of the items are 5-point Likert type and equally spaced.

### 3.3. Data Collection

First, a pilot study was conducted with the data obtained from 50 fans. The collected data was applied to validity and reliability tests, and minor revisions were made to some of the items in the form. The final version of the questionnaire form was filled in by Turkey's three big teams'(Fenerbahçe, Galatasaray, and Beşiktaş) fans in Istanbul.

Data in the forms was checked visually and by frequency analysis in the SPSS 22 statistical programme for the possibility of missing data. Whether the research variables had a normal distribution or not was tested with kurtosis and skewness values. Since the kurtosis and skewness values were between -2 and +2, it was determined that the variables had a normal distribution (Mardia, 1985). Thus, independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA/Welch tests were used in the analysis.

### 3.4. Sample

Of the participating fans in the study; 64.2% of them are males; 49.6% of them earn 4001–8000 TL per month; 48.6% of them belong to the Y generation (Between 22–40 years old); 33.9% of them have completed an associate degree education; 35.6% of them support Fenerbahçe; and 49.7% of them purchase from the club sports stores.

**Table 1:** Demographic Characteristics of Sample

	Frequency	%		Frequency	%
<b>Age</b>			<b>Education Level</b>		
Baby Boomers (59 years old and older)	3	%0.7	Primary School	79	%17.1
X Generation (41-58 years old)	43	%9.3	High School	97	%21.1

	Frequency	%		Frequency	%
Y Generation (22-40 years old)	224	%48.6	Associate Degree	156	%33.9
Z Generation (21 years old and younger)	191	%41.4	Bachelor's Degree and higher	129	%27.9
<b>Supported Team</b>			<b>Frequency of Purchase</b>		
Fenerbahçe	164	%35.6	Once/Several times a year	229	%49.7
Galatasaray	151	%32.7	Once/Several times a month	154	%33.4
Beşiktaş	146	%31.7	Once/Several times a week	78	%16.9
<b>Gender</b>			<b>Monthly Income</b>		
Male	296	%64.2	0-4000 TL	106	%23.1
Female	165	%35.8	4001-8000 TL	229	%49.6
			8001 TL and more	126	%27.3
<b>N=461</b>					

### 3.5. Validity

The scales was examined in terms of internal consistency using convergent validity analysis and reliability with the Cronbach alpha method and combined reliability analyzes. For convergent validity, all CR values for the scale are expected to be greater than the AVE values and the AVE value to be greater than 0.5. combined reliability; It is used to measure the overall reliability of multiple, heterogeneous, but similar statements, and this value is expected to be greater than 0.7 (Küçük, 2016). In order to test the validity of the research, the scales included in the study were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The standardized regression coefficients obtained for each scale item as a result of the confirmatory factor analysis are given in Table 2. Four items (Two of them are under "Commitment" and two of them are under "Social Environment" dimensions) were excluded from the analysis because their standardized regression coefficients were well below 0.7.

**Table 2:** Standardized Regression Coefficients Obtained for Each Scale Item as a Result of CFA

Scales	Standardized Regression Coefficients
<b>Commitment</b>	
I shop at the sports store for my favourite team because I feel like I belong to a special group.	0.796
I shop at the sports store of my favourite team because I support my team financially.	0.815
<b>Social Environment</b>	
I shop at the sports shop of my favourite team so that those around me see how loyal a fan I am.	0.839
I shop at the sports shop of my favourite team, so I feel accepted by those around me.	0.772
<b>Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players</b>	
Whether I like/dislike the club administration I support affects my decision to buy products from the sports store.	0.869
Whether I like/dislike the players of my favourite team affect my decision to buy products from the sports store.	0.873
Whether I like/dislike the technical staff of the team I support affects my decision to buy products from the sports store.	0.800
<b>Sporting Success</b>	
The overall performance of the team I support affects my decision to buy products from the sports store.	0.796
The derby performance of my favourite team affects my decision to buy products from the sports store.	0.811
The performance of my favourite team in league matches, excluding derbies, affects my decision to buy products from the sports store.	0.861
The European Cup performance of my favourite team affects my decision to buy products from the sports store.	0.842
<b>Economic Reasons</b>	
The products in the sports shop of my favourite team are not expensive.	0.716
The products in the sports shop of my favourite team are worth the money I give.	0.705
The price I pay for the products in the sports shop of my favourite team does not exceed my budget.	0.723
<b>Product Tangibles</b>	
I find the products I want in the sports shop of my favourite team.	0.785
The products in the sports shop of my favourite team look very nice.	0.820
I find products in the size I am looking for (Width, length etc.) in the sports shop of my favourite team.	0.835
The products in the sports shop of my favourite team are durable.	0.800

Note: "Maximum likelihood" technique was used in CFA.

DFA fit indices are given in Table 3. As seen, all of the fit indices are within the ideal range.

**Table 3:** CFA Fit Indices

Fit Measure	Calculated Value	Acceptance Criteria
Minimum Discrepancy Per Degree of Freedom (CMIN/DF)	1.525	Accepted < 5 , Ideal < 2
Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI)	0.958	Accepted > .90 , Ideal > .95
Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index (AGFI)	0.941	Accepted > .85 , Ideal > .89
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.985	Accepted > .95 , Ideal > .97
Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)	0.985	Accepted > .95 , Ideal > .97
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	0.958	Accepted > .90 , Ideal > .95
Root Mean Squared Error Approximation (RMSEA)	0.034	Accepted < .10 , Ideal < .05

Source: Schermelleh, Moosbrugger and Müller (2003).

Three criteria were considered for the validity of the scales: Divergence validity, convergent validity and content validity. All of the six scales included in the research are scales previously published in scientific publications. In this way, content validity criteria is provided (Hair, Babin, Black and Anderson, 2010).

The results of CFA show that scale items are loaded on the factors they belong to and there is a correlation between items loaded under the same factor. In this way, convergent validity criterion is provided (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988).

The results of CFA show that the factors are clearly differentiated from each other. In this way, the discriminant validity criterion is provided (Hair et al., 2010).

### 3.6. Reliability

Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the scales were calculated for reliability. Cronbach's alpha coefficients are given in Table 4. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients calculated for all of the scales are above 0.7. In this way, the reliabilities of the scales are ensured (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).

According to Küçük (2016:232), the scales are quite reliable when they stay between 0.60 and 0.80. If it is between 0.80 and 1, the scale is highly reliable (Küçük, 2016: 231-232). Accordingly, some of the scales are highly reliable and some are highly reliable. The results are shown in the table below.

**Table 4:** Calculated Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients

Scales	Calculated Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients
Commitment	0.815
Social Environment	0.784
Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players	0.884
Sporting Success	0.895
Economic Reasons	0.733
Product Tangibles	0.883

### 3.7. Testing Research Hypotheses with Independent Sample t-Tests and One-Way ANOVA/Welch Tests

Testing of research hypotheses was carried out with independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA/Welch tests. Independent sample t-test was performed with the variables of gender in which the independent variables were divided into two categories. One-way ANOVA/Welch tests were used in the tests performed with age, education level, monthly income, frequency of purchase and team variables that have more than two categories. In the independent sample t-tests, Levene statistic was used to check whether the variances were equal and the probability value in the relevant row was considered. Homogeneity of variances was checked before one-way ANOVA/Welch tests; if the variances were homogeneous, the ANOVA test results were considered, and if not, the Welch test results were considered. In case of a difference between groups as a result of ANOVA/Welch tests, Scheffe post hoc test was used for ANOVA test in order to determine from which groups the difference originated; Games-Howell post hoc test was used for the results of Welch test.

Independent sample t-test results are shown in Table 5. While there is a significant difference in "Social environment" perception levels according to gender ( $p < 0.01$ ) (H1.2 accepted); there is no significant difference in "Commitment", "Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players", "Sporting success", "Economic Reasons" and "Product Tangibles" ( $p > 0.05$ ) (H1.1, H1.3, H1.4, H1.5 and H1.6 rejected). The mean of the fans' social environment perception is higher for male fans ( $\bar{X} = 2.69 \pm 1.27$ ) than for female fans ( $\bar{X} = 2.36 \pm 1.06$ ).

**Table 5:** Results of Independent Samples t-Tests

Dependent Variables	Gender	Frequency (f)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Levene's Stat.	p
<b>Commitment</b>	Female	165	3.54	1.11	0.159	0.545
	Male	296	3.60	1.19		
<b>Social Environment</b>	Female	165	2.36	1.06	0.001	<b>0.005**</b>
	Male	296	2.69	1.27		
<b>Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players</b>	Female	165	2.19	1.08	0.603	0.988
	Male	296	2.19	1.08		
<b>Sporting Success</b>	Female	165	2.37	1.07	0.007	0.141
	Male	296	2.54	1.19		
<b>Economic Reasons</b>	Female	165	3.13	0.82	0.008	0.676
	Male	296	3.09	0.99		
<b>Product Tangibles</b>	Female	165	4.04	0.83	0.309	0.590
	Male	296	4.08	0.85		

Note: \*p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01.

The results of one-way ANOVA/Welch tests are given in Table 6,7,8,9 and 10.

The results of one-way ANOVA/Welch tests according to age are given in Table 6. While there is a significant difference in “Commitment” ( $p < 0.05$ ) and “Product Tangibles” ( $p < 0.01$ ) perception levels according to age (H2.1 and H2.6 accepted); there is no significant difference in “Social Environment”, “Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players”, “Sporting Success” and “Economic Reasons” ( $p > 0.05$ ) (H2.2, H2.3, H2.4 and H2.5 rejected). The mean of the fans’ commitment perception is lower for X generation fans ( $\bar{X} = 3.13 \pm 1.25$ ) than for Y generation fans ( $\bar{X} = 3.69 \pm 1.15$ ) and Z generation fans ( $\bar{X} = 3.56 \pm 1.14$ ) and the mean of the fans’ product tangibles is lower for X generation fans ( $\bar{X} = 3.76 \pm 0.93$ ) than for Y generation fans ( $\bar{X} = 4.13 \pm 0.77$ ) and Z generation fans ( $\bar{X} = 4.09 \pm 0.87$ ).

**Table 6:** One Way ANOVA/Welch Tests Results According to Age

Dependent Variables	Test Type	Age	Frequency (f)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Levene's Stat.	p
<b>Commitment</b>	ANOVA	X Generation	43	3.13	1.25	0.835	<b>0.036*</b>
		Y Generation	224	3.69	1.15		
		Z Generation	191	3.56	1.14		
<b>Social Environment</b>	ANOVA	X Generation	43	2.62	1.26	0.626	0.968
		Y Generation	224	2.59	1.25		
		Z Generation	191	2.55	1.16		
<b>Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players</b>	ANOVA	X Generation	43	2.34	1.06	0.692	0.736
		Y Generation	224	2.20	1.09		
		Z Generation	191	2.14	1.07		
<b>Sporting Success</b>	ANOVA	X Generation	43	2.57	1.18	0.304	0.699
		Y Generation	224	2.52	1.14		
		Z Generation	191	2.41	1.09		
<b>Economic Reasons</b>	Welch	X Generation	43	3.04	0.95	0.047	0.284
		Y Generation	224	3.14	0.99		
		Z Generation	191	3.21	0.83		
<b>Product Tangibles</b>	ANOVA	X Generation	43	3.76	0.93	0.408	<b>0.003**</b>
		Y Generation	224	4.13	0.77		
		Z Generation	191	4.09	0.87		

Note: \*p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01.

The results of one-way ANOVA/Welch tests according to education level are given in Table 7. While there is a significant difference in “Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players” ( $p < 0.01$ ) and “Sporting Success” ( $p < 0.05$ ) perception levels according to education level (H3.3 and H3.4 accepted); there is no significant difference in “Commitment”, “Social Environment”, “Economic Reasons” and “Product Tangibles” ( $p > 0.05$ ) (H3.1, H3.2, H3.5 and H3.6 rejected). The mean of the fans’ club administration, technical staff, players perception is lower for fans with primary school education ( $\bar{X} = 1.91 \pm 0.88$ ) than for fans with high school education ( $\bar{X} = 2.47 \pm 1.07$ ), fans with associate degree education ( $\bar{X} = 2.37 \pm 1.06$ ) and fans with bachelor’s degree ( $\bar{X} = 2.34 \pm 1.13$ ) and the mean of the fans’ sporting success is lower for fans with primary school education ( $\bar{X} = 2.11 \pm 1.12$ ) than for fans with high school education ( $\bar{X} = 2.69 \pm 1.14$ ), fans with associate degree education ( $\bar{X} = 2.59 \pm 1.13$ ) and fans with bachelor’s degree ( $\bar{X} = 2.60 \pm 1.17$ ).

**Table 7: One Way ANOVA/Welch Tests Results According to Education Level**

Dependent Variables	Test Type	Education Level	Frequency (f)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Levene's Stat.	p
<b>Commitment</b>	ANOVA	Primary School	79	3.51	1.17	0.295	0.502
		High School	97	3.60	1.12		
		Associate Degree	156	3.63	1.16		
		Bachelor's Degree and higher	129	3.50	1.15		
<b>Social Environment</b>	ANOVA	Primary School	79	2.70	1.22	0.308	0.179
		High School	97	2.79	1.11		
		Associate Degree	156	2.66	1.24		
		Bachelor's Degree and higher	129	2.61	1.19		
<b>Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players</b>	ANOVA	Primary School	79	1.91	0.88	0.116	<b>0.006**</b>
		High School	97	2.47	1.07		
		Associate Degree	156	2.37	1.06		
		Bachelor's Degree and higher	129	2.34	1.13		
<b>Sporting Success</b>	ANOVA	Primary School	79	2.11	1.12	0.858	<b>0.040*</b>
		High School	97	2.69	1.14		
		Associate Degree	156	2.59	1.13		
		Bachelor's Degree and higher	129	2.60	1.17		
<b>Economic Reasons</b>	Welch	Primary School	79	2.99	0.81	0.003	0.072
		High School	97	3.19	0.98		
		Associate Degree	156	3.18	0.84		
		Bachelor's Degree and higher	129	3.02	1.09		
<b>Product Tangibles</b>	Welch	Primary School	79	3.92	1.12	0.019	0.068
		High School	97	4.12	0.78		
		Associate Degree	156	4.13	0.82		
		Bachelor's Degree and higher	129	4.06	0.84		

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

The results of one-way ANOVA/Welch tests according to monthly income are given in Table 8. There is no significant difference in "Commitment", "Social Environment", "Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players", "Sporting Success", "Economic Reasons" and "Product Tangibles" ( $p > 0.05$ ) (H4.1, H4.2, H4.3, H4.4, H4.5 and H4.6 rejected) according to monthly income.

**Table 8: One Way ANOVA Tests Results According to Monthly Income**

Dependent Variables	Test Type	Monthly Income	Frequency (f)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Levene's Stat.	p
<b>Commitment</b>	ANOVA	0-4000 TL	106	3.55	1.13	0.648	0.565
		4001-8000 TL	229	3.54	1.15		
		8001 TL and more	126	3.67	1.22		
<b>Social Environment</b>	ANOVA	0-4000 TL	106	2.58	1.09	0.127	0.699
		4001-8000 TL	229	2.53	1.25		
		8001 TL and more	126	2.65	1.25		
<b>Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players</b>	ANOVA	0-4000 TL	106	2.24	1.11	0.585	0.821
		4001-8000 TL	229	2.16	1.06		
		8001 TL and more	126	2.20	1.10		
<b>Sporting Success</b>	ANOVA	0-4000 TL	106	2.49	1.06	0.102	0.659
		4001-8000 TL	229	2.43	1.15		
		8001 TL and more	126	2.55	1.22		
<b>Economic Reasons</b>	ANOVA	0-4000 TL	106	3.03	0.90	0.139	0.561
		4001-8000 TL	229	3.14	0.90		
		8001 TL and more	126	3.11	1.01		
<b>Product Tangibles</b>	ANOVA	0-4000 TL	106	4.02	0.76	0.201	0.783
		4001-8000 TL	229	4.07	0.83		
		8001 TL and more	126	4.10	0.93		

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

The results of one-way ANOVA/Welch tests according to frequency of purchase are given in Table 9. While there is a significant difference in "Commitment", "Social Environment", "Economic Reasons" and "Product Tangibles" ( $p < 0.01$ ) (H5.1, H5.2, H5.5 and H5.6 accepted) according to frequency of purchase; there is no significant difference in "Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players" and "Sporting Success" ( $p > 0.05$ )

(H5.3 and H5.4 rejected). The mean of the fans' commitment perception is lower for fans who purchase once/several times a year ( $\bar{X} = 3.17 \pm 1.16$ ) than for fans who purchase once/several times a month ( $\bar{X} = 4.01 \pm 1.01$ ) and fans who purchase once/several times a week ( $\bar{X} = 4.14 \pm 1.00$ ); the mean of the fans' social environment is higher for fans who purchase once/several times a week ( $\bar{X} = 3.20 \pm 1.38$ ) than for fans who purchase once/several times a month ( $\bar{X} = 2.59 \pm 1.17$ ) and fans who purchase once/several times a year ( $\bar{X} = 2.43 \pm 1.10$ ); the mean of the fans' economic reasons perception is lower for fans who purchase once/several times a year ( $\bar{X} = 2.90 \pm 0.88$ ) than for fans who purchase once/several times a month ( $\bar{X} = 3.33 \pm 0.90$ ) and fans who purchase once/several times a week ( $\bar{X} = 3.48 \pm 0.97$ ) and the mean of the fans' product tangibles perception is lower for fans who purchase once/several times a year ( $\bar{X} = 3.87 \pm 0.86$ ) than for fans who purchase once/several times a month ( $\bar{X} = 4.25 \pm 0.68$ ) and fans who purchase once/several times a week ( $\bar{X} = 4.29 \pm 0.95$ ).

**Table 9:** One Way ANOVA/Welch Tests Results According to Frequency of Purchase

Dependent Variables	Test Type	Frequency of Purchase	Frequency (f)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Levene's Stat.	p
<b>Commitment</b>	Welch	Once/Several times a year	229	3.17	1.16	0.020	<b>0.000**</b>
		Once/Several times a month	154	4.01	1.01		
		Once/Several times a week	78	4.14	1.00		
<b>Social Environment</b>	Welch	Once/Several times a year	229	2.43	1.10	0.007	<b>0.000**</b>
		Once/Several times a month	154	2.59	1.17		
		Once/Several times a week	78	3.20	1.38		
<b>Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players</b>	Welch	Once/Several times a year	229	2.26	1.06	0.016	0.157
		Once/Several times a month	154	2.15	1.02		
		Once/Several times a week	78	2.27	1.23		
<b>Sporting Success</b>	Welch	Once/Several times a year	229	2.42	1.10	0.049	0.595
		Once/Several times a month	154	2.55	1.14		
		Once/Several times a week	78	2.49	1.29		
<b>Economic Reasons</b>	ANOVA	Once/Several times a year	229	2.90	0.88	0.453	<b>0.000**</b>
		Once/Several times a month	154	3.33	0.90		
		Once/Several times a week	78	3.48	0.97		
<b>Product Tangibles</b>	Welch	Once/Several times a year	229	3.87	0.86	0.015	<b>0.000**</b>
		Once/Several times a month	154	4.25	0.68		
		Once/Several times a week	78	4.29	0.95		

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

The results of one-way ANOVA/Welch tests according to team are given in Table 10. While there is a significant difference in "Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players" ( $p < 0.05$ ) and "Economic Reasons" ( $p < 0.01$ ) according to team (H6.3 and H6.5 accepted); there is no significant difference in "Commitment", "Social Environment", "Sporting Success" and "Product Tangibles" ( $p > 0.05$ ) (H6.1, H6.2, H6.4 and H6.6 rejected). The mean of the fans' club administration, technical staff, players perception is higher for Fenerbahçe fans ( $\bar{X} = 2.36 \pm 1.10$ ) than for Galatasaray fans ( $\bar{X} = 2.05 \pm 1.10$ ) and Beşiktaş fans ( $\bar{X} = 2.04 \pm 1.02$ ) and the

mean of the fans' economic reasons is lower for Fenerbahçe fans ( $\bar{X} = 2.90 \pm 0.83$ ) than for Galatasaray fans ( $\bar{X} = 3.28 \pm 0.84$ ) and Beşiktaş fans ( $\bar{X} = 3.25 \pm 0.99$ ).

**Table 10:** One Way ANOVA/Welch Tests Results According to Team

Dependent Variables	Test Type	Team	Frequency (f)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Levene's Stat.	p
<b>Commitment</b>	ANOVA	Fenerbahçe	164	3.49	1.11	0.223	0.174
		Galatasaray	151	3.62	1.25		
		Beşiktaş	146	3.68	1.12		
<b>Social Environment</b>	Welch	Fenerbahçe	164	2.49	1.16	0.031	0.193
		Galatasaray	151	2.64	1.30		
		Beşiktaş	146	2.66	1.17		
<b>Club Administration, Technical Staff, Players</b>	ANOVA	Fenerbahçe	164	2.36	1.10	0.229	<b>0.029*</b>
		Galatasaray	151	2.05	1.10		
		Beşiktaş	146	2.04	1.02		
<b>Sporting Success</b>	ANOVA	Fenerbahçe	164	2.54	1.14	0.446	0.243
		Galatasaray	151	2.47	1.20		
		Beşiktaş	146	2.37	1.09		
<b>Economic Reasons</b>	ANOVA	Fenerbahçe	164	2.90	0.83	0.057	<b>0.001**</b>
		Galatasaray	151	3.28	0.84		
		Beşiktaş	146	3.25	0.99		
<b>Product Tangibles</b>	ANOVA	Fenerbahçe	164	4.05	0.87	0.867	0.621
		Galatasaray	151	4.12	0.79		
		Beşiktaş	146	4.03	0.86		

Note: \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, the level of perceptions of the fans regarding the factors affecting their intention to purchase products from sports stores and whether there is a significant difference in the perceptions of the fans according to various demographic characteristics were examined.

As a result of the independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA/Welch tests, it was found that the mean of the fans' social environment perception is higher for male fans according to gender; commitment perception is lower for X generation fans than for Y generation fans and Z generation fans and product tangibles is lower for X generation fans than for Y generation fans and Z generation fans according to age; club administration, technical staff, players perception is lower for fans with primary school education than for fans with high school education, fans with associate degree education and fans with bachelor's degree and the mean of the fans' sporting success is lower for fans with primary school education than for fans with high school education, fans with associate degree education and fans with bachelor's degree according to education level; commitment perception is lower for fans who purchase once/several times a year than for fans who purchase once/several times a month and fans who purchase once/several times a week; social environment is higher for fans who purchase once/several times a week than for fans who purchase once/several times a month and fans who purchase once/several times a year; the mean of the fans' economic reasons perception is lower for fans who purchase once/several times a year than for fans who purchase once/several times a month and fans who purchase once/several times a week and product tangibles perception is lower for fans who purchase once/several times a year than for fans who purchase once/several times a month and fans who purchase once/several times a week according to frequency of purchase; club administration, technical staff, players perception is higher for Fenerbahçe fans than for Galatasaray fans and Beşiktaş fans and the mean of the fans' economic reasons is lower for Fenerbahçe fans than for Galatasaray fans and Beşiktaş fans. The results of the study are similar to the findings of the previous studies. Kazançoğlu and Baybars (2016) have determined in their study that the identification of Fenerbahçe fans with the team is found in the dimension of fanaticism, while the identification of Beşiktaş and Galatasaray fans with the team is found in the dimension of commitment. This situation shows how important the management, technical team, and players are perceived by Fenerbahçe fans. In our study, it has been determined that those fans who are more loyal to the team have a greater intention to buy. Similarly, Altın et al. (2020) also found that team commitment has an impact on purchasing licenced products. On the other hand, Madrigal's (2001) found that fan identification with the team drives the purchase of licenced products. Similarly, Susiva (2019), on the other hand, revealed that having star players in a team has a positive effect on consumers' intention to purchase sponsored products.

In our research, we discovered that the tangible features of items fluctuate with the generations, with the product features becoming increasingly significant for the younger generations. Similarly, in a study conducted in

Turkey by Torlak et al. (2014), the quality perceptions of fans for the products of the teams they support were assessed, and it was concluded that the perception of quality had an effect on purchase behaviour. As a result, the marketing strategy considers it important for the teams to manufacture their licenced items at a specific quality level.

Although the three big team supporters have a very large share of the entire fan base in Turkey; the fact that the research was carried out only with the supporters of the three big teams living in Istanbul is a limitation. It would be beneficial to conduct a study with the participation of more team fans (like loyal fans who support their hometown team such as Trabzonspor, Malatyaspor, etc.) in future studies.

## REFERENCES

1. Altın, Ş., Ediş, L. B., Tüfekçi, İ., & Altın, B. (2020). Spor pazarlamasında lisanslı ürünlerin tercihinde, kulüp imajı, marka efangelizmi, takım sadakati ve takımla özdeşleşme değişkenlerinin etkisi. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 12(4), 3759-3775.
2. Anderson, J. C. & Gerbing D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach, *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 411–423.
3. Apostolopoulou, A., Papadimitriou, D. ve Damtsiou, V. (2010). Meanings and functions in olympic consumption: A study of the Athens 2004 olympic licensed products. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 10(4), 485-507.
4. Bauer, H.H., Stokburger-Sauer, N.E., and Exler, S. (2008). Brand image and fan loyalty in professional sport team: a refined model and empirical assessment. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(2), 205–226.
5. Bee, C.C., and Havitz, M.E. (2010). Exploring the relationship between involvement, fan attraction, psychological commitment and behavioural intentions in a sports spectator context. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 11(2), 140–157.
6. Bayuk, N. ve Küçük F. (2007), „Müşteri Tatmini ve Müşteri Sadakati İlişkisi“ *Marmara Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 22 (1), ss. 285-292.
7. Bodet, G., and Bernache-Assollant, I. (2011). Consumer loyalty in sport spectatorship services: the relationships with consumer satisfaction and team identification. *Psychology and Marketing*, 28(8), 781–802.
8. Chen, J. C. V., Lin, C., Wu, Y. S., (2013): “Electronic Word of Mouth: The Moderating Roles of Product Involvement and Brand Image”, *Proceeding of 2013 International Conference on Technology Innovation and Industrial Management*, Phuket, Thailand, p. 29- 47.
9. Fandos, C. and Flavian, C. (2006). Intrinsic and extrinsic quality attributes, loyalty and buying intention: An analysis for a PDO product. *British Food Journal*, 108(8), 646-662.
10. Fotopoulos, C., Krystallis, A., Vassallo, M., & Pagiaslis, A. (2009). Food Choice Questionnaire (FCQ) revisited. Suggestions for the development of an enhanced general food motivation model. *Appetite*, 52(1), 199-208.
11. Funk, D.C., and James, J. (2001). The psychological continuum model: A conceptual framework for understanding and individual’s psychological connection to sport, *Sport Management Review*, 4(1), 119–150.
12. Giray, C., ve Girişken, Y. (2015). Taraftar motivasyon faktörlerinin davranışsal sadakat üzerindeki etkisi: Fenerbahçe spor kulübü örneği, *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 11(2), 119-137.
13. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
14. Hedlund, D. P., & Naylor, M. E. (2020). Determinants impacting why college sports fans purchase merchandise. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics*, 14(1), 17-35.
15. Kazançoğlu, İ., & Baybars, M. (2016). Lisanslı spor ürünlerinin algılanan değer bileşenlerinin satın alma niyeti ile ilişkisi: Türkiye’nin en büyük üç futbol kulübünün incelenmesi. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 17(1), 51-66.

16. Khorshidi, R., Elahi, A., & Khabiri, M. (2022). Designing a Qualitative Model of the Factors Affecting Psychological Commitment in Football Fans based on Grounded Theory. *Journal of New Studies in Sport Management*, 3(1), 389-398.
17. Kunkel, T., Doyle, J. P., & Berlin, A. (2017). Consumers' perceived value of sport team games—A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(1), 80-95.
18. Küçük, O. (2016) *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*, Ekin Yayınevi, Bursa.
19. Kwak, D. H., & Kang, J. H. (2009). Symbolic purchase in sport: the roles of self-image congruence and perceived quality. *Management decision*. 47 (1), 85-99.
20. Kwon, H. H., & Armstrong, K. L. (2002). Factors influencing impulse buying of sport team licensed merchandise. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 11(3), 151-164.
21. Kwon, H. H. ve Armstrong, K. L. (2006). Impulse purchases of sport team licensed merchandise: What matters?. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 101-119.
22. Lee, D. ve Trail, G. (2011). A theoretical model of team-licensed merchandise purchasing (TLMP). *ICHPER-SD Journal of Research*, 6(1), 62-67.
23. Lock, D., Taylor, T., & Darcy, S. (2011). In the absence of achievement: The formation of new team identification. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(2), 171-192.
24. Lock, D., Taylor, T., Funk, D., & Darcy, S. (2012). Exploring the development of team identification. *Journal of Sport Management*. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26, 283–294.
25. Madahi, A., Sukati, I., (2012): The Effect of External Factors on Purchase Intention Amongst Young Generation in Malaysia, *International Business Research*, Vol:5, No: 8, published by Canadian Center of Science and Education, 153- 159.
26. Madrigal, R. (2001). Social identity effects in a belief-attitude intentions hierarchy: implications for corporate sponsorship. *Psychology & Marketing*, 18(2),145–165.
27. Mahony, D. F., Madrigal, R., & Howard, D. (2000). Using the psychological commitment to team (PCT) scale to segment sport consumers based on loyalty. *Sport marketing quarterly*, 9(1).
28. Mardia, K.V. (1985). Mardia's test of multinormality. In: Kotz, S., Johnson, N.L. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Statistical Science*. Wiley, New York.
29. Ngan, H. M., Prendergast, G. P., & Tsang, A. S. (2011). Linking sports sponsorship with purchase intentions: Team performance, stars, and the moderating role of team identification. *European Journal of marketing*.
30. Nunnally J. C. & Bernstein I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
31. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
32. Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of psychological research online*, 8(2), 23-74.
33. Smith, A., Graetz, B., & Westerbeek, H. (2008). Sport sponsorship, team support and purchase intentions. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 14(5), 387-404.
34. Spreng, R. A. Harrel, G. D. ve Mackoy, R. D. (1995). Service Recovery: Impact on Satisfaction and Intentions. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 9(1), 15-23.
35. Stevens, S., & Rosenberger, P. J. (2012). The influence of involvement, following sport and fan identification on fan loyalty: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship* 13 (3) pp. 220-234.
36. Susiva, S. (2019). Relationship Of Team Performance, Stars And Team Identity Towards Purchase Intention Of The Sponsors'products. *Journal of Global Business Review*., 21(2), 50-58.

37. Torlak, O., Ozkara, B. Y., & Dogan, V. (2014). Taraftarların Takımlarla Özdeşleşme Düzeylerinin, Takımların Lisanslı Ürünlerine Yönelik Kalite Algısı ve Satın Alma Niyetine Etkisi. *Ege Academic Review*, 14(1), 73-81.
38. Tsiotsou, R. H. (2013). Sport team loyalty: integrating relationship marketing and a hierarchy of effects. *Journal of Services Marketing*.
39. Yun, J. H., Rosenberger, P. J., & Sweeney, K. (2020). Drivers of soccer fan loyalty: Australian evidence on the influence of team brand image, fan engagement, satisfaction and enduring involvement. *Asia Pacific journal of marketing and logistics*.