



Sport, Business, Management: an International Journal

Sponsor networks and business relations orchestrated by team sports clubs

Journal:	<i>Sport, Business, Management: an International Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	SBM-07-2016-0030.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Small businesses, survey, team sports club management, Network theory, Business-to-business
Authors: Ulrik Wagner, H Thomas R Perssons, and Marie Overbye	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Sponsor networks and business relations orchestrated by team sport clubs

Purpose

This study investigates firms' reasons and motives for becoming sponsors and how they benefit from this networking engagement by exploring sponsorship networks associated with two Danish team sport clubs – a Premier League football club and a second-division handball club.

Design/methodology/approach

Two online surveys were conducted with firms associated with the networks during the autumn and winter of 2013/14 ($N=116$). The questionnaire was theoretically anchored in existing sponsorship literature, business network research and social capital theory.

Findings

The results show that business logics were the dominating reasons for joining the network. A large proportion of the respondents reported having increased their number of business (32%) and social (26%) relations with other network members after joining the network.

Furthermore, 37% of the respondents reported having made business agreements with companies external to the network via network contacts, which supports ideas of bridging social capital. More than half the respondents (59%) preferred doing business with network members rather than with non-members.

Originality/value

By investigating a local and regional sport-club context, the paper adds to our knowledge about sponsorship networks. It emphasizes the potential importance of team sport clubs for the business landscape, thus maintaining that sport clubs fulfill an important role for local communities beyond being mere entertainment industries.

Keywords: Small businesses, survey, team sport club management, network theory, social capital, business-to-business.

Paper type: Research paper

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Sponsorship management no longer focuses solely on reaching consumers by promoting products in the mass media. More recently, study has been devoted to sponsorships as an arena of network management (Ryan and Fahy, 2012). Whilst the mainstream of B2B network research has either focused on traditional networks such as supply chain networks (Capó-Vicedo et al., 2011) or determined types of networks by using categories such as geographic proximity, same industry, interactions with intended business outcomes (Human and Provan, 1997; Wincent et al., 2010), B2B networking facilitated by professional team sport clubs has been neglected. For sport organizations attracting sponsors through business-to-business networking opens the door to a new source of potential income: In an open league structure clubs always face the threat of being relegated, which often leads to situations of severe income reductions due to decreased media exposure. Hence, focusing solely on good sporting results as a strategy for income generation is associated with uncertainty. Instead, from the perspective of a sport club – that may not always belong to the best league – establishing a business-to-business network arrangement with sponsors that goes beyond mass-media exposure can prove financially beneficial for clubs in periods of poorer sporting results. From the point of view of businesses, sport-related networks may be viewed as alternatives or as additions to more traditional business networks. Inter-organizational relations made up by sponsors may be one such type of network. Research shows that the importance of being part of a network holds true for entrepreneurial start-ups just as it does for established small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), (Pirolo and Presutti, 2010; Street and Cameron, 2007; Sullivan and Marvel, 2011). Therefore, the overall purpose of this paper is to investigate empirically sponsor networks and business relations orchestrated by team sport clubs, which has so far received limited attention.

In recent decades sponsorship research has evolved to become a pivotal topic within

1
2
3 marketing research (Cornwell, 2008, 2014; Cornwell and Maignan, 1998; Walliser, 2003),
4
5 and over time the strategic use of sponsorships has gained increasing interest among
6
7 researchers (Demir and Söderman, 2015). The design of sponsorships today seeks new ways
8
9 to create value for the parties involved, which includes using networks as one of the more
10
11 recent forms of establishing sponsor-sponsee relations (Ryan and Fahy, 2012). By
12
13 investigating sponsorships in relation to network creation, this study unites a recent but
14
15 hitherto scarcely exposed strand within sponsorship research literature with the business
16
17 network literature. Thus, the aim of our study is to explore why and how firms engage in
18
19 these sponsor networks and, on the basis of these insights, to discuss the role of and
20
21 challenges for team sport clubs in facilitating and managing these networks. By using
22
23 quantitative data from two Danish sponsor networks, this study meets its aims through
24
25 investigating: 1) motives for becoming a sponsor; 2) reasons for participating in network
26
27 meetings and the degree to which business-oriented reasons are assessed and preferred to
28
29 social or sporting motives; 3) business creations and agreements achieved via network
30
31 engagement as well as changes in the number of business agreements and personal relations
32
33 prior to and after entering the network; and 4) whether or not membership of the network has
34
35 favored doing business with other network members.
36
37
38
39

40 The study is based on two cases: one football club belonging to the highest Danish
41
42 league during the 2013/14 season and one handball club figuring among the top teams in the
43
44 second-highest Danish division during the 2013/14 season. Whilst this study is an exploratory
45
46 pilot study covering only two networks, the ambition is to carry out an extended study in the
47
48 future covering all Danish clubs hosting similar networks. The clubs in this study are situated
49
50 on the periphery of Denmark, which is characterized by relatively low economic growth rates,
51
52 a stagnant housing market, and above-average unemployment rates. Football and handball
53
54 belong to the most popular and traditional team sports in Denmark in terms of participation,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mass-media promotion, sponsorship attractiveness, and the players' level of
4
5 professionalization. A common and standardized feature of professional Danish handball and
6
7 football clubs is that they have established networks of sponsors and business partners
8
9 associated with the team and the club. Theoretically, this study is embedded in network theory
10
11 with a specific focus on SMEs, and it also draws on insights from the field of social capital
12
13 theory and existing sponsorship and business-related literature. The research design provides
14
15 the basis for our analysis and discussion of the potentials of sport club-related sponsor and
16
17 business networks to create social networking and B2B relations, which enables us to
18
19 contribute to the discussion of sport's role in facilitating and orchestrating business relations
20
21 in local communities. We conclude by discussing the limitations and implications of
22
23 managing sponsor networks. As a result, the study seeks to extend the scope of current
24
25 sponsorship research as well as contributing to a better and more detailed understanding of the
26
27 roles and perspectives for as well as the constraints of professional team sport clubs in local
28
29 and regional business settings.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **From consumer orientation to network management: Insights from sport sponsorship** 38 39 **research**

40
41 There is no archetypal sponsor. Instead, one may describe the variety of intentions behind
42
43 sponsorship along a sliding scale between philanthropy or patronage with community
44
45 goodwill and bona fide business partnerships (Farrelly, 2010). The most prominent and direct
46
47 forms of sport sponsorship are still to be found in the act of exchanging money for logos on
48
49 shirts and in-arena signage with stadium banners, aimed at increasing and enhancing
50
51 awareness of brand image and reputation (Amis et al., 1999). Thus, sponsorship research is a
52
53 well-established research field within sport management and in particular marketing
54
55 (Cornwell, 2008; 2014; Walliser, 2003). The growth of sponsorships can be seen as an
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 extension of traditional advertising. Accordingly, early contributions to sponsorship literature
4
5 focused on how sponsorships could be regarded as a means of fulfilling classical marketing
6
7 objectives such as product promotion and increasing consumer awareness (Ryan and Fahy,
8
9 2012). However, today sponsorships have multifaceted purposes such as human resource
10
11 management (Farely et al., 2012), city branding (Evens, 2003), or emphasizing corporate
12
13 social responsibility (Flöter et al., 2016). While some researchers (Farrelly, 2010; Meenaghan,
14
15 1998; Miles, 2001) claim that they have detected an improvement in terms of applying a
16
17 business approach to sponsorship, others (Chadwick and Thwaites, 2004: 50) argue that many
18
19 corporations still engage in sponsorship for the association with the high end of sport.
20
21 Nonetheless, firms seem to engage in sponsorships much more strategically today than in the
22
23 past (Demir and Söderman, 2015).
24
25
26

27
28 One way of benefiting from sponsorships strategically is by using them for networking
29
30 purposes. This is in line with Ryan and Fahy (2012), who state that recent developments in
31
32 the field of sponsorship include network management. Accordingly, the network approach
33
34 highlights firms' capabilities of envisioning and orchestrating business-to-business creations.
35
36 A network perspective also creates the foundation for business-to-business relationships
37
38 between sport sponsors and sport entities for mutual benefit (Farely et al., 2005; Henseler et
39
40 al., 2011). Thus, network management becomes pivotal when the sponsored organization
41
42 takes on the role as a bridge between organizations in the development of relationships (Kim
43
44 et al. 2014). However, few contributions have so far looked at the role and functions of
45
46 sponsor and business networks empirically (Olkkonen et al., 2000), and even fewer at B2B
47
48 networks among sponsors with new business as an intended result. Exceptions to this, which
49
50 focus on networks and sponsorships, do exist (e.g. Kim et al. 2014; Olkkonen, 2001).
51
52 Investigating a network related to a Formula One team, Cobbs (2011) shows that a relational
53
54 network approach reveals new inter-organizational potentials for the sponsors. In a similar
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 way, Morgan et al. (2014) recently investigated an international sporting event in order to
4
5 examine the relationship between the sporting event and its sponsors. One of their conclusions
6
7 was “that as well as receiving financial benefits and brand associations, it is in the interest of
8
9 the sporting body and sponsors to integrate strategic thinking and planning into their
10
11 sponsorship relationships” (p. 280). Unlike the four above-mentioned sponsor network
12
13 studies, which all examine high-profile international cases, our study explores regional
14
15 network creations and local communities involving a majority of small business enterprises.
16
17 In doing so, it adds an additional dimension to what can be termed the relational dynamics of
18
19 sponsorships (Cornwell, 2008; Farrelly, 2010). Accordingly, knowledge about what motivates
20
21 sponsors to join a network is a precondition for discussing inter-organizational expectations
22
23 and benefits from sponsorship network engagement. Studies within relationship marketing
24
25 like that of Morgan and Hunt (1994) emphasize trust and communication as significant
26
27 variables supporting relationships. Contrary to this finding, Böhler et al. (2007) did not
28
29 consider trust and effective communication to have an influence on the success of a
30
31 sponsorship. Of interest to us is to explore what motivates firms to join less conspicuous sport
32
33 club networks. One can argue that sponsorships today represent complex settings that require
34
35 a multiple perspective, as suggested by Daellenbach et al. (2006). Following this logic,
36
37 investigating sponsorship relations in terms of a network approach is only one among many
38
39 approaches, but using this approach enables us, according to Daellenbach et al. (2006), to
40
41 view network access as a gateway to exchanging structures and resource suppliers.
42
43 Consequently, the next step is to embed these insights into sponsorship relations in a
44
45 theoretical design that builds on networks as a crucial feature of the modern business
46
47 landscape.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Networks as the theoretical point of departure**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 There is a common understanding that networks per definition are plural or hybrid forms of
4 strategic alliances and cooperation (Rus and Iglic, 2005). The interest in, as well as research
5 and literature on, networks is vast and includes – but is not limited to – positive and negative
6 outcomes of trust (Brunetto and Farr-Wharton, 2007; Farrelly and Quester, 2003), their ability
7 to generate new business and growth (Schoonjans et al., 2013), cooperation and innovation
8 (Tomlins and Fai, 2013), brand image (Mäläskä et al., 2011), and relational marketing
9 (O'Malley, 2014). There is a common understanding among small business alliances and
10 network researchers that networking frequently has far-reaching implications for SMEs'
11 success and profitability (Street and Cameron, 2007).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 In their extensive review of networks Brass et al. (2004) argue that the network
24 perspective differs from traditional perspectives in organizational studies because it does not
25 examine individual actors in isolation. In adopting this perspective, we argue that
26 relationships formed and facilitated in and by a network become the main analytical focus.
27 We embrace the definition of a network as “a set of nodes and the set of ties representing
28 some relationship, or lack of relationship, between the nodes” (Brass et al. 2004, p. 795).
29 Thus, nodes can be defined as individual actors or organizations. In this paper we argue that
30 relationships are formed by individuals but that, at the same time, these individuals are
31 leading representatives of organizations included in the sponsor and business networks. Ties
32 between the members of a network can take different shapes and forms depending on the
33 network (Granovetter, 1973). The strength of the individual tie is facilitated and defined by
34 trust and a “combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity [...] and the reciprocal
35 services which characterize the tie” (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1361). Although the quality of the
36 network takes front seat, size is also likely to matter. While the size of a network ought to be
37 related to the amount of new information spread within that network, a heterogeneous
38 network is more likely to generate new information for the individual members than a
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 homogeneous network made up of members that already share the same contextual
4
5 information (Sullivan and Marvel, 2011). For example, a heterogeneous network may, as
6
7 suggested by Björnfot and Torjussen (2012), take the form of complementary collaborations
8
9 where actors in supply chains share knowledge and production resources, creating a collective
10
11 strength that improves the individual suppliers' bargaining position vis-à-vis customers (see
12
13 also: Capó-Vicedo et al., 2011; Tomlinson, 2011; Tomlinson and Fai, 2013).
14
15

16 Although the focus tends to be on networking, cooperation or alliances between
17
18 businesses, some authors argue that it is the personal relationships between businesses that
19
20 facilitate the success of diffusion and adaptation of innovation, which in turn increases the
21
22 competitiveness of firms (Ceci and Iubatti, 2012). In similar fashion, MacGrath and O'Toole
23
24 (2010) point out that the outcome is heavily dependent on the individual perception of the
25
26 network as interconnected business relations or on personal contacts built on trust,
27
28 commitment, and communication. Nevertheless, rather than being one or the other, i.e.
29
30 social/personal or business-based relationships, Mäläskä et al. (2011) emphasize that it is the
31
32 combination of social and business networks that contributes to strengthening the brand image
33
34 of SMEs due to their regularly being directly or indirectly exposed to external influences.
35
36 Consequently, networks and networking are about building, maintaining, and retaining
37
38 relationships defined "as collaborative arrangements established via the interactions between
39
40 actors embedded in a social context" (Sydow and Windeler, 2003 in Jørgensen and Ulhøi,
41
42 2010, p. 398). This applies to individuals and their private relations as well as to the business
43
44 landscape (O'Malley, 2014; Webster, 1992). Thus, network research contains a multi-level
45
46 perspective by investigating inter-personal as well as inter-organizational relationships (Brass
47
48 et al. 2004). The concept of social capital has also become widely used to understand the
49
50 importance of network relations for enterprises (Li et al., 2013). The argument is that the mere
51
52 existence of a relationship says nothing or little about its quality – and hence little about the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 firm's access to others' resources. The quality of the relationship is, in fact, crucial in
4
5 motivating members of a network to share their resources and is only achieved through a high
6
7 degree of interaction frequency and interaction intensity over time (Semrau and Werner,
8
9 2012). Considering the key role played by the sport as the network facilitator, we define
10
11 social capital as

12
13 *the relational resources that we as individuals or as part of a collective, as well*
14
15 *as organizations or companies, inherit or intentionally construct in order to*
16
17 *achieve or own goals. Depending on structural and normative characteristics of*
18
19 *the social system in which it operates, social capital can facilitate but also limit*
20
21 *both individual and collective action*
22
23

24
25 (Persson, 2008, p. 40)
26

27 The underlying philosophy of our research design is therefore underpinned by
28
29 the relational character of networks. It is based on the idea of social embeddedness
30
31 (Granovetter, 1985). Nodes are not perceived as being made up of isolated, context-free
32
33 actors; nor are they pre-determined by existing social structures. Our dialectical perspective
34
35 resembles much more a tradition known as relational sociology (Emirbayer, 1997) in which
36
37 agency and structure mutually constrain, enable, and reproduce each other. This is done in
38
39 order to position our research beyond methodological individualism and structural
40
41 determinism (Giddens, 1984).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Methodology**

49 *The two cases*

50
51 This study comprises empirical data from two sponsor networks connected to two Danish
52
53 sport clubs: the football club FC Vestsjælland (henceforth FCV) and the handball club Team
54
55 Sydhavsøerne (henceforth TSØ). Both clubs geographically belong to the Region Zealand,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 one of the five Danish regions. Furthermore, they are situated away from urban centers in a
4
5 peripheral part of Denmark dominated by relatively high levels of unemployment, a stagnant
6
7 housing market, limited economic growth and rapid de-industrialization over the last two
8
9 decades (Kommunernes Landsforening, 2014). The two clubs were selected because they
10
11 share certain specific traits: they are situated on the periphery of Denmark; they are both
12
13 rather new clubs; they have elite superstructures, although they were founded on the grounds
14
15 of long-established clubs; and they do not belong to the national elite within their respective
16
17 sports. Although different sports, they represent the most popular team sports in Denmark.
18
19

20
21 FCV was officially founded in 2008 with the explicit purpose of qualifying for the top
22
23 Danish league, which the club managed after the 2012/13 season. The name refers to the
24
25 region of western Zealand; and representing and unifying the region was one of the aims
26
27 behind the club's establishment. The club was relegated after the 2014/15 season, and by the
28
29 end of 2015 it had become bankrupt. During its successful period it had formalized
30
31 partnerships with several clubs in the region and shared the characteristics of a merger club
32
33 without actually being a merger between two existing clubs. Although the team belonged to
34
35 the bottom of the Danish Premier League (PL), the FCV represented progress and success for
36
37 a region that before the 2013/14 season had not been represented in the Danish PL since the
38
39 late 1970s. From the very beginning the FCV had a network consisting of sponsors and
40
41 business partners – a network primarily managed by volunteers. Nevertheless, after its
42
43 promotion the club's marketing activities rapidly underwent a process of professionalization,
44
45 including offering pre-match and ad hoc events for their network members.
46
47
48

49
50 TSØ is currently (2016/17 season) playing in the second-highest Danish handball
51
52 division. The club, whose name refers to the islands in the south of the country close to the
53
54 German border, was established in 2003, and in 2005 it was organized as a merger between
55
56 the elite sport sections of two local clubs on an island with a longstanding handball tradition.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The club has played twice in the qualifying games for the top Danish handball league (during
4 the 2012/13 and 2013/14 seasons) but has not yet been successful. Like FCV, the club
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The club has played twice in the qualifying games for the top Danish handball league (during the 2012/13 and 2013/14 seasons) but has not yet been successful. Like FCV, the club arranges pre-match events, networking meetings and ad hoc activities for their sponsor network members.

Procedure, participants and measures

The questionnaires

We selected an explorative and quantitative approach due to the limited empirical research into sponsor networks of sport clubs. Moreover, this enables an assessment of more general perspectives of corporate motives and companies' use of these networks. A link to a web-based questionnaire was distributed to representatives of the two sponsor and business networks of both FCV and TSØ by email, facilitated by the sponsor and business networks' managers (FCV: N=67, response rate approx. 48%; TSØ: N=49, response rate approx. 39%). Respondents were informed that the research was independently carried out by researchers from the University of Southern Denmark; that the research was being undertaken in dialogue with the club management in order to optimize the sponsor and business networks; and that their answers would be anonymized. Data was collected during the autumn and winter of 2013/14. Table 1 provides an overview of the number of employees as well as years in the network of the companies participating in this study.

..... INSERT TABLE 1

Measures

1
2
3 The questionnaire contained questions about motives for becoming a sponsor, reasons for
4 participating in network meetings, business creation and agreements achieved through
5 network engagement prior to and after joining the network, as well as the number of social
6 relations established through the network. The strength of the network is measured by
7 whether the firms prefer to enter into business agreements with other network members
8 and/or under which conditions the firm will choose to do so.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 *Motives:* Some studies have revealed that corporate sponsorships are increasingly used
17 strategically (Demir and Söderman, 2015) while others have found that philanthropic reasons
18 and personal preferences of managers, e.g. 'being in it' for the sake of the sport (Slack and
19 Bentz, 1996), or more CSR-oriented reasons also exist (Flöter et al. 2016). Therefore, the
20 motives for becoming a sponsor were measured according to eight statements, four referring
21 to social motives, encompassing social and philanthropic reasons, and four referring to
22 business motives, encompassing strategic business purposes. Answer categories were:
23 "great", "some" or "no" influence. In addition, respondents were given the possibility of
24 replying "we do not believe it is like that".
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 *Reasons for participation:* Important contributions to the sponsorship literature claim
38 that sponsorships can be turned into a distinctive competence (Amis et al. 1999). Combined
39 with the notions that much of recent sponsorship engagement is about network orchestration
40 (Fahy and Ryan, 2012) and that activating a sponsorship is one of the key elements in value
41 creation through sponsoring (O'Reilly and Horning, 2013), we need to know which reasons
42 the companies use for participating in network activities because this provides an indication
43 of how the network is used by its members. This is a follow-up to the previous question
44 investigating why they decided to engage in sponsoring. Accordingly, to assess their reasons
45 for participating in network meetings, the respondents were asked to evaluate nine statements
46 related to business orientation (3 items), social purposes (4 items) and a combination of both
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 business and social reasons (2 items). Answer categories were: “great”, “some” or “no”
4
5 influence. Additionally, firms could answer: “We do not experience it like this”.

6
7 *Strength of the network:* Networks are considered to be durable relations (Granovetter,
8
9 1973). From the network literature we know that several indicators need to be looked at
10
11 (Brass et al. 2004). The strength of the network was assessed using different measurements:
12
13 Firstly, we estimated aspects of the strength of the network by counting the number of
14
15 business contacts with other network members prior to and after joining the network. In
16
17 particular, respondents were asked to evaluate the volume of business creation and number of
18
19 agreements achieved with other network members prior to and after joining the network. But
20
21 as emphasized in our theory section, networks can have a form as both interpersonal as well
22
23 as inter-organizational relations (Brass et al. 2004). In order to investigate both forms, we
24
25 therefore also measured the number of social relations and business contacts established with
26
27 other network members by asking the respondents to estimate the number prior to and after
28
29 joining the network. Answer categories regarding the change in the number of business
30
31 contacts and social relations after joining the network were: 0; 1-5; 6-10; 11-15; 16-20 and
32
33 more than 20.
34
35
36
37

38
39 *Social capital:* Although the *number* of ties may play an important role, it is most
40
41 probably the heterogeneity of the network – and therefore the *quality* of ties – that will
42
43 generate new contacts, new information, new resources, and new business (Sullivan and
44
45 Marvel, 2011). Often, network theory lends insights from studies on social capital (Brass et al.
46
47 2004). A central claim is the observation that a relationship between two parties opens the
48
49 door to a third party. Thus, to extend the focus on the number of contacts measured earlier,
50
51 the questions which followed also asked whether business agreements had been made with
52
53 companies outside the network by contacts gained via network engagement. In addition, this
54
55 led to a further inquiry into whether these ties also induced its members to give priority to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 other networks members and, if so, under which conditions. Accordingly, the strength of the
4
5 network was assessed by asking whether or not membership of the particular network induced
6
7 respondents to prefer making business agreements with other network members. This was
8
9 measured in seven items assessing the extent to which network members preferred relations
10
11 with other members when doing business, for example with regard to price and quality.
12
13

14 15 16 *Data analysis*

17
18 Data was analyzed using SPSS22. Descriptive data are reported as frequencies and
19
20 percentages. Bivariate nonparametric statistics were used to compare differences between
21
22 respondents from the two networks. Differences were assessed using a chi-square test and
23
24 gamma test (two-tailed); p-values of less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Findings**

31 32 *Reasons for sponsoring*

33
34 With regard to motives, the sponsoring firms were asked about their reasons for sponsoring
35
36 FCV and TSØ, and how they assessed business, social and sporting reasons (Table 2). The
37
38 largest share (68%) answered that using the network to make business deals was of *great*
39
40 *importance*. A further common reason for sponsoring was related to the notion that it was
41
42 important to support professional football/handball on West Zealand/ Lolland-Falster. Only a
43
44 small number reported that the reason for sponsoring was because it had always been
45
46 important to support the particular club. It must be noted that in this particular item a large
47
48 number of respondents indicated that they did not experience it in such a way – thus
49
50 suggesting that they disagreed that it had always been important to support the particular club.
51
52 Surprisingly, less than half (45%) reported that “using FCV/TSØ to advertise our firm/
53
54 organization and product(s)” was a reason of *great importance* for their sponsorship.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 :::::::::: INSERT TABLE 2 ::::::::::
6
7
8
9

10 *Reasons for attending network activities*

11 The next step was to investigate the firms' reasons for attending FCV's/TSØ's business
12 network activities and how business-related reasons were assessed compared with other social
13 and sporting reasons (Table 3).
14
15
16
17

18 The reasons most respondents regarded as being of *great importance* for participating in
19 network meetings were i) the opportunity to meet and interact with other businesses (66%)
20 and ii) to create opportunities for new businesses (61%). A minority (13%) regarded the
21 possibility of missing out on important information as a reason of *great importance*. The
22 opportunity to indulge in nice food and drink was not considered a reason for participating in
23 network meetings for members of FCV (2%), whereas 22% of TSØ respondents regarded this
24 as a reason of *great importance* for their participation in network meetings.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 :::::::::: INSERT TABLE 3 ::::::::::
37
38
39
40

41 *Business creation through network participation*

42 The following two sets of questions were designed to measure i) whether or not firms had
43 increased their business and social relations with other sponsors/firms *after* joining the FCV
44 and TSØ networks and ii) whether or not their participation in the networks had resulted in an
45 increase in business with firms outside the network. This was our way of measuring the social
46 capital achieved via network engagement, i.e. that a heterogeneous network opens a door to
47 additional resources, contacts and information channels beyond the formal network itself. The
48 first set of questions (Table 4) measured these aspects by asking the participants to estimate
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the number of business and private relations with network members prior to taking part in the
4 network and the current number of relations. The subsequent set of questions (Table 5)
5
6 measured whether networking with companies within the network had led to contacts outside
7
8 the network (business-to-business arrangements) and the extent to which this was related to
9
10 the number of years spent as part of the network.
11
12

13
14 Several of the firms participating in the survey stated that they had increased their
15
16 business with network members after becoming members of the network. No significant
17
18 differences were found between FCV and TSØ networks in the reported increase in the
19
20 number of business deals between network members. Therefore, the results from the two
21
22 networks were merged. Around one third (32%; $n=35$) of the sponsors reported an increase in
23
24 their number of business with other members of the sponsor network since becoming a
25
26 member; half (50%; $n=55$) reported doing business with approximately the same number of
27
28 members; and 6% ($n=7$) reported doing less business with other members within the network
29
30 than before becoming network members. A minority (12%; $n=13$) reported doing business
31
32 with more than twenty other sponsors, before as well as after joining the networks. For these
33
34 sponsors it was not possible to determine whether they were now in business with the same
35
36 number of, more or fewer partners than before becoming network members (see Table 4).
37
38
39
40
41

42 :::::::::: INSERT TABLE 4 ::::::::::

43
44
45
46
47 Several individuals representing the businesses included in the survey increased their
48
49 private relations with network members after joining the networks. No significant differences
50
51 were found between the FCV and the TSØ in the changes in numbers of social relations.
52
53 Therefore, results from these networks were merged. One fourth (26%; $n=28$) of the sponsors
54
55 increased the number of persons they met socially after becoming members of the network;
56
57 62% ($n=67$) met with approximately the same number of people; and 3% ($n=3$) reported a
58
59
60

1
2
3 decrease in the number of persons they met with on social occasions. A minority 9% ($n=10$)
4
5 of the sponsors met with 10 persons or more socially before *and* after joining the network.
6

7 Among these it is impossible to determine whether this number changed (i.e. remained the
8
9 same, decreased or increased) after they became members of the sponsor network (Table 5).
10
11

12
13
14 :::::::::: INSERT TABLE 5 ::::::::::
15

16
17
18
19 *Achieving business agreements with non-network members via network members*

20
21 When asked about new business agreements with non-network members, more than one third
22
23 of the respondents (37%) reported that they had made business agreements with companies
24
25 outside the network by contacts gained via their network engagement. Nearly half (46%) of
26
27 the sponsors engaged in the network for more than two years reported that they had used their
28
29 network contacts to make business agreements with companies outside the network. Among
30
31 those respondents with two years or less in the network, only a minority (13%) had as yet
32
33 signed business agreements with non-network members due to contacts through the network.
34
35

36
37 To identify the degree to which membership of the network influenced business
38
39 preferences, respondents were asked whether they would prefer to do business with other
40
41 firms within the network rather than firms which were not part of the network, or whether this
42
43 did not affect their decisions. Results showed that more than half of the respondents (59%)
44
45 would prefer to do business with network members rather than with non-members. Few
46
47 respondents indicated that this would only be the case if the price was better (6%) while one
48
49 third (33%) reported that they would prefer to do business with other network members rather
50
51 than with non-members only if the price of the product was the same. Most network members
52
53 would only prefer members over non-members when no differences were found in the quality
54
55 of the product of the non-member (38%) or if the quality of the product of the non-member
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was better (10%). However, a minority (14%) would prefer to do business with members over
4
5 non-members, even if the price was higher (see Figure 1).
6
7
8

9
10 ::::::::::: INSERT FIGURE 1 :::::::::::
11

12 13 **Discussion**

14
15 The study was designed to investigate motives for becoming a sponsor, reasons for
16
17 participating in network activities, business created by network engagement and whether
18
19 membership of a network favored doing business with other members.
20
21

22 *Firstly*, this study confirms that sponsorship engagement goes beyond mere advertising:
23
24 the motives for engaging in sponsor networks are first and foremost guided by the aim to
25
26 enter into business deals rather than to use the connection with the club for advertising
27
28 purposes. In line with Demir and Söderman (2015), the results of the current study reveal that
29
30 business engagement is linked to the strategic use of sponsorships. However, it must be
31
32 emphasized that the firms' support for local professional team sports is also given a relatively
33
34 high level of support. Accordingly, although business reasons dominate, social motives (such
35
36 as a local interest in supporting professional sport) also seem to contribute to a sponsor's
37
38 commitment to networks. The local commitment perspective of this study is unique to the
39
40 field since most other studies on sponsor networks deal with international high-profile events
41
42 with sponsors not linked to a local community (Cobbs, 2011; Morgan et al., 2014; Olkkonen,
43
44 2001). On the other hand, the sponsorship literature is rich in examples of community
45
46 engagement and local commitment (Wagner and Nissen, 2015; Zinger and O'Reilly, 2010);
47
48 thus, our study on local networks links the network literature to sponsorship research. An
49
50 important finding is that fewer than half of the firms surveyed (45%) indicated that they gave
51
52 great importance to advertising as a reason for joining the networks, which is in line with the
53
54 overview provided by Ryan and Fahy (2012): the market- and consumer-centered approach is
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 superseded in this particular context by an approach that emphasizes business-to-business
4
5 interaction orchestrated by a network.
6

7 *Secondly*, in a similar way our study shows that the reasons for participating in network
8
9 arrangements are dominated by business considerations. This suggests that sponsor networks
10
11 function first and foremost as sites for concrete business-to-business interactions. Our study
12
13 builds on and extends the insights provided by Street and Cameron (2007) as such networks
14
15 may have far-reaching implications for a local community. The local sport club – despite not
16
17 belonging to the national elite – is able to create business alliances between small businesses.
18
19 Therefore, a sport club becomes a pivotal point for local enterprises and small-scale business
20
21 interactions, and accordingly, its role in the local community is extended far beyond being
22
23 merely a part of the entertainment industry on home-match days. This may explain why
24
25 sponsors seem less stimulated by social reasons or a distinct sporting interest when asked to
26
27 assess their reasons for participating in network arrangements.
28
29
30

31
32 *Thirdly*, the results of this study suggest that one way of measuring the strength of a
33
34 network is to measure the increase in business agreements with other network members when
35
36 a firm enters the network. One important finding is that the majority does not report increased
37
38 numbers of relations (social as well as business) due to engagement with the network.
39
40 According to the results of this study, then, the importance and potentials of these networks
41
42 should not be over-emphasized. A recent study using Denmark as an example has also warned
43
44 against ‘over-selling’ the positive argument of the economic potentials for local communities
45
46 of hosting elite sport clubs (Storm et al. in press). Nonetheless, one third of the respondents
47
48 stated that they had increased their business with other members after joining the network. If
49
50 not the majority, a large proportion of firms seem – in their own assessment – to have
51
52 benefited from their engagement by increasing inter-organizational business agreements with
53
54 other network members. But, as pointed out by Ceci and Iubatti (2012), there is no clear
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 distinction between business and personal relations; rather, we should see these as intertwined
4
5 (Mäläskä et al., 2011). Approximately one fourth of the respondents stated that the number of
6
7 their personal relations had increased as a result of their sponsor network engagement. This
8
9 indicates, too, that a considerable minority gained new private relationships due to their
10
11 network engagement while a larger proportion remained unaffected.

12
13
14 *Fourthly*, it is worth emphasizing that the majority of members do not report being
15
16 positively prompted to engage with companies outside the network. Despite this, a notable
17
18 finding is that more than one third of the respondents report that they had entered into
19
20 business agreements with companies outside the network through their network engagement.
21
22 This partly extends the scope of the business-to-business potential of a sponsor network since
23
24 relations between two network members can pave the way for business relations with a third,
25
26 non-network member partner. The time invested in the network also matters as companies
27
28 associated with a club for over two years are more likely to have formed business relations
29
30 with non-members. This finding indicates that it takes some time before a firm can benefit
31
32 from its network engagement. Although our study is not able to identify how these relations
33
34 are formed (as discussed by MacGrath and O'Toole, 2010), this is an interesting aspect for
35
36 those firms using networks to engage with third parties as the implications of networking are
37
38 extended beyond the network itself. Thus, it also provides a key insight into understanding the
39
40 local and regional business landscapes. A possible explanation for using club facilitated
41
42 networks is that these sponsor networks are heterogeneous and, as suggested by Bjönfoot and
43
44 Torjussen (2012), will take the form of complementary collaborations. From the point of view
45
46 of social capital theory, a heterogeneous network (which bridges social capital) will provide
47
48 the opportunity to access new contacts beyond the network while the homogenous network
49
50 will (in most cases) add neither new information nor new contacts. Thus, contrary to existing
51
52 classical business networks, sport sponsor networks are perhaps far more inclusive as they
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 recruit members beyond retail and small production companies to include local service firms,
4
5 educational organizations, master craftsmen and cultural industries. For some network
6
7 members this inclusiveness paves the way for contacts and ultimately contracts beyond the
8
9 boundaries of the network itself, which seems to be the case for a large minority in our study.
10

11 A further means of identifying the strength of the network in our study was to ask
12
13 whether, and under which conditions, network members preferred doing business with other
14
15 network members. A majority of our respondents preferred doing business with members
16
17 rather than with non-members. An interesting finding here was that one out of seven members
18
19 were willing to give preference to other members even if the price was higher, thus indicating
20
21 that for few companies the importance of belonging to a network trumps the classical
22
23 economic assumption that firms strive to minimize costs and maximize profits. Although this
24
25 statement must be interpreted with caution as it has not been tested when a firm is actually
26
27 confronted with this decision (and is therefore of a hypothetical nature), it still gives us an
28
29 indication of the strength of the network. One could interpret both answers – regarding
30
31 contacts formed and contracts signed outside but through the network and the preference to do
32
33 business with members over non-members – as being deeply imbedded in trust between
34
35 network members and potentially underpinned by a high level of emotional intensity
36
37 (Granovetter, 1973). The passion for sport, although not the most significant rationale for
38
39 network engagement, can contribute with such emotional intensity familiar from studies on
40
41 fan identification (Donovan et al., 2005).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Conclusion**

50
51 This study explores the role of sponsor networks in local community settings, thus bridging
52
53 sponsorship research with existing research on business networks. The study aimed at
54
55 extending the scope of sponsorship research by contributing knowledge about the roles,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perspectives and constraints of team sport clubs in relation to local business. Knowledge was
4
5 contributed through the lens of network theory and by investigating the clubs' roles in
6
7 facilitating local business-to-business interactions. Overall, our findings provide insights into
8
9 corporate motives, the use of networks and potential outcomes of business-to-business
10
11 relations in sport settings that are not connected with large-scale international sporting events
12
13 but in settings that have a daily impact on the local and regional business landscape. Our
14
15 findings confirm that firms engage in sponsor networks primarily for business reasons. This is
16
17 consistent with existing strategic approaches to sponsorship engagement. However, a large
18
19 number of firms do not seem to benefit in terms of increasing numbers of business and social
20
21 relations by joining a network while some report that they do so as a result of their network
22
23 commitment. From a social capital theory perspective our study reveals that being a member
24
25 of a network actually enables some firms to form relations with non-members through the
26
27 mediation of other network members. Hence, the social capital gained through sponsor
28
29 networks for a minority in our study has the potential to facilitate the acquisition of new
30
31 knowledge, new resources and access to further information for those firms engaged in it.
32
33 Accordingly, our study shows that team sport clubs may be able to fulfill an important role in
34
35 local society beyond being mere entertainment industries. Therefore, building business
36
37 networks is meant to enhance their attractiveness for sponsors.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Managerial implications for the sport clubs*

46
47 That sponsors fit well together with their sponsorship object has always been regarded as a
48
49 crucial factor in sponsorship creations. At first glance, however, there is often no logical link
50
51 between corporate strategy and a particular sport organization (Coppetti et al., 2009; Wagner
52
53 and Nissen, 2015), and as a result, intensive sensemaking is often required in order to create a
54
55 fit. Involving sponsors, for instance in network activities, is a possible way of making sense of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a sponsorship. The clubs, and in particular the clubs' managers engaged in sponsor relations,
4
5 play a crucial role here when we discuss the managerial implications of our findings.
6

7
8 In their extensive review, Ryan and Fahy (2012) claim that contemporary sponsorship
9
10 management shares many of the characteristics of network management. Although earlier
11
12 approaches to sponsorships (such as focusing on consumers) still exist, sponsorship as
13
14 interaction is of more recent origin. Our study builds on this insight by adding an empirical
15
16 dimension to the network approach. The club management must not only concentrate on the
17
18 sporting achievements on the pitch but, in addition, be aware of its network orchestration
19
20 since its sponsors represent a generous financial foundation for the club. This implies that a
21
22 club's management must operate at various levels (Ryan and Fahy, 2012): it must create a
23
24 joint vision that is shared by all sponsors while simultaneously creating tailor-made visions
25
26 for individual sponsors by becoming familiar with their portfolios and how they are related to
27
28 other companies, including their competitors. This forms the basis for the next step, which is
29
30 being able to arrange the positions of the companies in the network so that network members
31
32 are able to benefit from other members' resources and activities. Although our study did not
33
34 look directly into the management of sponsor networks, the complexity of the managerial
35
36 implications are also to be considered. As suggested by Ryan and Fahy (2012) we need to
37
38 look at a sponsorship not so much as a communication tool but "rather more as a *platform* for
39
40 engaging in potentially relational forms of communication with consumers and other
41
42 stakeholders, the management of which incorporates relationship portfolio management
43
44 practices" (p. 1151). However, managing networks is difficult. A network is loosely coupled,
45
46 indicating that managing it has some natural limitations (Ritter et al., 2004). Consequently,
47
48 the term *orchestration* seems to be the most appropriate concept as it encapsulates the loose
49
50 interweaving of a network but still emphasizes that a sport club can actively create a network
51
52 and facilitate business-to-business relations. Rather than sketching a best-practice model, we
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 maintain that the sponsorship network should be conceived as a unique platform operated at
4
5 various levels and should take particular local and regional settings into consideration.
6

7 Furthermore, since our study manifests the importance of the network for a local and regional
8
9 community, local policy makers and regional business planners must integrate sport clubs into
10
11 their long-term decision making. Again, this underlines that sport clubs play a role beyond
12
13 being a mere branch of the entertainment industry.
14
15

16 17 18 *Methodological limitations and research implications* 19

20 This study has the status of an exploratory pilot study. Whilst on the one hand it has
21
22 limitations in terms of scope, on the other hand it clearly points out future research paths. One
23
24 obvious limitation is that it solely investigates networks connected with two clubs situated in
25
26 the rural areas of Denmark: the circumstances of top-tier clubs in the major urban areas of
27
28 Denmark might differ in a variety of ways. This obviously represents a limitation in terms of
29
30 generalizability. A future step, therefore, could be to extend the study to include all networks
31
32 associated with the top-tier divisions in handball and football since these two sports – contrary
33
34 to other less professionalized team sports such as volleyball or basketball – both facilitate and
35
36 orchestrate sponsor networks. Secondly, this study has not relied on the methodologies used
37
38 in existing studies which explore trust, commitment and satisfaction in network relations, and
39
40 as a consequence it has not tested already validated procedures to measure sponsorship
41
42 relationships (e.g. Farrelly and Quester, 2005). Finally, the study is quantitative. By adding a
43
44 qualitative methodology and adopting mixed- method approaches, we would be able to say
45
46 more about the perceptions and motivations of sponsors, the day-to-day nature of networks
47
48 and how business and personal/private relations interact in network settings. Such approaches
49
50 would generate knowledge about the balances of power prevailing in sports networks (Wolfe
51
52 et al., 2002). Qualitative interviews combined with ethnographic observation studies over a
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 longer period is recommended if one wishes to understand how the business landscape may
4
5 be reinvigorated and strengthened by sport clubs. Future studies could benefit by integrating
6
7 insights from this study into existing research on sponsorship relationships or combining them
8
9 with more generic studies in relationship marketing, including the methodologies applied
10
11 within that research field.
12

13
14 Despite these limitations, this study has drawn attention to the role of small and
15
16 medium-sized businesses in network building with the aim of adding empirically embedded
17
18 local and regional perspectives to a sponsorship network research that is otherwise dominated
19
20 by international events and large-scale sponsors. Future research should therefore pay
21
22 attention to the role and importance of such sport club-facilitated networks, for instance by
23
24 investigating whether they are able to generate more business-to-business activities and thus
25
26 contribute to local and regional economic growth and perhaps inter-organizational innovation.
27
28 These aspects of the networks have not been investigated in our study. Our approach to sport
29
30 management research on sponsorship is formed by a dialectical view of network
31
32 establishment. Rather than viewing decision making as either being conducted by a single
33
34 rational actor unaffected by social context or as being pre-determined by structures, our study
35
36 invites sport management scholars to perceive sponsorships as dialectical interactive
37
38 relationships that go beyond methodological individualism and structuralism (for related
39
40 proposals, see also Chanavat et al. 2016; Cousens et al. 2006; Daellenbach et al. 2006;
41
42 Olkkonen et al., 2000). From this perspective, the ties between the organizations become the
43
44 interesting point of departure for further studies.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **References**

52
53 Amis, J., Slack, T. and Berrett, T. (1999), "Sport Sponsorship as Distinctive Competence",
54
55 *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 33 No. 3/4, pp. 250-272.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Böhler, A. W., Hefferman, T.W. and Hewson, P.J. (2007), "The soccer club-sponsor
4 relationship: identifying the critical variables for success", *International Journal of*
5 *Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 4-22.
6
7
8
9 Björnfort, A. and L. Torjussen (2012), "Extent and Effect of Horizontal Supply Chain
10 Collaboration among Construction SME", *Journal of Engineering, Project, and*
11 *Production Management*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 47-55.
12
13
14 Brass, D.T., Galaskiewics, J., Greve, H.H., and Tsai, W. (2004), "Taking stock of networks
15 and organizations: A multilevel perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 47
16 No. 6, pp. 795-817.
17
18
19
20
21
22 Brunnetto, Y. and Farr-Wharton, R. (2010), "The Moderate Role of Trust in SME
23 Owner/Mangers' Decision-Making about Collaboration", *Journal of Small Business*
24 *Management*, Vol. 45 No 3, pp. 362-387.
25
26
27
28
29 Capó-Vicedo, J., J. Mula and J. Capó (2011), "A Social Network-Based Organizational
30 Model for Improving Knowledge Management in Supply Chain", *Supply Chain*
31 *Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 5, pp. 379-388.
32
33
34
35 Ceci, F. and D. Iubatti (2012), "Personal relationships and innovation diffusion in SME
36 networks: A content analysis approach", *Research Policy*, Vol. 41 No 3, pp. 565- 579.
37
38
39
40 Chadwick, S. and D. Thwaites, (2004), "Advances in the Management of Sport Sponsorship:
41 Fact or Fiction? Evidence form English Professional Soccer", *Journal of General*
42 *Management*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 39-60.
43
44
45
46
47 Chanavat, N., Desbordes, M. and Dickson, G. (2016), "Sponsorship networks: toward an
48 innovative model", *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 6
49 No. 4, pp. 424-439.
50
51
52
53
54 Cobbs, J. (2011), "The dynamics of relationship marketing in international sponsorship
55 networks", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 8, pp. 590-601.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Coppetti, C., Wentzel, D., Tomczak, T. and Henkel, S. (2009), "Improving incongruent
4 sponsorships through articulation of the sponsorship and audience participation",
5
6 *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 17-34.
7
8
9
10 Cornwell, T.B. (2008), "State of Art and Science in Sponsorship-linked Marketing", *Journal*
11
12 *of Advertising*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 41-55.
13
14 Cornwell, T.B. (2014), *Sponsorship in marketing. Effective communication through sports,*
15
16 *arts and events*, Routledge. London, UK.
17
18
19 Cornwell, T. B. and Maignan, I (1998), "Research on sponsorship: International review and
20
21 appraisal", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp.1-21.
22
23
24 Cousens, L., K. Babiak and C.L. Bradish (2006), "Beyond Sponsorship: Re-framing
25
26 Corporate-Sport Relationships", *Sport Management Review*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 1-23.
27
28
29 Daellenbach, K., Davies, J. and Ashill, N.J. (2006), "Understanding sponsorship and
30
31 sponsorship relationships – multiple frames and multiple perspectives", *International*
32
33 *Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 73-87.
34
35
36 Demir R. and Söderman S. (2015), "Strategic sponsoring in professional sport: a review and
37
38 conceptualization", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No.3, pp. 271-300.
39
40
41 Donovan, T., Carlsson, B. and Zimmermann, M. (2005), "The influence of personality traits
42
43 on sport fan identification", *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp 31-42.
44
45
46 Emirbayer, M. (1997), "Manifesto for a relational sociology", *American Journal of Sociology*,
47
48 Vol. 103 No. 2, pp. 281-317.
49
50
51 Evens, G. (2003), "Hard-branding the cultural city – from Prado to Prada", *International*
52
53 *Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 417-440.
54
55
56 Farrelly, F. (2010), "Not playing the Game: Why Sport Sponsorship Relationships Break
57
58 Down", *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 319-337.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3 commitment”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 37 No. 3-4, pp. 530-553.
- 4
5 Farrelly, F and Quester, P. (2005), “Examining important relationship quality constructs of
6
7 the focal sponsorship exchange”, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp.
8
9 211-219.
- 10
11 Farrelly, F., Quester, F. and Greyser, S.A. (2005), “Defending the Co-branding Benefits of
12
13 Sponsorship B2B Partnerships: The Case of Ambush Marketing”, *Journal of*
14
15 *Advertising Research*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 339–348.
- 16
17
18 Farrelly F, Greyser S and Rogan M (2012), “Sponsorship Linked Internal Marketing (SLIM):
19
20 A strategic platform for employee engagement and business performance”, *Journal of*
21
22 *Sport Management* Vol. 26 No.6, pp. 506-520.
- 23
24
25 Flöter, T, Benkenstein, M and Uhrich, S (2016), “Communicating CSR-linked sponsorship:
26
27 Examining the influence of three different types of message sources”, *Sport*
28
29 *Management Review*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 146-156.
- 30
31
32 Giddens, A. (1984), *The constitution of society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 33
34 Granovetter, M.S. (1973), “The Strength of Weak Ties”, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.
35
36 78 No. 6, pp. 1360-1380.
- 37
38 Granovetter, M.S. (1985), “Economic action and social structure: The problem of
39
40 embeddedness”, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91 No. 3, pp. 481-510.
- 41
42
43 Henseler, J., B. Wilson and K. Westberg (2011), “Managers’ Perceptions of the Impact of
44
45 Sport Sponsorship on Brand Equity: Which Aspects of the Sponsorship Matter Most?”,
46
47 *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 7–21.
- 48
49
50 Human, S.E. and Provan, K.G. (1997), “An Emergent Theory of Structure and Outcomes in
51
52 Small-Firm Strategic Manufacturing Networks”, *Academy of Management Journal*,
53
54 Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 368-403.
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Jørgensen, F. and J.P. Ulhøi (2010), “Enhancing Innovation Capacity in SMEs through Early
4 Network Relationships”, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp.
5 397-404.
6
7
8
9 Kim, A.C.H., Lee, H. and Kim, Y. (2014), “Sponsorship network portfolio of corporate
10 partners in the National Basketball Association”, *International Journal of Sport
11 Management and Marketing*, Vol. 15 No 5/6, pp. 340-359.
12
13
14
15 Kommunernes Landsforening (2014). *Danmark i forandring. Udvikling i lokal balance*.
16 Copenhagen. Available at: [http://www.kl.dk/ImageVaultFiles/id_67022/cf_202/Pixi_-
17 Danmark_i_forandring.PDF](http://www.kl.dk/ImageVaultFiles/id_67022/cf_202/Pixi_-_Danmark_i_forandring.PDF) (accessed 27 June 2016)
18
19
20
21
22 Li, W., R. Veliyath and J. Tan (2013), “Network Characteristics and Firm Performance: An
23 Examination of the Relationships in the Context of a Cluster”, *Journal of Small
24 Business Management*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 1-22.
25
26
27
28 McGrath, H. and T. O’Toole (2010), “The Potential and Challenge of the Network
29 Realization Capability for SMEs in Ireland and Finland”, *Journal of Business Market
30 Management*, Vol. 4 No.1, pp. 27-49.
31
32
33
34
35 Meenaghan, T. (1991), “The Role of Sponsorship in the Marketing Communications mix”,
36 *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 35-48.
37
38
39
40 Menaghan, T. (1998), “Current Developments and Future Directions in Sponsorship”,
41 *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 3-28.
42
43
44
45 Miles, L. (2001), “Successful sport sponsorship: Lessons from association football – the role
46 of research”, *International Journal of Sport Marketing and Sponsorship*, Vol. 2 No. 4,
47 pp. 85-97.
48
49
50
51 Morgan, R.M. and Hunt, S.D. (1994), “The commitment-trust theory of relationship
52 marketing”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58 No. 3, pp. 20-38.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Morgan, A., Adair, D., Taylor, T. and Hermens, A. (2014), "Sport sponsorship alliances:
4 relationship management for shared value", *Sport, Business & Management*, Vol. 4 No.
5 4, pp. 270-283.
6
7
8
9 Mäläskä, M., S. Saraniemi and J. Tähtinen (2011), "Network Actors' Participation in B2B
10 SME Branding", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 40 No.7, pp. 1144-1152.
11
12
13 Olkkonen, R. (2001), "Case study: The network approach to international sport sponsorship
14 arrangement", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 309-329.
15
16
17
18 Olkkonen, R., H. Tikkanen and K. Alajoutsijärvi (2000), "Sponsorship as Relationships and
19 Networks", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 1, 12-18.
20
21
22
23 O'Malley, L. (2014), "Relational marketing: development, debates and directions", *Journal of*
24 *Marketing Management*, Vol. 30 No. 11-12, pp. 1220-1238.
25
26
27
28 O'Reilly, N. and Horning, L.F. (2013), "Leveraging sponsorship: The activation ratio", *Sport*
29 *Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 424-437.
30
31
32
33 Persson, H.T.R. (2008) "Social capital and social responsibility in Denmark: More than
34 gaining public trust" *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 43 No. 35,
35 pp. 35-51.
36
37
38
39 Pirolo, L. and Presutti, M. (2010), "The impact of social capital on the start-ups' performance
40 growth", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 197-227.
41
42
43
44 Ritter, T., Wilkinson, I. and Johnston, W. (2004), "Managing in complex business networks",
45 *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 175-183.
46
47
48
49 Rus, A. and Iglıc, H. (2005), "Trust, governance and performance: The role of institutional
50 and interpersonal trust in SME development", *International Sociology*, Vol. 20 No.
51 3, pp. 371-391.
52
53
54
55 Ryan, A. and Fahy, J. (2012), "Evolving priorities in sponsorship: From media management
56 to network management", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 28 No.9-10, pp.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1132-1158.
4
5 Schoonjans, B., Van Cauwenberge, P and Vander Bauwhede, H. (2013), "Formal business
6
7 networking and SME growth", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 41 No.1, pp. 169-181
8
9
10 Semrau, T. and A. Werner (2012), "The Two Sides of the Story: Network Investments and
11
12 New Venture Creation", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp.
13
14 159-180.
15
16 Slack, T. and L. Bentz (1996), "The Involvement of Small Business in Sport Sponsorship",
17
18 *Managing Leisure*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 175-84.
19
20
21 Storm, R., Thomsen, F. and Jakobsen, T.G. (in press), "Do they make a difference?
22
23 Professional team sport clubs' effect on migration and local growth: Evidence from
24
25 Denmark", *Sport Management Review*, doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2016.09.003.
26
27
28 Street, C.T. and A.-F. Cameron (2007), "External Relationships and the Small Business: A
29
30 Review of Small Business Alliance and Network Research", *Journal of Small Business*
31
32 *Management*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 239-266.
33
34
35 Sullivan, D. and M. Marvel (2011), "How Entrepreneurs' Knowledge and Network Ties
36
37 Relate to the Number of Employees in New SMEs", *Journal of Small Business*
38
39 *Management*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp. 185-206.
40
41
42 Tomlinson, P.R. (2011), "Strong Ties, Substantive Embeddedness and Innovation: Exploring
43
44 Differences in the Innovative Performance of Small and Medium-Sized Firms in UK
45
46 Manufacturing", *Knowledge and Process Management*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 95-108.
47
48
49 Tomlinson, P.R. and F.M. Fai (2013), "The Nature of SME Co-Operation and Innovation: A
50
51 Multi-Scalar and Multi-Dimensional Analysis", *International Journal of Production*
52
53 *Economics*, Vol. 141 No. 1, pp. 316-312.
54
55
56 Wagner, U. and Nissen, R. (2015), "Enacted ambiguity and risk perceptions: Making sense of
57
58 national elite sport sponsorships", *Sport in Society*, Vol. 18 No. 10, pp. 1179-1198.
59
60

1
2
3 Walliser B (2003), "An international review of sponsorship research: extension and update",
4
5 *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 5-40.
6

7 Webster, Jr, F.E. (1992), "The changing role of marketing in the corporation", *Journal of*
8
9 *Marketing*, Vol. 56 No. 4, pp. 1-17.
10

11 Wincent, J., Anokhin, S. and Örtqvist, D. (2010), "Does network board capital matter? A
12
13 study of innovative performance in SME networks", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.
14
15 63 No. 3, pp. 265-275.
16
17

18 Wolfe, R., Meenaghan, T. and O'Sullivan, P. (2002), "The sports network: insights into the
19
20 shifting balance of power", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 55 No. 7, pp. 611-622.
21
22

23 Zinger, J. T. and O'Reilly, N. J. (2010), "An examination of sport sponsorship from a small
24
25 business perspective. *International Journal of Sport Marketing & Sponsorship*, Vol.11
26
27 No. 4, pp. 283-301.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

		FCV (N=67)	TSØ (N=54)	Total	P-values
Number of employees	0-9	23.9%	35.2%	32.2%	$p=0.185$
	10-49	46.3%	42.6%	41.3%	
	50-249	16.4%	13.0%	14.9%	
	250 or more	13.4%	9.3%	11.6%	
Number of years in the sponsor network	< 1 year	23.9%	5.6%	15.7%	$p=0.19$
	1-2	11.9%	11.1%	11.6%	
	3-4	17.9%	35.2%	25.6%	
	> 4 years	46.3%	48.1%	47.1%	

Table 1. The network members' number of employees and the number of years in the sponsor network.

Table 2. Firms' assessments of eight statements relating to their sponsorship engagement.

Reasons: business or social	Items	Great influence (%)	Some influence (%)	No influence (%)	<i>P</i> (FCV vs. TSØ)
Business	We wish to use FCV's/TSØ's business network to make business deals (B2B)	68	26	6	0.054
Social	We believe it is important to support professional football/handball on West Zealand/Lolland-Falster	51	38	11	0.020 ^a
Business	We wish to use FCV/TSØ to advertise our firm/organization and product(s)	45	45	10	0.033 ^b
Social	We believe that football/handball is an important social activity for West Zealand/Lolland-Falster	41	46	13	0.160
Business	We wish to promote West Zealand/Lolland-Falster in relation to the rest of Denmark	31	44	26	0.165
Social	We believe that support for professional football/handball improves football/handball-4-all	29	42	28	0.081
Business	We wish to use our sponsorship as part of our HR work	19	46	35	0.157
Social	We believe that it has always been important to support SBI (FCV's mother club) / RH and/or HMH (TSØ's mother clubs)	17	47	37	0.752

^aFCV: 41% great influence, 44% some influence, 14% no influence. TSØ: 63% great influence, 29% some influence, 8% no influence.

^bFCV: 55% great influence, 34% some influence, 11% no influence. TSØ: 32% great importance, 59% some influence, 9% no influence.

Note: The answer category "we do not believe it is like that" was not included in the statistical analyses. This figure was particularly high (14%) in statement "we believe it has always been important to support professional handball/football.

Table 3. Firms' assessments of nine statements relating to their participation in FCV/TSØ business network activities.

<i>Reasons: business or social</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Great influence (%)</i>	<i>Some influence (%)</i>	<i>No influence (%)</i>	<i>P (FCV vs.TSØ)</i>
<i>Business</i>	It provides good opportunities to meet and speak to other sponsors and business partners	66	32	2	0.075
<i>Business</i>	It provides opportunities to do business	61	36	4	0.242
<i>Social/ Business</i>	It provides good opportunities to meet new people	47	43	10	0.343
<i>Business</i>	It provides good opportunities to hear news from other companies and/or entrepreneurs	45	50	5	0.178
<i>Social</i>	It provides good opportunities to socialize	38	54	9	0.051
<i>Social</i>	It provides good opportunities to hear news from FCV/TSØ	21	66	13	0.535
<i>Social</i>	It provides good opportunities to meet other people interested in football	14	53	33	0.577
<i>Social/ Business</i>	It helps not to miss out on important information	13	59	29	0.092
<i>Social</i>	It provides good opportunities for nice food and drink	11	48	41	0.001 ^{***a}

***^aGreat influence: FCV=2%/TSØ=22%; some influence: FCV= 48%/TSØ=49%; no influence:*

FCV=51%/TSØ=29%.

Note: The answer category "we do not experience it like that" was not included in the statistical analyses. Between 1% and 4% reported they did not experience it like that.

	The number of sponsors inside the network that the company does business with	The number of business deals with other sponsors from the network after joining the network						<i>Total</i>
		0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-10	over 20	
The number of business deals with other sponsors from the network before joining the network	0	2	11	1	0	0	1	15
	1-5	1	38	10	4	0	2	55
	6-10	0	2	14	3	1	0	20
	11-15	1	1	1	1	2	0	6
	16-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	over 20	0	0	0	1	0	13*	14
	<i>Total</i>	4	52	26	9	3	16	110

Table 4. The number of business deals with other network members prior to and after joining the networks

Note: * the number of business deals with other sponsor network members may have increased, decreased or remained the same

Business, Management: an International Journal


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

		The number of persons inside the network "the company" meets up with on social occasions after joining the sponsor network					
		The number of persons "the company" meets up with on social occasions					Total
		None	1-3 persons	4-6 persons	7-9 persons	10 or more persons	
The number of persons inside the network "the company" meets up with on social occasions before joining the sponsor network	None	28	7	0	1	1	37
	1-3 persons	2	23	8	3	1	37
	4-6 persons	0	0	12	4	1	17
	7-9 persons	0	1	0	4	2	7
	10 or more persons	0	0	0	0	10*	10
Total		30	31	20	12	15	108

Table 5. The number of social relations with other network members prior to and after joining the networks

Note: *The number of private relations with other sponsor network members may have increased, decreased or remained the same.

Figure 1: Preferences among network members



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ment: an International J