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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A number of European football clubs are currently operating grassroots football development programs in foreign countries. We aim to assess the reasons for clubs being involved in this area; why they commenced the programs and what they hope to achieve. As well as a review of the relevant literature, we have (a) constructed a survey to be completed by European clubs on their attitudes to this topic and (b) conducted case studies into the programs being run by three European clubs (FC Internazionale Milano, SV Werder Bremen and RCD Espanyol). This topic involves each of the three separate modules of the FIFA Master; it discusses the role of football in broader society (Humanities), it considers management of a football club’s brand and its potential revenue streams, and it also touches on the question of the international transfer of minors, especially in light of UEFA’s move towards requiring a quota of ‘home-grown’ players.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY THE PHRASE “GRASSROOTS FOOTBALL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS”?

Grassroots Football Development Programmes (GFDPs) are defined herein as programmes run with the aim of encouraging people to play the game of football. They are undertaken at the grassroots level, meaning that people of all abilities are included. They are not to be confused with development programmes that target social, health or education issues and use football as a means to that end, but rather their primary objective is developing the game itself. In the context of this thesis, then, we are looking at development programmes run by European professional clubs in countries other than the one in which they are based, whose aim is to increase participation in and enjoyment of the game of football.
**Motivations for involvement in GFDPs**

We have isolated five possible motivations for clubs taking part in GFDPs in foreign countries:

1. GFDPs are a part of the club’s Corporate Social Responsibility programme and represent the right thing to do (CSR Model);
2. Clubs are under pressure from their stakeholders (e.g. fans, sponsors) to be socially active in these types of areas (Stakeholder Model);
3. GFDPs are part of a larger branding exercise and allow clubs to present a certain image of themselves to the public and market themselves accordingly (Branding Model);
4. These programmes are expected to generate income for the club and are therefore seen as one of the club’s revenue streams (Revenue Model); and
5. GFDPs are essentially scouting programs and are seen as an effective way of finding young talent (Scouting Model).

Our hypothesis is as follows:

1. *Only a limited number of European clubs have the organisational capabilities to consider undertaking GFDPs in foreign countries and the motivations for each individual club will differ depending on its size and brand recognition.*

2. *While GFDPs will bring benefits to the people who receive them, the primary aim of each club is either*
   a. *to increase the power of its brand on a national or international scale, or*
   b. *to scout talented youngsters as future players.*

3. *Where GFDPs are being undertaken without a primary expectation of branding or scouting benefits, this is in response to pressure being applied by external*
Stakeholders.

Methodology

Our methodology in critically assessing these motivations and in testing this hypothesis is two-fold:

1. Undertake a survey of European clubs that are in a position to be able to consider implementing GFDPs. The survey is based on the literature review undertaken by the group and also on preliminary interviews made with the following: i) Mr. Klaus Dieter Fischer, Vice-President of SV Werder Bremen; ii) Mr. Maurizio Ganz, former professional football player;¹ iii) academic staff of the FIFA International Master; and iv) various members of the UEFA Licensing System Unit. It seeks to discover what programmes are currently in place, the reasons why these programmes were started, and the hoped for benefits of these programmes. The aim of the survey is to ascertain whether there is any common approach to these programmes and to provide a quantitative snapshot of the state of GFDPs being run by European professional football clubs.

2. Conduct case studies with select European clubs. While the survey described above focuses solely on the actions of the football clubs, the aim of these case studies is to provide a 360-degree assessment, in which all of the stakeholders for that club are consulted. In this way we will be able to assess whether the varied stakeholders place the same value on GFDPs in foreign countries as the clubs themselves. The three clubs chosen were FC Internazionale Milano, SV Werder Bremen and RCD Espanyol. These three clubs show a cross section of the type of clubs for which GFDPs in foreign countries are relevant; ‘global’ clubs with international recognition (Inter), top national clubs aspiring to be ‘global’ (Werder Bremen), and established first division clubs occasionally participating in European competition (Espanyol).

¹ Maurizio Ganz played as a professional for many Italian football clubs, such as AC Milan and FC Internazionale Milano. Today he is youth coach and is running a football academy in Italy.
CONCLUSIONS

The responses received from both the survey and the case study tended to disprove all aspects of hypothesis, as follows.

- Participation in GFDPs is not dependent upon a club being of a certain size. While the scale of GFDPs being funded is obviously dependent upon the resources available, many less well-known European clubs are active in this area.
- While scouting does take place, and is the primary motive in only a handful of cases, for the majority of clubs this is not a relevant consideration in their GFDPs.
- While branding is a primary consideration for a small minority of clubs, it is far less relevant than was presumed to be the case.
- There is a strong commitment to Corporate Social Responsibility for its own sake. Almost all respondents are already involved in CSR in their local community and almost half are participating in GFDPs in foreign countries.
- The driver of this participation in GFDPs in foreign countries is not pressure from external stakeholders. On the contrary, we found that external stakeholders are far less involved/interested in the clubs’ programs than we imagined.
- The driver is rather internal stakeholders, usually a high-ranking board member or the club’s foundation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of this final project, our group would make the following recommendations:

- This subject should be monitored by UEFA. It is recommended that GFDPs (both in the club’s homeland as well as in foreign countries) be included as a Category C criterion within the UEFA licensing systems requirements for the season 2011/12.
- That further studies be entered into to measure the results of GFDPs in foreign countries, as a way of determining their effectiveness and value.
- For clubs entering into GFDPs, recommendations are as follows:
  - It is important that the clubs identify their own motivations for entering such programmes from within the five motivations listed above, in order to achieve a strategic alignment;
  - Finding a trustworthy and reliable local partner is crucial to achieving the
club’s goals;
- There is no fixed blueprint for success in this field. Every organisation consulted emphasised that flexibility is paramount in building a successful programme.
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1. INTRODUCTION

A number of European football clubs are currently operating grassroots football development programmes in foreign countries. The aim of this project is to assess the reasons for clubs being involved in this area; why and how they commenced the programmes and what they expect to achieve. As well as a review of the relevant literature, we have (a) constructed a survey to be completed by European football clubs on their attitudes to this topic and (b) conducted case studies into the programmes being run by three European clubs (FC Internazionale Milano, SV Werder Bremen and RCD Espanyol). This final project involves each of the three separate modules of the FIFA Master; it discusses the role of football in broader society (Humanities), it considers management of a football club’s brand and its potential revenue streams (Management), and it also touches on the question of the international transfer of minors, especially in light of UEFA’s move towards requiring a quota of ‘home-grown’ players (Law).

1.1. WHAT DO WE MEAN BY THE GRASSROOTS FOOTBALL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Grassroots Football Development Programmes (GFDPs) are defined herein as programmes run with the aim of encouraging people to play the game of football. They are undertaken at the grassroots level, meaning that people of all abilities are included. Although typically these programmes are aimed at children, there is no requirement that there be any age limitation in place.

There is a fine line between football development programmes (which promote the game of football) and development programmes targeting social, health or education issues that use football as an instrument. Generally, this thesis focuses on programmes which advance football itself. Such programmes can obviously bring associated social benefits, and we are in no way seeking to de-value these benefits; however to classify as GFDP for our purposes a program should aim to impart a greater understanding or enjoyment of the game of football.
We have also added another qualification in this discussion of GFDPs – we are concerned only with programmes being run in countries other than the country in which the organising club is based. It is expected that most clubs feel some sort of responsibility to the community in which they based. Given that European clubs are participating in GFDPs in foreign countries, it prompts the question as to why these clubs choose to invest resources overseas, rather than in their immediate surrounds.

Accordingly, this final project considers football development programmes run by European professional clubs in countries other than the one in which they are based, the primary aim of which is to increase participation in and enjoyment of the game of football.

1.2. Possible Motivations for Clubs

Implemented correctly, there is no doubt that GFDPs carried out by football clubs should result in a benefit to the people receiving these programmes. In fact, there is an academic argument that sport has a greater potential to achieve social benefits than any other industry\(^2\). That does not mean, however, that the motivation of the clubs in carrying out such programmes is necessarily philanthropic. For example, if a club spends $50,000 on running a programme in regional Brazil and through this program is able to recruit and develop a player with an eventual transfer value of $50,000,000, it is legitimate to question whether the true object of this programme is grassroots development or rather something more commercial.

We have isolated five possible motivations\(^3\) for clubs to take part in GFDPs in foreign countries, as follows:

---


\(^3\) These motivations are similar to the four “dominant lines of thought” with respect to CSR outlined by Garriga and Melé (Elisabet Garriga and Domènec Melé, “Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory”, Journal of Business Ethics 53 (2004), 51–71), however these five motivations are specific to the
1. GFDPs are a part of the club’s Corporate Social Responsibility programme and represent “the right thing to do” (CSR Model),

2. Clubs are under pressure from external stakeholders to be socially active in these types of areas (Stakeholder Model),

3. GFDPs are part of a larger branding exercise and allow clubs to present a certain image of themselves to the public and market themselves accordingly (Branding Model)

4. These programmes are expected to generate income for the club and are therefore seen as one of the club’s revenue streams (Revenue Model)

5. GFDPs are essentially scouting programmes and are seen as an effective way of finding young talent in underdeveloped locations (Scouting Model).

In the next chapter, we shall look at each of these five motivations in greater detail.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW OF THE FIVE MOTIVATIONS

2.1. THE CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL

2.1.2. What is Corporate Social Responsibility?

Although the precise definition of CSR is open to debate and many differing theories have been put forward (see Appendix 1 for a sample of some of these theories), for the purpose of this paper we use the following simple, and broadly inclusive, definition: Corporate social responsibility is the notion that an organization (“corporate”) is a member of a society or community (“social”) and, as such, has duties and obligations (“responsibility”) to that society, just as individuals do.4

GFDPs can therefore be seen as part of a club’s Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) program to the extent that they are “additional behaviours and activities that are not necessarily codified into law but nevertheless are expected of business by society’s members”5. The club’s motivation for undertaking such programs, in other words, should have nothing to do with either increasing financial performance or the performance of the team on the field. In the words of the NFL Atlanta Falcon’s owner, Arthur Blank: “Giving back is not part of the ‘brand’, it’s part of what’s the right thing to do.”6

It is now generally acknowledged that the modern professional sports team is much more analogous to a typical for-profit corporation than it is to an amateur sporting association of years gone by.7 Increasingly, football clubs are now being held to the same standard as other companies and require a modern corporate approach to CSR. The CSR model therefore

suggests that football clubs, which in many cases operate on the scale and manner of multinational corporations, are now taking note of their extra-commercial obligations and seeking to make socially based contributions to their environment.

Because GFDPs in foreign countries are dislocated from the local environment of the clubs undertaking them, the CSR model cannot be reliant upon a club’s relationship with or obligations to its local community. The CSR model as it relates to GFDPs must therefore be based on a ‘common good’ type of approach, where there is an obligation to positively contribute to a universal community. “Business should be neither harmful to nor a parasite on society, but purely a positive contributor to the well being of society.”

The most common belief is that football clubs do not engage in GFDPs as an altruistic end in itself, but rather as a means to a commercial end. The contention contained in much of the recent literature is that Corporate Social Responsibility is almost a contradiction in terms; these programs have moved away from a purely philanthropic role and now reside firmly in the sphere of strategy. “Such approaches broaden the focus of CSR from being solely altruistic and capture a view that links CSR and corporate financial performance.” Within the football community especially, there is scepticism as to whether GFDPs are being implemented for anything other than as a means to achieve an ulterior motive – either the commercial marketing of club as a whole or the scouting of the next generation of top players.

In assessing whether an altruistic CSR program is the driving force for clubs participating in GFDPs, we will consider whether there is best practice sharing and collaboration between the

---

8 The top club in Europe by revenues in 2009, Real Madrid, had yearly revenues of over 400 Million Euros. Austin Houlihan and others, “Spanish Masters: Football Money League” (Manchester: Dan Jones, 2010), Deloitte LLP.

9 Garriga and Melé, Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory, 62.

clubs. One of the most frequent issues raised by development agencies concerns the lack of co-ordination of efforts in development work. Given administration and other associated costs, far more can be achieved if efforts are centrally co-ordinated. While such an approach that aims at efficiencies has benefits for the recipients of the programs, it does at the same time limit the amount of individual mileage that a club is able to obtain as a result of its community service deeds. If clubs are genuinely undertaking GFDPs for philanthropic reasons, they should be prepared to come together with other like-minded institutions to maximise the effect of their programmes.

2.2. **The Stakeholder Model**

2.2.1. **Stakeholder Theory**

Freeman’s landmark 1984 book *Strategic Management: A stakeholder Approach* references stakeholders as “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives”. Donaldson and Preston extended the concept in the early nineties, to recommend that companies be aware of all their stakeholders' goals when elaborating a new strategic concept. They established that an equal and fair treatment of stakeholders is crucial to reach success, rather than simply focusing on economic results. While it is not feasible that all stakeholders’ objectives can be met by a company at all times, the sense is that clubs have to be flexible in setting their own goals, to take into consideration the impact these objectives could have on stakeholders. For football clubs then, who aim to maximize the number and value of stakeholders such as fans, sponsors and partners, it is important to take into consideration the priorities of these third parties. Zakhem et al. argue that “organisations that consider a strategy of corporate social responsibility have to address

---

the question ‘to whom are we responsible?’ In other words, does devoting resources to GFDPs meet the requirements and expectations of our stakeholders.

There is a requirement for coherence and alignment between the CSR program and the “values, norms, and missions of the organization.” The conclusion of Zakhem et al. is that if clubs want to have concrete and valuable results they have to be coherent in their organisational, sporting and business choices.

2.2.2. Stakeholder Theory and GFDPs

European football clubs are operating in an ever increasingly complex stakeholder environment, but are there really external pressures coming from stakeholders demanding or even forcing them to implement GFDPs programmes? This chapter aims to analyse the most important stakeholders for European football clubs in relation to the issue of GFDPs. The objective is to understand how those stakeholders influence the strategy and view of clubs in relation to GFDPs as well as to see how clubs are managing this central relationship. Do stakeholders understand the GFDPs programmes in the same way as the clubs or do they have different expectations.

2.2.3. Stakeholder Mapping

A stakeholder in the context of GFDPs can be referred to as any party which can affect or can be affected by the actions of the GFDPs as a whole. In the literature, Jiang and Klein note that, “the key to forming successful project relationships understands that different stakeholders have different expectations of the project and different definitions of project

14 Ibid., 239.
success. Thus, a project’s success or failure is strongly influenced by how well it meets its stakeholder’s expectations and their perceptions of its value.”¹⁵ Further to this Mitchell et al. have also analysed the concept of stakeholders and concludes that “it derives a typology of stakeholders based on the attributes of power (the extent a party has means to impose its will in a relationship), legitimacy (socially accepted and expected structures or behaviours), and urgency (time sensitivity or criticality of the stake holder's claims”).¹⁶

Within this final project, by the term “influence” we mean the potential pressure a stakeholder could have on clubs, influencing those to be involved in GFDPs. “Influence is perhaps best understood as the extent to which people, groups or organisations (i.e. stakeholders) are able to persuade or coerce others into making decisions, and following certain courses of action.”¹⁷ With the term “importance” we understand the significance and implication of the stakeholder during the running of the project itself.

Stakeholders can be categorised in different ways and one of the first thing to do is to divide a list into primary and secondary stakeholders in relation to GFDPs. Primary stakeholders we define as the most vital to the GFD, “one or a group without whose continuing participation the project cannot survive as a going concern, those who can disrupt the project plans, who may leads to uncertainty in the plans, to whom the project needs and relies on.”¹⁸ Secondary stakeholders are “those without whose continuing participation the project can still exist.”¹⁹

The table and map below illustrate the beliefs of this final project group at the beginning of our research. In section 4 we shall revisit these table and map after analysing the data received during this final project. The first table highlights our assumptions with respect to the relative influence and importance of clubs’ stakeholders in relation to GFDPs. The second

---

¹⁹ Ibid.
The diagram shows our understanding of the stakeholder map for a club considering entering into a GFDP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS INTERESTS</th>
<th>INFLUENCE</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorities Governments</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Management / Owners</td>
<td>Determine Club Strategy</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club’s National Association</td>
<td>Integration with FIFA and UEFA</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club’s Staff</td>
<td>Development and Implementation of GFDPs</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitors</td>
<td>CSR, Brand Awareness, Talent Detection</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>Member Clubs interests</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>Club success</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFA</td>
<td>Increase participation</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>Intermediation</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Communities</td>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Partners</td>
<td>Set up and technical support</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local National Association</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Public information</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs / Local Partner</td>
<td>Local &amp; logistic admin of project</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEFA</td>
<td>Promoting and development of football for all</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary and Secondary Key Actors

Before
If clubs are undertaking GFDPs as a result of stakeholder expectations, we should expect to see evidence of,

1. Stakeholders confirming that they require clubs to be involved in GFDPs; and/or
2. Clubs having actively reached out to these stakeholders in order to understand their respective priorities, and whether GFDPs are something stakeholders deem important.

2.3. THE BRANDING MODEL

2.3.1. What Are Brands and What is the Purpose of Branding?

A brand can be defined as a name and/or symbol “which is intended to identify the goods or services of an either one seller or a group of sellers, and to differentiate those goods or services from those of competitors.”

From the customer's perspective, a brand can be the expression of the accumulation of all their experiences of the product or service, whether good or bad, and is the main point of contact between the customer and the product. In this sense, brands enable consumers to identify and bond with a particular product, with the purpose of branding being the building of a positive emotional attachment between the product and the consumer. A successful brand identifies the product in such a way as to communicate relevant, unique qualities which correspond to the needs or desires of the consumer.

If European clubs are using GFDPs as a branding exercise, they are doing so with a view to bolstering their image amongst fans and other stakeholders. This is in line with the ‘Brand Affinity’ strategy suggested by Richelieu and Desborder, in which a team “builds a strong fan

---

base through a unique emotional experience that it offers to fans. The most publicised example of such a strategy is the shirt sponsorship deal negotiated between FC Barcelona and UNICEF, in which the football team actually pays the NGO for the right to wear its logo.

2.3.2. ‘Brand Identity’ and ‘Brand Association’ of Football Clubs

Branding takes on a more specific meaning when relating to sports team brands thanks to the degree to which individuals tend to identify with their favourite teams. To this end, a sports team’s brand identity should reflect to stakeholders the sum of all the team has to offer, as “the identity of the brand is strongly linked to a consumer’s knowledge of that particular team.” As well as performance of the football team on the pitch, then, brand identity can be linked with the club’s enduring objectives, structure, administration and ethos, to the extent that a club allows information about such areas to become available to the public.

Keller defines brand associations as the "other informational nodes linked to the brand node in memory": When seeing a logo or hearing a theme song (or even tasting a product in the case of food), there is an automatic recognition of the particular brand within the consumer. Any sensory impacts (thoughts or emotions) that retain value in the mind of the consumer can be considered an association, with the quality of the association determined by the strength and particularity of the sensory impact.

André Richelieu and Michel Desbordes, “Football Teams Going International – The Strategic Leverage of Branding”, Journal of Sponsorship 3 (2009), 15. The other strategies suggested are when a team capitalises on its results and/or history to go international (Brand Reputation), when a team spends its way to international prominence (Brand Challenger), and when a team invests in teams in other countries to springboard into that market (Brand Conquistador).

The five year deal began in 2006, with Barcelona contributing Euros 1.5 Million per year to projects fighting HIV and AIDS, plus Euros 500,000 per year in publicity assets to promote the partnership, plus wearing the UNICEF logo on the front of its playing shirt. Fundació FC Barcelona, “The Details of the Alliance with UNICEF", Futbol Club Barcelona, http://www.fcbarcelona.cat (accessed June 7, 2010).


Ibid.


Ibid. Keller classifies brand associations into three main categories with differing levels of abstraction: attributes, benefits and attitudes.
Most of the many associations that are formed with particular sports are intangible and experiential. Bhattacharya and Sen suggest that consumers identify with attractive companies which can satisfy their self-definitional needs such as self-continuity, self-distinctiveness, and self-enhancement, called elsewhere “the consumer’s ongoing identity project.” Within the sport context, this identification can be equated with a sense of belonging, with identified consumers subsequently become loyal fans. These associations are exemplified by the concept of ‘Fan-Team identification’, being the extent to which sports fans, as consumers, define themselves in terms of psychological oneness with a sport team as an organizational brand. It has been argued that managing the relationships between team brand identity, fan-team identification, and team brand loyalty can be the most powerful brand strategy for football teams.

A number of scholars have developed models to attempt to more thoroughly analyse brand associations, and some have even extended this work to focus on sports teams (for example, Gladden and Funk’s Team Association Model and Team Brand Association Scale of Ross et al.). None of these sports models however have placed any great importance on a team’s CSR practices in building ‘Fan-Team identification’. In this way, if clubs are taking part in GFDPs because of the Branding Model, they are suggesting that a team’s CSR activities can in fact build brand association and brand equity, and that this will in turn result in a stronger future for the club.

39 Although factors such as organisational attributes and tradition are referenced, these are not specific to CSR activities such as GFDPs in foreign countries and in any case are not rated as the being amongst the most important factors.
The theory of branding suggests that customer acquisition and retention is easier when consumers share deep, positive, emotional links to a business through any number of stimuli. For professional football teams, the majority of these stimuli are related to team performance, however there are other aspects that can build a positive relationship with stakeholders. For fans this means a higher degree of team loyalty, while for sponsors and partners this equates to a higher price being paid for association with the club. If clubs are undertaking GFDPs for branding purposes, they must believe that the positive impact of these programs on the value of the brand will outweigh the cost of the programs themselves over the long term. If this is the case, and clubs are trying to build brand equity through GFDPs, we should expect to see two things occurring:

1. Significant effort being spent to measure the value of the GFDPs to the brand being done in order to quantify return on investment, and

2. Clubs ensuring that all GFDP activities in foreign countries are publicised as widely as possible in target markets

2.4. **THE REVENUE MODEL**

The management of Professional Football Clubs has become increasingly similar with the management of commercial business. Issues such as the depreciation in capital over time of player contracts, stadium lease arrangements, negotiations of broadcasting rights all take modern clubs further away from the traditional image of a group of athletes coming together to play football. Accordingly, most professional football teams effectively have dual functions (Corporate and Sporting) in their organisational structure, because revenue has obvious implications in terms of supporting sporting goals.

The corporatisation of clubs is exemplified in this passage from a previous Manchester United Annual Board Report: “Manchester United has been able to achieve the very difficult task of being consistently profitable by building on the traditional strengths of the United
brand through a commercial development strategy with five key sub strategies Maintaining playing success, Treating fans as customers, Leveraging the global brand, Developing media rights, Maximising the use of Old Trafford ground. It is arguable then that all activities of a club are potential revenue streams, as a means to providing more funds to (hopefully) strengthen the playing squad.

The Revenue Model suggests that some European professional football clubs may also view GFDPs in foreign countries as an effective way of bringing in funds. Such clubs would be aiming at revenue generation from the main and auxiliary aspects of GFDPs. The ‘main’ aspects would be the registration fees paid by participants in the programs and selling merchandising and replica kits to those children. The ‘auxiliary’ aspects would include things such as indirect revenue resulting from building a fan base in a target market and thereby making TV, sponsorship and partnership deals worth more in those markets.

It is envisaged that wealthy European clubs will be aiming more at indirect revenues from the impact of GFDPs on television rights and commercial relationships, whereas the small and middle level clubs will be looking on direct sales, meaning participation fees and direct merchandising sales.

If the Revenue Model is applicable, we should expect to see the following;

1. The location of GFDPs being based on the potential of participants to pay registration fees and purchase merchandising, rather than on any social need for GFDPs.

2. Alternatively, the location of GFDPs being based on their potential to impact the value of certain markets with respect to television contracts and commercial contracts.

3. Clubs initiating Customer Relationship Management programs in the communities receiving the GFDPs, in order to encourage increased consumption of the club’s goods and services.

2.5. **THE SCOUTING MODEL**

With the globalisation of football, the increased movement of players post the Bosman case, and given the success of South American and African players in global competitions, it is little surprise that European clubs are looking further afield to scout players. The Scouting Model suggests that GFDPs are the natural progression of foreign scouting; training players at youth level to identify cheap future talent.

There are obvious social and personal implications in taking children away from their family and community in order to play football at a European club. In this context, the importance of the international and the continental federations is not only limited to monitoring and helping their member associations in the development of grassroots initiatives. FIFA and UEFA have also taken responsibility for regulating scouting practices, preventing any kind of abuse that clubs may cause on an international level, and at the same time encouraging clubs to have their own youth development programmes and to promote “home-made” young talents. The development and scouting of young players in foreign countries leads us to two important and much debated topics: the protection of minors and the “Home-Grown” rule established by UEFA.

2.5.1. **Protection of Minors**

In professional football players are committed to a club by an employment contract. When a player wants to move from one club to another during the term of his/her contract, the former club has to agree that the player can leave to the new club. The player’s registration is then transferred on payment of a transfer fee. The Bosman ruling specified that when a player came to an end of his contract no transfer fee was payable where that player moved from a club in one country to a club in a different country in the EU. Consequently, the Bosman

---

41 European Court of Justice, Case C-415/93 – Union Royale Belge Des Sociétés de Football Association ASBL vs. Jean-Marc Bosman, Royal Club Liégeois SA vs. Jean-Marc Bosman and others, and Union des Associations Européennes de Football (UEFA) vs. Jean-Marc Bosman.
ruling caused increased movement of players, rising player costs and also instability in some football clubs.

In order to seek to regulate this situation, new transfer rules came into effect on 1 September 2001 after an agreement between the European Commission, FIFA and UEFA. The FIFA Regulations for the Status and Transfer of Players (“Regulations”) was created with the objective to “set up rules regarding the international transfers of players, the status of players, their eligibility to participate in organised football as well as the release of players for association teams and the players’ eligibility to play for such teams.” It is important to underline that the Regulations were later revised, in order to adapt to new circumstances and jurisprudences that had arisen after it came into force. The first modification was in 2005 and the most recent, in the course of which the protection of minors was one of the most debated issues, is dated 1 October 2009.

Article 19(1) of the current edition of the Regulations defines a minor as someone under the age of 18 and provides that the international transfer of players aged under 18 is prohibited. However, article 19(2) provides three exceptions to this general rule:

• If the player's parents move to a new country for reasons not linked to football;

• If the player is aged between 16 to 18, and the transfer takes place between the territory of the EU or European Economic Area (EEA). Certain minimum obligations must also be fulfilled by the transferring club; and

---


43 The minimum obligations provided in article 19(2) are: i. It shall provide the player with an adequate football education and/or training in line with the highest national standards; ii. It shall guarantee the player an academic and/or school and/or vocational education and/or training, in addition to his football education and/or training, which will allow the player to pursue a career other than football should he cease playing professional football; iii. It shall make all necessary arrangements to ensure that the player is looked after in the best possible way (optimum living standards with a host family or in club accommodation, appointment of a mentor at the club, etc.); and iv. It shall, on registration of such a player, provide the relevant association with proof that it is complying with the aforementioned obligations.
• The player lives within 50 kilometres of an international border, and transfers to a club no more than 50 kilometres on the other side of that border.

In addition to the exceptions stated in article 19(2), the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), in the Midtjylland case\(^\text{44}\), confirmed the decision from the FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber in two new exceptions:

• The player has moved to another country for reasons relating to their studies, rather than for football reasons and is able to demonstrate this without any doubt.

• The transferring club has in place an agreement with the “Association of origin” that relates to a development programme for young players.

As can be seen, although the transfer of minors is prohibited there are some exceptions. It is questionable whether the Regulations are truly effective in protecting minors or if the exceptions are being exploited by clubs as a way to keep bringing young players to their home country.

With the revision of the Regulation in 2009, a number of important changes were introduced, the most relevant of which is the introduction of article 19(4). This paragraph provides that every international transfer of a minor is subject to the approval of a sub committee of the FIFA Players' Status Committee. This approval must be obtained prior to any request for an International Transfer Certificate and/or first registration of the player. The application for this approval is made by the national association that has been requested by a club to register a player, with the previous association (typically the association of the player’s homeland) being given the opportunity to submit its position\(^\text{45}\).


\(^{45}\) Previously, each national association was responsible for ensuring compliance with article 19 when registering a player for its competitions.
According to the Regulations, if the provisions of the article 19 are violated, the sub-committee can impose sanctions on a case-by-case basis. The most common sanction for clubs is the ban from registering any new players, either nationally or internationally, for two transfer periods. This was the case, for example, of Chelsea Football Club in the ‘Kakuta case’.  

It is still too early to analyse the effect that the sub-committee on the transfer of minors will cause since the first decisions are just now being released and there are no previous studies on this topic. It also remains to be seen how the decisions of this sub-committee will interact with the relevant sporting judicial bodies. Notwithstanding, the implementation of the sub-committee was an important step towards a more rigorous control for the transfer of minors.

In view of the above, European clubs that are undertaking GDFDs in foreign countries with scouting purposes must be aware of the consequences for violating article 19 of the Regulations. The international governing bodies of football, in particular FIFA and UEFA, are controlling and sanctioning clubs that are conducting transfer of players under the age of eighteen (18). The protection of minors must be seen by European clubs as a very serious and important issue and all the measures to strictly comply with the Regulations need to be taken.

2.5.2. The “Home-Grown Rule”

In an attempt “to encourage the local training of young players, and increase the openness and fairness of European competitions,” as from the season 2006/2007, UEFA established

---

46 Court of Arbitration for Sport - CAS 2009/A/1976 and 2009/A/1977 - RC Lens vs. Chelsea FC and Gael Kakuta. Gael Kakuta, a young French player, signed with Chelsea Football Club after terminating his employment contract with Racing Club de Lens without just cause. The French club filed a claim against the player and the English club before the FIFA Dispute Resolution Chamber and after two years, the DRC decided to sanction both Chelsea and Kakuta with a penalty of seven hundred and eighty thousand euros. Furthermore, Chelsea was banned from registering any players for two consecutive transfer periods and the player was suspended for four months. However, in February 2010, Lens and Chelsea reached an agreement before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), the case was closed and the ban for both player and club were withdrawn.

the so-called “Home Grown Rule”. According to this rule, clubs in the UEFA Champions League and UEFA Europa League require a minimum of home-grown players in a squad limited to 25. These rules are also in force in several national leagues across Europe.

UEFA introduced the rule in three phases: for the season 2006/07, it was required a minimum of 4 home-grown players in a 25 players squad; as for the season 2007/08, the minimum required was 6 home-grown players in the same number of players in a squad; finally, for the season 2008/09, the minimum of 8 home-grown players in 25-man squad was established and it remains until today.

“Home-grown” players are defined by UEFA as the ones who, regardless of their nationality, have been trained by their current club or by another club in the same national association for at least three years between the age of 15 and 21\(^{48}\). Up to half of the home-grown players must be from the club itself, and the other half can be either from the club or from the other clubs within the same national association.

As can be noticed, the rule contains no nationality conditions whatsoever given the illegality of such provisions under EU law in the wake of “Bosman”. The current formulation of this rule has already been approved as legal by the European Commission\(^{49}\) and received the support of the European Parliament in the Resolution on the White Paper on Sport\(^{50}\) (due to the objective pursued, being enhancing and protecting the training and development of talented young football talents).

European clubs that are investing in GFDPs overseas could see the “Home-Grown” rule as an opportunity to keep developing such projects. Considering that there are no restrictions on nationality, clubs could have in their squad players coming from the different countries where

---

\(^{48}\) Article 18.10 of the Regulations of the UEFA Champions League and the UEFA Europa League.

\(^{49}\) Statement in May 2008, and that a review would take place in 2012.

\(^{50}\) The White Paper of Sport is the European Commission’s contribution to the debate on the importance of sport in our daily lives. This is the first time that sport related issues have been addressed in such a comprehensive manner at EU level.
the grassroots activities are taking place. However, are the participants of the GFDPs considered “locally trained players” as provided in the Regulations of the UEFA Champions League and UEFA Europa League? If a club that has been providing an 18-year-old foreign player with training and education in a GFDP overseas since the age of 15, would it be allowed to register such player in the UEFA Champions League?

Based on the text of the Regulations of both the Champions League as well as the Europa League, in particular article 18.10\(^{51}\), if the player “has been registered with his current club for a period, continuous or not, of three entire seasons” he is considered a “club-trained player” or “home-grown player” and would be eligible to play in that competition. Also, article 5 of FIFA Regulations for the Status and Transfer of Players provides that, in order to participate in the Organised Football\(^{52}\), “a player must be registered in an association to play for a club as either a professional or amateur”. Therefore, if during the player’s training in a GFDP he has been regularly registered by the club in the respective national association for three years, we must assume that he would be perfectly able to participate in any of the above-mentioned competitions organised by UEFA. However, it would be difficult for a club to start the training and education of a registered young player in an international GFDP and then continue his development in their home youth teams, since the club would have to comply with the issues regarding the transfer rules, considering that the player should be registered in the association of the country where he/she is originally from.

It is important to stress that the objectives underlying UEFA’s ‘Home-Grown’ rule, notably promoting training for young players and consolidating the balance of competitions, seem to be legitimate objectives of general interest, as they are inherent to sporting activity. Consequently, this rule must not necessarily be understood as a suggestion to increase the search for young talents from everywhere in the world, making the transfer of minors an even more problematic issue, but it must be seen as a way to foster clubs to invest in the formation of their own footballers.

---

\(^{51}\) Regulations of the UEFA Champions League 2010/2011.

\(^{52}\) According to the definition provided in the FIFA Regulations for the Status and Transfer of Players, Organised Football is the association football organised under the auspices of FIFA, the confederations and the associations, or authorised by them.
2.5.3. Conclusion

If the Scouting Model is correct, we would expect to see the following:

1) Offering of professional contracts to graduates of GFDPs
2) Targeting of countries for implementation of GFDPs based on perceived ‘national footballing ability’ rather than on any other criteria such as developmental needs. This may be difficult to determine as many of the nations who could most benefit from GFDPs are the same as those that would be determined to be the most likely sources of footballing talent (for example, countries like Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay in South America, or Cameroon, Nigeria and Ghana in Africa);
3) GFDPs coming under the football development or scouting business units within a club, rather than within any social development or CSR function;
4) Scouts being involved on the ground in the GFDPs to advise the clubs as to the best potential talent available.

2.6. HYPOTHESIS

It is likely that most clubs will be involved in GFDPs for a combination of the reasons listed above rather than for one reason alone. Similarly, the mixture of these reasons will be dependent upon the particular circumstances of an individual club. As a starting point, however, we seek in this project to prove/disprove the following hypothesis, which represents the understanding and beliefs held by this final project group before we commenced this project.

Our hypothesis is as follows:

1. Only a limited number of European clubs have the organisational capabilities to consider undertaking GFDPs in foreign countries and the motivations for each individual club will differ depending on its size and brand recognition.

2. While GFDPs will bring benefits to the people who receive them, the primary aim of each club is either
a. to increase the power of its brand on a national or international scale, or

b. to scout talented youngsters as future players.

3. Where GFDPs are being undertaken without a primary expectation of branding or scouting benefits, this is in response to pressure being applied by external stakeholders.
3. **CASE STUDIES**

In this section, we provide a general overview of three different programmes carried out by European clubs from different levels. We seek to explain the idea of having a GFDP in foreign countries and to assess whether the varied stakeholders of each club place the same value on GFDPs as the clubs themselves.

3.1. **METHODODOLOGY**

The rationales for choosing the three clubs for individual case studies were as follows:

- Our initial belief was that a club’s level of participation in GFDPs in foreign countries could be determined or shaped by that club’s size and scale. Accordingly, we attempted to take one case study from each of the ‘levels’ of clubs that we believed might be involved in this area; one globally recognised club with a strong existing GFDP programme (Inter), one strong European club with existing or embryonic GFDPs (Werder), and one strong national level club that is in the process of entering into GFDPs or is considering same (Espanyol);
- The Grassroots Division at UEFA was consulted as to who it believed would be appropriate clubs to take part in the case studies;\(^{53}\)
- Efforts were made to ensure that the three case studies came from different European countries; and
- Two clubs were not chosen if they were carrying out the same GFDPs.\(^{54}\)

Efforts were made to speak with a spectrum of the relevant stakeholders for a club considering the introduction of GFDPs. Using the three case studies, we have attempted to add another dimension to the our understanding of the how GFDPs are implemented in clubs.

In addition, regarding our three case studies we sought feedback from fans. We found that the easiest way to reach these fans was to create a short questionnaire of nine questions and send

---

\(^{53}\) Interview with Frank Ludolph, Evelyn Ternes and David Gough, members of UEFA’s Football Development Division, on June 18, 2010.

\(^{54}\) For example, Scort Foundation works with a number of different European clubs using essentially the same model. Two ‘Scort’ clubs were not selected for the case studies.
it through digital networks and/or directly to fan groups (Appendix 3). The questionnaire was available in 4 languages: English, Italian, German and Spanish. We used the software developed by www.onlineumfrage.com. Fans were contacted as follows:

1) FC Internazionale Milano: we registered on the official Facebook page of the Inter fans and posted the link to the survey. We also posted the link in the forum of the official Inter Fans website (www.interfans.org). The total of answers received was 78.

2) SV Werder Bremen: we registered on the official forum of the club’s web site (www.werder.de) and posted the link to the survey. Furthermore we sent our questionnaire directly to over 50 officially recognized fan groups in Germany. The total of answers received was 27.

3) RCD Espanyol: we registered on one Facebook page of Espanyol fans and posted the link to the survey. We posted the same link in the Forum of the official fans’ web site (www.fuerzaperica.com). The total of answers received was 39.

There were not enough responses received to make definitive statements about the attitudes of the clubs’ fans, however it is believed that the responses give us at least an idea of the involvement of fans and their opinion about the topic.

3.2. **FC INTERNAZIONALE MILANO**

The creation of Internazionale’s grassroots program took place in the mid-90’s as a result of Internazionale’s President, Mr. Massimo Moratti. He created a project aiming to give back to the community the support that they have been giving to the Club throughout the years. The idea was to have a programme that could use football as a tool for social integration and peace. In 1996 Inter Campus was founded, beginning to operate in 1997. Mr. Moratti and his family remain key characters behind this project.

3.2.1. **The Development of Inter Campus**

*Inter Campus* “is a flexible and long term social service and cooperation programme in foreign countries assisted by local instructors, using the game of football as an educational
tool to give back to children the right to play.”

During the first years of existence, the programme was organised together and by the same staff as Inter’s Scuola Calcio – the Club’s football schools in Italy designed to develop children’s skills and to be the first step for the kid before entering into the youth teams. According to Nicoletta Flutti, Inter Campus Project Development Manager, “this kind of programme is made particularly to discover young talents.” Thus, while both programs originally sat under the Youth department, the Scuola Calcio aims should not be confused with the approach of Inter Campus.

The first two countries to be benefited by the programme were Brazil and China in 1998. In Brazil, the objective is to give support to literacy, provide football and educational activities during the spare time, avoiding kids to social deviances, and to valorise needy areas. 3,300 children participate in the project in five different cities. In China, the goal is to promote football as a game, integrating children and football formation of local instructors according to pedagogical methodologies. The programme in the Chinese territory is benefiting 200 children.

In 1999 five further countries were added to programme: Bosnia Herzegovina, Iran, Bulgaria, Colombia and Kosovo. Later, in 2000, Romania, Israel and Palestine joined the team of countries benefiting from Inter Campus. The next country to enter the programme was Cameroon in 2001. Poland and Slovenia joined in 2003. Then, Mexico and Argentina came in 2004. Additionally, Morocco and Cuba became part of the programme in 2005 and Lebanon in 2006. In 2008, four new countries joined Inter Campus: Angola, Uganda, Paraguay and Bolivia. Finally, in 2010, Congo became the last country so far to be part of the ‘Inter Campus family’.

Each one of the above-mentioned countries has a goal and the project is adapted to the different needs of the region. “The key word is flexibility”, says Nicoletta Flutti. “We cannot think that when we arrive in a specific country we already know what to do because we have been doing this for more than ten years. We need to understand and carefully analyse the needs and adapt to the circumstances we are facing”, she added.

---

55 Definition found in the Inter Campus Presentation Folder.
56 Interview with Nicoletta Flutti, Inter Campus Communications and Project Development Manager, on May 12, 2010.
57 Ibid.
58 Kosovo is no longer part of the Inter Campus, since the programme designed for the country has been concluded.
The year of 2008 was very special in the history of the programme. As part of the 100 years celebration of the FC Internazionale Milano a “World Cup” was organized among the countries participating in the Inter Campus. Winning or losing was not important, what mattered was seeing children and teenagers from the 21 countries at that time, sharing wonderful moments in Tuscany, Italy, where the event was hosted.59

3.2.2. The Inter Campus Model

In each one of these countries there is a “Main Partner” responsible for carrying out the activities and making sure that the requirements for participating in the programme are being fulfilled60. This partner is very important in the project and is chosen after a careful analysis. “It is not easy to find someone we trust”, said Ms Flutti. “If we choose a wrong person it is not only the name of the project that can be damaged but also the name of the FC Internazionale Milano”. In China, for example, Inter has sought to expand the programme into other regions, however has been unable to find reliable local partners to work with.

In order to be part of Inter Campus and to be appointed as the Main Partner, NGO’s, Associations, Clubs or foreign authorities must contact the organisers and apply for it providing all the necessary information. “We analyse the dossier in detail and always make an ultimate check on site before moving forward.”61 So far, the organisers have never had to stop or intervene in a project because of lack of professionalism or bad behaviour by the Main Partner.

59 A documentary was also made as part of the celebration of 100th anniversary of FC Internazionale’s founding. Such documentary was produced by Red House and distributed by Medusa and produced by Red House.
60 For example, to be a participant in the program, every student must be enrolled in and attending school.
61 Interview with Nicoletta Flutti, Inter Campus Communications and Project Development Manager, on May 12, 2010.
One important task for the Main Partner is to look for sponsors and commercial partners that can invest in the project. FC Internazionale Milano financially assists Inter Campus but for each project there must be help from local companies. On the one hand sponsors can provide Inter Campus the required support to build up a relevant socio-educative football program. On the other hand Inter Campus offers them a kind of marketing tool able to enhance the visibility of the company’s brand in foreign countries and maybe reach new markets. This is the case of Nike, a long-term partner with FC Internazionale Milano. Specifically for Inter Campus, Nike provides, free of any cost, between eight and nine thousand official kits every year.

The yearly budget for Inter Campus is to be spent on the projects and for the payment of the twelve staff members, being six in the administration and six in the technical part. As Ms Flutti says, “there is no financial return on the investment and we spend all the eight hundred thousand Euro budget that we have at our disposal every year”. The fans also acknowledged that the GFDP developed by Inter has no profit interest. 46% of the Inter fans that replied to our online survey do not consider that GFDPs in foreign countries are a way of making more money.

So, how is the success of the project measured? “For us the smile on the faces of the children is the best proof of success”, attests Nicoletta. There is no specific research to analyse the success of the projects. There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that criminality in the subject areas has decreased, however Inter says that at this stage they cannot measure the success of the project academically. Interestingly, measurement of the programmes’ success is seen in terms of social outcomes rather than footballing ones. In any case, there are currently twenty-two countries being benefited by the projects and more than ten thousand needy children playing football and growing up learning essential values for life.

Finally, we should note that the Moratti family did not want to advertise what it doing through Inter Campus; it was simply a way of doing corporate social responsibility for the well being of the Club as well as the family, benefiting the international community, and

---

62 The official kit comprehends jersey, shorts and socks, exactly as the ones used by the professional players.
63 In the same survey, 20% of the fans answered “Yes” and 33% “I don’t know”.
64 As advised to the staff that visit the subject countries 3-4 times per year.
there was no need to publicise it. This “Farlo e no Raccontarlo”\textsuperscript{65} policy remained until 2006. The decision to publicise Inter Campus was taken in 2006 principally to distinguish it from the work of the Scuola Calcio. From that moment on, the Club and the company\textsuperscript{66} that runs it wanted to clarify and present what they were doing overseas through Inter Campus\textsuperscript{67} and the club has consequently benefited from the exposure and positive publicity. In the words of Ms. Flutti, “we did not create the Inter Campus in order to build a global brand, but this is what ended up happening”.  

3.3. **SV Werder Bremen**

In 2003 Werder Bremen\textsuperscript{68} was divided into two distinct entities: SV Werder Bremen von 1899 e.V. and Werder Bremen GmbH & Co KG aA. In the first entity, while generally “SV” stands for Sport Verein, in Werder’s case it stands for Soziale Verantwortung\textsuperscript{69} as explained by Björn Schierenbeck\textsuperscript{70}. This shows the relevance of building the link between the business and professional world of football and the grassroots, amateur football in a clear legal and transparent basis. Werder Bremen takes is role as social actor seriously. From the beginning the club hired professionals and created a staff focusing exclusively on the project coordination. Today Werder Bremen is the only Team in the Bundesliga with its own social management department. \textsuperscript{71} Klaus Dieter Fischer, SV Werder Bremen’s Vice-President, during the Congress of UEFA in 2007 said: “Almost half of our fans are playing or played grassroots football. Football is unimaginable without thriving grassroots structures and we realize that if professional players strays too far away from grassroots, the number of spectators and the interest in professional football will both start to sink. So by helping grassroots football, we are indirectly helping ourselves to establish and maintain our fan

\textsuperscript{65} Free Translation: “Just Do It. Don’t Talk About It”.  
\textsuperscript{66} The Inter Campus is organised by Inter Futura SRL, a company member of the Group FC Internazionale.  
\textsuperscript{67} An indication that the decision to publicize the programme was successful is that 65% of the Inter fans that answered our online survey are aware that the Club is developing international GFDP; 34% replied “I don’t know and only 1% wrongly said that the club does not have any international GFDP.  
\textsuperscript{68} The club was founded on 4 February 1899 as Fußballverein Werder. In opposition to other clubs, where the local sides are often subject to intense media attention, players, coaching staff and board of direction are usually left in relative peace. Werder Bremen's reputation is that of a sensible, respected and financially healthy club. Today Werder Bremen is one of the leading football clubs in Germany.  
\textsuperscript{69} Free Translation: Social Responsibility  
\textsuperscript{70} Interview with Björn Schierenbeck, Vice President of the Football Academy at Werder Bremen, on June 29, 2010.  
\textsuperscript{71} Soziales Engagement, “100% Werder-Partner”, SV Werder Bremen, \textsuperscript{http://www.werder.de} (accessed on June 23, 2010).
Question 3 of our questionnaire to Werder Fans confirms the vision of Mr. Fischer: for 83% of the fans it is important that Werder Bremen run development programs.

3.3.1. 100% Partner

Since 2002, SV Werder Bremen has provided its local community with a lot of educational services and social activities through the project 100% Partner. As Mr. Fischer explains, “it is our concern to support the permanent development of the sport in our region and particularly focusing on kids. We would like to sensitize young people to topics as fair play, anti-discrimination and violence.”

According to the results of question 8 of our questionnaire, 92% of the European clubs asked are also involved in a local development programs.

In addition to presentations or conferences taking place in the local community, Werder Bremen freely provides for the participants a stadium tour, a first-team training visit, tickets for home game, equipment, among other things. Also, as an award for the best player in the project, the Club usually invites him for test training sessions with the youth teams. This award confirms that there is a fine line between pure CSR GDFPs and the scouting activities run by clubs in general.

At Werder Bremen, however, the first idea when doing GDFPs is the wish from the club to be socially involved and responsible. Anne-Kathrin Laufmann, Social Manager at Werder Bremen says that “scouting is definitely not our intention,” while Björn Schierenbeck adds, “these projects have nothing to do with scouting. As Vice President of the Football Academy, I sometimes wonder if we are not doing too much for social (and not enough for scouting). But at the end the answer is no. GDFPs give Werder Bremen an important human dimension and this is important aspect of our club.” According to question 5 of our questionnaire, 36% of the fans understand that the main purpose of Werder Bremen doing GDFPs is not to have a better team in the future.

---

72 Andy Roxburgh, “When the Peak Supports the Base”, Grassroots Football Newsletter n.6, July 2007, 4.
74 Ibid.
75 Interview with Anne-Katrin Laufmann, Corporate Social Manager at Werder Bremen, on June 23, 2010.
76 In the same question, 36% of respondents did not know the main purpose and only 27% could imagine that the aims of running such project are for scouting reasons.
3.3.2. **100% World Wide Werder**

In 2009 Werder Bremen decided to give its program an international dimension. Under the patronage of Wynton Rufer\(^77\) the project **100% World Wide Werder** was created. “For years we have had a lot of requests from foreign countries. We had clubs or schools asking at the end of the season for equipments and player kits. So we regularly sent material all over the world and one day we thought it would be great thing to implement a solid program”, said Ms Laufmann.\(^78\) Today through this program Werder Bremen is engaged in schools, associations as well as in non-profit organizations in over thirty countries all around the world.

3.3.3. **Partnership with the Scort Foundation**

3.3.3.1. **Special Youth Camp**

Since 2007, under the umbrella project **100% World Wide Werder** and together with the Scort Foundation\(^79\), Werder Bremen has participated in the “Special Youth Camp” in Switzerland. The camp proposes cultural as well as sport related activities for children with learning difficulties or physical disabilities. According to Ms Laufmann, “Scort asked Werder Bremen whether there was an interest in such an action and we gladly accepted.”\(^80\) The main objectives of the camp as written in the Scort Project Report\(^81\) are the following:

- Supporting the self-esteem and personal development of the youth through sport;
- Capacity building and networking for coaches, educators and representatives of the football clubs;
- Promote the integration of persons with a disability in public – especially through a sense of responsibility in football clubs;

---

\(^77\) Former Werder Bremen and Oceania player of the century. FIFA Ambassador against Racism, he is now running a soccer academy based in Auckland promoting excellence and serving youth soccer throughout New Zealand.

\(^78\) Interview with Anne-Katrin Laufmann, Corporate Social Manager at Werder Bremen, on June 23, 2010.

\(^79\) Scort is a non-profit and politically independent foundation that organises and supports socially oriented sport activities for children and youth. To implement this Scort cooperates with football clubs and social organisations. Together with its partners Scort initiates projects on local as well on international level.


• The engagement for people with a disability should be supported. Give youngsters with a disability a chance to take responsibility as assistant coaches and by leading training sessions.

3.3.3.2. The Kosovo Project

From 2008 to 2009, international GFDPs took place in Kosovo. Werder Bremen participated together with its strategic partner the Scort foundation and FC Basel. Coaches from both clubs led training sessions with local coaches and mixed groups of children from an Albanian and a Serbian primary school. Furthermore they gave to those children of 14 to 17 years of age a coaching education, teaching them coaching models to be used in the community in the future. The final objective of the programme was to encourage the integration of diverse ethnicities within football.

3.3.3.3. The Model Used By SV Werder Bremen and the Scort Foundation in Kosovo

Looking at this model, a trusting relationship between the club and the strategic partner is essential. “Scort has a great know how, very good contact with main local partners and they have also network of people and sponsor they can easily activate. This is this is for us crucial” Ms Laufmann attests. “Everything went fine. Each party could bring their knowhow and strength for the good of the kids”, Mr Schierenbeck added.

---

83 PDF Presentation sent by Mr. Marc-André Buchwalder, CEO of Scort Foundation, on June 9, 2010.
84 Interview with Anne-Katrin Laufmann, Corporate Social Manager at Werder Bremen, on June 23, 2010.
85 Interview with Björn Schierenbeck, Vice President of the Football Academy at Werder Bremen, on June 29, 2010.
The key partner for Werder Bremen in GFDPs in foreign countries is the Scort Foundation. Mr. Marc-André Buchwalder, Chief Executive Officer, presented his vision of GFDPs: “in 2005/2006 clubs motivation to implement socially oriented sport activities was there but at the same moment they weren’t prioritising foreign development, perhaps nervous about getting involved in the politics or because of a lack of know-how”. It can be said that the role of Scort is to be a kind of facilitator, a link between clubs such as Werder Bremen and the political world. This gives the opportunity to clubs to be involved in anything they want (i.e. not just football) and deciding where, what and with whom (i.e. which NGOs or local partners) they want to work with.

With respect to the mechanics of this concept, Mr. Buchwalder says that the “fundamental thing is to have a main local project partner that you can trust and rely on”. The local partner plays a fundamental role in implementing and running a project, given that the club is miles away from the project location. At Scort “the aim is to visit every three months after initial implementation visit, take feedback, ‘teach the teachers’. Sometimes the legacy and the results are easy to see and evaluate. Did we reach the goals we fixed at the beginning, yes or no?”

### 3.3.3.4. The Scort Foundation Concept

---

**Notes:**

86 Interview with Marc-André Buchwalder, Chief Executive Officer at Scort Foundation, on June 09, 2010.

87 In 2009 the Werder Bremen Foundation was founded with the aim of securing funding for future projects.

88 Interview with Marc-André Buchwalder, Chief Executive Officer at Scort Foundation, on June 09, 2010.

89 Ibid.

90 PDF Presentation sent by Mr. Marc-André Buchwalder, CEO of Scort Foundation, on June 9, 2010.
This concept was put in place by Scort in 2005, devised by one of the Board of Directors who was previously the former Special Adviser to the UN-Secretary General on Sport for Development and Peace. While Scort, and similarly Werder Bremen, are satisfied with its effectiveness, there is still no guarantee that this is the best approach to GFDPs. Mr Buchwalder says that “in terms of best practice, it is difficult to say because the methodology is still relatively new. Our first project had coaches between ages of 15 and 17 and later we discovered that this was too young, so now we have slightly older coaches. We should probably be aiming to team up, share knowledge and use an expertise model but we can’t say for sure yet.”

Looking at the aims of clubs running GFDPs, Mr. Buchwalder believes that “usually the management of the clubs is not necessarily on board with the idea of foreign grassroots development. They don’t really understand the benefits of it. Their top agenda is in fact a successful first team, then a successful reserve team and a good youth program. These aims are completely separate from the social department.” It is the typical experience that, when talking about CSR programs, clubs are mainly involved on a local scale with the local community. Often the initiative to start an international GFDP is linked to the desire of one of the board member of the club who champions the idea to the rest of the Board.

Of course development work can be used as a valuable PR tool, increasing international recognition. As Mr. Buchwalder notes, “some clubs, like FC Barcelona, are doing a great job and publicise it – others prefer to keep the work secret”. However the fact that GFDPs often take place in very remote regions, with a limited number of participants doesn’t really provide a significant exposure within the foreign community. Mr. Buchwalder thinks that “GFDPs is not about building foreign fan base. Each program works with 200 to 300 kids in rural areas of countries in need of development assistance. It would be naive to think that this work impacts in the number of foreign fans.” This accords with Werder Bremen’s contention that their GFDPs programme is not about branding in the international marketplace.

On a financial point of view, Scort’s understanding is that clubs are not making money out of GFDPs. “Some clubs obviously try and scout in foreign countries, and also even try to market their football schools as CSR but the ones we are working with don’t see a financial benefit.

---

91 Interview with Marc-Andre Buchwalder, Chief Executive Officer at Scort Foundation, on June 09, 2010.
92 Ibid.
in his experience”. In the Scort experience, the financial aspect does remain an important one however, with the toughest barrier for Scort in working with clubs being to convince them that they will not have to pay large costs to participate. Rather, the clubs are asked only to contribute their time and expertise, plus relatively low personal costs. According to Mr Buchwalder, “Once clubs find out that Scort isn’t after their money, these are happy to share their brand and expertise.” In this way, we see that some other clubs differ in their experience to Werder Bremen, whose GFDPs program has been supported at each step by Mr Fischer.

In conclusion with respect to the Werder Bremen case study, and looking at Question 1 of our questionnaire, 46% of the fans are aware about GFDPs in foreign countries run by Werder Bremen, while 54% are unaware of the programs. This tends to confirm Werder Bremen’s statement that their first purpose in doing GFDPs is not the brand awareness, but rather is to make a positive social contribution and increase football participation.

3.4. RCD ESPANYOL DE BARCELONA

The Reial Club Deportiu Espanyol de Barcelona is one of the most traditional clubs in Spain. It has established a strong connection with the Catalonia region, in the northeast of Spain, and a strong reputation for the formation of young football players. Its fútbol de cantera is known as one of the most successful in the Spanish League and the club can demonstrate this by having more than ten players coming from its youth teams in their first team squad. One of the challenges for Espanyol lies in differentiating itself from the other club in the city, ‘bigger brother’ FC Barcelona, and in gaining attention in a marketplace saturated with news of Barcelona’s initiatives.

3.3.1. The Fundació Privada RCD Espanyol de Barcelona

On 23 December 1997, the Fundació Privada del Reial Club Deportiu Espanyol de Barcelona was founded as a tool to foster and spread the “Espanyolism” feeling. According to its By-Laws, the aim of the foundation is to promote the history of the club and the practice of sports in general, particularly football, as well as fomenting, from a cultural and humanitarian perspective, the formation of sport fans. In order to achieve these objectives and develop new projects, the Foundation receives funds from the RCD Espanyol football club
and donations, mainly made by fans and local companies. By promoting the practice of football, the Foundation is also aiming to help the club improve its training and education of young players and, consequently, continue its formation culture. As mentioned, the club has already a strong power in developing football talents and this is part of the Espanyol DNA.

During the first seven years of its existence, the Foundation was part of many campaigns to help persons in need, mainly in the local area and in partnership with entities such as the Red Cross and the Ronald McDonald Foundation. However, it was after the creation of the Xarxa d’Ecoles de Futbol and the Africa’s Project that the Foundation began a new era.

### 3.3.2. XEF – Xarxa d’Escoles de Futbol del RCD Espanyol

In 2005, the Foundation started a new concept of football training camps in the Catalonia area. The XEF – Xarxa d’Escoles de Futbol del RCD Espanyol was designed based on a combination of desires from both the club and the Foundation. On one hand, the club was seeking to expand its training camps beyond the Ciudad Deportiva, Espanyol’s main training centre, making it possible to reach kids not only from other parts of Catalonia, but also from different regions in Spain. The Foundation, on the other hand, wanted to keep promoting football and the formation of sports fans.

The main characteristics of the XEFs are to develop a top quality training and to target the integral formation of kids between 5 and 12 years of age, not only as sportspersons but to teach them values such as education, respect, cooperation, team work and discipline.

Due to the success of the XEFs, two consequences happened: 1) the expansion of these football schools to different places, reaching the current number of eleven schools around Spain; and 2) the Club and the Foundation understood it was time to develop the same method and values to a different continent, and this is how the Proyecto Africa was created.

### 3.3.3. The Proyecto Africa

The Proyecto Africa was idealized by Mr. Oscar Riera, a physical education professor and son of a former Espanyol footballer. He thought that the Club could do more to benefit the international community and, as a consequence, benefit itself. In his own words, “Espanyol
has always been the poor and ugly brother from our city and the Club wasn’t giving much attention to foreign countries. We wanted to change this scenario”.  

The timing of this idea matched perfectly with the decision of a former employee to return to his home country, Nigeria. Mr. Christopher Nwaehi, an English teacher, became the Club’s main partner and the director of the Nigerian Academy when the project was launched in July 2009. Christopher says that clubs have been going to Africa just to benefit themselves without giving anything back to the country. This is not the case for Espanyol.

The Proyecto Africa is based on three pillars: social, educational and sportive. For each one of these pillars, the Club and the Foundation have different works and objectives, as follows:

• Social: the aim is to integrate the family of the kids and teenagers participating in the project. There are frequent visits from staff members to speak to parents and encourage them to come and watch their son/daughter play and to have interest on what they are doing when they are not at home;

• Educational: to teach basic principles to the participants, such as respect, cooperation, teamwork and discipline. This is not only to the players, but also to the coaches. Further on that, it is required that every participant be enrolled in a school in order to participate in the project. Finally, to the older participants, between 15 and 17 years of age, the project provides classes of Spanish and Catalan, already thinking in a future adaption of the player in Spain;

---

93 Interview with Mr. Oscar Riera, Director of the Proyecto Africa, on June 21, 2010.
94 As an example of how seriously Espanyol takes this responsibility, we were advised that the club was forced to terminate the employment of one of its workers in Nigeria, because she was not felt to be taking this aspect of her role seriously enough.
• Sportive: to form professionals as players and coaches. The players could be selected to training sessions in Barcelona and one or more of the selected players could become part of the Club’s youth teams.

Besides the humanitarian and social values of the project, characteristics of the two previous case studies, it is interesting to notice the scouting purpose of the Proyecto Africa. According to Mr. Riera, “the sportive pillar is a consequence of the social and educational pillars”. Different from the Foundation’s objectives, the Club is constantly looking for talented players, aiming for a stronger team in the future.

In 2009 Espanyol created a selection process for foreign players and they named it ‘Draft’. The Draft started because the Club was receiving many player endorsements from players’ agents around Europe, clubs and other related persons. They decided to choose some of these suggested players, train them for a week and choose one or two to become part of the youth teams. After the beginning of the Proyecto Africa, the Draft could match perfectly the desire of the Club and the work of the Foundation, as Proyecto Africa students were entered into this Draft process.

The selection process of players coming from Nigeria is divided in three phases: Firstly, approximately three hundred players coming from different regions of the country, but not participating in Proyecto Africa, have the chance to show their abilities. Secondly, after choosing thirty out of the three hundred, there were new training sessions, but now together with the participants of the Academy. Thirdly, out of a final group of twenty players, eight were selected to go to Barcelona.

Therefore, during the year of 2010, these eight players from the RCD Espanyol Academy in Lagos, Nigeria, participated in the Draft with other players coming from Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Panama, Cameroon, Ivory Coast, France, Hungary, Switzerland and South Korea. The draft lasted one week and at the end two players were selected to play for the Club’s youth team. One of these players is from the Academy in Nigeria.

95 Interview with Mr. Oscar Riera, Director of the Proyecto Africa, on June 21, 2010.
It is important to point out that the Nigerian players receive assistance from the club and from a host family that is responsible for giving attention to the player, mainly on weekends when there is no practice. Also, the player receives a student visa from the Spanish authorities and, thus, he is regularly enrolled in a school in Barcelona.

In only 10 months of work, the club could leave a very positive impact in the community in Lagos and could also benefit from bringing a player that had never played organised football before. As Mr. Nwaehi stated of the player ultimately selected by the Espanyol youth team, “we found him playing in the streets”. While this is a football program, Mwaehi has also noticed social benefits, “We noticed that some of the families are now more interested in knowing what their kids are doing”, he said.

The awareness of the Spanish fans in relation to the project can also be considered positive. 88% of the Espanyol fans that participated in an online survey understand that the international GFDP carried out by the Club is to build a better team in the future. In other words, it is clear for the fans that there is a scouting reason for doing the project. In the same context, only 42% of the fans understand that this is a profitable business.

“The cycle was perfectly finished”. These were the words that Oscar Riera summarized the first experience of the Proyecto Africa. The Club and the Foundation are very happy with the results achieved so far and the plans of expansion are moving fast. There are conversations with authorities from Ivory Coast and this will probably be the next destination of the project. Cameroon and Ghana are the other countries that are being carefully analysed by the managers. They admit that the countries are decided not only based on their needs, but also on their historical record of successful players. In summary though, Proyecto Africa serves to fulfil not only the aim of creating a talent pipeline for RCD Espanyol, it also serves as contributing a valuable GFDP that benefits over 800 Nigerian children a year in football and social areas.
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96 Interview with Mr. Christopher Nwaehi, responsible for the Academy in Nigeria, on June 30, 2010.
97 Ibid.
98 Only 6% understand that the international GFDP is not to build a better team in the future and 6% replied “I don’t know”.
99 39% believe that the international GFDP is not a profitable business and 18% answered “I don’t know”.
100 Interview with Mr. Oscar Riera, Director of the Proyecto Africa, on June 21, 2010.
4. FINDINGS AGAINST FIVE MOTIVATIONS

4.1. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey (see copy attached at Appendix 2) was constructed in 4 parts, from simplest questions through to questions requiring more complex responses, as follows:

- In part 1, respondents were asked 5 ‘yes or no’ questions.
- In part 2, respondents were asked 20 questions in which they were asked to rank how strongly they agreed with a particular statement. A Likert scale was employed, giving the respondents five possible options, as follows; 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neutral, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree. Within these 20 questions, 2 questions were posed using the negative form, in order to prevent respondents from becoming too familiar with the questioning style101.
- Part 3 was only answered by clubs already participating in GFDPs and consisted of 8 open ended questions requesting details about the programmes already in place.
- Part 4 was only answered by clubs already participating in GFDPs and consisted of 5 open ended questions requesting details about the club’s intention to enter into GFDPs.

The survey was made available in the following languages, in order to maximise the probability of receiving responses: English, German, French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese. Clubs were selected to take part in the survey using various criteria:

- 17 clubs were recommended by the European Club Association, of which 11 contributed to the survey pool;

---

101 Isabella Soscia. Lecture presented to FIFA MA class on February 17, 2010.
- 102 clubs were contacted through different channels of communication and they are all currently playing the first division of leagues across Europe\textsuperscript{102}, of which 29 contributed to the survey pool.

It is believed that the surveys collected are a representative and unbiased\textsuperscript{103} selection of European clubs who may be interested in undertaking GFDPs in foreign countries. In all, we received 39 surveys that were valid to be included in the study, being a positive response rate of approximately 34\% of the total requests forwarded to clubs.\textsuperscript{104} It is believed that given the total number of European clubs that may be interested in participating in GFDPs in foreign countries,\textsuperscript{105} the number of responses received is sufficient for meaningful conclusions to be drawn from the results.

Additionally, the data was also split into two sub-sets in order to ascertain whether there were any trends that were more applicable to one group of clubs than to the other. In this instance, the first group consists of the top 20 clubs in Europe as determined by the most recent version of the Deloitte Football Money League,\textsuperscript{106} for the season 2008/9, with the remainder of clubs in the other subset. Of the ‘top clubs’ sub-set, we received completed surveys from 10, being 50\% of the clubs in that sub-set\textsuperscript{107}. The rationale for choosing these two subsets was our hypothesis that the approach of clubs to GFDPs would be dependent upon their individual

\textsuperscript{102} The clubs that answered the survey participate on one of the leagues from the following countries members of UEFA: England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Italy, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Holland, Czech Republic, Croatia, Serbia, Poland, Romania, Greece, Turkey, Russia, Moldova, Liechtenstein and Israel.

\textsuperscript{103} Consideration was given to whether the survey could be biased by the fact that respondents had been recommended by the ECA. It was not initially believed that this represents a problem, given a) the number of ‘ECA suggested clubs’ as a percentage of the total number of requests sent, b) the reality that there are a limited number of clubs with a possible interest in this area, c) the fact that the clubs recommended by the ECA represent a cross section of leagues within Europe rather than one particular league or interest group, and d) a number of the clubs recommended by the ECA would have been contacted in any case, using one of the other selection criteria referenced above.

\textsuperscript{104} These figures are taken as at 25 June 2010 on which date the online survey was closed.

\textsuperscript{105} It is not possible to definitively state the number of clubs interested in this area without obtaining responses from every professional European football club. Taking into consideration the responses received from our survey, including the size and nature of the clubs that expressed an interest, we would estimate the number of interested clubs in Europe as being approximately 150.

\textsuperscript{106} Based on the “Spanish Master: Football Money League” (Delloite LLP, 2010), the top 20 clubs, in order, were: Real Madrid, FC Barcelona, Manchester United, Bayern Munich, Arsenal, Chelsea, Liverpool, Juventus, Internazionale, AC Milan, Hamburger SV, AS Roma, Olympique Lyonnais, Olympique de Marseille, Tottenham Hotspur, Schalke 04, Werder Bremen, Borussia Dortmund, Manchester City and Newcastle United (responses received from the underlined clubs).

\textsuperscript{107} One survey was received that did not provide details of the club that had responded. It is believed that this club was FC Bayern München, which is included within the ‘top clubs’ list, however this was unable to be confirmed prior to the closure of the data collection period. This anonymous club has been included in the data as one of the other clubs rather than as one of the ‘top clubs’. 
circumstances, of which wealth is arguably the most determinative. Other studies have split the research into country-by-country analysis, arguing that individual countries may have a particular historic approach to CSR, however we believe that the financial strength of a modern club is a more accurate predictor of action in this area than its geographic location. The purpose of splitting the data into these two sets, then, is to ascertain whether the ‘top clubs’ have a different agenda in taking part in GFDPs than other European clubs.

Surveys were completed by the clubs using the online service provider onlineumfragen.com GmbH and all graphs, figures and statistics with respect to the information received were generated through onlineumfragen.com software. Visual representation of all the answers received for sections 1 and 2 of the survey is shown in pie chart form at Appendix 4. Appendix 5 and 6 shows the same data for the ‘top clubs’ and ‘small clubs’ sub-sets, respectively.

4.2. CSR Model

The results received from the survey show that clubs are clearly invested in Corporate Social Responsibility, not only as believers in the philosophical principle but as a reality in the way they run their businesses.

Not one of the respondents disagreed with the proposition that “It is important for my organisation to be philanthropic because it is the right thing to do” (Question 7), and similarly all respondents positively agreed with the statement that “My organisation has a responsibility to its local community” (Question 10). All but one of the clubs said that they were involved in local CSR activities (Question 8), while 92% of the clubs stated that they were already specifically involved in GFDPs in their local community (Question 2).

More specifically for the purposes of this final project, with respect to the question of whether clubs had “a responsibility to the international community” (Question 11), the majority of clubs were still in agreement. 69% of respondents either ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ with this international responsibility, while 21% were neutral and 9% disagreed. As to having put this belief into practice, 44% of respondents stated that they were already

108 Breitbarth and Harris, 2008, 179-206.
involved in GFDPs in a foreign country, while a further six clubs said that future involvement was part of their current plans (Question 36). This is perhaps a larger commitment to an international agenda than was expected: even assuming that the clubs believed in CSR in principle, it was expected that a large percentage of clubs would limit their focus to their local communities. This response represents a clear majority believing that clubs should be involved in the international scene.

The conclusion that GFDPs in foreign countries are generally being undertaken for CSR rather than commercial reasons is reinforced when this data is split into the groups for ‘Top 20’ clubs and the rest. If clubs were involved for commercial reasons, we would expect the ‘Top 20’ clubs to be far more involved than the others, given their bigger profile and greater ability to leverage these projects in different markets. While the involvement in GFDPs in foreign countries of the ‘Top 20’ clubs is greater as a percentage than the involvement of the rest, the difference is not as large as would be expected (55% for ‘Top 20’, 40% for the rest). As noted above, involvement in GFDPs does not necessarily mean that such programs are being undertaken for altruistic reasons, however the manner in which clubs are carrying out these programs also suggest that there is substance to their claims of actually following a CSR model.

We suggested at the outset that if clubs were carrying out GFDPs altruistically, then they would be happy to share information with other clubs and build best practices; such knowledge sharing is taking place. As seen from the Werder Bremen case study, Werder Bremen is partnering with the Scort Foundation, which works with a number of clubs (info about joint projects). Furthermore, as noted by Mr. Marc-Andre Buchwalder of Scort, and as confirmed by Björn Schierenbeck, Vice-President of Werder Bremen’s Football Academy, the coaches themselves greatly value the opportunity to learn from each other and to connect with coaches from other clubs.

The open questions at the end of the survey similarly reflected an open approach to involvement in GFDPs; one club advised of a European network of seven clubs\textsuperscript{109}, named the European Football Social Response Network, which is involved “with the intention of sharing experience, developing common programs and spreading information to our national

\textsuperscript{109} These clubs are Djurgaden IF, Charlton Athletic FC, PSV Eindhoven, Club Brugge, Rhyl FC, Derry City FC and Valerenga Fotball.
clubs”. This respondent specifically lists aims of “learning from clubs from other countries’ experience from development programs, and jointly planning and developing new programs”. Although it is easy to be sceptical of motives, the responses received suggest that a significant proportion of GFDPs are, in fact, run because the subject clubs believe it is ‘the right thing to do’.

4.3. **STAKEHOLDER MODEL**

We commence this analysis with a review of some of the perceived major stakeholders for clubs in implementing GFDPs in foreign countries.

4.3.1. **Role and Expectations of Fans**

More than just a ticket to watch a game, football fans have an emotional link with their favourite team, a kind of identification that goes much further. Looking at the different interviews we have made, clubs agree that supporters are essential for them and that they have in some ways an influence on strategy generally, and therefore on GFDPs. Fans are not a homogenous group though. While Werder Bremen noted that “families with young kids are the kind of fans that are usually the most interested in what we’re doing (in social areas), and according to that fact we are already working on common project together with the Fan Care Management department”\(^{110}\), at the same time the club confirmed that the ‘football fans’, being the majority of Bremen supporters, do not have any interest in the club’s GFDPs. Looking at the results of Question 19 of the questionnaire, 80% of the clubs believed that their fans expected them to be involved in CSR programmes, yet if we look at the results of Question 7 of the Fan’s Survey, more than 69% of the Inter fans, 70% of the Espanyol fans and 85% of the Werder Bremen fans say that it wouldn’t affect their behaviour in any way if their favourite club cancelled its GFDPs. Interestingly, in response to Question 9 by the fans of Intern and Werder Bremen about 60% of them are happy that their favourite clubs spend money in GFDPs even if it means there may be less money to spend on other things like transfers.

---

\(^{110}\) Interview with Anne-Katrin Laufmann, Corporate Social Manager at Werder Bremen, on June 23, 2010.
4.3.2. Fédération Internationale de Football Association – FIFA

FIFA is based in three different pillars: to develop the game, to touch the world and to build a better future. FIFA has recently developed its own Grassroots Program, based under the Technical Department and a part of the “Develop the Game” pillar. The main goal of the grassroots projects carried out by FIFA is “to bring as many people as possible into the game, because football is a school of life”\textsuperscript{111}.

The members of FIFA are the 208 national associations from everywhere in the world. Thus, the grassroots projects developed by FIFA are designed to help such member associations to start carrying out their own programs in their territories. After understanding the needs of the country, FIFA implements its programme and this includes seminars and conferences to teach volunteers and coaches how to work with the children. There is no involvement of any other entities or clubs, other than the local member associations and sometimes the local governments. “Our relationship is only with the member associations, they are our members”\textsuperscript{112} confirms Mr. Cidoncha. There is no interaction between FIFA and football clubs. Once, a Japanese club asked for assistance to implement a grassroots project, but “we recommended them to talk to their national association. We cannot help clubs from all over the world, because it would be insane”. In this way, we see that FIFA has zero involvement in the GFDPs run by individual clubs, nor any regulatory role in same.

4.3.3. Union of European Football Associations - UEFA

“UEFA’s mission as a parent body of European football includes helping to cultivate the games’ grassroots. The foundation on which elite football can thrive.”\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{112} Interview with Mr. Jorge Diaz-Cidoncha, Coordinator Grassroots and Course Programmes, and Mr. Christian Stamm, CSR Advocacy Manager, on May 4, 2010.
There is a clear difference for FIFA and UEFA regarding the definition of Grassroots. For UEFA, grassroots is “all football which is non-professional and non-elite, including football in amateur clubs, children’s football, school football, beach football, leisure football, company football, football in cities (disadvantages groups), commercial programs, indoor football/futsal, football for disable players, veterans’ football”\(^{114}\). There is no age limitation, no gender, and no discrimination of any kind. Grassroots for UEFA is the genuine concept of football for all. UEFA’s grassroots strategy is based upon the following Football Pyramid concept:

![Football Pyramid](image)

UEFA announced the start of its Grassroots programs in 1997 during a conference in Belgium. Probably the main achievement came in 2004 when UEFA decided to create “Best Practice Recommendations”, to what they called the Grassroots Charter. The aim of this Charter is to support the grassroots activities of the member associations – these include nurturing women's and girls' football, and developing social programs such as disability football. Today almost all the member associations have signed the Charter.


\(^{115}\) Ibid.
In a recent new promotion of grassroots football, UEFA created the Grassroots Day, an event that celebrates grassroots football across Europe. In the week of the most high-profile club fixture of the year, the UEFA Champions League final, the goal is to “emphasize UEFA’s stance that elite football cannot flourish without healthy grassroots. Therefore one of the day’s key objectives will be to transmit the all-important message that football is open to everyone.”

Conceived of as an annual undertaking, UEFA Grassroots Day is multi-faceted, involving all the member national associations. During this day UEFA will grant an award to the Best Grassroots Leader, the Best Grassroots Project and the Best Grassroots Club.

While FIFA and UEFA may have differing concepts of grassroots, both entities have an important similarity: the grassroots programs are designed to help member associations. The governing body of football in Europe seeks to involve national associations and promote activity in social responsibility programs, particularly grassroots football programs. As Frank Ludolph, Grassroots Manager at UEFA, says, “we try to bring national associations together to give them the opportunity to exchange ideas and know-how.” The clubs, once again, are left behind. This is in spite of the fact that 43% of clubs agree or strongly agree that GFDPs should be regulated by a governing body (Question 13).

Mr Ludolph states, “clubs can contact us and we could give them some information, share our knowledge. However, most of the time we suggest clubs to contact directly their national association.”

Mr. Ludolph is clear when answering the question about clubs implementing GFDP in foreign countries. “Whatever are the aims of clubs doing Grassroots, if for social, financial, brand awareness or scouting reason, as long as they are ethically correct and under the rules of football it is ok for us.” Again, interest in, or a regulatory role over, what individual clubs are doing is practically non-existent.

---

117 According to Mr. Ludolph, the awards are decided based on the nominations of the member associations. UEFA has no first hand knowledge of the work being carried out by these winners.
118 Interview with Frank Ludolph, Evelyn Ternes and David Gough, members of UEFA’s Football Development Division, on June 18, 2010.
119 40% were neutral on this question, meaning that only 17% disagreed.
120 Ibid.
121 Ibid.
In conclusion, while the words of UEFA’s President, Mr. Michel Platini, can explain the philosophy of UEFA, these words appear to apply more to national associations than to European clubs: "Football is based on the grassroots, played everywhere by men and women, boys and girls. The top professional level is just the tip of the iceberg. UEFA will continue with, and even strengthen solidarity, both to protect the future of football and to deliver the wider benefits that our sport brings to society as a whole. And it is also because the strength of football lies in its grassroots that we have to preserve the local, regional and national identities of our game, always in accordance with the law."^122

4.3.4. Sponsors

If we have a look at the main sources of revenues of European clubs, sponsorship is one of the main revenue contributors.\(^123\) Sponsors associate their image with clubs and try in this way to gain brand awareness and brand value. In the case on Inter, international brands like Nike or Pirelli have supported and invested in GFDPs over a number of years. “We have good relations with our sponsors. Usually and in their own way, they are all willing to participate to Inter Campus. Some of them are doing donations other like Nike provide us material. Some other like Pirelli uses the visibility of Intercampus to improve their image of a responsible company”. \(^124\)

However during our research we have noticed differences between the situations of the clubs chosen as case studies. While at Inter sponsors seem to collaborate financially as well as with equipment, at Werder Bremen and Espanyol the situation is quite different “We have a good relationship with our local sponsors. However it is often difficult for us to convince the big ones (to be involved)”\(^125\) argues Ms. Laufmann at Werder Bremen. Similarly at Espanyol sponsors have absolutely no involvement in GFDPs in foreign countries. According to Question 21 of the questionnaire, 60% agree or strongly agree with the fact that sponsors

\(^{122}\) Andy Roxburgh, “When the Peak Supports the Base”, Grassroots Football Newsletter n.6, July 2007, 4.
\(^{123}\) Generally, television revenue is the highest contributor. TV networks have not been specifically addressed here as a stakeholder given that the overwhelming majority of television deals are done on a league wide basis rather being negotiated on an individual club basis.
\(^{124}\) Interview with Nicoletta Flutti, Inter Campus Communications and Project Development Manager, on May 12, 2010.
\(^{125}\) AOK/Bremen and Kraft Food.
\(^{126}\) Interview with Anne-Katrin Laufmann, Corporate Social Manager at Werder Bremen, on June 23, 2010.
demand the club to be involved in CSR, yet we must question how strong this requirement is if the same sponsors are not directly involved in the implementation.

Sponsors have definitively a role when analyzing GFDPs. However their importance, commitment and impact change from club to club and from project to project. While for big programs such as *Inter Campus*, sponsors seems to use GFDPs as a PR platform, sponsors of smaller clubs and programs don’t really see the opportunity to gain in awareness.

Generally sponsors of clubs are interested in linking their own image to GFDPs, however in terms of influencing clubs to become involved in this area, it seems an exaggeration to suggest that sponsors play much of a role

### 4.3.5. International Partner and Specialized Foundations

Organization, usually structured as foundations or non-profit organization are working as liaisons between clubs and the on-site local partner working on the project. Specialized companies like the Scort Foundation are intermediaries, and influence and directly affect the clubs through their know-how and strategic approach to GFDPs. Our research suggests a two way street for this relationship – either clubs approach these entities with their requirements or else organizations can directly approach a club to partner with them. With their understanding of local conditions (including local connections), prior knowledge of running GFDPs or with their mandate to seek involvement in such areas, these organizations that typically end up partnering with the clubs are without doubt a key stakeholder in this process.

### 4.3.6. Stakeholder Mapping

As a result of the data collected, it is necessary to revisit the stakeholder tables we began with. These now look as follows:
Our conclusion must therefore be that external stakeholders do not play such an important role in the decision of European clubs to participate in GFDPs in foreign countries. While the results of the survey suggest that stakeholders do require involvement in projects such as
foreign GFDPs, this ‘requirement’ does not appear to be strong enough to actually affect the stakeholder’s involvement with the club – if clubs shut down their GFDPs tomorrow, it is likely that their stakeholders would remain exactly the same.

Conversely, we see that the biggest influencers in the decision are those that are either fully or partially internal to the club. Typically this takes the form of a high profile leader within the club, with foundations linked to the clubs also being relevant. Third party intermediaries such as the Scort Foundation can play a role in this initial decision process, however their impact is far more noticeable in the process of choosing/setting up the programs and in the subsequent implementation process.

### 4.4. Branding Model

The outcomes from our research suggest that most clubs participating in GFDPs in foreign countries do not do so for branding purposes. Question 23 within the survey asked this point directly, asking respondents whether “building a global brand for my organisation” was the main purpose of the GFDPs. Only 11% (equalling four respondents) said that it was the main purpose, with 71% either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the proposition. 11% is a material percentage, and we are aware of programmes such as Internazionale’s Abu Dhabi Academy, which Inter states is mainly for branding and exposure purposes, however 11% does not represent the significance that we anticipated branding would play in the development of foreign GFDPs by clubs.

While branding may not be the primary purpose of clubs’ involvement, the marketing divisions within those same clubs do still use the work of the clubs in this area for branding purposes. The case study of Inter Milan is instructive here: for the first ten years of Inter Campus the project was not publicised at all, yet it is now widely known and creates much positive publicity for Inter Milan. One feels that Mr Moratti would be horrified if it was suggested to him that Inter Campus was a branding exercise, yet the club does now encourage the effect on its brand image that Inter Campus brings. With all professional clubs now

---

127 Interview with Nicoletta Flutti, Inter Campus Communications and Project Development Manager, on May 12, 2010.
having their own websites, newsletters and fan groups, and in an age of the free and immediate transfer of information, even a club with no primary purpose of branding can communicate its GFDP work to stakeholders with a minimum of time and effort. In this context, the results of Question 18 (are your stakeholders adequately aware of your CSR programs) are difficult to interpret. 65% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their clubs’ stakeholders were adequately aware, while 23% of the respondents were neutral and 11% disagreed with the statement. On one reading 65% seems a strong result, however we believe that if branding was the key purpose here then clubs would be making concerted efforts to ensure that all of their stakeholders were aware.

For the majority of clubs it seems that branding is a secondary consideration. In Question 37, clubs not already involved in GFDPs in foreign countries were asked what the potential benefits might be of entering into this domain. Of the 19 responses to this question, five included references to brand amongst other considerations, while the only response to mention brand alone stated, “we can’t see many benefits out of (carrying out GFDPs in foreign countries). From a global perspective it is only to assist in the image point of view”. This would tend to confirm that few clubs see branding as a sufficient reason to enter into GFDPs in foreign countries.

At the beginning of this final project we suggested that if the Branding Model was correct, we should see clubs 1) spending resources to measure the value of GFDPs to their brands, and 2) widely publicising the work that they are carrying out. In all of the data we have collected, the prevailing opinion seems to be that it is difficult/impossible to measure that value of GFDPs, making the Branding Model at best a risky strategy given the inability to accurately calculate return on investment.128 With respect to publicising a club’s GFDPs in foreign countries, we have not found any clubs spending significant amounts of money in this regard. As a part of the Werder Bremen case study, for example, the club stated129 that its programs were highlighted on the website and in newsletters but that no further advertising of the programs took place. We believe that such an approach is typical – quick, easy and cheap.

128 Even FIFA has difficulties in quantifying success. Mr. Christian Stamm attests that “measuring the results is very challenging because it is still not possible to understand how football has an effect on the changes. We are currently developing new strategies in order to help us analyse these results”.
129 Interview with Anne-Katrin Laufmann, Corporate Social Manager at Werder Bremen, on June 23, 2010.
publicising of GFDPs in foreign countries takes place on the clubs’ own internal information sources, however little time or money is devoted to external public relations or marketing in this area.

4.5. **Revenue Model**

The data received suggests that seeking to use GFDPs as a revenue stream is not a high priority for most clubs. Only 15% of respondents simply agreed that their organisations saw grassroots programs as a profitable business activity (Question 15), while 47% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

This is not to say that there are no clubs whose main objective in GFDPs in foreign countries is to raise revenue. In Question 29, where clubs were asked to provide details of the programs that they are operating, one club advised of sport schools running in seven different countries\(^{130}\) that are “all dependent on registration fees from attendees”. Similarly, for Question 33 (have you seen any positive return on investment from you GFDPs), a different club responded that “all grassroots development programs run in Ireland have been profitable.”\(^{131}\) This does prompt a question as to whether the programs run by these clubs truly fit within the definition of GFDPs – if attendees are able to afford registration fees that are high enough to guarantee profitability of a program, perhaps there is no need for grassroots football development in such areas.

In any case, the majority of clubs interviewed simply did not see GFDPs primarily as a revenue raiser. We say ‘primarily’ here, as it is clear that clubs are not averse to making money from such programs. For instance, only 18% of respondents did not agree that GFDPs would result in higher revenues for their clubs (Question 25). The distinction must be drawn therefore between clubs establishing programs for a profit motive, and those with different primary motivations who may at the same time also see a return on GFDPs.

\(^{130}\) Germany, Australia, Switzerland, England, Nigeria, Holland and Cyprus.

\(^{131}\) The French club Paris Saint Germain runs football tours and camps in foreign countries as a purely commercial enterprise.
Earlier we suggested that if the Revenue Model was being used, we should be seeing the location of GFDPs being determined by the ability of the recipient community to contribute significant expenditure to clubs, and by Customer Relationship Management programs being implemented in those target communities to maximise revenue opportunities. We have seen no evidence of such CRM activities. With respect to the location of GFDPs, we have seen evidence of programs being run in countries such as India, Kosovo, Palestine, Haiti, Rwanda, Burkina Faso and Nigeria. By and large these programs are located in exactly the type of areas which are completely unable to contribute revenues. As succinctly summed up by the CEO of Scort Foundation, “do you think clubs are going to be able to sell enough shirts in the Sudan to make this profitable?”\textsuperscript{132}

4.6. **Scouting Model**

Probably the first reason that comes to the general public’s mind when linking European football clubs carrying out GFDPs in foreign countries is scouting for players, yet our research shows that this is not the most common reason for clubs to commence GFDPs in foreign countries. Question 17 of the survey stated, “Scouting young players is NOT the main purpose of my organization’s GFDP”. 26 out of the 35 clubs that replied to this question strongly agreed or simply agreed with such statement, corresponding to 74% or almost three quarters of all the answers. 6% (or two clubs) replied “neutral” and 20% (or seven clubs) disagreed with the assertion. None of the clubs “strongly disagreed” with it. Among the ‘top clubs’, 78% agreed or strongly agreed with the sentence and only one disagreed and one answered neutral.\textsuperscript{133}

It is interesting to compare the answers given on Question 17 with the answers presented on Question 26. This latter question stated that, “GFDPs give a long-term competitive advantage on the field”. 60% of the total number of clubs strongly agreed or agreed with the sentence, while only 14% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The remaining 26% replied “neutral”.

The answers given here appear contradictory to the answers from question 17. On the one hand, 74% of the clubs said that scouting is not the main reason for doing GFDPs. However,

\textsuperscript{132} Interview with Marc-Andre Buchwalder, Chief Executive Officer at Scort Foundation, on June 09, 2010.

\textsuperscript{133} One of the ‘top clubs’ did not respond to this question.
now 60% understand that the GFDPs could result in the club having a long-term competitive advantage in the football pitch.

We see two potential reasons for this apparent contradiction. Firstly, it could represent that clubs have other reasons to believe that GFDPs would give them a long-term advantage on the pitch without being as a result of scouting. These reasons would be the indirect benefits gained from carrying out GFDPs, such as increasing the fan base or brand awareness. Alternatively, and as has been mentioned before, it is very common to have more than one motivation to carry out GFDPs. For example, a club may be running a GFDP for purely altruistic reasons, however if the program happens to unearth the next Pele then it would be illogical not to try and sign such a player. When viewed in the light of either of these alternatives, the responses received no longer seem inherently contradictory.

At the same time, scouting is clearly the number one priority for some clubs engaging in GFDPs. In Question 29 clubs were asked to provide other reasons for carrying out GFDPs in foreign countries. One of the ‘top clubs’ clearly confirmed that “the scouting for young talents is the basis for international grassroots programmes, as well as they help the club save money with future transfers”.

Further, Question 35 asked the clubs if they had ever offered a professional contract to a participant of any international GFDP. Two of the clubs replied that they have offered professional contracts to the participants and one mentioned that “a number of participants have been taken on by the Academy”. Another one confirmed that 12 players that now have professional contracts came from the international GFDP. These clubs coherently and clearly demonstrated that the main reason for doing GFDPs overseas is for scouting.

Additionally, it is also relevant to analyse some of the answers given by the clubs that are not currently undertaking GFDPs in foreign countries. On Question 37, when clubs were asked to estimate what would be the benefits of carrying out international GFDPs, 4 clubs included scouting or player development as reasons to get involved in the area. 3 clubs replied that they were still not sure about the motivations for entering the area but scouting reasons together with other motives would likely be the case. Also, one of the ‘top clubs’ replied that one of the reasons would be “player development of course”. We can assume that the player development could also mean that the GFDP would include scouting for young talents.
We also saw in the Espanyol case study example of scouting based GFDPs; although in an embryonic stage, the program is tailored around providing young Nigerian players to be assessed by the club with a view to a professional contract. As noted, Espanyol has signed one of the Nigerian youngsters from the first year’s intake to a professional contract in June of this year. While it may not be the most common reason for involvement in GFDPs in foreign countries, it is clear that scouting represents a definite priority for some clubs.

In view of the above and confronting the present analysis with the hypothesis we had for the Scouting motivation, we saw that this reason for undertaking GFDP is not as common as we believed it would be. Furthermore, only a few clubs have offered professional contracts to the participants of the programs.\textsuperscript{134}

4.7. \textbf{Limitations of Methodology}

In the course of this final project, we have encountered several situations that should be taken into consideration in the assessment of these findings. These are described below, along with the strategies we employed to minimize their impact.

- The difficulties of being comprehensive: This final project seeks to present a snapshot of the GFDPs currently being undertaken by European football clubs. In order to present a comprehensive analysis it would be necessary to receive feedback from all clubs in Europe. This is currently not feasible. Even the UEFA licensing program, which has succeeded in gathering more information about clubs than has previously been possible, is not a mandatory requirement for clubs who do not wish to participate in European club competition. We do believe, however, that both the response rate, as well as the total number of responses received to the survey, mean that weight can be given to the conclusions drawn.

\textsuperscript{134} Although we included a question to verify under which department the GFDP was based in the football clubs, the answers varied and it is not possible to draw a conclusion of a common department. Furthermore, even though it may not be for scouting reasons only, the countries that are perceived for their ‘national footballing ability’ are usually the main destinations for clubs doing international GFDPs with scouting as the main reason.
- Languages: Naturally, clubs throughout Europe speak any number of languages. We are fortunate that within the final project group we have a variety of language skills, however this language limitation should be acknowledged; there is always a chance of miscommunication and of things being lost in translation. To minimize the possible impact of language issues, the survey was offered in 6 languages.

- Lack of consistency in the respondents from the clubs: The survey was completed by people with differing roles, and hence viewpoints, within each club. For example, we received responses from, amongst others, the following positions; CEO, Marketing Director, Social Management Director, Sponsorship Manager, Club Secretary, Finance Manager, Fundraising Manager, Head coach. It was not feasible to have the same person with each club answer the survey, given that different clubs have different organization charts and the GFDPs themselves often sit under different business units from club to club.

- Confidentiality of Information: We must say at the outset that the assistance provided by all three clubs involved in the case studies was more than we could have hoped for. However there are still gaps in the information that we were able to receive, including the following; we were unable to obtain contact details for some fan groups due to privacy consideration, some clubs were understandably reluctant to release financial information with respect to their spend on areas such as GFDPs, clubs were unable to convince some of their stakeholders to speak with us. In particular, we were unable to gain access to the sponsors of the three case study clubs, in order to find out their perspectives. The purpose of the case studies is not to conclusively determine any ‘law’ of GFDPs but is rather to show some examples of the types of programs being run, so we do not believe that these gaps prevent the case studies from being useful. At the same time, however, it is admitted that the case studies are not definitive and conclusive in their scope.

- Telling us what we want to hear: Obtaining information in this manner from clubs always runs the risk of receiving data that is not completely objective. People may be trying to present their organization in the best possible light or there may be some sub-conscious desire to appear to be a good corporate citizen. Having reviewed the results received, however, if such a bias is present in the data it is of minimal impact.
Although the aim of the survey was to be representative of the types of clubs who may be interested in GFDPs, in hindsight we have been guilty of a ‘big club bias’. We initially believed that only clubs of a certain size would be active in this area and did not appreciate that the involvement ran so deep amongst clubs. By way of example, one of the member clubs of the European Football Social Responsibility Network is Rhyl FC. The writers confess that none of them had ever heard of Rhyl FC. In seeking survey respondents, then, we should have sought responses from a broader cross section of European clubs.

---

135 Rhyl FC is a club competing in the Welsh Cymru Alliance League, having been relegated from the Welsh Premier League in May 2010 for administrative restructuring reasons.
5. MONITORING OF GFDPS – THE ROLE OF UEFA

Our work on this project has confirmed that there is little to no centralised understanding of the work being carried out by European clubs in GFDPs in foreign countries. Furthermore, there is no one agency that shows any interest in doing so:

1. National associations have no interest in things taking place outside their geographic borders and, in any case, the “Home-Grown” rule is administered by UEFA and the transfer of minors is regulated by FIFA.

2. The European Club Association is, in spite of its name, un-representative of European clubs and this area does not fall within its mandate or interests,

3. UEFA maintains a public stance that its members are national associations rather than clubs, and sees this topic as “already governed by existing regulations such as the FIFA Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players”\(^\text{136}\)

4. FIFA maintains a similar stance that its members are confederations and will not discuss this area with individual clubs\(^\text{137}\).

In short, given the hierarchical nature of world football superimposed over a more complex reality, every group is able to present a reasonable argument as to why this is someone else’s area of concern. Our final project group firmly believes that this area should be monitored as a first step and, if deemed to be necessary after a review of the current state of affairs, regulated. Importantly, 43% of the clubs surveyed either agreed or strongly agreed that GFDPs should be monitored by a governing body of some form, while 40% were neutral on the questions and only 17% of clubs disagreed with this proposition (Question 13).

We believe that UEFA is the most appropriate body to take on this monitoring role. Our suggestion as a first step would be that UEFA include GFDPs within its club licensing system, which is “a series of defined quality standards which must be fulfilled by clubs in order to be admitted to all UEFA competitions”\(^\text{138}\). The club licensing system has been a great success in collating information about European clubs on matters of importance to

\(^{136}\) Giancarlo Dapoto, e-mail to the authors of this paper, July 2, 2010.
\(^{137}\) Reference discussion with FIFA where they were approached by the Japanese Club Urawa Reds about this area and were told to take it up locally.
\(^{138}\) Dino Ruta and Laura Maccio, “Is the Licensing Systems for Clubs a Tool for Good Governance in Sport? The cases of UEFA, Euroleague Basketball and NBA” (Milan: SDA Bocconi, 2009), 12.
UEFA, such as financial status and youth development, and there is no reason why this same system could not be used to monitor GFDPs\textsuperscript{139}.

It is appreciated that it is already incumbent upon clubs to provide a large amount of information as a part of their application under the UEFA licensing system, however it is not believed that this addition would create any material burden. Information should be required as a ‘C’ class requirement – the failure to provide such information should have no ramifications for the club – rather the object is simply at this stage to have an understanding of what work is going on.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{139} This club licensing system is also instructive with respect to UEFA’s claim to only be interested in the actions of its members, that is, the national associations. This is not a criticism. Rather, the system reflects UEFA’s understanding that for any meaningful reporting and analysis to take place of the state of club football in Europe, the reality is that the responsibility for the same will ultimately fall on the confederation.

\textsuperscript{140} Whether UEFA would ever have a requirement for clubs to contribute to GFDPs in order to obtain their European license is outside the scope of this final project, and a philosophical question for another day.
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The responses received from both the survey and the case study tended to disprove all aspects of our hypothesis, as follows:

- **Hypothesis:** Only a limited number of European clubs have the organisational capabilities to consider undertaking GFDPs in foreign countries and the motivations for each individual club will differ depending on its size and brand recognition. Participation in GFDPs is not dependent upon a club being of a certain size. While the scale of GFDPs being funded is obviously dependent upon the resources available, many less well-known European clubs are active in this area, as can be seen through the membership of organisations such as the European Football Social Responsibility Network. This reinforces the conclusion that for many clubs, GFDPs in foreign countries is not something that is considered only when the club reaches a certain level of prominence but rather is seen to be an essential part of who the club is and what it stands for.

- **Hypothesis:** The primary aim of the club is either to increase the power of its brand on a national or international scale. Branding is not as important for clubs as was expected. The responses received suggest that around 10% of clubs are involved in GFDPs in foreign countries for global branding purposes (Question 23), however by and large branding is an afterthought. Even one of the most well known examples of GFDPs, Inter Campus, was kept a secret by the club and the Moratti family for the first ten years of its existence. While the marketing and communications divisions of football clubs may seek to leverage participation in GFDPs in foreign countries into positive publicity, this is very much a secondary concern in the large majority of cases.

- **Hypothesis:** Or the primary aim of the club is either to scout talented youngsters as future players. While scouting does take place in GFDPs and is the main purpose for 20% of the clubs interviewed (Question 17), for the majority of clubs this is not the main relevant consideration. For those few clubs, GFDPs are an opportunity to tap into hitherto underdeveloped talent pools – choice of location for these GFDPs is
based less on social, environmental or developmental need and more on assumptions as to areas most likely to produce high quality football players.

- **Hypothesis:** Where GFDPs are being undertaken without a primary expectation of branding or scouting benefits, this is in response to pressure being applied by external stakeholders. The driver of this participation in GFDPs in foreign countries is not pressure from external stakeholders. On the contrary, we found that external stakeholders are far less involved/interested in the clubs’ programs than we imagined. In discussions with clubs as well as foundations such as Scort, the general feeling was that unless the first team is involved, there is minimal interest from the majority of external stakeholders in GFDPs.

- The typical driver is rather internal stakeholders, usually a high-ranking board member or the club’s foundation. As has been stated elsewhere, “when it comes to CSR, professional sport, teams tend to be motivated by the beliefs held by top leaders”141. The cases of Internazionale (Massimo Moratti) and Werder Bremen (Klaus Dieter Fischer) are excellent examples of the way in which clubs can be introduced to the reality of running GFDPs through the work of one internal leader.

- There is a strong commitment to Corporate Social Responsibility for its own sake. Almost all respondents are already involved in CSR in their local community and almost half are participating in GFDPs in foreign countries. Only 15% of the clubs surveyed saw GFDPs as a profitable business activity (Question 13), showing that a failure to achieve a commercial return on investment is not the primary motivation for most clubs.

- Distinctions should be drawn between primary and secondary motivations. While relatively few clubs had any of scouting, brand management or revenue generation as their primary objective, it is illogical that professional clubs would turn their backs on such possibilities. In the majority of cases however, such considerations are secondary, and the ability of a club to leverage its work in GFDPs into commercial avenues should not be mistaken for the situation where these commercial opportunities are the primary motivation for participation in GFDPs in foreign

141 Hervé Blanchard, “Case Study of Corporate Social Responsibility & Social Integration Models adopted by Football Club Barcelona” (Barcelona: Universitat Ramon Llull, 2010). Much of the evidence cited by Blanchard comes from the American experience. Given the historical difference in attitudes towards, and the role of, philanthropy between the United States and Europe, we were reluctant to give too much weight to these findings in the first instance, however the data collected by this final project group leads us to the same conclusion.
countries.

6.1. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

As a result of this final project, our group would make the following recommendations:

- This subject should be monitored by UEFA. The work being done by European clubs as GFDPs in foreign countries is currently unregulated. None of the top administrative levels (FIFA, UEFA, ECA or the national associations) are presently willing to take the lead in this respect given demarcation disputes between the levels as to where the responsibility lies. UEFA currently has an effective licensing system in place that would be a practical means of determining, firstly, which clubs are active in this field and secondly, whether regulation is required. It is therefore recommended that GFDPs (both in a club’s home territory and in foreign countries) be included as a Category C requirement for the UEFA licensing system for season 2011/12 as a first step. The purpose of this recommendation is to fulfil an ‘audit’ type function, to enable a clear picture to develop of the current state of GFDPs being organised by European clubs.

- Further studies should be entered into to measure the results of GFDPs in foreign countries, as a way of determining their effectiveness and value. Assistance could be sought from governing bodies, research institutes or the private sector, or the model of Werder Bremen (which has entered into a relationship with Sportschule Koeln in order to assist with this monitoring and evaluation) could be adopted.

- For clubs entering into GFDPs, recommendations are as follows;

  - It is important that the clubs identify their own motivations for entering such programs from within the five motivations listed above, in order to achieve a strategic alignment
  - Finding a trustworthy and reliable local partner is crucial to achieving the club’s goals
  - There is no blueprint for success in this field. Every organisation consulted emphasised that flexibility is paramount in building a successful program.
It should be stressed that no moral judgement or preferences are being made with respect to a club’s reasons for taking part in GFDPs in foreign countries. Irrespective of motive GFDPs, if properly administered, bring an enhanced understanding and enjoyment of football to the communities affected, as well as raising participation levels. In the RCD Espanyol case study, for example, the club’s work in Nigeria is openly focused on scouting players yet this does not in any way take away the benefits received by approximately 800 children every year who would otherwise receive none of this football development assistance. The object of this analysis is not to say whether one motive is better than another, but rather to try and give an understanding of what is actually going on in this field, and why clubs are drawn to participate in GFDPs in foreign countries.
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### Appendix 1 – Academic Findings in CSR

#### Table I. Selected theoretical papers on CSR (REF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Theoretical Perspective</th>
<th>Key argument/result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friedman (1970)</td>
<td>Agency theory</td>
<td>CSR is indicative of self-serving behavior on the part of managers, and thus, reduces shareholder wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman (1984)</td>
<td>Stakeholder Theory</td>
<td>Managers should tailor their policies to satisfy numerous constituents, not just shareholders. These stakeholders include workers, customers, suppliers, and community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson and Davis (1991)</td>
<td>Stewardship theory</td>
<td>There is a moral imperative for managers to ‘do the right thing’, without regard to how such decisions affect firm performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson and Preston (1995)</td>
<td>Stakeholder theory</td>
<td>Stressed the moral and ethical dimensions of stakeholder theory, as well as the business case for engaging in CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones (1995)</td>
<td>Stakeholder theory</td>
<td>Firms involved in repeated transactions with stakeholders on the basis of trust and cooperation have an incentive to be honest and ethical, since such behavior is beneficial to the firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart (1995)</td>
<td>Resource-based view of the firm</td>
<td>For certain companies, environmental social responsibility can constitute a resource or capability that leads to a sustained competitive advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings and Zandbergen (1995)</td>
<td>Institutional theory</td>
<td>Institutions play an important role in shaping the consensus within a firm regarding the establishment of an ‘ecologically sustainable’ organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron (2001)</td>
<td>Theory of the firm</td>
<td>The use of CSR to attract socially responsible consumers is referred to as strategic CSR, in the sense that firms provide a public good in conjunction with their marketing/business strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feddersen and Gilligan (2001)</td>
<td>Theory of the firm</td>
<td>Activists and NGOs can play an important role in reducing information asymmetry with respect to CSR on the part of consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWilliams and Siegel (2001)</td>
<td>Theory of the firm</td>
<td>Presents a supply/demand perspective on CSR, which implies that the firm’s ideal level of CSR can be determined by cost-benefit analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWilliams et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Resource-based view of the firm</td>
<td>CSR strategies, when supported by political strategies, can be used to create sustainable competitive advantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waldman et al. (2004)  
Theory of the firm / strategic leadership theory  
Certain aspects of CEO leadership can affect the propensity of firms to engage in CSR. Companies run by intellectually stimulating CEOs do more strategic CSR than comparable firms.
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QUESTIONNAIRE

We are a group of post-graduate students researching grassroots football programs being carried out by professional European football clubs in foreign countries. The purpose of this questionnaire is to discover which clubs are working with these types of programs, why European football clubs are carrying these programs out, and what the clubs are hoping to gain from these programs.

By the phrase "grassroots football development programs", we mean community programs that encourage the development of young football players. The youth teams of your club are not included in this definition (e.g. Academies, Under Teams, Reserve Teams).

The survey is divided into four sections:

(i) In the first section you are asked five (5) questions about grassroots football development programs being carried out by your organisation and requested to tick either Yes or No.

(ii) In the second section you are given twenty five (25) statements concerning grassroots football development programs and are asked to respond on a scale of 1-5 according to how your club feels about this statement, using the following scale; 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neutral, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree.

(iii) In the third section, clubs involved in international grassroots football development programs are asked eight (8) open questions where you are requested to respond in as much detail as possible.

(iv) In the fourth section, clubs not currently involved in any international grassroots programs are asked five (5) open questions where you are requested to respond in as much detail as possible.

CONTACT DETAILS:

1. Please inform us your current position in the organisation and provide us with your contact details (telephone and e-mail).

SECTION 1

2. My organisation is involved in a grassroots football development program in its local community. Y( ) N( )
3. My organisation is involved in a grassroots football development program in a foreign
4. My organisation has discussed implementing grassroots football development programs with either foreign football federations, governments, non-government organisations, or confederations other than UEFA.  

5. My organisation has discussed implementing grassroots football development programs with its national federation, the European Club Association (ECA), UEFA, Association of European Professional Football Leagues (EPFL) or FIFA.

6. My organisation has discussed philanthropic programs and/or Corporate Social Responsibility with its national federation, the European Club Association (ECA), UEFA, Association of European Professional Football Leagues (EPFL) or FIFA.

SECTION 2

7. It is important for my organisation to be philanthropic because it is the right thing to do.
8. My organisation contributes to educational initiatives, school programs or charities.
9. The public expects sports teams to be socially responsible.
10. My organisation has a responsibility to its local community.
11. My organisation does not have a responsibility to the international community.
12. Philanthropy should be undertaken at the governing body (FIFA and/or UEFA) level rather than by individual clubs.
13. Grassroots football development programs carried out by clubs in foreign countries should be regulated by UEFA, the EPFL or the ECA.
14. If my club is relegated it will have the same commitment to Corporate Social Responsibility.
15. My organisation sees grassroots development programs as a profitable business activity.
16. External commercial partners and/or sponsors are involved in the grassroots development programs of my organization.
17. Scouting young players is not the main purpose of my organisation’s grassroots football development program.
18. All of our stakeholders (e.g. sponsors, fans, community, national association, partners) are adequately aware of my organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility programs.
19. My organisation's fans expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
20. My organisation's players expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
21. My organisation's sponsors demand that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
22. The local community of my organisation expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
23. Building a global brand for my organisation is not the main purpose of my organisation’s grassroots football development programs.
24. International grassroots football development programs will enable my organisation to build a bigger fan base.
25. Grassroots football development programs will result in higher total revenues for my organization.
26. Grassroots football development programs give the clubs a long-term competitive advantage on the field.

SECTION 3 - Details of your programs (only for clubs involved in international grassroots programs)

27. Other than the reasons already referred to above, please advise of any other reason why your organisation participates in grassroots football development programs in foreign countries.
28. Please provide details of any international grassroots football development programs that are currently being carried out by your organisation - where they are based, staffing, budget, commercial partners, objectives, plans of expansion, etc.
29. Where does international grassroots development sit within your organisation chart (e.g. marketing department, commercial department, technical department, community relations department, foundation, etc.)?
30. How does your organisation measure the success of its international grassroots football development initiatives (eg. commissioned research, surveys, feedback on website etc)?
31. Before commencing your programs, did you ask any of the following stakeholders about whether they believed it was important for your organisation to take part in grassroots football development programs in foreign countries? If so, what response did you receive:
   - Fans:
   - Sponsors:
   - Local Community:
   - Commercial Partners:
   - Players or coaching staff:
32. Have you seen any positive return on your investment in grassroots football development programs in foreign countries? If so, please provide details.
33. Does your organisation intend to increase/decrease/maintain the amount of funding and support it provides to your grassroots football development programs in foreign countries?
34. Have you ever offered a professional contract to a former participant of your international grassroots football program? If so, how many former participants?

SECTION 4 (only for clubs not involved in any international grassroots programs)

35. Does your organisation have any plans to carry out a grassroots football development program in a foreign country? If so, which countries would be your main targets and why?
36. What do you think would be the benefits for your organisation, if any, of carrying out a grassroots football development program in a foreign country?
37. Has your organisation ever conducted research or market analysis about starting an international grassroots football development program?
38. Are you monitoring what other clubs in your country are doing in relation to international grassroots programmes?

39. Have you asked any of the following stakeholders about the value they place on your organisation taking part in Corporate Social Responsibility program? If so, what response did you receive:

- Fans:
- Sponsors:
- Local Community:
- Commercial Partners:
- Players and coaching staff:
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QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FANS

We are a group of post-graduate students researching grassroots football programs being carried out by professional European football clubs in foreign countries. The purpose of this questionnaire is to discover which clubs are working with these types of programs, why European football clubs are carrying these programs out, and what the clubs are hoping to gain from these programs.

By the phrase "grassroots football development programs", we mean community programs that encourage the development of young football players. The youth teams of your club are not included in this definition (e.g. Academies, Under Teams, Reserve Teams).

1. My favourite club is involved with grassroots programmes in foreign countries.
   Y ( )  N ( )  I Don’t Know ( )

2. It is important for me that my favourite club have a strategic philanthropy program.
   Y ( )  N ( )

3. I would like to participate or be involved in the grassroots development programs of my favourite club.
   Y ( )  N ( )

4. As a fan I expect that my favourite club be involved in CSR programs.
   Y ( )  N ( )

5. In my opinion the grassroots programmes in foreign countries promoted by my favourite club is a way to have a better team in the future.
   Y ( )  N ( )

6. In my opinion the grassroots programmes in foreign countries promoted by my favourite club is a way of making more money.
   Y ( )  N ( )

7. If my favourite club cancels its grassroots programmes in foreign countries it will affect my behaviour towards the club.
   Y ( )  N ( )

8. My favourite club does not have any responsibility to the international community.
   Y ( )  N ( )

9. I would rather my favourite club spending more money on players than on CSR campaigns in foreign countries.
   Y ( )  N ( )
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Statistics - ALL

Raw Data

Raw Data show how often an answer to a question has been given. These data are being presented in absolute numbers (actual answers) and percentages. All answers to a question make a total of 100%.

Question 2
My organisation is involved in a grassroots football development program in its local community?
Total Probanden: 39

- Yes: 36 (92%)
- No: 3 (8%)

Question 3
My organisation is involved in a grassroots football development program in a foreign country.
Total Probanden: 39

- Yes: 17 (44%)
- No: 22 (56%)

Question 4
My organisation has discussed implementing grassroots football development programs with either foreign football federations, governments, non-government organisations, or confederations other than UEFA.
Total Probanden: 38

- Yes: 22 (58%)
**Question 5**
My organisation has discussed implementing grassroots football development programs with its national federation, the ECA (European Club Association), UEFA, EPFL (Association of European Professional Football Leagues) or FIFA.
Total Probanden: 36

- Yes: 17 (47%)
- No: 19 (53%)

**Question 6**
My organisation has discussed philanthropic programs and/or Corporate Social Responsibility with its national federation, the ECA (European Club Association), UEFA, EPFL (Association of European Professional Football Leagues) or FIFA.
Total Probanden: 34

- Yes: 16 (47%)
- No: 18 (53%)
### Question 7
It is important for my organisation to be philanthropic because it is the right thing to do.
Total Probanden: 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 8
My organisation contributes to educational initiatives, school programs or charities.
Total Probanden: 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 9
The public expects sports teams to be socially responsible.
Total Probanden: 34

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 2 (6%) neutral
- 14 (41%) agree
- 18 (53%) strongly agree

Question 10
My organisation has a responsibility to its local community.
Total Probanden: 33

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 0 (0%) neutral
- 9 (27%) agree
- 24 (73%) strongly agree
**Question 11**
My organisation does NOT have a responsibility to the international community.
Total Probanden: 33

- **strongly disagree**: 7 (21%)
- **disagree**: 16 (48%)
- **neutral**: 7 (21%)
- **agree**: 3 (9%)
- **strongly agree**: 0 (0%)

**Question 12**
Philanthropy should be undertaken at the governing body (FIFA and/or UEFA) level rather than by individual clubs.
Total Probanden: 35

- **strongly disagree**: 2 (6%)
- **disagree**: 17 (49%)
- **neutral**: 10 (29%)
- **agree**: 3 (9%)
- **strongly agree**: 3 (9%)
**Question 13**
Grassroots football development programs carried out by clubs in foreign countries should be regulated by UEFA, the EPFL or the European Clubs Association (ECA).

Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 6 (17%) disagree
- 14 (40%) neutral
- 14 (40%) agree
- 1 (3%) strongly agree

**Question 14**
If my club is relegated it will have the same commitment to corporate social responsibility.

Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 1 (3%) disagree
- 4 (11%) neutral
- 18 (51%) agree
- 12 (34%) strongly agree
**Question 15**
My organisation sees grassroots programs as a profitable business activity.
Total Probanden: 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 16**
External commercial partners or sponsors are involved in the grassroots development programs of my organization.
Total Probanden: 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 17
Scouting young players is NOT the main purpose of my organisation’s grassroots football development program.
Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 7 (20%) disagree
- 2 (6%) neutral
- 13 (37%) agree
- 13 (37%) strongly agree

Question 18
All of our stakeholders (e.g. sponsors, fans, community, national association, partners) are adequately aware of my organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility programs.
Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 4 (11%) disagree
- 8 (23%) neutral
- 19 (54%) agree
- 4 (11%) strongly agree
Question 19
My organisation’s fans expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 2 (6%) disagree
- 5 (14%) neutral
- 23 (66%) agree
- 5 (14%) strongly agree

Question 20
My organisation’s players expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 35

- 1 (3%) strongly disagree
- 2 (6%) disagree
- 15 (43%) neutral
- 14 (40%) agree
- 3 (9%) strongly agree
**Question 21**
My organisation's sponsors demand that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 5 (14%) disagree
- 9 (26%) neutral
- 18 (51%) agree
- 3 (9%) strongly agree

**Question 22**
The local community of my organisation expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 1 (3%) disagree
- 4 (11%) neutral
- 21 (60%) agree
- 9 (26%) strongly agree
Question 23
Building a global brand for my organisation is NOT the main purpose of my organisation's grassroots football development programs.
Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 4 (11%) disagree
- 6 (17%) neutral
- 19 (54%) agree
- 6 (17%) strongly agree

Question 24
International grassroots football development programs will enable my organisation to build a bigger fan base.
Total Probanden: 35

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 5 (14%) disagree
- 6 (17%) neutral
- 19 (54%) agree
- 5 (14%) strongly agree
Question 25
Grassroots football development programs will result in higher total revenues for my organization.
Total Probanden: 34

- 1 (3%) strongly disagree
- 5 (15%) disagree
- 16 (47%) neutral
- 11 (32%) agree
- 1 (3%) strongly agree

Question 26
Grassroots football development programs give the clubs a long-term competitive advantage on the field.
Total Probanden: 35

- 1 (3%) strongly disagree
- 4 (11%) disagree
- 9 (26%) neutral
- 16 (46%) agree
- 5 (14%) strongly agree
If your club is currently carrying out grassroots programs in foreign countries please click "Section 3" If your club is not carrying out grassroots programs in foreign countries please click "Section 4"

Total Probanden: 35

- 12 (34%) Section 3
- 23 (66%) Section 4
Statistics – TOP CLUBS

Raw Data

Raw Data show how often an answer to a question has been given. These data are being presented in absolute numbers (actual answers) and percentages. All answers to a question make a total of 100%.

Question 2
My organisation is involved in a grassroots football development program in its local community?
Total Probanden: 9

- Yes: 8 (89%)
- No: 1 (11%)

Question 3
My organisation is involved in a grassroots football development program in a foreign country.
Total Probanden: 9

- Yes: 5 (56%)
- No: 4 (44%)

Question 4
My organisation has discussed implementing grassroots football development programs with either foreign football federations, governments, non-government organisations, or confederations other than UEFA.
Total Probanden: 9

- Yes: 4 (44%)
**Question 5**
My organisation has discussed implementing grassroots football development programs with its national federation, the ECA (European Club Association), UEFA, EPFL (Association of European Professional Football Leagues) or FIFA.
Total Probanden: 9

![Pie chart showing 56% No and 44% Yes](image)

- Yes: 5 (56%)
- No: 4 (44%)

**Question 6**
My organisation has discussed philanthropic programs and/or Corporate Social Responsibility with its national federation, the ECA (European Club Association), UEFA, EPFL (Association of European Professional Football Leagues) or FIFA.
Total Probanden: 9

![Pie chart showing 33% Yes and 67% No](image)

- Yes: 3 (33%)
- No: 6 (67%)
**Question 7**
It is important for my organisation to be philanthropic because it is the right thing to do.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 0 (0%) neutral
- 0 (0%) agree
- 9 (100%) strongly agree

**Question 8**
My organisation contributes to educational initiatives, school programs or charities.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 0 (0%) neutral
- 1 (11%) agree
- 8 (89%) strongly agree
Question 9
The public expects sports teams to be socially responsible.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 1 (11%) neutral
- 3 (33%) agree
- 5 (56%) strongly agree

Question 10
My organisation has a responsibility to its local community.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 0 (0%) neutral
- 0 (0%) agree
- 9 (100%) strongly agree
**Question 11**

My organisation does NOT have a responsibility to the international community.
Total Probanden: 9

- 4 (44%) strongly disagree
- 3 (33%) disagree
- 2 (22%) neutral
- 0 (0%) agree
- 0 (0%) strongly agree

**Question 12**

Philanthropy should be undertaken at the governing body (FIFA and/or UEFA) level rather than by individual clubs.
Total Probanden: 9

- 1 (11%) strongly disagree
- 5 (56%) disagree
- 1 (11%) neutral
- 2 (22%) agree
- 0 (0%) strongly agree
**Question 13**
Grassroots football development programs carried out by clubs in foreign countries should be regulated by UEFA, the EPFL or the European Clubs Association (ECA).

Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 3 (33%) disagree
- 2 (22%) neutral
- 4 (44%) agree
- 0 (0%) strongly agree

**Question 14**
If my club is relegated it will have the same commitment to corporate social responsibility.

Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 1 (11%) neutral
- 1 (11%) agree
- 7 (78%) strongly agree
My organisation sees grassroots programs as a profitable business activity.

**Total Probanden:** 8

- **Strongly disagree:** 3 (38%)
- **Disagree:** 3 (38%)
- **Neutral:** 2 (25%)
- **Agree:** 0 (0%)
- **Strongly agree:** 0 (0%)

External commercial partners or sponsors are involved in the grassroots development programs of my organization.

**Total Probanden:** 9

- **Strongly disagree:** 1 (11%)
- **Disagree:** 1 (11%)
- **Neutral:** 2 (22%)
- **Agree:** 3 (33%)
- **Strongly agree:** 2 (22%)
**Question 17**
Scouting young players is NOT the main purpose of my organisation’s grassroots football development program.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 1 (11%) disagree
- 1 (11%) neutral
- 2 (22%) agree
- 5 (56%) strongly agree

**Question 18**
All of our stakeholders (e.g. sponsors, fans, community, national association, partners) are adequately aware of my organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility programs.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 1 (11%) disagree
- 1 (11%) neutral
- 6 (67%) agree
- 1 (11%) strongly agree
My organisation’s fans expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.

Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 2 (22%) neutral
- 5 (56%) agree
- 2 (22%) strongly agree

Question 20
My organisation's players expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 3 (33%) neutral
- 6 (67%) agree
- 0 (0%) strongly agree
**Question 21**
My organisation’s sponsors demand that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 1 (11%) disagree
- 2 (22%) neutral
- 4 (44%) agree
- 2 (22%) strongly agree

**Question 22**
The local community of my organisation expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 1 (11%) neutral
- 5 (56%) agree
- 3 (33%) strongly agree
Question 23
Building a global brand for my organisation is NOT the main purpose of my organisation’s grassroots football development programs.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 1 (11%) disagree
- 1 (11%) neutral
- 5 (56%) agree
- 2 (22%) strongly agree

Question 24
International grassroots football development programs will enable my organisation to build a bigger fan base.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 2 (22%) disagree
- 1 (11%) neutral
- 4 (44%) agree
- 2 (22%) strongly agree
Question 25
Grassroots football development programs will result in higher total revenues for my organization.
Total Probanden: 8

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 4 (50%) disagree
- 4 (50%) neutral
- 0 (0%) agree
- 0 (0%) strongly agree

Question 26
Grassroots football development programs give the clubs a long-term competitive advantage on the field.
Total Probanden: 9

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 3 (33%) disagree
- 0 (0%) neutral
- 6 (67%) agree
- 0 (0%) strongly agree
If your club is currently carrying out grassroots programs in foreign countries please click "Section 3" If your club is not carrying out grassroots programs in foreign countries please click "Section 4"

Total Probanden: 9

- 5 (56%) Section 3
- 4 (44%) Section 4

- a strongly disagree - 0(0%)
- b disagree - 3(33%)
- c neutral - 0(0%)
- d agree - 6(67%)
- e strongly agree - 0(0%)
Appendix 6
Statistics – SMALL CLUBS

Raw Data

Raw Data show how often an answer to a question has been given. These data are being presented in absolute numbers (actual answers) and percentages. All answers to a question make a total of 100%.

Question 2
My organisation is involved in a grassroots football development program in its local community?
Total Probanden: 30

- Yes: 28 (93%)
- No: 2 (7%)

Question 3
My organisation is involved in a grassroots football development program in a foreign country.
Total Probanden: 30

- Yes: 12 (40%)
- No: 18 (60%)

Question 4
My organisation has discussed implementing grassroots football development programs with either foreign football federations, governments, non-government organisations, or confederations other than UEFA.
Total Probanden: 29
**Question 5**
My organisation has discussed implementing grassroots football development programs with its national federation, the ECA (European Club Association), UEFA, EPFL (Association of European Professional Football Leagues) or FIFA.
Total Probanden: 27

- Yes: 18 (62%)
- No: 11 (38%)

**Question 6**
My organisation has discussed philanthropic programs and/or Corporate Social Responsibility with its national federation, the ECA (European Club Association), UEFA, EPFL (Association of European Professional Football Leagues) or FIFA.
Total Probanden: 25

- Yes: 14 (52%)
- No: 13 (48%)
Question 7
It is important for my organisation to be philanthropic because it is the right thing to do.
Total Probanden: 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8
My organisation contributes to educational initiatives, school programs or charities.
Total Probanden: 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 9
The public expects sports teams to be socially responsible.
Total Probanden: 25

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 1 (4%) neutral
- 11 (44%) agree
- 13 (52%) strongly agree

Question 10
My organisation has a responsibility to its local community.
Total Probanden: 24

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 0 (0%) disagree
- 0 (0%) neutral
- 9 (38%) agree
- 15 (63%) strongly agree
**Question 11**
My organisation does NOT have a responsibility to the international community.
Total Probanden: 24

- 3 (13%) strongly disagree
- 13 (54%) disagree
- 5 (21%) neutral
- 3 (13%) agree
- 0 (0%) strongly agree

**Question 12**
Philanthropy should be undertaken at the governing body (FIFA and/or UEFA) level rather than by individual clubs.
Total Probanden: 26

- 1 (4%) strongly disagree
- 12 (46%) disagree
- 9 (35%) neutral
- 1 (4%) agree
- 3 (12%) strongly agree
Question 13
Grassroots football development programs carried out by clubs in foreign countries should be regulated by UEFA, the EPFL or the European Clubs Association (ECA).
Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 3 (12%) disagree
- 12 (46%) neutral
- 10 (38%) agree
- 1 (4%) strongly agree

Question 14
If my club is relegated it will have the same commitment to corporate social responsibility.
Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 1 (4%) disagree
- 3 (12%) neutral
- 17 (65%) agree
- 5 (19%) strongly agree
Question 15
My organisation sees grassroots programs as a profitable business activity.
Total Probanden: 26

- 3 (12%) strongly disagree
- 7 (27%) disagree
- 11 (42%) neutral
- 5 (19%) agree
- 0 (0%) strongly agree

Question 16
External commercial partners or sponsors are involved in the grassroots development programs of my organization.
Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 4 (15%) disagree
- 5 (19%) neutral
- 15 (58%) agree
- 2 (8%) strongly agree
**Question 17**
Scouting young players is NOT the main purpose of my organisation’s grassroots football development program. 
Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 6 (23%) disagree
- 1 (4%) neutral
- 11 (42%) agree
- 8 (31%) strongly agree

**Question 18**
All of our stakeholders (e.g. sponsors, fans, community, national association, partners) are adequately aware of my organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility programs. 
Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 3 (12%) disagree
- 7 (27%) neutral
- 13 (50%) agree
- 3 (12%) strongly agree
Question 19
My organisation's fans expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 2 (8%) disagree
- 3 (12%) neutral
- 18 (69%) agree
- 3 (12%) strongly agree

Question 20
My organisation's players expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Total Probanden: 26

- 1 (4%) strongly disagree
- 2 (8%) disagree
- 12 (46%) neutral
- 8 (31%) agree
- 3 (12%) strongly agree
**Question 21**

My organisation's sponsors demand that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.

Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 4 (15%) disagree
- 7 (27%) neutral
- 14 (54%) agree
- 1 (4%) strongly agree

**Question 22**

The local community of my organisation expect that we be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility.

Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 1 (4%) disagree
- 3 (12%) neutral
- 16 (62%) agree
- 6 (23%) strongly agree
Question 23
Building a global brand for my organisation is NOT the main purpose of my organisation’s grassroots football development programs.
Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 3 (12%) disagree
- 5 (19%) neutral
- 14 (54%) agree
- 4 (15%) strongly agree

Question 24
International grassroots football development programs will enable my organisation to build a bigger fan base.
Total Probanden: 26

- 0 (0%) strongly disagree
- 3 (12%) disagree
- 5 (19%) neutral
- 15 (58%) agree
- 3 (12%) strongly agree
Grassroots football development programs will result in higher total revenues for my organization.

Total Probanden: 26

1 (4%)  strongly disagree
1 (4%)  disagree
12 (46%) neutral
11 (42%) agree
1 (4%)  strongly agree

Grassroots football development programs give the clubs a long-term competitive advantage on the field.

Total Probanden: 26

1 (4%)  strongly disagree
1 (4%)  disagree
9 (35%) neutral
10 (38%) agree
5 (19%)  strongly agree
If your club is currently carrying out grassroots programs in foreign countries please click "Section 3" If your club is not carrying out grassroots programs in foreign countries please click "Section 4"

Total Probanden: 26

- Section 3: 7 (27%)  
- Section 4: 19 (73%)

- a strongly dis - 1 (4%)  
- b disagree - 1 (4%)  
- c neutral - 9 (35%)  
- d agree - 10 (38%)  
- e strongly agr - 6 (16%)