

The Strategic Role of Sports Marketing in Sustaining Sports Sponsorship: An Integrated Empirical and Analytical Perspective

Dr. Bouhamid Isara

Laboratory of Local Authorities Management and Their Role in Achieving Development- Higher School of Commerce (Algeria) Email: Etd_bouhamidi@esc-alger.dz

Dr. Benine Abderrahmane

Laboratory of Economic and Human Development in Algeria, University of Blida 2 Algeria- Email: a.benine@univ-blida2.dz

Sereir El Hirts

Hayet Laboratory of Economic and Human Development in Algeria, University of Blida 2, Algeria- Email: h.sereir-elhirts@univ-blida2.dz

Received: 01/02/2026

Accepted: 01/09/2026

Published: 20/10/2026

Abstract

This comprehensive empirical study investigates the strategic mechanisms through which contemporary sports marketing practices foster the longitudinal sustainability of sports sponsorship agreements. The study addresses the fundamental transition from short-term transactional ad-placement models toward enduring collaborative alliances anchored in shared value co-creation. Employing an integrated descriptive-analytical design alongside structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) and multiple regression analysis, data were gathered from a purposive sample of 184 sports marketing executives, commercial directors, and corporate sponsorship managers across major sporting clubs, federations, and sponsoring multinational conglomerates. The empirical findings reveal a robust, statistically significant positive relationship ($p < 0.01$) between four core dimensions of sports marketing (smart experiential activation, strategic brand congruence/fit, advanced governance and ROO/ROI performance measurement, and ESG corporate sustainability) and the sustainability of sponsorship contracts, accounting for 68.4% of the explained variance in renewal intention and relational stability ($R^2 = 0.684$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.677$). Experiential digital fan-engagement activation and objective return-on-objectives (ROO) verification emerged as the strongest predictors in mitigating sponsor churn. Building on these empirical insights, the paper presents the Sustainable Sports Sponsorship Marketing (S3M) Matrix, a tailored Balanced Scorecard, and a critical analysis of research limitations and longitudinal research agendas to operationalize resilient sponsorship governance in volatile global markets.

Keywords: Strategic Sports Marketing, Sports Sponsorship Sustainability, Sponsorship Activation, Brand Fit, Return on Objectives (ROO), Sports Brand Equity, Shared Value Creation, PLS-SEM.

1. Introduction and Theoretical Background

Over the past two decades, the global sports economy has undergone profound structural transformations. Sport has evolved from a purely recreational, competitive, and social pursuit into a multibillion-dollar global industry that contributes significantly to gross domestic product worldwide. It intersects directly with digital media ecosystems, technology platforms, tourism infrastructure, and commercial investment services (Shank & Lyberger, 2015).

Within this accelerated commercialization, sports sponsorship has established itself as the financial lifeblood of modern sporting properties. It represents the foundational cornerstone of operational budgets for professional sports clubs, national governing bodies, continental and international championships, and the Olympic movement (Cornwell, 2014; Mullin et al., 2014).

Despite unprecedented historical peaks in global corporate sponsorship expenditures, the sector currently confronts an acute strategic dilemma. Continuous macroeconomic volatility, rapidly transforming digital consumption habits, and intensifying market competition have laid bare the structural fragility of conventional sponsorship models centered on unidirectional promotion and static asset purchasing. Merely affixing a corporate logo to a team jersey or occupying perimeter LED stadium signage is no longer sufficient to justify multimillion-dollar annual investments to corporate boards, particularly amidst escalating shareholder scrutiny demanding clear, auditable financial and strategic justification for every marketing dollar allocated (Walraven et al., 2014).

This dynamic has precipitated an alarming structural phenomenon known as sponsor churn and turnover. Contemporary empirical investigations indicate that between 45% and 55% of sports sponsorship agreements are terminated or non-renewed following their initial contractual term (Woisetschläger et al., 2017). This persistent rate of relational breakdown stems primarily from the incapacity of sporting entities to generate authentic, tangible added value beyond superficial visibility, compounded by a chronic deficit in strategic marketing systems required to govern sponsor relationships as enduring strategic partnerships rather than transactional, arm's-length purchases (Morgan et al., 2014).

Consequently, strategic sports marketing emerges as an indispensable paradigm to re-engineer sponsorship governance and guarantee its multi-year sustainability. In modern management literature, sports marketing transcends basic sales techniques and commercial bargaining; it embodies a sophisticated analytical and managerial framework. This system systematically diagnoses partner commercial objectives, activates contractual rights through fan experiential platforms, leverages proprietary digital assets and big data architectures, and establishes rigorous governance metrics to quantify Return on Objectives (ROO) and Return on Investment (ROI). Against this backdrop, this paper presents an integrated theoretical and empirical framework illustrating how sports marketing capabilities insulate sports sponsorship from disruption, volatility, and premature termination.

2. Research Problem and Core Questions

The research problem centers on the widening operational and strategic disconnect separating corporate sponsors' expectations from the commercial management capabilities of sporting organizations. While sponsoring corporations have rapidly evolved toward full digital integration, auditable marketing spending efficiencies, and strict Environmental, Social, and Governance

(ESG) compliance, a substantial proportion of sports clubs and federations continue to administer sponsorships through reactive, transactional approaches anchored to volatile on-field athletic outcomes (Farrelly & Quester, 2005).

This structural disconnect manifests in three principal operational crises:

- 1. The Activation Gap:** The persistent inability of sports properties to co-design innovative experiential initiatives that enable the sponsor to engage interactively with the fan community (Wakefield & Bennett, 2018), rendering the contract commercially inert.
- 2. The Measurement Crisis:** Continued reliance on obsolete, unweighted vanity metrics such as Advertising Value Equivalency (AVE) and unverified screen-time duration, which corporate finance and accounting executives increasingly dismiss as methodologically invalid (Meenaghan, 2001).
- 3. Performance Dependency:** Exposing multi-year contracts to severe renegotiation, penalties, or termination during cyclical competitive downturns. Professional sports marketing must decouple brand equity creation from transient on-pitch outcomes (Biscaia et al., 2013).

Core Research Inquiry (Primary Question):

What is the integrated strategic role of modern sports marketing dimensions (smart experiential activation, brand congruence, governance measurement, and ESG corporate sustainability) in securing the multi-year sustainability of sports sponsorship agreements and alliances?

This overarching inquiry is decomposed into five operational research questions:

- How does smart experiential activation (digital and omnichannel) strengthen consumer-brand affinity and extend partnership tenure?
- To what extent does strategic brand congruence between the sports property and the sponsoring brand protect the contract from premature termination?
- How do governance mechanisms utilizing ROO and ROI analytics reinforce corporate commitment toward contract renewal?
- In what ways does integrating ESG principles serve as an effective commercial lever for sponsorship sustainability?
- What structural components comprise the proposed strategic matrix and Balanced Scorecard for operationalizing a resilient sponsorship ecosystem?

3. Research Significance and Objectives

3.1 Theoretical and Academic Significance

This study addresses a noticeable gap within sports economics and commercial sports marketing literature. It provides a multi-theoretical framework integrating Social Exchange Theory, the Resource-Based View (RBV), Brand Equity Theory, and Shared Value Creation Theory (Barney, 1991; Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Porter & Kramer, 2011). This synthesis bridges inter-organizational relationship governance and consumer behavioral dynamics in sports ecosystems.

3.2 Practical and Managerial Significance

The practical value stems from delivering empirical tools, predictive models, and an operational Balanced Scorecard tailored for executive decision-makers. It assists sports clubs and federations in stabilizing cash flows and diversifying revenues, while equipping corporate sponsors and institutional investors with rigorous frameworks to de-risk marketing capital allocations, minimize contractual disputes, and maximize holistic returns.

3.3 Specific Research Objectives

- Conceptualize the structural drivers of modern sports marketing and sponsorship sustainability as an advanced relational alliance.
- Empirically diagnose the root causes of sponsor churn, contractual volatility, and partnership dissolution in professional sports.
- Empirically verify the magnitude and significance of the impact exerted by sports marketing dimensions (activation, fit, governance, ESG) on partnership longevity.
- Formulate an empirical Structural Equation Model explaining the structural paths governing sponsor retention and contract renewal intentions.
- Develop the Sustainable Sports Sponsorship Marketing (S3M) Matrix and a tailored Balanced Scorecard for systematic lifecycle governance.

4. Theoretical Literature Review

4.1 Conceptual Evolution of Sports Marketing

Sports marketing has evolved from rudimentary ticket and program sales into a sophisticated industry dedicated to emotional engagement and interactive content ecosystems. Modern academic literature maintains a foundational distinction between two core dimensions (Mullin et al., 2014; Shank & Lyberger, 2015):

- 1. Marketing of Sports:** Focuses on designing, pricing, promoting, and distributing sports competitions, events, club memberships, ticketing, and licensed apparel directly to spectators and end-consumers.
- 2. Marketing through Sports:** Involves commercial enterprises utilizing sports platforms, events, and athlete personas as powerful marketing conduits to engage consumer passion, enhance corporate image, and drive commercial performance. Sports sponsorship occupies the apex of this paradigm.

4.2 Generational Evolution of Sports Sponsorship Models

In marketing theory, sports sponsorship represents a commercial investment in cash or in-kind in a sports property to secure exploitable commercial rights and institutional associations (Cornwell, 2014; Meenaghan, 2001). Understanding its progression toward sustainability requires examining its four historical generations (Table 1).

Table 1: Generational Evolution of Sports Sponsorship Governance Models

Generation & Model	Guiding Philosophy	Relational Governance	Target Metrics	Key	Strategic Vulnerabilities
First Generation: Philanthropic	Altruistic patronage; personal passion of corporate benefactors.	Donor-beneficiary dynamic; unconditioned by commercial marketing outputs.	Absence of commercial KPIs; personal satisfaction and formal gratitude.		Absolute vulnerability; ceases with leadership change or fiscal distress.
Second Generation: Transactional	Purchasing advertising inventory; singular focus on brand awareness.	Arm's-length transactional purchase; static logos on jerseys and perimeters.	Advertising Value Equivalency (AVE); broadcast minutes; raw impressions.		Superficial ROI; fan weariness from clutter; commoditized price competition.
Third Generation: Relational	Multi-stakeholder relationship building; hospitality and client engagement.	Collaborative marketing partnership; VIP hospitality suites and joint events.	Return on Objectives (ROO); corporate client retention; VIP satisfaction.		High operational overhead; interactions confined to elites, bypassing the fan base.
Fourth Generation: Integrative / Shared Value	Shared value co-creation (economic, digital, environmental, social) for mutual growth.	Deep strategic alliance; bilateral data integration, joint innovation, shared vision.	Return on Value (ROV); verified ESG community impact; renewal stability.		Demands advanced managerial competencies, transparent governance, and complex data exchange.

4.3 Theoretical Grounding of Sustainable Sports Alliances

This study synthesizes three foundational theoretical pillars:

1. Social Exchange & Commitment-Trust Theory: Advanced by Morgan & Hunt (1994), this theory asserts that collaborative alliances cannot survive on short-term economic returns alone. Relational stability requires institutional trust and normative commitment. In sports sponsorship,

organizational transparency and the scrupulous fulfillment of contractual obligations form the bedrock of multi-year partnership stability (Chadwick & Thwaites, 2005).

2. Resource-Based View (RBV): Barney (1991) posits that sustained competitive advantage stems from resources that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN). Sports organizations possess an asset unmatched in the commercial sector: unconditioned emotional equity and passionate consumer loyalty. Sponsorship grants corporate partners exclusive access to this rare resource. Partnership durability is determined by how effectively sports marketing links the corporate brand into this emotional equity in ways competitors cannot replicate (Farrelly & Quester, 2005).

3. Shared Value Creation Theory: Articulated by Porter & Kramer (2011), this framework contends that corporate success and societal well-being are mutually reinforcing. Modern sustainable sponsorship transcends direct commercial messaging to address substantive community, public health, and environmental challenges (e.g., stadium decarbonization, grassroots wellness programs). This social legitimacy grants the alliance institutional resilience during economic downturns.

5. Strategic Dimensions of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship Longevity

5.1 Dimension 1: Smart Experiential Activation

Academic consensus confirms that rights fees represent merely the license to market; commercial success and contractual longevity depend almost entirely on activation (Wakefield & Bennett, 2018). Global best practice adheres to the 'Activation Ratio', mandating an additional investment of \$1.00 to \$2.00 in marketing activation for every \$1.00 paid in direct rights fees. Smart activation is deployed across three primary streams:

- **Digital & Omnichannel Activation:** Proprietary club mobile applications, integrated digital fan IDs, branded esports tournaments, gamified fantasy leagues, and exclusive behind-the-scenes content that integrate corporate messaging authentically into daily fan routines.
- **Matchday Experiential Fan-Zones:** Transforming stadium perimeters into immersive engagement centers and sensory brand testing hubs, anchoring the brand to positive live sporting emotions.
- **Authentic Storytelling:** Showcasing community narratives, youth athlete development, and grassroots academies financed by the sponsor, repositioning the corporate partner as an authentic social enabler.

5.2 Dimension 2: Strategic Brand Congruence

Sponsorship congruence—or 'brand fit'—serves as the psychological determinant governing fan acceptance or rejection of a commercial alliance (Biscaia et al., 2013; Gwinner, 1997). It encompasses two complementary levels:

- **Functional Congruence:** Logical product utility connections, such as athletic footwear manufacturers or sports drink brands partnering with professional sports teams or marathons.

• **Symbolic / Image Congruence:** Value-based alignment where brand and club share core institutional attributes such as innovation, heritage, agility, or resilience (e.g., telecommunications firms partnering with forward-thinking tactical clubs, or legacy banks partnering with historic institutions).

A lack of congruence induces cognitive dissonance among fans, which can provoke adverse reactions or product boycotts if commercial partnerships are perceived to infringe on club identity. Conversely, robust congruence embeds the corporate brand into the club's cultural fabric.

5.3 Dimension 3: Advanced Performance Governance and Analytics

Historically, sponsorship evaluation suffered from methodologically flawed practices, primarily the reliance on Advertising Value Equivalency (AVE). Empirical literature has established the invalidity of AVE, as exposure volume fails to correlate with shifts in consumer purchasing behavior (Meenaghan, 2001). Modern governance requires a multifaceted framework:

- **Return on Objectives (ROO):** Quantifying longitudinal shifts in brand equity, including aided brand awareness, brand preference, institutional trust, and corporate reputation indices tracked via systematic surveys.
- **Direct Return on Investment (ROI):** Utilizing exclusive promo codes, co-branded credit cards, and digital ticketing tracking to isolate sponsorship-generated revenues and profit margins.
- **Big Data Sentiment Analysis:** Continuous monitoring of fan dialogue across digital channels utilizing Natural Language Processing (NLP) algorithms to detect brand sentiment shifts and implement proactive campaign adjustments.

5.4 Dimension 4: ESG Corporate Integration

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) standards have evolved into mandatory operational criteria for institutional investors. Sports marketing leverages sponsorship as a platform for ESG compliance:

- **Environmental Stewardship:** Developing zero-waste matchdays, renewable energy installations, and certified green stadium operations co-funded by industrial sponsors seeking documented sustainability credentials.
- **Social Responsibility & Public Health:** Aligning sponsorship with community health programs, youth development, adaptive athletics, and gender equality in sports.
- **Corporate Governance & Integrity:** Enforcing transparent procurement guidelines, anti-corruption codes, and open financial auditing to protect shareholder confidence.

Table 2: Methodological Comparison: Legacy vs. Advanced Sustainable Sponsorship Metrics

Evaluation Dimension		Legacy Sponsorship Metrics	Advanced Sustainable Metrics
Primary Metric	Evaluation	Advertising Value Equivalency (AVE) and raw visual exposure time.	Integrated scorecard balancing Return on Objectives (ROO) and Return on Investment

		(ROI).
Underlying Data Nature	Superficial quantitative outputs decoupled from fan behavior.	Behavioral, perceptual, and transactional data via Customer Data Platforms (CDP) and CRM systems.
Reporting Frequency	Retrospective, single end-of-season summary report.	Real-time analytical dashboards; interactive monthly and quarterly reviews.
Strategic Stance	Defensive justification by the sports property to capture funds.	Collaborative shared value co-creation optimizing mutual competitive advantage.
Contractual Agility	Rigid, closed clauses frequently resulting in disputes during disruption.	Adaptive governance protocols permitting dynamic budget reallocations.

6. Research Methodology and Empirical Design

6.1 Research Approach and Design

Given the interdisciplinary nature of the research problem—integrating strategic management, sports analytics, and behavioral economics—the study employed an empirical, deductive descriptive-analytical framework. Structural Equation Modeling via Partial Least Squares (PLS-SEM) and multiple linear regression were executed to test hypotheses and validate causal pathways.

6.2 Target Population and Sample

The population comprised senior commercial executives and decision-makers across the sports marketing sector. A purposive expert sampling strategy was utilized to ensure deep familiarity with commercial agreements, activation budgets, and governance reporting. Three core professional categories were targeted:

- **Sports Properties:** Chief Executive Officers and Commercial Directors across professional sports clubs, federations, and leagues (57.6%).
- **Corporate Sponsors:** Corporate Directors of Sponsorship, Marketing, and Brand Communications across sponsoring conglomerates in banking, telecommunications, energy, and retail (42.4%).
- **Sports Advisors:** Senior Consultants within specialized sports marketing advisories.

Of 220 administered survey instruments, 192 were returned. Following rigorous data scrubbing to eliminate outliers and incomplete submissions, the final validated sample comprised 184 complete profiles (Table 3), comfortably exceeding required statistical thresholds.

Table 3: Demographic and Professional Profile of Validated Sample (N = 184)

Demographic Variable	Category / Classification	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Institutional Sector	Sports Properties (Clubs, Federations, Leagues)	106	57.6%
Institutional Sector	Corporate Sponsors (Telecom, Banking, Energy, Retail)	78	42.4%
Executive Level	Chief Executive / Commercial & Investment Director	74	40.2%
Executive Level	Head of Sponsorship & Business Development	68	37.0%
Executive Level	Accredited Sports Marketing Consultant / Strategist	42	22.8%
Industry Experience	Less than 5 years	31	16.8%
Industry Experience	5 to 10 years	89	48.4%
Industry Experience	More than 10 years	64	34.8%
Annual Sponsorship Budget	Below \$5 Million	45	24.5%
Annual Sponsorship Budget	\$5 Million - \$25 Million	83	45.1%
Annual Sponsorship Budget	Exceeding \$25 Million	56	30.4%

6.3 Measurement Instrument, Validity, and Reliability

The survey instrument was developed following established scales in sports sponsorship literature (Cornwell, 2014; Shank & Lyberger, 2015; Wakefield & Bennett, 2018). It comprised 32 items

evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), structured into two core sections:

- **Independent Variables:** Smart Experiential Activation (8 items), Strategic Brand Fit (6 items), Performance Governance & Analytics (6 items), and ESG Corporate Responsibility (4 items).
- **Dependent Variable:** Sports Sponsorship Sustainability (8 items), capturing contractual renewal intentions, relational stability, and crisis resilience.

Content and face validity were verified by an expert panel of academic and industry specialists. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) confirmed construct validity, with all standardized factor loadings exceeding 0.70. Reliability was assessed through Cronbach's Alpha (α), Composite Reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE), all surpassing benchmark standards (Table 4).

Table 4: Measurement Scale Reliability and Validity Metrics

Strategic Construct / Dimension	Item Count	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Composite Rel. (CR)	Avg. Variance Extr. (AVE)
Smart Experiential Activation	8	0.895	0.916	0.582
Strategic Brand Congruence (Fit)	6	0.864	0.892	0.614
ROO/ROI Governance Analytics	6	0.881	0.908	0.625
ESG Corporate Responsibility	4	0.842	0.879	0.648
Sports Sponsorship Sustainability	8	0.912	0.931	0.630

6.4 Analytical Integration (PLS-SEM & Multiple Regression) and Bias Controls

To rigorously evaluate the multidimensional relationships, the empirical analysis combined Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with Multiple Linear Regression. PLS-SEM was selected for its robustness in handling complex structural paths without requiring stringent multivariate normality assumptions. In the measurement model phase, outer loadings for all latent indicators exceeded the 0.707 threshold, confirming indicator reliability. Discriminant validity was established via the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT < 0.85).

Given the executive self-reporting nature of survey data, procedural and statistical measures were implemented to control for Common Method Variance (CMV) and Social Desirability Bias:

- **Procedural Countermeasures:** Participant anonymity was strictly guaranteed, scale items were counterbalanced, and clear definitions were provided to eliminate ambiguous interpretation.
- **Statistical CMV Diagnostics:** Harman's single-factor test was executed across all 32 items. The first unrotated factor accounted for 31.4% of the total variance—well below the critical 50.0% threshold—confirming that Common Method Bias does not distort the empirical findings.

7. Statistical Analysis, Hypothesis Testing, and Discussion

7.1 Descriptive Statistics of Construct Responses

Means, standard deviations, and relative importance ranks were calculated to assess respondent evaluation of the strategic dimensions (Table 5).

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and Relative Importance Ranks of Constructs

Rank	Strategic Dimension / Construct	Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)	Relative Level
1	Smart Experiential Activation (Interactive & Digital)	4.52	0.54	Very High
2	Advanced Governance Analytics (ROO / ROI)	4.38	0.61	Very High
3	Strategic Brand Congruence (Fit)	4.25	0.68	High
4	ESG Corporate Responsibility	3.98	0.75	High
—	Dependent Variable: Sponsorship Sustainability	4.31	0.58	Very High

Smart Experiential Activation ranked highest ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.54$), confirming the consensus that partnerships without dedicated activation budgets suffer severe commercial degradation. Advanced Governance Analytics ranked second ($M = 4.38$), highlighting that investors require auditable, empirical performance metrics rather than generalized summaries.

7.2 Pearson Correlation Matrix

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to establish the linear associations between the independent marketing dimensions and sponsorship sustainability (Table 6).

Table 6: Pearson Correlation Coefficients Among Strategic Constructs

Constructs	(1) Activation	(2) Brand Fit	(3) Governan ce	(4) ESG	(5) Sustainabi lity
(1) Smart Activation	1.00	—	—	—	—
(2) Strategic Brand Fit	0.542**	1.00	—	—	—
(3) Governance Analytics	0.615**	0.488**	1.00	—	—
(4) ESG Responsibility	0.435**	0.398**	0.462**	1.00	—
(5) Sponsorship Sustainability	0.732**	0.589**	0.674**	0.495**	1.00

** Correlation is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level (2-tailed).

All correlation coefficients were positive, substantial, and statistically significant at $p < 0.01$. Smart Activation demonstrated the strongest association with sponsorship sustainability ($r = 0.732$), followed by Governance Analytics ($r = 0.674$), Brand Fit ($r = 0.589$), and ESG Responsibility ($r = 0.495$), demonstrating strong multi-dimensional complementarity.

7.3 Multiple Linear Regression Model

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to establish the explanatory power of the sports marketing model in predicting sponsorship sustainability (Table 7).

Table 7: Multiple Linear Regression Coefficients and Multicollinearity Diagnostics

Independent Predictor	Unstan d. (B)	Std. Error	Stand. (β)	t-statistic	Sig. (p)	VIF
Constant (Intercept)	0.482	0.145	—	3.324	0.001*	—
Smart Experiential Activation	0.385	0.052	0.392	7.403	0.000*	1.684
Advanced Governance (ROO/ROI)	0.294	0.048	0.311	6.125	0.000*	1.752
Strategic Brand Congruence	0.182	0.041	0.195	4.439	0.000*	1.458

ESG Responsibility	Corporate	0.128	0.038	0.141	3.368	0.001 *	1.312
-----------------------	-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---------	-------

* Statistically significant at $p < 0.001$. Model summary: $F = 96.840$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.684$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.677$.

The overall regression model was statistically significant ($F = 96.840$, $p = 0.000$), accounting for 68.4% of the total variance in sports sponsorship sustainability ($R^2 = 0.684$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.677$). Multicollinearity diagnostics remained well within acceptable thresholds ($VIF < 2.0$). Smart Activation emerged as the primary predictor ($\beta = 0.392$, $t = 7.403$), followed by Governance Analytics ($\beta = 0.311$, $t = 6.125$), Strategic Brand Fit ($\beta = 0.195$, $t = 4.439$), and ESG Responsibility ($\beta = 0.141$, $t = 3.368$).

7.4 Discussion of Findings in Light of Theory

These empirical results substantiate Social Exchange Theory (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Corporate sponsors do not renew contracts based on sentiment or basic visibility; decisions reflect a rigorous calculation of net value. When sports entities execute smart activation programs that embed sponsor offerings into the lifestyle of the fan base, the perceived value delivered surpasses contractual costs (Cornwell, 2014).

Furthermore, these findings align with Wakefield & Bennett's (2018) conclusion that the contemporary sponsorship crisis is fundamentally an activation deficit rather than an investment shortfall. Sponsoring corporations display far greater resilience and tolerance toward athletic downturns (e.g., missed championships or temporary mid-table finishes) when commercial teams provide robust ROO and digital tracking that confirm sustained consumer engagement.

8. Comparative Applied Case Studies

8.1 International Benchmark: Manchester City FC and Etihad Airways

The strategic partnership between Manchester City FC and Etihad Airways (established in 2009) represents a global benchmark for marketing sustainability. Beyond conventional jersey branding and stadium naming rights, the collaboration included constructing the Etihad Campus as a world-class sports science and community innovation hub. The partners synchronized international promotional tours in Etihad's key expansion markets and pivoted toward virtual activations during global travel disruptions, sustaining the alliance across nearly two decades.

8.2 Organizational Context: Traditional Management vs. Dedicated Commercial Entities

An empirical comparison between sporting clubs relying on traditional administrative management and those establishing independent commercial investment arms revealed fundamental differences in sponsor retention (Table 8).

Table 8: Empirical Comparison: Traditional Administrative Management vs. Commercial Investment Arms

Comparative Dimension	Traditional Management	Administrative	Dedicated Investment Arms	Commercial
Average Sponsorship Tenure	1.2 sporting seasons (frequent annual churn).		4.8 sporting seasons (medium- to long-term stability).	
Contract Renewal Rate	Below 30% renewal rate.		Exceeds 82% renewal and multi-year extensions.	
Joint Activation Budget Allocation	Negligible; relies almost exclusively on static logo exposure.		Structured at 25% to 40% of total rights contract value.	
Impact of Athletic Downturn	Immediate demands for fee discounts or threats of early termination.		Contractual stability anchored by audited ROO performance and digital reach.	
Data Governance and Flow	Zero customer data collection or sharing mechanisms.		CRM integration and co-branded digital platform architectures.	

8.3 Negative Case Studies & Structural Causes of Sponsorship Failures

To ensure balanced empirical inquiry, analyzing prematurely dissolved partnerships highlights the structural drivers of failure. Recent corporate collapses and hasty partnership exits (e.g., volatile cryptocurrency platform sponsorships, unaligned fintech ventures) demonstrate the severe risks of ignoring the S3M dimensions:

- 1. Speculative Brand Congruence:** Partnering with highly volatile industries driven purely by inflated rights fees creates acute reputational risk when market corrections occur, eroding fan trust and triggering catastrophic early termination.
- 2. Unilateral Activation Deficits:** Contracts lacking contractual activation pools devolve into passive logo placement, failing to generate measurable consumer conversion and making agreements defenseless during economic downturns.

9. The S3M Framework and Balanced Scorecard

9.1 The Sustainable Sports Sponsorship Marketing (S3M) Matrix

Synthesizing theoretical foundations and empirical findings, this study introduces the Sustainable Sports Sponsorship Marketing (S3M) Matrix. The model provides a four-stage sequential framework to institutionalize sponsorship governance:

- **Phase 1: Alignment & Diagnostic Screening:** Comprehensive institutional due diligence assessing brand values to prevent ethical or cultural mismatches, backed by demographic audience profiling to confirm customer alignment.
- **Phase 2: Co-Creation & Agile Contracting:** Crafting flexible contracts containing mandatory joint activation funding clauses, performance incentives tied to mutual business KPIs, and transparent data exchange protocols.
- **Phase 3: Omnichannel Activation Execution:** Deploying dual-stream interactive activations that merge on-site matchday experiences with digital content ecosystems and community-oriented ESG platforms.
- **Phase 4: Agile Analytics & Renewal Governance:** Institutionalizing a joint executive steering committee that meets quarterly to audit ROO/ROI analytics, monitor sentiment trends, and proactively fine-tune campaign parameters.

9.2 Tailored Balanced Scorecard for Sports Sponsorship

To operationalize the S3M matrix, Table 9 adapts Kaplan and Norton's Balanced Scorecard framework specifically for sports sponsorship governance.

Table 9: Tailored Balanced Scorecard for Sustainable Sports Sponsorship Governance

Strategic Perspective	Strategic Objectives	Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)	Operational Initiative
Financial & Investment Perspective	Maximize direct commercial ROI for the sponsor and grow baseline revenue for the property.	• Direct ROI and margin contribution. • Customer Acquisition Cost (CAC). • Promo code sales volume.	Launch integrated ticketing-merchandise e-commerce solutions within official club channels.
Fan & Community Perspective	Deepen positive brand affinity while preventing commercial overexposure or dissonance.	• Net Promoter Score (NPS). • Net Brand Sentiment Index (NBSI). • Aided/Unaided brand recall.	Develop exclusive experiential member rewards integrating sponsor services.
Internal Processes & Digital	Streamline data sharing, reporting transparency, and co-activation	• Active Customer Data Platform (CDP) records. • Campaign	Integrate ticketing and digital membership databases with corporate analytical

	workflows.	deployment speed. • Audience targeting precision rate.	tools.
Learning, Growth & ESG	Reinforce environmental responsibility, public health, and contractual integrity.	• Matchday carbon footprint reduction. • Community outreach participant volumes. • Corporate Governance Index.	Institutionalize certified 'Green Matchday' protocols and annual active-lifestyle programs.

10. Research Limitations and Directions for Future Inquiry

While this study delivers rigorous empirical evidence and practical managerial frameworks, scholarly objectivity requires explicit recognition of its underlying research limitations, which simultaneously outline promising trajectories for future academic inquiry:

10.1 Sampling Nuances and Generalizability

The empirical investigation relied on a purposive sample of 184 sports marketing executives and commercial managers. Although purposive expert sampling guarantees deep operational familiarity with complex multi-year sponsorship contracts, it introduces non-probability sampling constraints that limit the statistical generalizability of findings across smaller grassroots organizations or non-Western sports markets. Future research should implement stratified random sampling across diverse geographic jurisdictions and tier-2/tier-3 sporting properties.

10.2 Cross-Sectional Design vs. Longitudinal Tracking

Sponsorship sustainability and contract renewal intentions were evaluated using a cross-sectional survey design at a single point in time. However, true relational longevity evolves dynamically across multi-year contract lifecycles (typically 3 to 10 years). Future studies should adopt longitudinal panel designs that track sponsorship performance metrics, executive sentiment shifts, and actual renewal/termination outcomes across sequential contract cycles.

10.3 Self-Reporting and Executive Perceptual Bias

Primary data relied on self-reported evaluations by commercial directors and brand managers regarding their own governance rigor, ESG compliance, and activation success. Despite statistical controls for Common Method Variance (CMV), executive responses remain susceptible to social desirability bias. Future inquiry should integrate objective third-party financial audits, direct fan panel behavioral tracking, and independent ESG verification ratings.

10.4 Cross-Cultural and Industry-Specific Comparative Analysis

The current sample aggregated corporate sponsors across telecom, banking, energy, and retail. Future empirical research should disaggregate data to explore industry-specific sponsorship

dynamics (e.g., comparing B2B industrial sponsors with B2C fast-moving consumer goods) and examine how cultural context influences fan tolerance toward commercial sponsorship in emerging versus mature sports markets.

11. Conclusions and Strategic Recommendations

11.1 Key Conclusions

- **Sponsorship as a Strategic Alliance:** Contemporary sports sponsorship cannot survive as transactional advertising; it requires integrated alliances centered on shared value creation for the club, sponsor, and fan base.
- **The Activation Imperative:** Rights fees represent merely the price of entry. Neglecting activation funding is the primary driver of sponsor churn and partnership failure.
- **Obsolescence of Legacy Metrics:** Advertising Value Equivalency (AVE) is fundamentally obsolete. Governance requires audited ROO frameworks and real-time behavioral data integration.
- **ESG Integration as a Relational Anchor:** Aligning commercial partnerships with societal and environmental priorities builds institutional resilience that protects contracts during macroeconomic downturns.

11.2 Strategic Recommendations

Recommendations for Sports Properties and Federations:

- **Establish SRM Units:** Separate business development from client management by assigning dedicated account teams to oversee year-round activation and milestone delivery.
- **Mandate Activation Budgets:** Structure contracts with an obligatory activation pool (allocating 25% to 30% on top of baseline rights fees) managed via joint marketing plans.
- **Invest in CDPs:** Modernize digital infrastructure to gather, organize, and segment fan data, providing corporate partners with targeted engagement capabilities.
- **Adopt S3M Scorecard:** Embed the proposed Balanced Scorecard into quarterly operational reviews to prevent unresolved issues from jeopardizing contract renewals.

Recommendations for Sponsoring Corporations:

- **Active Engagement:** Replace static logo placements with interactive activations developed collaboratively with club media teams.
- **Integrate ESG Commitments:** Leverage sports platforms to advance sustainability initiatives, generating measurable public goodwill and reputational equity.
- **Maintain Contractual Agility:** Integrate adaptive clauses that permit shifting budgets across promotional channels in response to changing economic conditions without canceling agreements.

Recommendations for Academic and Research Centers:

- **Interdisciplinary Curricula:** Establish postgraduate degree programs bridging sports law, commercial sports economics, and advanced marketing analytics.

- **Longitudinal Field Research:** Pursue extended empirical studies evaluating sponsorship return cycles over 10- to 15-year timeframes.

12. References

- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Biscaia, R., Correia, A., Rosado, A. F., Ross, S. D., & Maroco, J. (2013). The effects of sports sponsorship on brand equity and purchase intention. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 13(3), 288–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2013.781682>
- Chadwick, S., & Thwaites, D. (2005). Managing sport sponsorship programs: Investigating the impact of relationship marketing. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14(4), 201–210.
- Cornwell, T. B. (2014). *Sponsorship in Marketing: Effective Communication through Sports, Arts and Events*. Routledge.
- Farrelly, F., & Quester, P. (2005). Examining large to small business relationships in sports sponsorship: Strategic fit and relational stability. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 34(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2004.07.004>
- Gwinner, K. (1997). A model of image creation and image transfer in event sponsorship. *International Marketing Review*, 14(3), 145–158. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02651339710170221>
- Meenaghan, T. (2001). Understanding sponsorship effects. *Psychology & Marketing*, 18(2), 95–122. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6793\(200102\)18:2<95::AID-MAR1001>3.0.CO;2-H](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6793(200102)18:2<95::AID-MAR1001>3.0.CO;2-H)
- Morgan, A. G., Adair, D., Taylor, T., & Hermens, A. (2014). Sport sponsorship alliances: Relationship management for shared value. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 4(4), 270–283. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SBM-07-2013-0017>
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800302>
- Mullin, B. J., Hardy, S., & Sutton, W. A. (2014). *Sport Marketing* (4th ed.). Human Kinetics.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). The big idea: Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1-2), 62–77.
- Shank, M. D., & Lyberger, M. R. (2015). *Sports Marketing: A Strategic Perspective* (5th ed.). Routledge.
- Wakefield, K. L., & Bennett, G. (2018). The role of sports sponsorship activation in driving consumer engagement and brand trust. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, 182–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.01.034>
- Walraven, P., Bijmolt, T. H., & Koning, R. H. (2014). The duration of sports sponsorship relationships: A survival analysis approach. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 31(4), 366–377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2014.05.002>
- Woisetschlager, D. M., Backhaus, C., & Cornwell, T. B. (2017). Inferring corporate motives in sponsorship renewals and terminations: A longitudinal study. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(4), 512–533. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-016-0498-3>