

A Tri-Sector Social Partnership Model Within the Professional Sports Industry

Anton KLISCHEWSKI

Université de Bordeaux
12 Camille Jullian St., Bordeaux, France
klischewski@etu.u-bordeaux.fr

Diana-Luiza SIMION

National University of Political Studies and Public Administration (SNSPA)
31A Expozitiei Blvd., 012104, Bucharest, Romania
diana.dumitriu@comunicare.ro

Abstract. *Due to the wide social interest and impact of sports, it has become a resourceful field for the emergence and development of social partnerships. This paper aims to better understand the dynamics of the tri-sector social partnerships that football foundations are part of, looking at the role and input of different parties: football clubs, public institutions, and international NGO's structures. Focusing on the successful case of the European Football for Development Network (EFDN), which promotes the power of football as a tool for social development, we run a qualitative study that addresses not only each partnership dyad within this model (foundation-sport club; foundation-public institutions, foundation-EFDN) but also the model itself. Because the paper builds on the perspective of the sport foundations as binding agents within this type of multi-sector partnership, we reached to the EFDN members, interviewing 12 corporate social responsibility (CSR) executives working for these organizations. The findings outline not only the key-role of the tri-sector social partnership in terms of knowledge sharing and sustainability for the CSR projects but also the gatekeeper role that the partners play in terms of networking and legitimation within and beyond the sports market. Nevertheless, while focusing more on their benefits and less on what they have to offer, EFDN members tend to overlook their equal-party position within the social partnership and have a more operational rather than strategic approach upon the partnership. Beyond this resource-dependency logic that the football foundations tend to be caught up in, the fact that being part of this multi-sector social partnership empowers them is beyond dispute. Starting with the access to infrastructure assets and funding, to winning media coverage and credibility on both local and international market, EFDN members underline the fact that the power of this tri-sector social partnership exceeds a simple sum-up of all the opportunities provided by each dyad-partnership.*

Keywords: *social partnership; Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR); social capital; sport foundations; knowledge sharing*

Introduction

The field of sports has long been defined and spontaneously associated with high competitiveness, closely linked to the zero-sum game theory and the winning-losing dialectics. Nevertheless, going from the micro-level of the competition on the field, with teams or athletes playing against each other, to a macro-level one, sports provides us with a resourceful field for a more collaborative business approach and a ripe opportunity for successful social partnership.

Part of the popular culture, as well as a powerful bonding agent bringing people together and enhancing the community sense of belonging, sports actors, whether individual or organizational, have been expected to act socially responsible and be highly involved in supporting social causes (e.g. health, education, social equality related causes). Therefore, there is no wonder that sport has been a resourceful field for corporate social responsibility actions, playing an important role for both local and global communities.

As more and more sport organizations went from dealing with CSR internally to developing new separate structures as independent charitable organizations¹ (Walters & Panton, 2014), the research on the ascending trend of the foundation model in sports has expanded significantly (Jenkins & James, 2012; Kolyperas, Anagnostopoulos, Chadwick, & Sparks, 2016). So did the interest in how these foundations are linked to the business or the performance of their <parent clubs> (Cobourn & Frawley, 2017; Walters, 2009). Still, the way in which these charitable organizations are linked to other stakeholders is scarcely covered by the literature.

The general turn towards sustainable development and higher social responsibility brought along new business models that could answer the challenges of the social-economic dynamics. Important players on the global market redefined the rules of the game, setting new frameworks. The United Nations (UN) sees innovation as a new form of social practice and organization, promoting technologies and processes and, consequently, be recognized as “the outcome of a (difficult) process of learning and interaction between a diverse set of actors” (UNCTAD, 2017, p.2). Moreover, UN admitted that “sport, including football, has proven to be a cost-effective and flexible tool in promoting peace and development objectives” (EFDN, 2019) and that there are various ways in which it can potentially contribute to all of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Nevertheless, the mere accomplishment of such a sustainable development agenda requires multi-sector partnerships between governments, the private sector and the civil society (UN, 2019). This tri-sector partnership model, which assists both companies and their stakeholders in pursuing sustainable development goals, contributes to meeting broader social needs and drive policies, both locally and globally (Warhurst, 2001).

Within the professional football industry, social partnerships are an important promoter of CSR. In the last decades, sport CSR went from a “nice to have” component of the business, to a “must-have one”, going way beyond just a reputational asset logic and entering a more sustainable strategic direction. Hence, CSR sets resourceful grounds for social partnerships, which, in turn, provide a way of bridging between sharing and leveraging resources, as much as sharing the risks that come along. The emergence and development of international networks, such as The European Football for Development Network (EFDN), attest to the institutionalization of these cause-related communities of action. While promoting the power of football as a tool for social development that various communities throughout Europe can benefit from, EFDN creates a collaborative environment for knowledge sharing between its members. Moreover, it provides them access to external resources coming from a broader network, as the 75 clubs, leagues and FA’s from 28 European countries, who are now part of the EFDN, can benefit from the official strategic partnerships with the Fare network, Centre for Access in Football Europe (CAFE), the Social Football Club Alliance, European Healthy Stadia Network, European Club Association and UEFA Foundation for Children.

How do sport foundations that are EFDN members manage their role within the broader sports ecosystem? How do they handle and leverage the multi-sector social partnership matrix they are part of? Our paper aims to address these aspects, analyzing the tri-sector social partnership that the sport foundations bridge and build on, both from a dyad-partnership perspective, as well as from a more macro partnership-matrix one.

Theoretical framework: CSR and social partnerships in sports

Whether we go way back to the ‘60s or ‘70, when the first debates around CSR started - ranging from being a way for making profit (Friedman, 1962), to going beyond a purely commercial objective (Davis, 1960; McGuire, 1963; Carroll, 1979); or we just turn to the ‘90s, when major themes such as the stakeholder theory, business ethics theory, and corporate citizenship took center stage” (Carroll, 1999, p.288), CSR has continued to be a significant theme underpinning moral, financial, and ethical judgments of corporate activity (Lockett, Moon, & Visser, 2006; Windsor, 2006).

If older studies tended to approach CSR as a “tool for building company image, reputation or other marketing goals” (Vaaland, Heide, & Grønhaug, 2008, p. 948), newer ones refer to it as an integrative (Maignan & Ferrell, 2004) or a conceptual framework (Chahal & Sharma, 2006), laying emphasis on its strategic value in enhancing organizations’ performance and competitiveness (Brietbarth & Harris, 2008).

¹ *these external organizational entities can be found in sports community trusts or foundations; to facilitate the terminology, both concepts will be referred to under the general “sport foundations” term*

As a vehicle for deploying social responsibility (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007), sport is "unique for being both a social and an economic institution, and, as such, well-suited to be interpreted by the business principles and practices of CSR" (Bradish & Cronin, 2009, p. 692). Nevertheless, the literature on CSR and sports have long been dominated by the CSR sponsorship deals or by case-studies used in highlighting the reputational benefits of the CSR actions (Athanasopoulou, Douvis, & Kyriakis, 2011; McGowan, John, & Mahon, 2010). While there is no doubt that professional sports teams are increasingly engaging in socially responsible activities (Babiak & Wolfe, 2009; Irwin, Lachowetz, Cornwell, & Clark, 2003), there has been little research on the wider CSR network support and social partnerships developed around it.

It has been always argued that sports cannot be limited only to competitive athletic activity, as it acts as a powerful *cultural* and *socializing force* (Sklair, 1991; Creedon, 1998), with a high impact on wider audiences in terms of social values and practices. Moreover, sport is part of the popular culture, addressing and empowering masses, as much as bringing people together. It is why it provides dynamic forms of values-based education (i.e. Olympic values such as Excellence, Respect and Friendship) for both the ones that practice it, as well as for those who simply watch it. This aspirational and, somehow prescriptive, the ethical profile of sports, meets the general business tendencies and the quest for more sustainable, socially responsible organizations that look back and give back to the society they are impacting through their activity.

Within this framework, social partnerships or alliances, which are generally defined as "voluntary collaborations between business and social enterprises, addressing social problems too complex to be solved by unilateral organizational action" (Sakarya, Bodur, Yildirim-Öktem, & Selekler-Göksen, 2012, p.1) have started to emerge and develop within the sports market. Understanding that investing in better relationships, interactions, and stakeholders could bring along relevant outcomes, growth and profitability (Chen & Miller, 2015) for all parties, played sports stakeholders more interested in social partnership. It is true that the idea of creating greater value in a group rather than as an individual was not new, but the social component, made it go beyond the pro-profit business logic. Even if they primarily act in their own benefit, organizations are also addressing issues of social concern. Due to this "social" layer, these synergies between organizations which, in turn, influence the effectiveness of partnerships (Lasker, Weiss, & Miller 2001), are reaching more people and are easier gaining their support. Moreover, in a global economy that was forced to re-evaluate and adopt sustainable development lenses, there are a lot of resources devoted to social activities such as money, time, personnel and expertise (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004).

CSR is also seen as a positive means for the reputation and stakeholder management (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006), so it comes as no surprise that it can work as a resourceful unifying force that can bring public, private and non-profit sport-related stakeholders together. Yet, a lot of past studies focused mainly on the relation between the sports organization and a linked charitable foundation, as this link "creates a unique dynamic, bringing a variety of stakeholders together in collective forums" (Cobourn & Frawley, 2017, p.116). Explaining the interconnectedness between sport foundations and their parent club's business performance, Anagnostopoulos, Byers and Shilbury (2014) revealed four different simultaneous micro-social processes - *harmonizing*, *safeguarding*, *maneuvering* and *transcending*, which can help in understanding different decision-making patterns or implementation strategies of CSR projects. The literature on more complex social partnerships, which include more stakeholders, private, public or non-profit actors, remains still scarce, despite the generally accepted sustainability of this model.

Social partnerships provide a purposeful collaborative framework for all parties to win from, sharing their social capital and knowledge to grow together and serve a broader common goal. It is commonly expected that the partners generate sustainable value to the social alliance. Non-profit organizations, on the one hand, are demanded to deploy entrepreneurial initiatives that do not correspond to their conservative strategy to rule out any financial risks (Berger, Cunningham, & Drumwright, 2004). On the other hand, they might perceive that the time and resources spent in nurturing alliance-related activities are exploited and little-noticed or appreciated. It often occurs that non-profit's contribution to partnerships is undervalued. Adding to this, CSR benefits often require a certain amount of time to be seen and prove their sustainability (Weber, 2008).

When discussing social partnerships, social capital plays a key role in understanding the dynamics created by them and within them. It works as an "investment in social relations by individuals through which they gain access to embedded resources to enhance expected returns of instrumental or expressive actions"

(Lin, 2017, p.39). Social partnerships, hence, provide this purposeful collaborative framework for all parties to win from, using the power of social collectivity and resource sharing to grow together and serve a broader common goal. The social capital can refer to both the internal one, created by the members within the network, through their interactions and shared resources, as well as the external one. Nevertheless, the probability of accessing resources outside the network depends "on the openness of the collectivity (the extent to which individual members and officers have connections to the 'outer layers' of the network), the richness of the accessed resources, and the relationship between the connections" (Lin, 2008, p.16).

Methodological framework

In addressing how sports foundations position themselves and understand the overall dynamics of this tri-sector social partnership model, we run a qualitative study based on semi-structured interviews with representatives of EFDN members. The population of this study consisted of the 67 members of the EFDN (as in January 2019), among which eleven football clubs and a key executive of the EFDN were chosen based on their willingness to participate in the study. From that eleven clubs, ten had linked-foundations and one organized CSR within its own community department. The organizations came from the following countries across Europe: Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, Poland, Greece, Portugal, England, and Scotland.

For each sports foundation, the person we discussed with was either the director, head of the department or the person directly responsible for CSR activities and strategies. The contact was first established through email or LinkedIn and the interviews, which lasted between 30 minutes and 50 minutes, were done in English or German. Having the participant informed the agreement, all interviews were recorded.

The analysis of the data followed the Grounded Theory coding procedures presented by Strauss & Corbin (2014). During the procedure, open coding, axial coding, and selective coding were utilized, keeping in mind the main research objectives. For better understanding and integrating the data into the context, additional documents were used, whether they referred to the EFDN activity or to each foundation one (i.e. annual CSR and community reports, press releases and internal presentations).

Findings

The way the football foundations define themselves and their activity is strongly related to the three-layer social partnership matrix they are both investing in and benefiting from. As much as this type of social partnership business model is seen as consistent with the mission of the foundations, they feel like they are breaking new grounds and are "pioneering in, how you use football as a tool" (FR-11) to engage the civil society. Before discussing the implication of this positioning, the dynamics, and the potential of this social partnership model, we will further present how the representatives of the sport foundations described and defined the role and relation to each of the key-actors of this tri-sector partnership: sports clubs, public institutions, and EFDN.

Sports clubs – playing their brand magic

Compared to the football clubs they are linked to; the foundations are relatively small entities. However, in terms of both identity and legitimation, they are heavily relying on sports clubs. This comes with a significant resource-dependency, whether we are speaking in terms of financial, human or image capital resources. Several foundation managers mentioned that, generally, around 50% of the revenue accounts are provided by the club, whereas the other half is collected from fundraising activities, donations, private sponsorships and grants from the city or other organizations. Shared facilities and resources are a common practice within these organizations, serving to reduce expenses. For some of them, the cost allocation of the foundation personnel is transferred on the payroll of the football club (FR-5). Going even further with the financial domino, Smith, and Westerbeek (2009) argue that without the financial "muscle" of a bigger external sponsor the club's CSR reach is limited, even proposing a model where sports clubs could arguably be seen as mere intermediaries of a bigger purpose within the sponsor's CSR strategy.

Another key-resource that the foundation's relay on is the players within the sports club, who act as brand ambassadors for the foundation and the social causes it supports, providing higher awareness and media coverage for their activities. Leveraging the interest and attachment that fans have to the players,

foundations can build on their image capital and fan community to promote and get people involved within the CSR projects. Nevertheless, as some interviewees admitted, they are also aware of the risks and vulnerabilities that may come with this type of image association as “a professional football player is a human being who makes mistakes; you can have a professional football player in some health campaigns, making a movie with them about tobacco, and, the next day, he is smoking cigarettes in a bar. It can happen and then your credibility as a foundation is zero. So, I’m very careful about using football players as role models.” (FR-9)

Besides these operational aspects of the foundation-sport club nexus, some of them are looking towards a more strategic integration of the CSR component into the sports clubs’ business model. Some foundations have recently re-structured the organization to align more with the CSR objectives of the football club, and thus, becoming more active as shareholders and strengthening both their operational and strategic relationship: “I’m joining each department in order to see what they can do for us, the main objective is our vision and our impact target and I ask the departments how they can help us. (...) So I try to challenge the departments to achieve our goals” (FR-10). While for the foundation this means a symbolic seat to the table and acknowledgment of their role, for the club it brings higher credibility in terms of their interest and involvement in CSR initiatives.

Some of the foundations’ representatives see people engagement with sports as a key trigger for their support for CSR initiatives, turning to their passion for football to enhance the emotional appeal to CSR. Nevertheless, there are others who explain that, in the end, “it’s not about football” (FR-4), as the foundation received even more recognition in times of the lack of sporting success, proving the sustainability of their activity.

Public institutions – sharing their backyard

The partnership between the foundations and the public institutions is mainly based on generating social value for and within the (local) community. Local authorities tend to be proactively reaching out to the foundations for support in urban areas if the social projects align with “something that the football club can do” (FR-5), such as reducing poverty, crime or unemployment. Still, the foundations need to meet several key performance indicators and prove some visible social impact to be accepted as partners. In return, the sport foundations receive financial resources, following a simple equation: “the more people we help towards work, the more money we receive” (FR-10). The expected reach in terms of social impact is, hence, seen as the main factor influencing the financial support and involvement from the public institutions’ part.

Another important component of this partnership sector is the active role of schools and universities in supporting educational projects. This allows the foundations not only to reach an important mass of young people but also to access the knowledge of the teaching and the research staff and corollary networking. Moreover, educational CSR projects enjoy great social support among different stakeholders, due to their long-term social value and sustainability. Alongside the involvement of the research personnel, one foundation is offering a degree and has established its own sports college “which is designed to ensure that we appeal to a broad spectrum of young people as a place they could come and conduct all their post-high school education” (FR-3). This is also a way to build long-term loyalty to the club, as one senior executive said: “It starts off with a BTEC in sports, which is about practical-based qualification helping mainly 16 to 19-year-old to gain great experience in how to run a sports club or how to manage sporting facilities, deliver coaching and various other types of networks that are closely connected to the work of an organization like ours” (FR-3). This educational provider position of the foundations and their involvement in the community life build a more solid bridge between the educational objectives and the labor market benefits, as it facilitates, and it increases the chances and the quality of young people insertion on the sports labor market.

A complementary direction of this partnership is identifying and reaching international partners by accessing the network of public institutions. This facilitates access to human resources, potential collaborators and funding opportunities, acting as an important source of growth for the foundations. In turn, it helps them not only in making their voice louder and heard in broader contexts, but it also provides them with legitimacy as potential project partners. And, despite the formal or informal requisites, people feel that this acts if not as a constraint, at least as a competitive advantage, as one of the interviewee admitted when referring to a project addressing immigrants: “we just had to partner with local organizations to make this possible” (FR-1).

EFDN network – putting on the stage for the show

The third layer of this social partnership matrix that sports foundation could benefit from is formed by the international networks that build around a specific cause or field of action, like EFDN. The network works as a support provider, aiming to increase the quality of the CSR initiatives and enhance foundations' organizational development. On the one hand, it acts as a powerful entity and institutional partner, getting easier access to European funds and opportunities; on the other hand, it provides an additional and stronger mix of promotion channels that the foundations could benefit from, increasing their reach and visibility.

The EFDN also allows for the football foundations to stay connected, facilitating not only the communication but also the exchange of know-how and the daily updating process on relevant issues that are of common interest. As most interviewees explicitly admitted, they see the network as an opportunity to “communicate with people on the same level” (FR-5), regardless of the size or the international success of the linked football club. Sharing the same knowledge and the same ambition to change the modern football industry becomes more important and defining for the participants of the EFDN than their sport-club affiliations. This degree of autonomy from the sport clubs' brand allows for equal-party relations within the network, but it also underlines the fact that the social cause is more relevant in defining them and keeping them together than the power of the sport clubs' brands and the rivalries that come with it: “we don't see ourselves as competitors, maybe rivals on the pitch, but not off the pitch” (FR-5). Sharing good practices or risky decisions, cultural or business experiences, ideas, and contacts, becomes an asset for all members, as they understand that sharing the knowledge and the know-how helps all of them grow individually and collectively, as a cause-related community. As a CSR responsible stated: “We need to have a dialogue. We need to share ideas. We need to share some things that have worked or haven't worked. So, if I have something that works here, I will share that with any other football club because, you know, I don't have a monopoly on helping people” (FR-4).

Redefining the football community beyond the competitive framework it is actually what brings these foundations together and what their mission is all about. One respondent mentioned that the foundation needed the support from various other foundations to commonly showcase a social project on a European scale and to finally receive the funding from the European Commission. Consequently, a supranational project needs to be delivered with the same methodology and in the same way, having this type of international structure to mediate the collaboration and provide the working framework.

Adding to all these benefits brought by being a member of the EFDN, there are also the events and projects developed by the network to serve both knowledge exchange and business networking purposes. Attending the biannual CSR event organized by the EFDN is seen by all interviewees as a great way to keep track of the changes and opportunities within the field, but also to remain visible and active within the community. It also provides a resourceful setting for developing other layers of the social partnership matrix, as this type of dedicated event facilitates getting access to or getting noticed by “clubs that otherwise we wouldn't get to talk to in local meetings” (FR-3). Along with the conference, the EFDN organizes the *More than Football* week that is meant to contribute to the visibility and recognition of the foundations' work. These PR events are as much about exposure, as they are about legitimation, acting as important reputational milestones. They, thus, contribute to both the external and internal communication and relationship building, bringing benefits for all parties involved: EFDN, individual EFDN members, sports clubs and other social partners of the foundations. As the interviews showed, foundations are aware and are looking for getting their efforts acknowledged outside the inner circle of the EFDN members, so that they, further on, attract and engage more sports clubs to act socially responsible and support their cause. Moreover, these events come with important media coverage opportunities enhancing visibility and reputational benefits.

Discussion: the power of the tri-sector partnership

The previous section provided us with a descriptive image of how the sport foundations define the role of each actor within this social partnership matrix and its dynamics. If we move from the three dyads (foundations - sports clubs, foundations -public institutions, foundations – EFDN), we can get a different and more organic understanding of the tri-sector partnership model as a whole.

First, the mere positioning as breaking new grounds in adopting this type of multi-layered social partnership structure places the foundations in learning by doing logic and practice. This, in turn, explains and enhances their interest in knowledge sharing and guidance, which they look for and leverage from all three types of partners. Still, they tend to engage separately in these partnerships rather than address them in a more systemic way. This overlaps with a rather bottom-up approach in which each foundation cuts its way through, underusing the full potential of this type of social partnerships, as one of the interviewees noticed: “the ideal scenario is organizations like United Nations, World Bank, UNESCO the EFDN as well and bigger organizations, especially again governments from each countries getting together and understanding things in a holistic way in order to define those policies from top-level down to the clubs” (FR-8).

Each of the parties involved in this tri-sector partnership is perceived as a facilitator and a gatekeeper in terms of networking and legitimation. Despite this apparently overlapping benefits that were brought out during the interviews, we can argue that we are facing a relation of complementary rather than redundancy. The sports clubs help with the support and legitimation within the sports community. Leveraging the brand image transfer from the sports club over the foundation, the latter can easily reach and attract fans, media or sponsors to support, promote or get involved in their projects. When it comes to the public institutions, this partnership enhances the local-community support and legitimation, infrastructure facility access, as well as simplified administrative process in developing and getting approvals for several actions and projects. As for the EFDN structure, it comes with support and legitimation on a broader international CSR stage, within the sport-related charitable community and its corollary stakeholders. The PR benefits add to the ones of being part of a knowledge-sharing community, bridging between the image and the intellectual capital they could leverage on.

What is also interesting to mention is that, within this tri-sector partnership matrix, each branch ends-up enhancing the power of the others. In other words, being a member of the EFDN helps in legitimating yourself in front of sport clubs and public institutions, having the support of public institutions helps in legitimating yourself in front of sport clubs and be attractive as member in international structures and projects, while having a sport club as a partner legitimates you when addressing public institutions, as well as international structures such as EFDN. It is why we argue that being part of a tri-sector partnership empowers the foundations beyond a simple sum-up mechanism of all the one-to-one partnerships, and, provides higher stability and sustainability for the social-causes that these partnerships are contributing to.

Nevertheless, whether we speak about sports clubs, public institutions or the EFDN, the focus seems to be not so much on the common interest for the social-cause, but rather on a type of resource-dependency that foundations need to address so that they could serve this social cause. This could explain the discourse during the interview when we noticed a tendency towards a functional, instrumental positioning when discussing the partnerships. Moreover, much of the data brought out the benefits for the foundations, less than the benefits of the other parties from this partnership. So, not only can we speak about an unbalanced relation between the symbolic, cause-related nature of the social partnership and its transactional value, but we can add to it an unbalanced relation between the other partners' benefits and the foundations' ones. We should mention, however, that this does not reflect a factual reality, but the mere representation and positioning of the foundations themselves within this tri-sector partnership matrix. In turn, this is expected to be seen and reflected in the implicit power relation and negotiation power they have with all these partners. We can, thus, expect that a redefinition and re-evaluation of their role and of the mutual gains from this win-win relations could empower the sport foundations and even help them win more partners over. This is consistent with Berger, Cunningham and Drumwright's (2004) perspective that NGOs need to understand the value they are leveraging and to actively and better communicate their brand equity.

Conclusions

In the very dynamic and demanding field of sports, always subject to public scrutiny, sports foundations are also coping with high social expectations in terms of social causes support and community involvement. Nevertheless, due to the wide interest and stakeholders' pool sports benefits from, these foundations can develop multi-sector social partnerships, gaining both local and international support.

Analyzing how they position themselves within the tri-sector social partnership (i.e. sports clubs, public institutions, EFDN), we identified a dominant resource-dependency logic in the way foundations relate to the other parties. Although they mention the mutual benefits that this social partnership model relies on, the participants to the study were rather focused on their benefits from this partnership and less to what they bring in and provide for the others. Their discourse mirrors an implicit inferiority relation they position themselves in, seeing the others as gatekeepers to strategic resources (i.e. human, financial, reputational, etc.), but underestimating their own facilitator role within the partnership network.

Despite the general benefits provided by this tri-sector social partnership model, which mainly refers to knowledge sharing and enhancing social capital, each partnership-dyad seems to tip the scale towards a key-resource: sport clubs bring in the image capital (of its sport brand, as well as of its players as endorsers), the fan community access and support and a consistent financial input; the public institutions bring in the local community support and opportunities for international partners; while the EFDN brings in international exposure and recognition, along with a collaborative knowledge-sharing framework. Still, sports foundations tend to have a more operational rather than strategic approach of their role within this social partnership matrix. This comes with underuse of this social partnership potential but leaves room for a lot of improvement to be made in this direction, starting with a reevaluation of their position as an equal party in this partnership model.

References

- *** UNCTAD (2017). New innovation approaches to support the implementation of sustainable development goals. *United Nations conference on trade and development*, Geneva.
- *** UN (2019). *The UN Global Compact and the United Nations*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/press/en/2019/ecosoc6970.doc.htm>, last accessed on 09/05/19.
- Anagnostopoulou, C., Byers, T., & Shilbury, D. (2014). Corporate social responsibility in professional team sport organisations: Towards a theory of decision-making. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14(3), 259-281. doi: 10.1080/16184742.2014.897736.
- Athanasopoulou, P., Douvis, J., & Kyriakis, V. (2011). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) in sports: antecedents and consequences. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 1(4), 1-11, Retrieved from http://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/athanasopoulou_p_douvis_j_and_kyriakis_v_article_8_vol_1_4.pdf.
- Berger, I.E., Cunningham, P.H., & Drumwright, M.E. (2004). Social alliances: Company/nonprofit collaboration. *California Management Review*, 47(1), 58-90. doi: 10.2307/41166287.
- Babik, K., & Wolfe, R. (2009). Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility in Professional Sport: Internal and External Factors. *Journal of Sport Management*, 23 (6), 717-742. doi: 10.1123/jsm.23.6.717.
- Bhattacharya, C.B., & Sen, S. (2004). Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review*, 47(1), 9-24. doi: 10.2307/41166284.
- Bradish, C., & Cronin, J.J. (2009). Corporate Social Responsibility in Sport. *Journal of Sport Management*, 23(6), 691-697. doi: 10.1123/jsm.23.6.691.
- Breitbarth, T., & Harris, P. (2008). The role of corporate social responsibility in the football business: Towards the development of a conceptual model. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8(2), 179-206. doi: 10.1080/16184740802024484.
- Carroll, A. (1979). A three dimensional conceptual model of corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497-505. doi: 10.2307/257850.
- Carroll, A. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268-295. doi: 10.1177/000765039903800303.
- Chahal, H., & Sharma, R. D. (2006). Implications of Corporate Social Responsibility on Marketing Performance: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Services Research*, 6(1), 205-216.
- Chen, M., & Miller, D. (2015). Reconceptualizing competitive dynamics: A multidimensional framework. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36, 758-775. doi: 10.1002/smj.2245.
- Cobourn, S., & Frawley, S. (2017). CSR in professional sport: an examination of community models. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 22(2), 113-126. doi: 10.1080/23750472.2017.1402694.
- Creedon, P.J. (1998). Women, sport, and media institutions: Issues in sports journalism and marketing. In L. A. Wenner (Ed.), *MediaSport: Cultural sensibilities and sport in the media age* (pp. 88-99). London, UK: Routledge.

- Davis, K. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *California Management Review*, 2(3), 70-76. doi: 10.2307/41166246.
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Irwin, R.L., Lachowetz, T., Cornwell, T.B., & Clark, J.S. (2003). Cause-related sport sponsorship: An assessment of spectator beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 12(3), 131-139.
- Jenkins, H., & James, L. (2012). *It's not just a game: community work in the UK football industry and approaches to corporate social responsibility*. Centre for Business Relationships Accountability Sustainability & Society. Retrieved from <https://www.efdn.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Its-not-just-a-game-community-work-in-the-UK-Football-Industry.pdf>.
- Kolyperas, D., Anagnostopoulos, C., Chadwick, S., & Sparks, L. (2016). Applying a communicating vessels framework to CSR value co-creation: Empirical evidence from professional team sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(6), 702-719. doi: 10.1123/jsm.2016-0032.
- Lasker, R. D., Weiss, E. S., & Miller, R. (2001). Partnership synergy: a practical framework for studying and strengthening the collaborative advantage. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 79(2), 179-205. doi: 10.1111/1468-0009.00203.
- Lin, N. (2008). A network theory of social capital. In Castiglione, D., van Deth, J.W., & Wolleb, G. (Eds.). *The handbook of social capital*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://pro-classic.com/ethnicgv/SN/SC/paper-final-041605.pdf>.
- Lin, N. (2017). Building a network theory of social capital. In Lin, N., Cook, K., & Burt, R.S. (Eds.). *Social capital. Theory and Research* (pp.3-28). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lockett, A., Moon, J., & Visser, W. (2006). Corporate social responsibility in management research: Focus, nature, salience and sources of influence. *Journal of management studies*, 43 (1), 115-136. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00585.x.
- Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, C.B. (2006). Corporate social responsibility, customer satisfaction, and market value. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(4), 1-18. doi: 10.1509/jmkg.70.4.1.
- Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O.C. (2004). Corporate social responsibility and marketing: An integrative framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(1), 3-19. doi: 10.1177/0092070303258971.
- Mcgowan, R., & Mahon, J. (2010). Corporate Social Responsibility in Professional Sports: An Analysis of the NBA, NFL, and MLB. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/5091556/Corporate_Social_Responsibility_in_Professional_Sports_An_Analysis_of_the_NBA_NFL_and_MLB.
- McGuire, J.W. (1963). *Business and society*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Sakarya, S., Bodur, M., Yildirim-Öktem, Ö., & Selekler-Göksen, N. (2012). Social alliances: Business and social enterprise collaboration for social transformation. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(12), 1710-1720. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.012.
- Sklair, L. (1991). *Sociology of the global system*, London, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Smith, A. C., & Westerbeek, H. M. (2007). Sport as a vehicle for deploying corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 25(1), 43-54. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.472.4859&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research. Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (4th edition). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publication.
- Vaaland, T. I., Heide, M., & Grønhaug, K. (2008). Corporate social responsibility: investigating theory and research in the marketing context. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(9/10), 927-953. doi: 10.1108/03090560810891082
- Walters, G. (2009). Corporate social responsibility through sport: the community sports trust model as a CSR delivery agency. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 35, 81-94. Retrieved from <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/glbj/jcc/2009/00002009/00000035/art00008?crawler=t>.
- Walters, G., & Panton, M. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and social partnerships in professional football. *Soccer & Society*, 15(6), 828-846. doi: 10.1080/14660970.2014.920621.
- Warhurst, A. (2001). Corporate Citizenship and Corporate Social Investment: Drivers of Tri-Sector Partnerships. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, (1), 57-73. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/jcorpcti.1.57>.
- Weber, M. (2008). The business case for corporate social responsibility: A company-level measurement approach for CSR. *European Management Journal*, 26(4), 247-261. doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2008.01.006.
- Windsor, D. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Three key approaches. *Journal of management studies*, 43 (1), 93-114. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00584.x.