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Who?

NIERS: One of ten research institutes of Hochschule Niederrhein

„Soccer Research Team“:
• Christina Fischer, MA
• Angelika Jäger, MA
• Prof. Dr. Rüdiger Hamm

And of course Borussia Mönchengladbach …

… as without the club‘s support this type of research would not be possible!
In Mönchengladbach – Rhein-Ruhr is one of the biggest European agglomerations with nearly endless sights and cultural and leisure facilities.
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And we have one of the best German soccer clubs: Borussia Mönchengladbach.

In between: Mönchengladbach is a relatively quiet place with about 260,000 inhabitants.

Mönchengladbach has HSNR with:
- Nice students
- Qualified professors
One of our research interests:

Analyzing the relationships between sports and events and regional economic development

Especially – regional effects of soccer clubs

Let’s talk about this!

- Can a soccer club influence regional economic development?
- How can a soccer club do this?
Regional effects of a Major league soccer club

Supply side

- City becomes well-known
- Improves city-image
- Relevant factor for firms' location decision
- psychic income

Other Effects

- Salaries
- Intermediates
- Expenses of Fans
- Invest-
ment

Demand side

- Improves international understanding
- Health of people
- Use of Infrastructure
- Vandalism of Fans

Other

- Well-known city
- Image of Fans
Theoretical Considerations

Literature distinguishes demand and supply side effects:

• **Demand side effects:**
  - **Direct effect** – regional employment, income and gross value added
  - **Indirect effects** – Investment, demand for intermediate goods and expenses of supporters – regional employment, income and value added
  - **Induced effects via regional income cycle** – regional employment, income and value added
Theoretical Considerations

• Supply side effects:
  o Increase of awareness level
  o Image transfer (improvement of image?)
  o Regional location effects
  o Regional „psychic income“
  o Nucleus of a regional communication and cooperation network
Empirical Studies on regional effects of soccer clubs normally focus on demand-side effects, i.e. regional multiplier analysis.

But there seems to be “something more” – beyond regional multipliers (CROMPTON).

Our research and this presentation does not only deal with “traditional demand side analysis” …

… but also tries to find out if there is something beyond.

Aim: To empirically analyse all kind of effects as complete as possible.

Research Design: Case study for Borussia Mönchengladbach.
Empirical Findings – Aims, Research Design and Methods

Methods for demand side effects:

• Regional multiplier analysis

• Iterative procedure using some information stemming from national input-output-tables

• Calculation of regional multipliers = overall effect / direct effect

• Overall effect = direct + indirect + induced effect

Data:

• Information from the club is needed (salaries, expenditure, investment)

• Primary statistics for fans’ expenses – surveys in the stadion

• Secondary statistics from the German Federal Statistical Office
Empirical Findings – Aims, Research Design and Methods

Methods for supply side effects:

• Mainly survey-based descriptive and partially multivariate analysis
• „Equivalent-value-analysis“ based on „Media coverage analysis“
• Basic network analysis

Data:

• Media coverage analysis (done by “Repucom”) and
• a list of partners have been provided by Borussia
Empirical Findings – Aims, Research Design and Methods

• But most of the data stems from three surveys conducted in autumn 2013.
  o Audience of soccer matches (913)
  o Face-to-face passerby-surveys (579)
  o Family-and-friends online-surveys (265)

• This last mentioned data set has been used in different ways:
  o Total data set (only seldom)
  o Reduced data set without audience of matches (in some cases)
  o Reduced data set only with fans and “non-fans”, but without sympathizers - clustered data set (in most cases)
Empirical Findings – Aims, Research Design and Methods

- Respondents have been clustered the following way
Empirical Results – Demand Side Effects in the City

Results: Direct, Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts (City)

**Borussia VfL 1900 Mönchengladbach**

**Direct Impacts**
- Income: 44.3 Mio. €
- Value Added: 64.5 Mio. €
- Employment: 326
- Gross Production: 95.8 Mio €

**Indirect Effects**
- Income: 13.8 – 17.9 Mio. €
- Value Added: 23 – 29.5 Mio. €
- Employment: 
- Gross Production: 44.1 - 56.7 Mio €

**Induced Effects**
- Income: 3.4 – 6.7 Mio €
- Value Added: 6.6 – 13.2 Mio €
- Employment: 695 - 982
- Gross Production: 13.5-26.9 Mio €

**Multiplier**
- Income: 1.39 – 1.55
- Value Added: 1.46 – 1.66
- Employment: 3.13 – 4.01
- Gross Production: 1.60 – 1.87

Total Income, Employment and Value Added Effects
Empirical Results – Supply Side Effects
Some supply-side at first glance

In your opinion, how much does the soccer club BMG contribute to the following effects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Arithmetic Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of population with hometown</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of leisure time facilities</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism development</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of retail sales</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of level of awareness (inland)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of international level of awareness</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image improvement of the city</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 844, pedestrian and F&F-surveys
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects

Awareness

1. Increasing the city’s national awareness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Home-Fan</th>
<th>Satellite-Fan</th>
<th>Regional Non-Fan</th>
<th>Outsider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>64,5%</td>
<td>56,0%</td>
<td>30,5%</td>
<td>24,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>29,0%</td>
<td>33,6%</td>
<td>45,8%</td>
<td>45,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4,4%</td>
<td>7,6%</td>
<td>19,2%</td>
<td>22,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>,6%</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td>4,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• 93.5% of the home-fans think that the club increases the national awareness of the city

• Even 70,1% of the outsiders believe so
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Empirical Findings – Supply side effects

2. Increasing the city’s international awareness?

- About 75% of the two fan groups believe that Borussia increases the city’s international awareness

- Nearly 30% of the outsiders believe in these effects, too
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Empirical Findings – Supply side effects

Value of Borussia’s media coverage for the city

- Time and number of people reached by different TV-programs
- Valued by average TCP firms have to pay for advertising on TV
- 10 % of that as an estimation: Between 10,3 Mio. € und 20,8 Mio. €.
- That’s what the city of MG would have to pay to have a similar effect of advertising
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects
Improvement of Image

Image Improving Effects of Borussia Mönchengladbach for the City

- 76,5% of the home-fans and nearly 40% of the outsiders believe in these effects.
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects
Improvement of Image

Respondents had to rate a number of image-forming attributes for the city and the club

- In all respects the club is noticeably rated more positive than the city
- Results suggest that an image transfer takes place
- More probable from the club to the city than vice versa
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects

Improvement of Image

Ratings by fan groups

• Expectation in case of a transfer: fans of Borussia do not only judge the club more positive than non-fans but also the city.

• Exactly this can be observed in diagram.

• The points tend to move to the upper right part of the coordinate system meaning that home-fans give better ratings to both – club and city.
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects

Ratings by fan groups

• The same can be observed comparing satellite fans and outsiders.
• The points tend to move to the upper right part of the coordinate system meaning that satellite-fans give better ratings to both – club and city.
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects
Improvement of Image

• Results suggest that a transfer of (positive) image takes place.

• Combination of factor analysis and regression to check the results.

• In the surveys the respondents had to evaluate seven attributes for the city and the club. Factor analysis is used
  o to discover whether variables are overlapping,
  o to structure the relationships between these variables and
  o to identify groups of variables highly correlated to each other and to separate them from those with low correlation.

  o Results of Factor analysis are used to calculate values for the structured factors.

  o Finally new variables are used for analysing the relationship between the city’s and the club’s image by means of a regression.
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects

Improvement of Image

1. Testing appropriateness of data (city-image and club-image). Result: Data is appropriate!

2. Deciding how many factors should be extracted. Scree-test and Kaiser-Criterion suggest to extract one factor in both cases (city-image and club-image).

3. Principal component analysis for extraction of factors. Calculation of two new variables: “Image of the club” and “Image of the city”.

4. Last step: OLS.

\[ I_{\text{city}} = f(I_{\text{club}}) \]

Expectations:
- The better the club‘s image, the better the city‘s image,
- i.e. first derivation is expected to be positive:
  \[ \frac{dl_{\text{city}}}{dl_{\text{club}}} > 0 \]
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects
Improvement of Image

Results of Regression Analysis - Dependent Variable: Image of the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression 1</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>R² corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Const.</td>
<td>0,024</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>0,452</td>
<td>0,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of the club</td>
<td>0,417</td>
<td>13,45</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own calculations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of OLS:

• „Image of the city“ is the better the better the „Image of the club“ - so there seems to be a transfer of image.

• The transfer-effect of the negative attribute “boring” (0,025) is less intensive than that of positive attributes (like e.g. „successful“: 0,079)
Empirical Findings – Supply side effects

Improvement of Image

Extension

Are there differences due to sex, age, origin or fan-status? Using dummies.

Results:

• There are no significant effects of sex and age.
• Transfer effects are significantly higher for people living in and around Mönchengladbach.
• Surprisingly the effects are lower for fans of Borussia.
Empirical Results – Supply Side Effects
Regional „psychic income“

→ Psychological benefit of population due to existence of soccer club
→ Self-assurance, self-esteem, pride, patriotism, identification

Survey: „Imagine, BMG would face bankruptcy. How much would you be willing to donate for the soccer club in this year, to continually avoid this situation?“

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fan-Cluster</th>
<th>Willingness to donate, Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-Fan</td>
<td>110.58€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite-Fan</td>
<td>97.51€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Non-Fan</td>
<td>7.04€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>5.22€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample, Ø</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.60€</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrian and F&F-surveys, participants that live in Mönchengladbach

Calculation of total willingness to donate in Mönchengladbach per year (Population in Mönchengladbach older than 15 years: 222,518)$^1$

\[ 9,557,148 \, \text{€} \]

1. Calculation based on population statistics.
Empirical Results
Nucleus of regional communication and cooperation network

Borussia Mönchengladbach
Distance of Sponsors & Partners

> 60% of all sponsors and partners are located within a distance of 50km

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance Range</th>
<th>Cumulated Share of Sponsors and Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 km</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 – 10 km</td>
<td>15.65 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 – 20 km</td>
<td>31.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 – 50 km</td>
<td>62 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.1 - 100 km</td>
<td>81.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.1 - 250 km</td>
<td>91.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 250 km</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Main results:

1. There are considerable demand side effects
2. Borussia Mönchengladbach is increasing the city’s national and international awareness
3. Estimations suggest the existence of a “psychic income”
4. Borussia has a great number of regional partners – whether this means that the club is a nucleus of a regional communication- and cooperation-network is an interesting topic for further research
Summary

Main results as to image and transfer of image:

- Descriptive analysis and the combination of factor analysis and regressions suggest a transfer of image from the club to the city.
- Furthermore, regression analysis gives a hint that positive image attributes are transferred more probably than negative ones.
- The transfer-effect seems to be highest for people stemming from Mönchengladbach and around without being fan of the club.

Conclusion: In the case of Borussia Mönchengladbach …

- … the soccer club influences regional image …
- … and as regional image is a relevant factor of location …
- … the soccer club also influences regional development behind regional multipliers.
Literature and Data References
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Factor Analysis

First step: Testing appropriateness of data (city-image and club-image):

• Correlation: All variables used to describe the image are correlated to each other. Correlation is below $|0.7|$ in all cases, i.e. no clear conclusion.

• Significance of correlation: All correlations are highly significant (1%-level).

• The Bartlett-Test tests whether a sample stems from a population of uncorrelated variables. Result: With a probability < 1% the variables are uncorrelated.

• The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin-Criterion ("measure of sampling adequacy"=MSA) tests whether a factor analysis is meaningful or not. It allows an evaluation of the overall correlation matrix as well as of single variables. Literature suggests the MSA to be above 0.8; in our case the MSA-values for the correlation matrices are above 0.9, the MSA-values for the single variables lie between 0.779 (middling) and 0.940 (marvellous).

• Data is appropriate!
Factor Analysis

Second step: Deciding how many factors should be extracted

Literature suggests two different ways for solving this problem.

1. Scree-test, i.e.
   - Plotting the eigenvalues in diminishing order,
   - Look where the difference of the eigenvalues between two factors takes a maximum (the curve must have a sharp bend),
   - Choose the first point left to this sharp bend – it determines the number of factors to be extracted.
   - Method suggests to extract one factor in both cases (left hand – city; right hand – club!)
Factor Analysis

Alternatively:

2. **Kaiser-Criterion**: Number of extracted factors should equal the number of factors with an eigenvalue above one.
   - The table shows that only the eigenvalue of the first factor is above one. So this method, too, would propose to extract one factor in both cases.
   - **Decision**: Extraction of one factor for the city and the club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original Eigenvalues</td>
<td>Original Eigenvalues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>60,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,759</td>
<td>10,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,515</td>
<td>7,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,493</td>
<td>7,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,360</td>
<td>5,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,345</td>
<td>4,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0,316</td>
<td>4,52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraktionsmethode: Hauptkomponentenanalyse.
Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th></th>
<th>Club</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Component</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>First Component</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern, cosmopolitan</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-frinedly</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, dynamic</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>-0.571</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td>-0.240</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Own calculations by principal component method

Image of the city:

- All variables have high factor loadings.
- Coefficients of the components of factor 1 estimated by multiple regression.
- They are the weights for calculating the values of the new factor by multiplication with the original data for the seven attributes.
- Six positive attributes with similar positive weights.
- Negative attribute “boring” has a lower, but negative weight.
- New variable is defined as ”Image of the city”.
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Factor Analysis

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & \text{City} &  & \text{Club} &  \\
 & \text{First Component} & \text{Coefficient} & \text{First Component} & \text{Coefficient} \\
\hline
\text{Sympathetic} & 0.793 & 0.188 & 0.847 & 0.209 \\
\text{Modern, cosmopolitan} & 0.821 & 0.195 & 0.826 & 0.204 \\
\text{Inspiring} & 0.840 & 0.199 & 0.862 & 0.213 \\
\text{Family-frinedly} & 0.749 & 0.178 & 0.786 & 0.194 \\
\text{Successful} & 0.818 & 0.194 & 0.764 & 0.189 \\
\text{Young, dynamic} & 0.805 & 0.191 & 0.803 & 0.198 \\
\text{Boring} & -0.571 & -0.136 & -0.240 & -0.059 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\text{Own calculations by principal component method}

Image of the club:

- Similar results as in the case of the city.
- New variable is defined as "Image of the club".
Regression Analysis

Last step: OLS.

\[ I_{\text{city}} = f(I_{\text{club}}) \]

Expectations:

- The better the club‘s image, the better the city‘s image,
- i.e. first derivation is expected to be positive:
  - \[ \frac{dI_{\text{city}}}{dI_{\text{club}}} > 0 \]
Results: Direct, Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts (Region)

**Borussia VfL 1900 Mönchengladbach**

**Direct Impacts**
- Income: 44.3 Mio. €
- Value Added: 64.5 Mio. €
- Employment: 211
- Gross Production: 95.8 Mio €

**Indirect Impacts**
- Value Added: 24.3 – 33.4 Mio. €
- Employment: 46.6 - 64.2 Mio €

**Induced Impacts**
- Income: 4.6 – 9.4 Mio €
- Value Added: 9.0 – 18.7 Mio €
- Employment: 749 – 1,162
- Gross Production: 18.8 - 39.2 Mio €

**Multiplier**
- Income: 1,42 – 1,66
- Value Added: 1,52 – 1,81
- Employment: 4,55 – 6,51
- Gross Production: 1,68 – 2,08

**Total Income, Employment and Value Added Effects**
### Effects on Income, Value Added, Employment and Gross Production within the city MG

#### (1) High Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Value Added</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Gross Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>44,314,000€</td>
<td>64,467,057€</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>95,759,657€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect (Investment, expenditure)</td>
<td>1,883,002€</td>
<td>3,863,140€</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,087,000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect (Expenses of fans and visitors)</td>
<td>15,980,518€</td>
<td>25,622,348€</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,588,342€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced Effects</td>
<td>6,720,651€</td>
<td>13,246,288€</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>26,933,734€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Effect</strong></td>
<td>68,898,171€</td>
<td>107,198,833€</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>179,368,733€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiplicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (2) Low Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Value Added</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Gross Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>44,314,000€</td>
<td>64,467,057€</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>95,759,657€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect (Investment, expenditure)</td>
<td>1,883,002€</td>
<td>3,863,140€</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,087,000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect (Expenses of fans and visitors)</td>
<td>11,929,163€</td>
<td>19,126,612€</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,016,786€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced Effects</td>
<td>3,386,072€</td>
<td>6,644,527€</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>13,462,157€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Effect</strong></td>
<td>61,512,237€</td>
<td>94,101,336€</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>153,325,600€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiplicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Empirical Results – Supply Side Effects
Value of Borussia’s Media Coverage for the City

What would the city Mönchengladbach have to pay for the TV media coverage it received for free by the TV presence of the soccer club BMG?

Advertising Value Equivalency (AVE)

→ Calculation: Media exposure \( \text{broadcast time} \times \text{number of viewers} \) divided by \( 1.000 \times \text{TCP} \) (thousands of contact price, price per 1,000 page impressions)

→ As the city cannot influence the broadcasting content, we calculate a low estimation of TCP (5% of average TCP in last three years) and a high estimation (10% of average TCP in last three years)

Season 2011/12: 18,062 Mio media exposure / 1,000 * 0.69TCP (l.e.) accordingly 1.39 (h.e.)
AVE = 12.46 Mio. € (low estimation) and accordingly 25,05 Mio. € (high estimation)

Season 2012/13: 14,087 Mio media exposure / 1,000 * 0.69TCP (l.e.) accordingly 1.39 (h.e.)
AVE = 10,34 Mio. € (low estimation) and accordingly 20,79 Mio. € (high estimation)