

## **The Negative Effects of Sports Sponsorship and its Relationship to the Purchasing Tendencies of Sports Club Fans**

**\*Dr/ Ahmed El-Sayed Ali El-Hosiny**

### **Introduction and Research Problem:**

Sports sponsorship has evolved from a more decision based primarily on the personal interests of managing sports clubs to being a strategic marketing and financing tool that is considered a vibrant and highly influential sector in the sports industry. Based on this development, sports sponsorship has become more diverse and linked to the actors in sports, both at the individual level. , clubs, sports federations, and is translated into the form of a common desire to link one of the economic institutions and sports institutions and achieve the goals and benefits expected for each of them.

Despite the recession and the general economic climate, sports sponsorship, which can be described as the “bed rock” of all sports marketing arrangements and procedures, continues to be a commonly used marketing tool for companies around the world. (6: 122)

The sports sponsorship market has grown strongly in recent years, as it was estimated at \$63.74 billion in 2023 and is expected to reach \$67.56 billion in 2024 at a compound annual growth rate of 6.0%, and by 2028 it is estimated to reach \$84.37 billion. At a growth rate of 5.7%, the growth of sports sponsorship in this period can be explained by increased brand visibility and recognition, increased fan

participation, globalization of sports, and the influence of social media. ((23) From the perspective of economic institutions, sports sponsorship has become the magic door to advertising and promoting their products, taking advantage of the emotional connection between the sporting event, the club, the team and its fans, which enables it to reach the target groups, especially after the consumer began to suffer from the abundance of advertising messages in the media, which is known With "media chaos."

On the other hand - for clubs - sports sponsorship constitutes an important financing tool that helps clubs meet their financial requirements, the most important of which is the wage bill for players and technical managers, as well as equipping sports facilities and providing the necessary equipment and tools to provide club services. (1:86)

The basis for the distinct success of sponsorship lies in the exchange of benefits between companies and sports institutions. As sports organizations seek money and in-kind services from sponsors, sponsors in turn seek increased brand awareness, improved image, hospitality opportunities, increased product experience and sales.(11:38)

Although the rationale on which companies decide to invest in sports

---

\* Asst. Prof.at Sport Management Department, Faculty of Physical Education, Mansoura University.

sponsorship varies widely and widely, what can be said is that the main motivation is no longer just increasing brand visibility and awareness, but also reaping a deeper and deeper emotional connection with the brand. fans and the team, and also enhance perceptions towards the sponsoring company. (15)

It should be noted that despite the positives associated with sponsorship, it has some negative effects. When sports organizations accept financial contributions from sponsors, they may implicitly give up some of their control, such as accepting changes in the form or rules of any sport, and the excessive influence of sponsors on organizations and sporting events. Decreased “fan status” due to excessive commercialization, negative perceptions associated with sponsors that may be linked to the reputation of the sporting entity. (11: 129)

Sports sponsorship outcomes are behavioral and cognitive outcomes, and include the following: purchasing behavior, consumer sentiment, and attitudes toward the sponsoring brand; brand associations; trademark rights; Brand loyalty; and purchase intentions.(24, 2)

Fan attitudes can be divided into three stages. The first stage is “cognitive”: where consumers collect information about brands. The second stage is “affective”: where consumers begin to attach feelings and feelings toward a particular brand. The third and final stage is the “behavioral” stage. Conative: Fans show loyalty towards a brand and have the

motivation/desire to do something. Bridge Walter (8:56, 57)

Purchasing trends are one of the most commonly used sponsorship outcomes to measure sponsorship effectiveness. Sponsorship changes consumers' responses toward a specific sponsor, and leads to the development of positive attitudes toward the sponsor, which in turn leads to increased consumer willingness to purchase the sponsor's products. (14: 400)

From another perspective, we find that there are negative attitudes shown by fans towards sponsors. First, there may be external, uncontrollable events related to the sponsor. These events are unexpected in nature, which leads to negative perceptions regardless of the sponsor's efforts to improve them. Such as the emergence of a corruption case, the negative effects can affect the image of the sponsor and the club. Second: Negative perceptions of specific categories of fans essentially carry negative attitudes towards the sponsor. . This means that negativity is not spread across the entire market but rather concentrated within specific groups. (19:362)

The academic community has made great efforts to analyze and evaluate the potential benefits of sponsorship for sports companies and institutions, such as the study Luchengm, H. & Ting-ting, Z. 2007, Runsbeck, A. & Sjolín, D. (2011), Biscaia et al 2013, Grohs, R. et al (2015), Ahmed El Hosiny (2016), Reem Muhammad Abdel Tawab (2021), Li, J. Gu, Z. and Dai, Y. (2022) However, there has been little attention to the negative effects resulting from

the sponsorship relationship between companies and sports clubs. Therefore, this research aims to identify the most important negative effects of sports sponsorship and their relationship to the purchasing trends of fans.

### **Research terms**

#### **Sports sponsorship:**

A commercial relationship in which a monetary or qualitative fee is paid to any sporting organization or sporting event in exchange for access to the investable commercial potential associated with that organization or event. (12: 286)

#### **Purchasing tendencies :**

They are positive or negative attitudes that fans take towards the products or services of the club sponsors, and include the cognitive dimension, the emotional dimension, and the behavioral dimension.

#### **Research Goal:**

The research aims to identify the negative effects of sports sponsorship and its relationship to the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans by answering the following questions:

#### **Research questions:**

1. What are the most important negative effects of sports sponsorship from the point of view of sports club fans?
2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans?
3. What is the impact of the negative effects of sports sponsorship (administrative interference, conflicts of interest, increasing

commercialization, competitive balance, bias and corruption) on the purchasing tendencies of fans of sports clubs?

4. Are there statistically significant differences in the negative effects of sports sponsorship and its relationship to the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans due to the variable (type)?

5. Is there a statistically significant difference in the negative effects of sports sponsorship and its relationship to the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans due to the variable (age)?

#### **Search variables:**

**Independent variable:** negative effects and included (administrative interference, conflict of interest, commercialization, competitive balance, bias and corruption)

**The dependent variable:** purchasing trends and included the following axes (cognitive dimension, perceptual dimension, behavioral dimension)

#### **Search procedures:**

#### **Research Methodology:**

The researcher used the descriptive method (survey method)  
Population and research sample:

#### **research community:**

The research community consists of sports club fans.

#### **The research sample:**

The researcher randomly selected the research sample from fans of sports clubs in the Arab Republic of Egypt, and its number reached (546) fans, with (50) fans for the survey sample and (473) fans for the basic study sample. A number of (23) forms were excluded because they did not meet the application requirements.

**Table (1)**  
**Numbers and percentages for the research sample, n=(523)**

No	Variables		Exploratory sample		Basic sample	
			Number	Percentage%	Number	Percentage%
1	Gender	Male	34	%68	359	%75.8
		Female	16	%32	114	%24.2
2	Duration of club fandom	Less than	15	%30	191	%40.3
		From 5 to	23	%46	217	%45.9
		Greater	12	%16	65	%13.8
3	Total		50	%100	473	%100

#### **Data Collection Tools:**

The researcher used the following data collection tools:

- Reviewing research and scientific references related to sports sponsorship and purchasing trends.
- Questionnaire on the negative effects of sports sponsorship.
- Questionnaire on the purchasing trends of sports club fans.

#### **Pilot Study:**

To verify the suitability of the questionnaire statements, the researcher applied the negative effects questionnaire and the purchasing trends questionnaire (Appendix 1, Appendix 3) to a pilot sample consisting of 50 fans from within the research community and outside the main study sample. The researcher used internal consistency validity by finding the correlation coefficients between each statement and the total score of the axis it represents, the total

score of the questionnaire, the correlation coefficients between the axes themselves, and the correlation coefficients between the total score of each axis and the total score of the questionnaire.

#### **First: Internal Consistency Validity of the Negative Effects of Sports Sponsorship Questionnaire:**

The researcher used internal consistency validity to calculate the validity of the statements and dimensions of the questionnaire by finding the correlation coefficient between each statement and the total score of the dimension it represents and the total score of the questionnaire, as well as between the dimensions of the questionnaire and between the total score of each dimension and the total score of the questionnaire, as shown in the following tables:

**Table (2)**  
**Internal Consistency Validity of the Negative Effects of Sports Sponsorship Questionnaire (n=50)**

Administrative Intervention			Conflict of Interest			commercialization		
phrases	axis	questionnaire	phrases	axis	questionnaire	phrases	axis	questionnaire
1	*0.629	*0.627	6	*0.539	*0.530	11	*0.708	*0.622
2	*0.476	*0.467	7	*0.567	*0.549	12	*0.672	*0.561
3	*0.732	*0.726	8	*0.681	*0.649	13	*0.583	*0.609
4	*0.478	*0.504	9	*0.650	*0.572	14	*0.566	*0.435
5	*0.733	*0.660	10	*0.589	*0.510	15	0.157	0.122
competitive balance			bias and corruption					
16	*0.571	*0.516	20	*0.770	*0.719			
17	*0.655	*0.562	21	*0.561	*0.515			
18	*0.537	*0.464	22	*0.690	*0.645			
19	*0.583	*0.528	23	0.136	0.011			
			24	*0.642	*0.585			

\* value of tabular "R" at a significant level of 0.05 = 0.273

It is clear from Table (2), that there is a statistically significant correlation between the questionnaire statements and the total score of the corresponding dimension and the total score of the questionnaire. The calculated correlation coefficient (r) values are greater than the critical values at a significance level of 0.05, indicating the validity of these statements. It is also evident that there is no correlation for statement number

(15) with the commercialization dimension, as the calculated (r) value was lower than the critical (r) value at a significance level of 0.05, indicating the lack of validity of these statements. Similarly, there is no correlation for statement number (23) with the bias and corruption dimension, as the calculated (r) value was lower than the critical (r) value at a significance level of 0.05, indicating the lack of validity of these statements.

**Table (3)**  
**Correlation Coefficients Between Dimensions, Between Dimensions and Total Score of the Negative Effects of Sports Sponsorship Questionnaire (n=50)**

axis	Administrative Intervention	Conflict of Interest	commercialization	competitive balance	bias and corruption	Total score
Administrative Intervention		*0.876	*0.887	*0.849	*0.808	*0.839
Conflict of Interest			*0.850	*0.811	*0.765	*0.814
commercialization				*0.767	*0.803	*0.808
competitive balance					*0.771	*0.767
bias and corruption						*0.747
Total score						

\* value of tabular "R" at a significant level of 0.05 = 0.273

It is clear from Table (3) that there is Table (3) illustrates the statistically significant correlation between the score of each dimension and the total score of the questionnaire, as the calculated correlation coefficient (r) values are greater than the critical values at a significance level of 0.05. This indicates the internal consistency validity of the questionnaire.

#### **Stability of Negative Effects of Sports Sponsorship Questionnaire**

#### **factors affecting financial performance questionnaire:**

To verify the Stability of the questionnaire, the researcher applied it to a sample within and outside the primary study sample, consisting of 50 items. The researcher used Cronbach's alpha coefficient and Guttman split-half coefficient, as well as Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, to calculate the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire.

**Table (4)**  
**stability of the Negative Effects of Sports Sponsorship Questionnaire (n=50)**

Axis	correlation coefficient		
	Gittman stability	Spearman-Brown	Cronbach's alpha
Administrative Intervention	0.785	0.772	0.760
Conflict of Interest	0.815	0.811	0.770
Commercialization	0.788	0.780	0.707
competitive balance	0.740	0.740	0.788
bias and corruption	0.738	0.725	0.787
Total score	0.953	0.949	0.931

\* value of tabular "R" at a significant level of 0.05 = 0.273

It is clear from Table (4) questionnaire stability and its axes was 0.931 using Cronbach's alpha method, 0.953 using Guttman's split-half method, and 0.949 using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. The internal consistency coefficient for all dimensions was significant, indicating a high reliability coefficient of the questionnaire under study.

#### **Second: Internal Consistency Validity of the Purchasing Trends Questionnaire for Sports Club Fans:**

The researcher used internal consistency validity to assess the

validity of the statements and dimensions of the questionnaire by finding the correlation coefficient between each statement and the total score of the dimension it represents and the total score of the questionnaire. Additionally, the researcher examined the correlation coefficients between the dimensions of the questionnaire, between each dimension, and between the total score of each dimension and the total score of the questionnaire, as illustrated in the following tables.

**Table (5)**  
**Internal Consistency Validity of the Purchasing Trends Questionnaire for Sports Club Fans (n=50)**

cognitive dimension			emotional dimension			behavioral dimension		
phrases	axis	questionnaire	phrases	axis	questionnaire	phrases	axis	questionnaire
1	*0.506	*0.460	5	*0.610	*0.562	8	*0.612	*0.576
2	*0.579	*0.522	6	*0.449	*0.448	9	*0.646	*0.600
3	*0.695	*0.662	7	*0.650	*0.599	10	0.198	0.102
4	*0.517	*0.482				11	*0.411	*0.391

\* value of tabular "R" at a significant level of 0.05 = 0.273

It is clear from Table (5), that there is a statistically significant correlation between the questionnaire statements and the total score of the corresponding dimension and the total score of the questionnaire, as the calculated correlation coefficient (r) values are greater than the critical values at a significance level of 0.05.

This indicates the validity of these statements. It is also evident that there is no correlation for statement number (10) with the behavioral dimension, as the calculated (r) value was lower than the critical (r) value at a significance level of 0.05, indicating the lack of validity of this statement.

**Table (6)**  
**Correlation Coefficients Between Dimensions, Between Dimensions and Total Score of the Purchasing Trends Questionnaire for Sports Club Fans (n=50)**

Axis	cognitive dimension	emotional dimension	behavioral dimension	Total Score
cognitive dimension		*0.869	*0.847	*0.889
emotional dimension			*0.862	*0.897
behavioral dimension				*0.873
Total Score				

\* value of tabular "R" at a significant level of 0.05 = 0.273

It is clear from Table (6) that there is statistically significant correlation between the score of each dimension and the total score of the questionnaire, as the calculated correlation coefficient (r) values are greater than the critical values at a significance level of 0.05. This indicates the internal consistency validity of the questionnaire.

**Stability of Purchasing Trends Questionnaire for Sports Club Fans questionnaire**

To verify the Stability of the questionnaire, the researcher applied it to a sample within and outside the primary study sample, consisting of 50 fans. The researcher used Cronbach's alpha coefficient, Guttman split-half coefficient, and Spearman-Brown prophecy formula to calculate the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire.

**Table (7)**  
**stability of the Purchasing Trends Questionnaire for Sports Club Fans (n=50)**

Axis	correlation coefficient		
	Gittman stability	Spearman-Brown	Cronbach's alpha
cognitive dimension	0.837	0.839	0.802
emotional dimension	0.839	0.844	0.801
behavioral dimension	0.805	0.809	0.767
Total Score	0.924	0.928	0.922

It is clear from Table (7) stability of questionnaire and its axes as stability coefficient value using was 0.922 using Cronbach's alpha method, 0.924 using Guttman's split-half method, and 0.928 using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. The internal consistency coefficient for all dimensions was significant, indicating a high reliability coefficient of the questionnaire under study

#### Basic Study:

After conducting the scientific procedures for validity and reliability, the researcher applied the two final

questionnaires, as attached (Appendix 2) and (Appendix 4), to the main research sample consisting of 473 participants during the period from January 10, 2024, to February 10, 2024. Upon completion of the application, the data was organized, compiled, and tabulated to conduct the appropriate statistical analyses.

**Results presentation and discussion of first question: What are the most significant negative effects of sports sponsorship on the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans?**

**Table (8)**  
**Statistical Significance of the Opinions of the Research Sample on the Negative Effects of Sports Sponsorship and the Purchasing Behaviors of Sports Club Fans (N=473)**

Phrases		yes		to some extent		No		Mean	odds ratio	ranking
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
The negative effects of sports sponsorship	Administrative Intervention	239	50.53	144	30.44	90	19.03	1.68	%56.17	2
	Conflict of Interest	270	57.00	162	34.29	41	8.71	1.52	%50.57	3
	commercialization	241	50.95	112	23.63	120	25.42	1.74	%58.16	1
	competitive balance	277	58.51	155	32.77	41	8.72	1.50	%50.07	4
	bias and corruption	316	66.70	110	23.26	47	9.99	1.43	%47.75	5
The purchasing behaviors of sports club fans	cognitive dimension	176	37.16	202	42.76	95	20.08	1.83	%60.98	1
	emotional dimension	193	40.80	197	41.65	83	17.55	1.77	%58.91	2
	behavioral dimension	244	51.59	166	35.17	63	13.25	1.62	%53.89	3



It is clear from Table (8) that the average responses of the research sample on the negative effects of sports sponsorship ranged between (1.43) with a weighting percentage of (47.75%) for the "Bias and Corruption" axis. The researcher attributes the "Bias and Corruption" axis receiving the lowest weighting percentage from the perspective of the research sample to the fact that, despite the various forms of bias and corruption in sports—such as bribing referees, forging sports tournament results, and money laundering—these are not new issues. However, the secretive nature of bias and corruption has made it difficult to uncover many of these actions, especially those related to sponsorship.

In this regard, Brooks, G., Lee, J., and Kim, H. (2012) point out that sports are a commercial activity that exhibits the same types of corruption and fraud as business activities everywhere, including payroll and procurement fraud, election rigging, tax evasion, and, most notably, match-fixing. (9: 84)

The "Commercialization" axis received the highest weighting percentage (58.16%). The researcher attributes this result to the conflicts between the interests of sponsors and the interests of the club, which may lead to an excessive focus on money and profits at the expense of true sports values such as sportsmanship and fair competition. This, in turn, raises fans' concerns that the spread of sponsorship in elite sports and the accompanying commercialization might, in the long

run, lead to an erosion of the fan base, which is essential for sports.

This is consistent with Crompton, J. (2014), who, despite acknowledging that sponsorship money has become a steady source of revenue for many sports clubs, notes four possible negative outcomes for entities that might be associated with them. Excessive commercialization is one of the most significant negative effects. (11: 129)

Additionally, the average responses of the research sample on the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans ranged between (1.62) with a weighting percentage of (53.89%) for the "Behavioral Dimension" axis and (1.83) with a weighting percentage of (60.98%) for the "Cognitive Dimension" variable. The researcher attributes the "Cognitive Dimension" receiving the highest rank to the fact that fans' interaction with sponsors goes through several stages, starting from awareness of the sponsors to the likelihood of purchasing and finally making an actual purchase. Fans' awareness of sponsors positively or negatively affects their attitudes toward the sponsors.

The researcher attributes the "Affective Dimension" receiving the second rank to the fact that fans' purchasing behavior is influenced by the team's achievements, awareness of sponsorship, and the positive motivations that fans perceive in sponsors, which may lead them to show more loyalty and empathy towards the sponsor. Sports sponsorship can improve fans' perception of sponsoring brands, which

can, in turn, enhance fans' purchasing behavior.

The researcher attributes the "Behavioral Dimension" receiving the third rank with the lowest weighting percentage to the fact that fans' purchasing behavior decreases when the sponsor's motive is perceived as self-serving, such as achieving profits at the expense of the club and its fans. This negatively impacts their purchasing behaviors and higher purchase intentions. If consumers perceive that the sponsorship is driven by selfish motives, it weakens their purchase intentions for the sponsor's products.

This is consistent with the study by Islam Raafat (2017), which

confirmed that economic institutions aiming to maximize the benefits of sports sponsorship must focus on achieving a positive impact on brand awareness, as it significantly influences the attitude toward the sponsor. It is necessary for the image of the sponsoring brands to align with the status of the sports clubs among their fans and members to achieve sponsorship objectives. (2)

**Results presentation and discussion of second question: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans?**

**Table (9)**  
**Correlation coefficients between the negative effects of sports sponsorship and purchasing behaviors of sports club fans (N = 473)**

Axis		purchasing behaviors of sports club fans			
		cognitive dimension	emotional dimension	behavioral dimension	Total Score
The negative effects of sports sponsorship	Administrative Intervention	0.926	0.972	0.963	0.980
	Conflict of Interest	0.975	0.908	0.929	0.963
	commercialization	0.950	0.948	0.947	0.975
	competitive balance	0.985	0.903	0.915	0.961
	bias and corruption	0.951	0.890	0.918	0.962
	Total Score	0.984	0.945	0.954	0.988

\* value of tabular "R" at a significant level of 0.05 = 0.095

**-It is clear from Table (9), that:**

- There is a statistically significant positive correlation between the negative effects of sports sponsorship (administrative intervention, conflict of

interest, commercialization, competitive balance, bias and corruption) and the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans. The

calculated correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was greater than the critical value at the 0.05 level and amounted to 0.988.

- There is a statistically significant positive correlation between administrative intervention and the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans, where the calculated correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was greater than the critical value at the 0.05 level and amounted to 0.980.

- There is a statistically significant positive correlation between conflict of interest and the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans, where the calculated correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was greater than the critical value at the 0.05 level and amounted to 0.963.

- There is a statistically significant positive correlation between commercialization and the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans, where the calculated correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was greater than the critical value at the 0.05 level and amounted to 0.975.

- There is a statistically significant positive correlation between competitive balance and the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans, where the calculated correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was greater than the critical value at the 0.05 level and amounted to 0.961.

- There is a statistically significant positive correlation between bias and corruption and the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans, where the calculated correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was greater than the critical value at the 0.05 level and amounted to 0.962.

**Results presentation and discussion of third question: What is the impact of the negative effects of sports sponsorship (administrative intervention, conflict of interest, increasing commercialization, competitive imbalance, bias, and corruption) on the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans?**

**Table (10)**  
**Simple linear regression analysis of the effect of administrative intervention on purchasing behaviors of sports club fans**

Independent variable	R	R2	Regression coefficient	Standard error	B value	T value	Significance Level	F value	Significance level
Fixed amount	0.975	0.951	3.914	0.164		23.805	0.000	9140.619	0.000
Administrative Intervention			2.068	0.022	0.975	95.607	0.000		

Table (10) shows that the calculated "F" value is (9140.619), which is statistically significant at the 0.05 significance level, with a significance level of 0.00, indicating a significant effect of administrative intervention on the purchasing behaviors of sports club fans. This is further supported by the calculated "T"

value of (0.00), which is less than the study's default significance level of (0.05).

It also reveals a statistically significant relationship between administrative intervention and purchasing behaviors of sports club fans, with a correlation coefficient ( $R$ ) of (0.975). Moreover, there is a

statistically significant effect of administrative intervention by 95.10%, assuming the stability of other factors. This effect is statistically significant at the 0.05 significance level.

The researcher attributes these results to the fact that sports clubs often demand more from sponsors than what sponsors expect to achieve their own goals in return for their investment. This gives sponsors the right to intervene in some decisions to ensure the club fulfills its commitments

towards them. Additionally, sponsors often demand the club to assess the effectiveness of sponsorship and the extent to which their goals are achieved, which is crucial for sponsorship contract renewals.

This is consistent with the study by Huang, L. & Zhou, T. (2007), which indicated that imbalance between sponsors' motivations and sports entities' expectations increases administrative conflicts in sponsorship relationships.

**Table (11)**  
**Simple linear regression analysis of the effect of Conflict of Interest on purchasing behaviors of sports club fans**

Independent variable	R	R2	Regression coefficient	Standard error	B value	T value	Significance level	F value	Significance level
Fixed amount			3.030	0.212		14.295	0.000		
Conflict of Interest	0.963	0.928	2.019	0.026	0.963	77.884	0.000	6065.947	0.000

It is evident from Table (11) that the computed value of "F" is (60.65.947), which is statistically significant at a significance level of 0.05, with a significance level of 0.00, lower than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates the impact of conflicts of interest on the purchasing preferences of sports fans, as confirmed by the computed value of "T" and its significance level of (0.00), which is lower than the assumed study level of (0.05).

Additionally, there is a statistically significant relationship between conflicts of interest and purchasing preferences of sports fans, with a correlation coefficient (R) of (0.963). It is also evident that conflicts of interest have a statistically significant effect of (92.8%), assuming other factors remain constant,

significant at a significance level of 0.05.

The researcher attributes these results to the fact that sponsorship investments grant companies the right to associate with sports clubs. However, they often prioritize their personal interests and needs by gaining numerous benefits, especially when key decision-makers in sports clubs have special relationships with sponsors. As a result, they make decisions in favor of their commercial partners or sponsors, leading to conflicts of interest and creating situations of conflict. This aligns with a study by Saeed Ahmed Haj Issa (2013), which emphasized that sponsorship management must be based on scientifically strategic approaches in its administrative practices.(4)

**Table (12)**  
**Simple linear regression analysis of the effect of commercialization on purchasing behaviors of sports club fans**

Independent variable	R	R2	Regression coefficient	Standard error	B value	T value	Significance level	F value	Significance level
Fixed amount	0.980	0.961	0.860	0.172		4.987	0.000	11607.083	0.000
commercialization			2.076	0.019	0.980	107.736	0.000		

It is evident from Table (12) that the computed value of "F" is (11607.083), which is statistically significant at a significance level of 0.05, with a significance level of 0.00, lower than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates the impact of commercialization on the purchasing preferences of sports fans, as confirmed by the computed value of "T" and its significance level of (0.00), which is lower than the assumed study level of (0.05).

Additionally, there is a statistically significant relationship between commercialization and purchasing preferences of sports fans, with a correlation coefficient (R) of (0.980). It is also evident that commercialization has a statistically significant effect of (96.1%), assuming

other factors remain constant, significant at a significance level of 0.05. The researcher attributes these results to the excessive focus by sponsors on profits, which from the perspective of fans may sideline sporting values such as sportsmanship and fair competition.

This is reflected in increased ticket prices, reducing the ability of fans from different social classes to attend matches, excessive marketing campaigns, lack of focus on athletic performance, and using sports to sell products that fans may perceive as harmful to health. Consequently, fans' perceptions towards sponsors are negatively affected, influencing their purchasing preferences towards these products.

**Table (13)**  
**Simple linear regression analysis of the effect of competitive balance on purchasing behaviors of sports club fans**

Independent variable	R	R2	Regression coefficient	Standard error	B value	T value	Significance level	F value	Significance level
Fixed amount	0.961	0.923	3.577	0.213		16.792	0.000	5635.553	0.000
competitive balance			2.458	0.033	0.961	75.070	0.000		

It is evident from Table (13) that the computed value of "F" is (5635.553), which is statistically significant at a significance level of 0.05, with a significance level of 0.00, lower than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates the impact of

competitive balance on the purchasing preferences of sports fans, as confirmed by the computed value of "T" and its significance level of (0.00), which is lower than the assumed study level of (0.05).

Additionally, there is a statistically significant relationship between competitive balance and purchasing preferences of sports fans, with a correlation coefficient (R) of (0.961). It is also evident that competitive balance has a statistically significant effect of (92.3%), assuming other factors remain constant, significant at a significance level of 0.05. The researcher attributes these results to the perception of the research sample that sponsoring companies prefer to associate with highly popular sports clubs at the expense of smaller clubs, which reinforces inequality in competition.

As a result, fans of these clubs perceive sponsorships as hindering their team's development and their ability to compete for championships, leading to a sense of mere presence and domination of certain teams in winning championships. Consequently, fans' perceptions towards sponsors are negatively affected, influencing their purchasing preferences towards their products. This aligns with a study by Grohs, R. et al. (2015), which indicated that negative perceptions of the team adversely affect fans' perceptions towards sponsors, especially among fans with high levels of loyalty to their team.(13)

**Table (14)**  
**Simple linear regression analysis of the effect of bias and corruption on purchasing behaviors of sports club fans**

Independent variable	R	R2	Regression coefficient	Standard error	B value	T value	Significance level	F value	Significance level
Fixed amount			2.706	0.220		12.312	0.000		
bias and corruption	0.962	0.925	2.731	0.036	0.962	76.438	0.000	5842.843	0.000

It is evident from Table (14) that the calculated "F" value is (5842.843) and is statistically significant at the 0.05 significance level, where the significance level is 0.00, which is less than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates the impact of bias and corruption on the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans. This is confirmed by the calculated "T" value and its significance level of (0.00), which is less than the study's default level of (0.05).

It is also evident that there is a statistically significant relationship between the axis of bias and corruption and the purchasing tendencies of sports

club fans, with the correlation coefficient (R) reaching (0.962). Furthermore, there is a statistically significant effect of bias and corruption amounting to (92.5%) assuming other factors remain constant. This effect is statistically significant at the 0.05 significance level. The researcher believes that bias and corruption resulting from sports sponsorship pose serious threats to the sports industry and negatively affect its integrity and fairness if the club is associated with sponsors suspected of bias and corruption. This may harm the club's brand image and extend this disgraceful behavior to corruption within the sports clubs.

This aligns with the study by Taylor, L. (2012), which suggests that a sports team's fan base may feel moral outrage if their team is sponsored by exploitative companies that seemingly lack "ethical practices." (22)

This also aligns with the study by Crompton, J. (2015), which indicated that the political affiliations of sponsors, bias, and ignoring fans' perceptions of what they expect from "sponsors" are likely to lead to negative outcomes. (10)

**Results presentation and discussion of forth question: Are there**

**statistically significant differences in the negative effects of sports sponsorship and its relationship with the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans attributable to the variable (gender)**

The researcher used the "T-test" to statistically verify the validity of the question, aiming to determine the differences in the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans across its axes according to gender, as shown in Table (15).

**Table (15)**  
**Differences between the study sample scores on the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans according to gender (N=473).**

variables		Female N=114		Male N=359		T-value	Significance Level
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation		
negative effects of sports sponsorship	Administrative Intervention	7.265	2.261	12.079	2.027	*20.291	0.000
	Conflict of Interest	6.426	2.226	11.237	2.325	*19.888	0.000
	commercialization	5.696	2.122	11.018	1.408	*25.071	0.000
	competitive balance	5.056	1.902	9.009	1.621	*20.001	0.000
	bias and corruption	4.819	1.580	8.588	1.545	*22.311	0.000
	Total score	29.262	9.822	51.930	8.342	*22.224	0.000
the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans	cognitive dimension	4.819	1.580	8.588	1.545	*22.311	0.000
	emotional dimension	6.460	2.001	10.018	1.248	*17.905	0.000
	behavioral dimension	4.535	1.412	7.719	1.179	*21.791	0.000
	Total score	15.813	4.751	26.325	3.804	*21.528	0.000

It is evident from Table (15) that there are differences between the study sample scores on the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans at the 0.05 level, according to gender, in favor of males. The "T" values were (2.60, 2.74) respectively,

which are statistically significant values. The researcher attributes this result to the fact that the majority of highly loyal fans, who regularly attend matches and are characterized by loyalty, passion, and a strong emotional attachment to the club, are males. This is in contrast to females,

despite the noticeable increase in the number of female fans and the number of women participating in sports.

**Are there statistically significant variance exist in the negative effects**

**of sports sponsorship and its relationship with the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans attributable to the variable (age)?**

**Table (16)**

**Differences between the study sample scores on the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans according to the duration of support (N=473).**

variables		Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	Significance Level
The negative effects of sports sponsorship	Administrative Intervention	Between	2,802.47	2	1,401.24	439.901	0.000
		Within	1,497.11	470	3.19		
		total	4,299.59	472			
	Conflict Interest of	Between	2,195.37	2	1,097.69	235.425	0.000
		Within	2,191.41	470	4.66		
		total	4,386.78	472			
	commercialization	Between	2,444.00	2	1,222.00	311.839	0.000
		Within	1,841.79	470	3.92		
		total	4,285.79	472			
	competitive balance	Between	1,410.67	2	705.34	216.207	0.000
		Within	1,533.29	470	3.26		
		total	2,943.97	472			
	bias and corruption	Between	1,152.15	2	576.08	218.410	0.000
		Within	1,239.67	470	2.64		
		total	2,391.82	472			
	Total score	Between	48,345.67	2	24,172.84	295.000	0.000
		Within	38,512.60	470	81.94		
		total	86,858.27	472			
the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans	cognitive dimension	Between	1,152.15	2	576.08	218.410	0.000
		Within	1,239.67	470	2.64		
		total	2,391.82	472			
	emotional dimension	Between	1,577.28	2	788.64	328.850	0.000
		Within	1,127.15	470	2.40		
		total	2,704.43	472			
	behavioral dimension	Between	1,076.40	2	538.20	376.771	0.000
		Within	671.37	470	1.43		
		total	1,747.77	472			
	Total score	Between	11,041.86	2	5,520.93	315.164	0.000
		Within	8,233.28	470	17.52		
		total	19,275.14	472			



It is evident from Table (16) that there are significant differences between the study sample scores on the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing tendencies of sports

club fans according to the duration of support at the 0.05 level of significance. The "F" values were (216.207, 439.901) respectively, which are statistically significant values.

**Table (17)**  
**Least significant differences between the means of duration of support (less than 5 years - 5 to 15 years - 15 years or more) (N=473).**

Variabels	Duration of club fandom	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Test			
					Less than 5 years	From 5 to 15 years	Greater than 15 years	
The negative effects of sports sponsorship	Administrative Intervention	Less than 5 years	191	5.953	2.143		-3.199	-7.309
		From 5 to 15 years	217	9.152	1.354			-4.109
		Greater than 15 years	65	13.262	1.890			
	Conflict Interest of	Less than 5 years	191	5.550	2.238		-2.455	-6.619
		From 5 to 15 years	217	8.005	1.877			-4.165
		Greater than 15 years	65	12.169	2.736			
	commercialization	Less than 5 years	191	4.618	1.865		-3.124	-6.751
		From 5 to 15 years	217	7.742	2.149			-3.627
		Greater than 15 years	65	11.369	1.692			
	competitive balance	Less than 5 years	191	4.429	1.754		-1.843	-5.340
		From 5 to 15 years	217	6.272	1.850			-3.497
		Greater than 15 years	65	9.769	1.809			
	bias and corruption	Less than 5 years	191	4.398	1.622		-1.441	-4.864
		From 5 to 15 years	217	5.839	1.595			-3.423
		Greater than 15 years	65	9.262	1.726			
Total score	Less than 5 years	191	24.948	9.547		-12.062	-30.883	
	From 5 to 15 years	217	37.009	8.540			-18.822	
	Greater than 15 years	65	55.831	9.221				
the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans	cognitive dimension	Less than 5 years	191	4.398	1.622		-1.441	-4.864
		From 5 to 15 years	217	5.839	1.595			-3.423
		Greater than 15 years	65	9.262	1.726			
	emotional dimension	Less than 5 years	191	5.277	1.864		-2.911	-5.123
		From 5 to 15 years	217	8.189	1.227			-2.211
		Greater than 15 years	65	10.400	1.487			
	behavioral dimension	Less than 5 years	191	3.754	1.454		-2.025	-4.508
		From 5 to 15 years	217	5.779	0.854			-2.483
		Greater than 15 years	65	8.262	1.326			
	Total score	Less than 5 years	191	13.429	4.762		-6.377	-14.494
		From 5 to 15 years	217	19.806	3.545			-8.117
		Greater than 15 years	65	27.923	4.349			

It is evident from Table (17) that there are significant differences between the means of the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans according to the duration of

support, favoring those supporting for 15 years or more across all survey items. The researcher attributes this result to the fact that the longer fans are associated with their club, the stronger their commitment and loyalty

grow. This naturally increases their interest and susceptibility to influence from the club's stakeholders, particularly sponsors. This finding aligns with Boyle, B. A., & Magnusson, P. (2007), which suggested that the stronger a person feels connected to any team, the greater the team's value to them, and the more willing they are to engage in its activities.

#### **Conclusions:**

1. The study found that the negative effects of sports sponsorship, from the perspective of the research sample, include exploitation, administrative intervention, conflict of interest, competitive imbalance, bias, and corruption.
2. There is a statistically significant positive relationship at the 0.05 level between the negative effects of sports sponsorship and the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans.
3. The variable of administrative intervention has a statistically significant impact of 95.1% on the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans, assuming other factors remain constant.
4. The variable of conflict of interest has a statistically significant impact of 92.8% on the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans, assuming other factors remain constant.
5. The variable of exploitation has a statistically significant impact of 96.1% on the purchasing tendencies of sports club fans, assuming other factors remain constant.
6. There are statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level attributed

to the gender variable in the purchasing tendencies, favoring males.

#### **Recommendations:**

1. Use the current research findings when entering into sponsorship contracts to manage potential risks and negatives effectively.
2. Ensure clarity on the true purpose of sponsorship and the expected returns on investment to all stakeholders before signing contracts to avoid potential negative impacts.
3. Sponsors should focus on activities that enhance their brand credibility to increase sales through positive perceptions.
4. Manage sports exploitation cautiously to preserve sportsmanship and core values, utilizing them for financial development and infrastructure.
5. Sports clubs should ensure alignment between potential sponsor brand images and their fans' expectations to achieve common goals.
6. Continuously measure fans' purchasing tendencies as a strong indicator of sponsor product consumption and a crucial factor in sponsorship negotiations.
7. Conduct comprehensive studies on potential sponsors before entering into sponsorship contracts to fulfill obligations towards sponsors effectively.

#### **References:**

##### **First: Arabic References:**

**1-Ahmed El Sayed Al Hosiny (2016):** The reality of sports sponsorship in the second division football clubs in the Arab Republic of Egypt. Volume 29, Journal of Sports Sciences, Minia University.

- 2- slam Raafat Abdou Eltantawi (2017).** The impact of sports sponsorship on the purchasing behavior of members of Al Ahly Club in Egypt. Unpublished master's thesis, College of Physical Education, Mansoura University.
- 3- Reem Mohamed Abdel-Tawab Hamad (2021).** The role of sports sponsorship in brand promotion. Article 5, Volume 10, Issue 10, Journal of Media Research and Communication Technology, South Valley University.
- 4- Sayed Ahmed Haj Issa (2013).** Sports sponsorship: Improving the image of economic institutions and fostering professionalism in sports institutions. Journal of Studies and Research, Issue 10, El Golea, Algeria. Second: English References:
- 5- Biscaia, R., Correia, A., Fernando, A, Rosado., Ross, S., & Maroco, J.(2013).** Sport Sponsorship: The Relationship Between Team Loyalty, Sponsorship Awareness, Attitude Toward the Sponsor, and Purchase Intentions, Journal of Sport Management, 2013, 27, 288-302.
- 6- Blackshaw, S, I. (2012).** Sports Marketing Agreements: Legal, Fiscal and Practical Aspects, Asser Press By Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Netherlands.
- 7- Boyle, B. A., & Magnusson, P. (2007).** Social identity and brand equity formation: A comparative study of collegiate sports fans. Journal of Sport Management, 21(4), 497–520.
- 8- Bridgewater, S. (2010).** Football Brands, Palgrave, Macmillan, London, UK.
- 9- Brooks, G. Lee, J. & Kim, H. (2012).** ‘Match-fixing in Korean Football: Corruption in the K-League and the Importance of Maintaining Sporting Integrity’, International Journal of Contents, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 82–88
- 10- Crompton., j. (2015).** Potential negative outcomes from sports sponsorship, Reasearh Paper International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship,P20:34
- 11- Crompton., j. (2014).**Sponsorship for Sport Managers, Fitness Information Technology, Inc, U.S.
- 12- Fetchko, M. Roy, D. & Clow, K. (2013).** Sports Marketing, Prentice Hall, U.S.A.
- 13- Grohs, R. Reisinger,H. & Woisetschläger, D.(2015).**Attenuation of negative sponsorship effects in the context of rival sports teams’ fans,European Journal of Marketing Vol. 49 No. 11/12, 2015 pp. 1880-1901
- 14- Harvery, B., Gray, S. and Despain, G. (2006),** “Measuring the effectiveness of true sponsorship”, Journal of Advertising Research, December, pp. 398-409.  
<https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/hospitality-leisure/pdf/changing-the-game-outlook-for-the-global-sports-market-to-2015.pdf>
- 15- Huang, L. & Zhou, T. (2007).** How to Build Successful Sponsorship Relationships: A Text Mining Approach, Second International Conference on Innovative Computing, Informatio and Control (ICICIC 2007), Kumamoto
- 16- Lee, J-Y.& Hyun, J-C.(2019).** The effect of sponsor's brand on consumer-brand relationship in sport

sponsorship, *Global Business & Finance Review (GBFR)*, ISSN 2384-1648, People & Global Business Association (P&GBA), Seoul, Vol. 24, Iss. 1, pp. 27-43,.

**17- Li, J. Gu, Z. & Dai, Y. (2022).** Impact of Sports Sponsorship Motivation on Consumer Purchase Intention: Mediating Effect Based on Consumer Attitude, Mediating Effect Based on Consumer Attitude. *Sustainability* 2022, 14, 15430. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142215430>

**18- Merkel, U. (2012),** "Football fans and clubs in Germany: conflicts, crises and compromises", *Soccer & Society*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 359-376.

**19- Runsbech, A. & Sjolind, D. (2011).** Negative effects of sponsorships A quantitative study on negative effects of image transfer through sponsorship in the U.K, Final Thesis of the European Business and Economics

Programme, Faculty of Business and Technology, Halmstad University

**20- Tanvir, A., & Shahid, M. (2012).** Impact of Sports Sponsorship on Brand Image and Purchase Intention, *Interdisciplinary Journal Of Contemporary Research In Business*, Vol 4, No 2.

**21- Taylor, L. (2012).** Alan Pardew: Wonga can propel Newcastle into Premier League top four. *Guardian*. October 10.

**22- The business research company. (2024).** sport sponsorship global market report, <https://www.thebusinessresearchcompany.com/report/sports-sponsorship-global-market-report>

**23- Woodside, F. M., & Summers, J. (2010).** The role of sponsor brand loyalty in sponsorship arrangements: Fmcg context. In *Anzmac 2010*, Christchurch, New Zealand.