



**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  
41 The study is based on two cases: one football club belonging to the highest Danish  
42  
43 league during the 2013/14 season and one handball club figuring among the top teams in the  
44  
45 second-highest Danish division during the 2013/14 season. Whilst this study is an exploratory  
46  
47 pilot study covering only two networks, the ambition is to carry out an extended study in the  
48  
49 future covering all Danish clubs hosting similar networks. The clubs in this study are situated  
50  
51 on the periphery of Denmark, which is characterized by relatively low economic growth rates,  
52  
53 a stagnant housing market, and above-average unemployment rates. Football and handball  
54  
55 belong to the most popular and traditional team sports in Denmark in terms of participation,  
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 (Farelly 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 (Farelly 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  
17 Although the focus tends to be on networking, cooperation or alliances between  
18  
19 businesses, some authors argue that it is the personal relationships between businesses that  
20  
21 facilitate the success of diffusion and adaptation of innovation, which in turn increases the  
22  
23 competitiveness of firms (Ceci and Iubatti, 2012). In similar fashion, MacGrath and O'Toole  
24  
25 (2010) point out that the outcome is heavily dependent on the individual perception of the  
26  
27 network as interconnected business relations or on personal contacts built on trust,  
28  
29 commitment, and communication. Nevertheless, rather than being one or the other, i.e.  
30  
31 social/personal or business-based relationships, Mäläskä et al. (2011) emphasize that it is the  
32  
33 combination of social and business networks that contributes to strengthening the brand image  
34  
35 of SMEs due to their regularly being directly or indirectly exposed to external influences.  
36  
37 Consequently, networks and networking are about building, maintaining, and retaining  
38  
39 relationships defined "as collaborative arrangements established via the interactions between  
40  
41 actors embedded in a social context" (Sydow and Windeler, 2003 in Jørgensen and Ulhøi,  
42  
43 2010, p. 398). This applies to individuals and their private relations as well as to the business  
44  
45 landscape (O'Malley, 2014; Webster, 1992). Thus, network research contains a multi-level  
46  
47 perspective by investigating inter-personal as well as inter-organizational relationships (Brass  
48  
49 et al. 2004). The concept of social capital has also become widely used to understand the  
50  
51 importance of network relations for enterprises (Li et al., 2013). The argument is that the mere  
52  
53 existence of a relationship says nothing or little about its quality – and hence little about the  
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 Sydhavsørerne (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  
43 :::::::::: INSERT TABLE 4 ::::::::::  
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 <sup>a</sup>
Business	We wish to use FCV/TSØ to advertise our firm/organization and product(s)	45	45	10	0.033 <sup>b</sup>
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

<sup>a</sup>FCV: 41% great influence, 44% some influence, 14% no influence. TSØ: 63% great influence, 29% some influence, 8% no influence.

<sup>b</sup>FCV: 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 <sup>***a</sup>

*\*\*<sup>a</sup>Great 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 <b>after</b> joining the network						Total
		0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-10	over 20	
The number of business deals with other sponsors from the network <b>before</b> 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
	Total	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

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

Business, Management: an International Journal


		The number of persons inside the network "the company" meets up with on social occasions <b>after</b> 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 <b>before</b> 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