

## **The minimum standards for the rise of football clubs in the Egyptian Premier League**

**Dr/ Mohamed Ahmed Fadl Allah<sup>1</sup>**

**Dr/ Mohamed Sayed Ahmed Zoromba<sup>2</sup>**

### **Abstract:**

The current research aims to identify the availability of standards of qualification to the Egyptian premier league among Egyptian soccer clubs. The researchers used the descriptive (survey) approach. The researchers chose (11) clubs with total participants of (93) persons divided as (20) persons for the pilot study and (73) for the main study. After distributing the questionnaire, only (60) persons returned it fully and this led the researchers to exclude the other (13) persons. The researchers designed and calibrated "Questionnaire of the Minimum Standards of Qualification for Egyptian Soccer Premier League" as a research data collection tool. Results indicated that: Sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer seek to fulfill the standards of youth development programs, sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer seek to fulfill the standards of courts and facilities, there are clear limitations concerning anti-doping activities, sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer seek to fulfill the administrative standards, sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer are willing to fulfill all standards of qualification for premier league as a professional league.

**Key words:** Soccer – Premier League – Standards for rise

### **Introduction and Research**

#### **Problem:**

In the light of mass developments in the field of economics, investment and resources management, sport has become a major field of investment as it represents an

excellent market for many products and services due to its attraction to great numbers of audiences and fans all over the world (Kesenne 2015).

Most countries try to improve its economic status due to international recess and

---

1 Assistant Professor – Department of Sport Administration – Faculty of Physical Education for Men – Helwan University

2 Lecturer - Department of Sport Administration and Recreation – Faculty of Physical Education– Port Said University

exorbitant costs of traditional industries. Therefore, those countries and especially developing countries and countries with weak economies should find real investment alternatives for improving their economies quickly and in a low-risk and granted way (Silva et al 2015). Those countries concentrate on specific fields of investment that are high-profit and low-risk sectors like tourism, telecommunications and sport (Gedvilaite-Moan & Laskiene 2015).

Sports investment is relatively granted to a high degree as beneficiaries are of large numbers and it is easy to reach the target market due to telecommunication and information developments that facilitated watching sports event not only locally or regionally but also globally (Sodiya 2016).

Investment in the field of sport includes various things like sports products, equipment and devices for teams and clubs of various levels and types. It also includes what fans buy to indicate their loyalty for their favorite teams and sports. This creates severe

competition among major companies not working in the field of sports equipment to buy sponsorship rights of teams and clubs so as to expand its market shares and gain more buyers, in addition to revenues gained from the broadcast rights of major sports events and matches (Grossmann 2015).

Like other industries, sport requires well-established infrastructure to enable it to be more competitive and to gain more market share of audience. This includes facilities and capabilities related to organizing major sports events and championships in addition to other potentials of clubs and teams (Andreff 2015). Teams and clubs need to fulfill certain requirements to expand its base of audiences, fans and supporters in addition to establishing a brand name that urges investors to support and sponsor its activities. This enables sports organizations to secure budgets necessary for providing beneficiaries with quality services in a competitive way that guarantees these clubs the highest possible market share (Eddosary et al 2015).

Soccer is a worldwide popular sport as it is ranked first among other popular sports. In addition, it is a highly competitive sport that covers various age groups from junior amateur to highly professional teams (Nahm 2016).

Professional (premier) leagues have the highest watching rate, either through direct watch in courts or through TV broadcast. This makes such event valuable investment opportunities for both teams and sponsors (Francis et al 2016).

All premier league teams all over the world seek to fulfill the highest possible level of criteria to be qualified to involve in such leagues. These criteria are not merely limited to the number or prices of professional players among those teams. Instead, it covers other criteria set by local soccer federations or the FIFA itself to recognize the competition as a professional (premier) league. In addition, there are other administrative conditions that should be fulfilled so that the team continues to be qualified as a

competitor in the league (Ismail, N. 2015).

Criteria and standards required for qualification to the premier league include several aspects. One of these aspects is the physical aspect represented in facilities like the main court, training courts, rooms, lockers, halls and technical support equipment. A second aspect is the nature of soccer programs provided by the club. This includes qualified coaches, trainers, planners and administrators in addition to logistic support for such programs. The third aspect includes all legal and administrative requirements for initiating these programs and guarantees provided by clubs to initiate them like professionalism, transparency and governance. These three aspects help clubs to gain a competitive advantage in gaining more investment opportunities and improving team results as well (Radoman & Voia 2015).

According to their direct observation, the researchers did not observe any clear standards for qualifying, or disqualifying, teams for the premier league except for team results at the

previous section (Class A league) without any consideration to the above mentioned aspects of qualification. This may mean that the Egyptian premier league lacks for international standards of professional leagues, which in turn mean that it may lose valuable investment opportunities although it is very popular inside Egypt and abroad. This led the researchers to try to identify the availability of standards of qualification to the Egyptian premier league and how far Egyptian soccer clubs are aware of these qualification standards.

Furthermore, the researchers noticed that this particular issue is fully absent in the literature dealing with sports economics and sports administration in Egypt.

The current research aims to identify the availability of standards of qualification to the Egyptian premier league among Egyptian soccer clubs.

To fulfill this aim, the researchers addressed the following major question:

**What are the minimum standards of qualification that should be fulfilled by**

### **Egyptian soccer clubs qualifying to the Egyptian premier league?**

This major question is divided into the following minor questions:

- What are the standards of qualification fulfilled by Egyptian soccer clubs qualifying to the Egyptian premier league concerning youth development programs?
- What are the standards of qualification fulfilled by Egyptian soccer clubs qualifying to the Egyptian premier league concerning facilities and infrastructure?
- What are the standards of qualification fulfilled by Egyptian soccer clubs qualifying to the Egyptian premier league concerning administrative aspects?

#### **Methods:**

#### **Approach:**

The researchers used the descriptive (survey) approach.

#### **Participants:**

Research community included chairmen, board members and administrators of Egyptian soccer clubs participating in the Egyptian soccer premier league and the second league. The researchers chose (11) clubs with total

participants of (93) persons divided as (20) persons for the pilot study and (73) for the main study. After distributing the questionnaire, only (60) persons returned it fully and

this led the researchers to exclude the other (13) persons. Table (1) shows the clubs and persons participating in this study.

**Table (1)  
Clubs and Persons participating in the current study (n=93)**

| Club             | Chairman | Board member | Administrator | Total |
|------------------|----------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| alahly           | 0        | 5            | 3             | 8     |
| zamalek          | 0        | 5            | 3             | 8     |
| alismaily        | 0        | 4            | 4             | 8     |
| almesry          | 1        | 5            | 5             | 11    |
| aletihad         | 0        | 3            | 3             | 6     |
| smouha           | 1        | 3            | 4             | 8     |
| inby             | 0        | 3            | 4             | 7     |
| wady dijla       | 0        | 2            | 5             | 7     |
| arab contractors | 0        | 6            | 4             | 10    |
| altersana        | 0        | 5            | 5             | 10    |
| almerrikh        | 1        | 5            | 4             | 10    |
| total            | 3        | 46           | 44            | 93    |

**Data collection tools (Questionnaire of the Minimum Standards of Qualification for Egyptian Soccer Premier League):**

The researchers designed and calibrated "Questionnaire of the Minimum Standards of Qualification for Egyptian

Soccer Premier League" as a research data collection tool designed to answer the research questions. The researchers established the axes of the questionnaire and presented them to experts (n=7) to show their opinions about these axes as seen in table (2).

**Table (2)  
Frequency, percentage and relative importance of experts' opinions about the axes of questionnaire (n=7)**

| No. | Axes                               | Agree |        | Disagree |       | Relative weight | Relative importance |
|-----|------------------------------------|-------|--------|----------|-------|-----------------|---------------------|
|     |                                    | F     | %      | F        | %     |                 |                     |
| 1   | Youth Development Programs         | 7     | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 7               | 100.00              |
| 2   | Standards of Courts and Facilities | 6     | 85.71  | 1        | 14.29 | 6               | 85.71               |
| 3   | Administrative Standards           | 7     | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 7               | 100.00              |

Table (2) showed that researchers included all axes agreement percentages ranged from 14.29% and 100%. The above 85% of agreement.

**Table (3): Preliminary and Final number of items of the questionnaire (n=7)**

| No. | Axes                               | Preliminary number of items | Sum of excluded items | Numbers of excluded items | Final number of items |
|-----|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1   | Youth Development Programs         | 32                          | 2                     | 5-18                      | 30                    |
| 2   | Standards of Courts and Facilities | 84                          | 3                     | 7-39-57                   | 81                    |
| 3   | Administrative Standards           | 19                          | 1                     | 11                        | 18                    |
| Sum |                                    | 135                         | 6                     | 6                         | 129                   |

Table (3) indicated that according to experts' opinions the researchers excluded (6) items out of (135) items and the final number of items reached (129). All items with relative importance above 71.43% were included.

**Logical validity of the questionnaire:**

The researchers verified that all axes and items of the questionnaire are logical valid

to measure what they are meant to measure through review of literature and interviews with participants.

Internal consistency of the questionnaire:

The researchers applied the questionnaire on a pilot sample (n=20) from the same research community and outside the main sample to calculate correlation coefficients among each item

and its axis, each item and total score of the questionnaire and each axis and total score of the

questionnaire as seen in table (4) and (5).

**Table (4)**  
**Correlation coefficients among each item and its axis and each item with sum of the questionnaire (n=20)**

| First axis |                |               | Second axis |                |               |     |                |               |     |                |               | Third axis |                |               |
|------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|-----|----------------|---------------|-----|----------------|---------------|------------|----------------|---------------|
| No.        | Item with axis | Item with sum | No.         | Item with axis | Item with sum | No. | Item with axis | Item with sum | No. | Item with axis | Item with sum | No.        | Item with axis | Item with sum |
| 1          | 0.90           | 0.85          | 1           | 0.84           | 0.88          | 31  | 0.89           | 0.83          | 61  | 0.83           | 0.89          | 1          | 0.85           | 0.91          |
| 2          | 0.87           | 0.83          | 2           | 0.86           | 0.90          | 32  | 0.90           | 0.87          | 62  | 0.91           | 0.82          | 2          | 0.92           | 0.86          |
| 3          | 0.89           | 0.91          | 3           | 0.88           | 0.83          | 33  | 0.85           | 0.91          | 63  | 0.84           | 0.88          | 3          | 0.90           | 0.82          |
| 4          | 0.76           | 0.83          | 4           | 0.87           | 0.85          | 34  | 0.81           | 0.86          | 64  | 0.80           | 0.89          | 4          | 0.92           | 0.86          |
| 5          | 0.73           | 0.84          | 5           | 0.85           | 0.89          | 35  | 0.90           | 0.82          | 65  | 0.89           | 0.84          | 5          | 0.88           | 0.85          |
| 6          | 0.88           | 0.78          | 6           | 0.92           | 0.86          | 36  | 0.91           | 0.86          | 66  | 0.83           | 0.87          | 6          | 0.90           | 0.93          |
| 7          | 0.83           | 0.89          | 7           | 0.87           | 0.83          | 37  | 0.88           | 0.84          | 67  | 0.88           | 0.78          | 7          | 0.92           | 0.89          |
| 8          | 0.91           | 0.82          | 8           | 0.90           | 0.84          | 38  | 0.83           | 0.87          | 68  | 0.93           | 0.89          | 8          | 0.86           | 0.92          |
| 9          | 0.84           | 0.88          | 9           | 0.91           | 0.86          | 39  | 0.84           | 0.89          | 69  | 0.90           | 0.93          | 9          | 0.92           | 0.86          |
| 10         | 0.80           | 0.89          | 10          | 0.85           | 0.81          | 40  | 0.83           | 0.87          | 70  | 0.86           | 0.90          | 10         | 0.87           | 0.85          |
| 11         | 0.82           | 0.84          | 11          | 0.87           | 0.91          | 41  | 0.91           | 0.83          | 71  | 0.83           | 0.87          | 11         | 0.85           | 0.91          |
| 12         | 0.88           | 0.92          | 12          | 0.84           | 0.87          | 42  | 0.80           | 0.86          | 72  | 0.88           | 0.84          | 12         | 0.92           | 0.86          |
| 13         | 0.83           | 0.89          | 13          | 0.88           | 0.83          | 43  | 0.88           | 0.84          | 73  | 0.92           | 0.89          | 13         | 0.90           | 0.82          |
| 14         | 0.86           | 0.91          | 14          | 0.90           | 0.86          | 44  | 0.91           | 0.88          | 74  | 0.89           | 0.84          | 14         | 0.84           | 0.86          |
| 15         | 0.88           | 0.82          | 15          | 0.81           | 0.84          | 45  | 0.89           | 0.86          | 75  | 0.90           | 0.93          | 15         | 0.90           | 0.85          |
| 16         | 0.89           | 0.85          | 16          | 0.84           | 0.88          | 46  | 0.84           | 0.90          | 76  | 0.92           | 0.86          | 16         | 0.92           | 0.86          |
| 17         | 0.84           | 0.90          | 17          | 0.88           | 0.85          | 47  | 0.86           | 0.81          | 77  | 0.88           | 0.84          | 17         | 0.88           | 0.84          |
| 18         | 0.92           | 0.88          | 18          | 0.89           | 0.91          | 48  | 0.81           | 0.84          | 78  | 0.89           | 0.93          | 18         | 0.89           | 0.92          |
| 19         | 0.88           | 0.85          | 19          | 0.83           | 0.87          | 49  | 0.87           | 0.91          | 79  | 0.86           | 0.91          |            |                |               |
| 20         | 0.89           | 0.84          | 20          | 0.82           | 0.91          | 50  | 0.84           | 0.89          | 80  | 0.78           | 0.83          |            |                |               |
| 21         | 0.90           | 0.86          | 21          | 0.80           | 0.78          | 51  | 0.86           | 0.90          | 81  | 0.85           | 0.92          |            |                |               |
| 22         | 0.87           | 0.92          | 22          | 0.88           | 0.83          | 52  | 0.82           | 0.87          |     |                |               |            |                |               |
| 23         | 0.89           | 0.86          | 23          | 0.92           | 0.89          | 53  | 0.91           | 0.88          |     |                |               |            |                |               |
| 24         | 0.90           | 0.87          | 24          | 0.90           | 0.86          | 54  | 0.83           | 0.87          |     |                |               |            |                |               |
| 25         | 0.88           | 0.91          | 25          | 0.92           | 0.88          | 55  | 0.87           | 0.89          |     |                |               |            |                |               |
| 26         | 0.78           | 0.83          | 26          | 0.89           | 0.84          | 56  | 0.91           | 0.87          |     |                |               |            |                |               |
| 27         | 0.88           | 0.84          | 27          | 0.90           | 0.86          | 57  | 0.90           | 0.87          |     |                |               |            |                |               |
| 28         | 0.84           | 0.91          | 28          | 0.83           | 0.87          | 58  | 0.89           | 0.85          |     |                |               |            |                |               |
| 29         | 0.85           | 0.88          | 29          | 0.89           | 0.84          | 59  | 0.84           | 0.91          |     |                |               |            |                |               |
| 30         | 0.87           | 0.84          | 30          | 0.91           | 0.86          | 60  | 0.93           | 0.88          |     |                |               |            |                |               |

R table value on  $P \leq 0.05 = 0.44$

Table (4) indicated statistically significant correlations among each item

and its axis and each item and total sum of the questionnaire.

**Table (5)**

**Correlation coefficients among each axis and sum of the questionnaire (n=20)**

| No. | Axes                               | R    |
|-----|------------------------------------|------|
| 1   | Youth Development Programs         | 0.90 |
| 2   | Standards of Courts and Facilities | 0.92 |
| 3   | Administrative Standards           | 0.86 |

R table value on  $P \leq 0.05 = 0.44$

Table (5) indicated statistically significant correlations among each axis and total sum of the questionnaire. These results indicated the validity of the questionnaire.

**Reliability of the questionnaire:**

To identify the reliability of the questionnaire, the researchers used test/retest procedure on a pilot sample (n=20) to calculate correlation coefficients between test and retest and Cronbach's Alpha as seen in table (6) and (7).

**Table (6)  
Correlation coefficients between test and retest for the questionnaire (n=20)**

| First axis |      | Second axis |      |    |      |    |      | Third axis |      |
|------------|------|-------------|------|----|------|----|------|------------|------|
| No         | R    | No          | R    | No | R    | No | R    | No         | R    |
| 1          | 0.89 | 1           | 0.87 | 31 | 0.76 | 61 | 0.88 | 1          | 0.86 |
| 2          | 0.82 | 2           | 0.83 | 32 | 0.89 | 62 | 0.86 | 2          | 0.91 |
| 3          | 0.90 | 3           | 0.84 | 33 | 0.83 | 63 | 0.89 | 3          | 0.84 |
| 4          | 0.87 | 4           | 0.91 | 34 | 0.92 | 64 | 0.91 | 4          | 0.88 |
| 5          | 0.83 | 5           | 0.89 | 35 | 0.82 | 65 | 0.87 | 5          | 0.92 |
| 6          | 0.89 | 6           | 0.87 | 36 | 0.90 | 66 | 0.86 | 6          | 0.84 |
| 7          | 0.92 | 7           | 0.85 | 37 | 0.79 | 67 | 0.92 | 7          | 0.87 |
| 8          | 0.84 | 8           | 0.91 | 38 | 0.86 | 68 | 0.84 | 8          | 0.89 |
| 9          | 0.91 | 9           | 0.87 | 39 | 0.83 | 69 | 0.91 | 9          | 0.84 |
| 10         | 0.88 | 10          | 0.76 | 40 | 0.88 | 70 | 0.89 | 10         | 0.90 |
| 11         | 0.85 | 11          | 0.84 | 41 | 0.91 | 71 | 0.85 | 11         | 0.84 |
| 12         | 0.91 | 12          | 0.89 | 42 | 0.86 | 72 | 0.89 | 12         | 0.93 |

**Follow Table (6)  
Correlation coefficients between test and retest for the questionnaire (n=20)**



| First axis |      | Second axis |      |    |      |    |      | Third axis |      |
|------------|------|-------------|------|----|------|----|------|------------|------|
| No         | R    | No          | R    | No | R    | No | R    | No         | R    |
| 13         | 0.93 | 13          | 0.91 | 43 | 0.87 | 73 | 0.87 | 13         | 0.88 |
| 14         | 0.85 | 14          | 0.86 | 44 | 0.89 | 74 | 0.90 | 14         | 0.89 |
| 15         | 0.86 | 15          | 0.83 | 45 | 0.90 | 75 | 0.88 | 15         | 0.91 |
| 16         | 0.87 | 16          | 0.88 | 46 | 0.85 | 76 | 0.91 | 16         | 0.87 |
| 17         | 0.91 | 17          | 0.89 | 47 | 0.84 | 77 | 0.88 | 17         | 0.89 |
| 18         | 0.86 | 18          | 0.90 | 48 | 0.90 | 78 | 0.89 | 18         | 0.90 |
| 19         | 0.92 | 19          | 0.87 | 49 | 0.88 | 79 | 0.85 |            |      |
| 20         | 0.88 | 20          | 0.88 | 50 | 0.85 | 80 | 0.84 |            |      |
| 21         | 0.91 | 21          | 0.84 | 51 | 0.86 | 81 | 0.91 |            |      |
| 22         | 0.83 | 22          | 0.89 | 52 | 0.87 |    |      |            |      |
| 23         | 0.84 | 23          | 0.91 | 53 | 0.92 |    |      |            |      |
| 24         | 0.86 | 24          | 0.86 | 54 | 0.91 |    |      |            |      |
| 25         | 0.90 | 25          | 0.87 | 55 | 0.88 |    |      |            |      |
| 26         | 0.88 | 26          | 0.85 | 56 | 0.87 |    |      |            |      |
| 27         | 0.84 | 27          | 0.91 | 57 | 0.89 |    |      |            |      |
| 28         | 0.91 | 28          | 0.87 | 58 | 0.82 |    |      |            |      |
| 29         | 0.87 | 29          | 0.83 | 59 | 0.87 |    |      |            |      |
| 30         | 0.82 | 30          | 0.91 | 60 | 0.92 |    |      |            |      |

R table value on  $P \leq 0.05 = 0.44$

Table (6) indicated statistically significant correlations between test and

retest ranging from 0.76 to 0.93 and this proves the reliability of the questionnaire.

**Table (7)**

**Cronbach's Alpha for the three axes of the questionnaire (n=20)**

| Cronbach's Alpha |                                    |                                  |
|------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 0.856            |                                    |                                  |
| No.              | Axes                               | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
| 1                | Youth Development Programs         | 0.854*                           |
| 2                | Standards of Courts and Facilities | 0.853*                           |
| 3                | Administrative Standards           | 0.855*                           |

Table (7) indicated the Cronbach's Alpha for the three axes were highly significant.

#### **Pilot Study:**

The researchers performed a pilot study from 28-11-2016 to 9-12-2016 on a pilot sample (n=20) from the same research community and outside the main sample. Results of this pilot study verified the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. In addition, it was clear that all items were clear and understandable and there are no difficulties that may hinder the main application.

#### **Main Study:**

The researchers applied the questionnaire to the main sample (n=60) from 2-1-2017 to 23-1-2016 on an individual basis. After application, participants' responses were tabulated to be treated statistically.

#### **Statistical Treatment:**

The researchers used SPSS software to calculate the following: mean– SD – Median – Correlation coefficient– Cronbach's Alpha– frequency – percentage– relative weight– relative importance –  $CHI^2$ .

#### **Results:**

**Table (8)**  
**frequency, percentage, relative weight, relative importance and  $CHI^2$  of participants' responses to the first axis (Youth Development Programs) (n=60)**

| Item | Yes |        | Somewhat |       | No |      | Relative weight | Relative importance | $CHI^2$ |
|------|-----|--------|----------|-------|----|------|-----------------|---------------------|---------|
|      | F   | %      | F        | %     | F  | %    |                 |                     |         |
| 1    | 60  | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00  |
| 2    | 56  | 93.33  | 4        | 6.67  | 0  | 0.00 | 176             | 97.78               | 97.60   |
| 3    | 51  | 85.00  | 6        | 10.00 | 3  | 5.00 | 168             | 93.33               | 72.30   |
| 4    | 56  | 93.33  | 4        | 6.67  | 2  | 3.33 | 178             | 98.89               | 93.80   |
| 5    | 53  | 88.33  | 2        | 3.33  | 5  | 8.33 | 168             | 93.33               | 81.90   |
| 6    | 59  | 98.33  | 1        | 1.67  | 0  | 0.00 | 179             | 99.44               | 114.10  |
| 7    | 60  | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00  |
| 8    | 60  | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00  |
| 9    | 60  | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00  |
| 10   | 60  | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00  |
| 11   | 60  | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00  |
| 12   | 60  | 100.00 | 0        | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00  |

**Follow Table (8)**  
**frequency, percentage, relative weight, relative importance and**  
**CHI<sup>2</sup> of participants' responses to the first axis (Youth**  
**Development Programs) (n=60)**

| Item | Yes |        | Somehow |       | No |       | Relative weight | Relative importance | CHI <sup>2</sup> |
|------|-----|--------|---------|-------|----|-------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
|      | F   | %      | F       | %     | F  | %     |                 |                     |                  |
| 13   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 14   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 15   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 16   | 51  | 85.00  | 9       | 15.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 171             | 95.00               | 74.10            |
| 17   | 51  | 85.00  | 9       | 15.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 171             | 95.00               | 74.10            |
| 18   | 59  | 98.33  | 9       | 15.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 195             | 108.33              | 102.10           |
| 19   | 56  | 93.33  | 4       | 6.67  | 0  | 0.00  | 176             | 97.78               | 97.60            |
| 20   | 48  | 80.00  | 12      | 20.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 168             | 93.33               | 62.40            |
| 21   | 56  | 93.33  | 4       | 6.67  | 0  | 0.00  | 176             | 97.78               | 97.60            |
| 22   | 56  | 93.33  | 4       | 6.67  | 0  | 0.00  | 176             | 97.78               | 97.60            |
| 23   | 56  | 93.33  | 4       | 6.67  | 0  | 0.00  | 176             | 97.78               | 97.60            |
| 24   | 51  | 85.00  | 9       | 15.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 171             | 95.00               | 74.10            |
| 25   | 58  | 96.67  | 2       | 3.33  | 0  | 0.00  | 178             | 98.89               | 108.40           |
| 26   | 41  | 68.33  | 3       | 5.00  | 16 | 26.67 | 145             | 80.56               | 37.30            |
| 27   | 31  | 51.67  | 9       | 15.00 | 20 | 33.33 | 131             | 72.78               | 12.10            |
| 28   | 51  | 85.00  | 9       | 15.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 171             | 95.00               | 74.10            |
| 29   | 43  | 71.67  | 17      | 28.33 | 0  | 0.00  | 163             | 90.56               | 46.90            |
| 30   | 53  | 88.33  | 7       | 11.67 | 0  | 0.00  | 173             | 96.11               | 82.90            |

CHI2 table value on  $P \leq 0.05 = 5.99$

**Table (9)**  
**frequency, percentage, relative weight, relative importance and**  
**CHI<sup>2</sup> of participants' responses to the second axis (Standards of**  
**Courts and Facilities) (n=60)**

| Item | Yes |        | Somehow |      | No |       | Relative weight | Relative importance | CHI <sup>2</sup> |
|------|-----|--------|---------|------|----|-------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
|      | F   | %      | F       | %    | F  | %     |                 |                     |                  |
| 1    | 49  | 81.67  | 0       | 0.00 | 11 | 18.33 | 158             | 87.78               | 66.10            |
| 2    | 49  | 81.67  | 0       | 0.00 | 11 | 18.33 | 158             | 87.78               | 66.10            |
| 3    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 4    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 5    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 6    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 7    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00 | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |

**Follow Table (9)**  
**frequency, percentage, relative weight, relative importance and**  
**CHI<sup>2</sup> of participants' responses to the second axis (Standards of**  
**Courts and Facilities) (n=60)**

| Item | Yes |        | Somehow |       | No |       | Relative weight | Relative importance | CHI <sup>2</sup> |
|------|-----|--------|---------|-------|----|-------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
|      | F   | %      | F       | %     | F  | %     |                 |                     |                  |
| 8    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 9    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 10   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 11   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 12   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 13   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 14   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 15   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 16   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 17   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 18   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 19   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 20   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 21   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 22   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 23   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 24   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 25   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 26   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 27   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 28   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 29   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 30   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 31   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 32   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 33   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 34   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 35   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 36   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 37   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 38   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 39   | 43  | 71.67  | 2       | 3.33  | 15 | 25.00 | 148             | 82.22               | 43.90            |
| 40   | 31  | 51.67  | 12      | 20.00 | 17 | 28.33 | 134             | 74.44               | 9.70             |
| 41   | 31  | 51.67  | 12      | 20.00 | 17 | 28.33 | 134             | 74.44               | 9.70             |

**Follow Table (9)**  
**frequency, percentage, relative weight, relative importance and**  
**CHI<sup>2</sup> of participants' responses to the second axis (Standards of**  
**Courts and Facilities) (n=60)**

| Item | Yes |        | Somehow |       | No |       | Relative weight | Relative importance | CHI <sup>2</sup> |
|------|-----|--------|---------|-------|----|-------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
|      | F   | %      | F       | %     | F  | %     |                 |                     |                  |
| 42   | 31  | 51.67  | 12      | 20.00 | 17 | 28.33 | 134             | 74.44               | 9.70             |
| 43   | 31  | 51.67  | 12      | 20.00 | 17 | 28.33 | 134             | 74.44               | 9.70             |
| 44   | 22  | 36.67  | 13      | 21.67 | 25 | 41.67 | 117             | 65.00               | 3.90             |
| 45   | 22  | 36.67  | 13      | 21.67 | 25 | 41.67 | 117             | 65.00               | 3.90             |
| 46   | 58  | 96.67  | 2       | 3.33  | 0  | 0.00  | 178             | 98.89               | 108.40           |
| 47   | 58  | 96.67  | 2       | 3.33  | 0  | 0.00  | 178             | 98.89               | 108.40           |
| 48   | 31  | 51.67  | 0       | 0.00  | 29 | 48.33 | 122             | 67.78               | 30.10            |
| 49   | 31  | 51.67  | 0       | 0.00  | 29 | 48.33 | 122             | 67.78               | 30.10            |
| 50   | 58  | 96.67  | 2       | 3.33  | 0  | 0.00  | 178             | 98.89               | 108.40           |
| 51   | 29  | 48.33  | 0       | 0.00  | 31 | 51.67 | 118             | 65.56               | 30.10            |
| 52   | 48  | 80.00  | 0       | 0.00  | 12 | 20.00 | 156             | 86.67               | 62.40            |
| 53   | 58  | 96.67  | 0       | 0.00  | 2  | 3.33  | 176             | 97.78               | 108.40           |
| 54   | 21  | 35.00  | 0       | 0.00  | 39 | 65.00 | 102             | 56.67               | 38.10            |
| 55   | 21  | 35.00  | 0       | 0.00  | 39 | 65.00 | 102             | 56.67               | 38.10            |
| 56   | 21  | 35.00  | 0       | 0.00  | 39 | 65.00 | 102             | 56.67               | 38.10            |
| 57   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 58   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 59   | 51  | 85.00  | 0       | 0.00  | 9  | 15.00 | 162             | 90.00               | 74.10            |
| 60   | 51  | 85.00  | 3       | 5.00  | 6  | 10.00 | 165             | 91.67               | 72.30            |
| 61   | 51  | 85.00  | 3       | 5.00  | 6  | 10.00 | 165             | 91.67               | 72.30            |
| 62   | 32  | 53.33  | 6       | 10.00 | 22 | 36.67 | 130             | 72.22               | 17.20            |
| 63   | 32  | 53.33  | 6       | 10.00 | 22 | 36.67 | 130             | 72.22               | 17.20            |
| 64   | 32  | 53.33  | 6       | 10.00 | 22 | 36.67 | 130             | 72.22               | 17.20            |
| 65   | 32  | 53.33  | 6       | 10.00 | 22 | 36.67 | 130             | 72.22               | 17.20            |
| 66   | 32  | 53.33  | 6       | 10.00 | 22 | 36.67 | 130             | 72.22               | 17.20            |
| 67   | 32  | 53.33  | 6       | 10.00 | 22 | 36.67 | 130             | 72.22               | 17.20            |
| 68   | 29  | 48.33  | 3       | 5.00  | 28 | 46.67 | 121             | 67.22               | 21.70            |
| 69   | 33  | 55.00  | 15      | 25.00 | 12 | 20.00 | 141             | 78.33               | 12.90            |
| 70   | 58  | 96.67  | 2       | 3.33  | 0  | 0.00  | 178             | 98.89               | 108.40           |
| 71   | 31  | 51.67  | 9       | 15.00 | 20 | 33.33 | 131             | 72.78               | 12.10            |
| 72   | 33  | 55.00  | 12      | 20.00 | 15 | 25.00 | 138             | 76.67               | 12.90            |
| 73   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 74   | 33  | 55.00  | 12      | 20.00 | 15 | 25.00 | 138             | 76.67               | 12.90            |

**Follow Table (9)**  
**frequency, percentage, relative weight, relative importance and**  
**CHI<sup>2</sup> of participants' responses to the second axis (Standards of**  
**Courts and Facilities) (n=60)**

| Item | Yes |        | Somehow |       | No |      | Relative weight | Relative importance | CHI <sup>2</sup> |
|------|-----|--------|---------|-------|----|------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
|      | F   | %      | F       | %     | F  | %    |                 |                     |                  |
| 75   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 76   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 77   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 78   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 79   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00 | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 80   | 53  | 88.33  | 7       | 11.67 | 0  | 0.00 | 173             | 96.11               | 82.90            |
| 81   | 51  | 85.00  | 9       | 15.00 | 0  | 0.00 | 171             | 95.00               | 74.10            |

CHI2 table value on  $P \leq 0.05 = 5.99$

**Table (10)**  
**frequency, percentage, relative weight, relative importance and**  
**CHI<sup>2</sup> of participants' responses to the third axis (Administrative**  
**Standards) (n=60)**

| Item | Yes |        | Somehow |       | No |       | Relative weight | Relative importance | CHI <sup>2</sup> |
|------|-----|--------|---------|-------|----|-------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
|      | F   | %      | F       | %     | F  | %     |                 |                     |                  |
| 1    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 2    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 3    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 4    | 47  | 78.33  | 3       | 5.00  | 10 | 16.67 | 157             | 87.22               | 55.90            |
| 5    | 31  | 51.67  | 4       | 6.67  | 25 | 41.67 | 126             | 70.00               | 20.10            |
| 6    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 7    | 31  | 51.67  | 2       | 3.33  | 27 | 45.00 | 124             | 68.89               | 24.70            |
| 8    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 9    | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 10   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 11   | 33  | 55.00  | 6       | 10.00 | 21 | 35.00 | 132             | 73.33               | 18.30            |
| 12   | 60  | 100.00 | 0       | 0.00  | 0  | 0.00  | 180             | 100.00              | 120.00           |
| 13   | 49  | 81.67  | 3       | 5.00  | 8  | 13.33 | 161             | 89.44               | 63.70            |
| 14   | 21  | 35.00  | 2       | 3.33  | 37 | 61.67 | 104             | 57.78               | 30.70            |
| 15   | 39  | 65.00  | 2       | 3.33  | 19 | 31.67 | 140             | 77.78               | 34.30            |
| 16   | 39  | 65.00  | 2       | 3.33  | 19 | 31.67 | 140             | 77.78               | 34.30            |
| 17   | 39  | 65.00  | 2       | 3.33  | 19 | 31.67 | 140             | 77.78               | 34.30            |
| 18   | 39  | 65.00  | 2       | 3.33  | 19 | 31.67 | 140             | 77.78               | 34.30            |

CHI2 table value on  $P \leq 0.05 = 5.99$

**Discussion:  
The First Axis: "Youth  
Development Programs"**

Table (8) indicated that  $\text{CHI}^2$  values were between 120 and 12.10. These values were higher than its table value on  $P \leq 0.05$  (5.99). The researchers think that this is a clear indication about the quality programs of youth development initiated by the clubs under investigation. These programs improve the performance level of junior players through well-balanced training and participation in major matches as this improves them physically, mentally and technically. In addition, these programs fulfill the general aim of amateur sports; that is enjoyment and preparation of an integrated character of the junior player. Furthermore, such programs prepare junior players to their future professional careers as professional soccer players.

This is in agreement with Ferrari et al (2009), Viciano & Mayorga-Vega (2015) and Smolianov et al (2015) who indicated the importance of clearly planned programs for youth development in sports clubs as

such programs help developing players' loyalty to their team in addition to helping them smoothly evolve from amateur stage to professional stage.

Morgan & Whitehead (2015) indicated the importance of physical, mental and technical preparation of players not only for amateur competitions but also for their future career life as professional soccer players.

Pache (2015) indicated that sports clubs specialized in a particular sports activity regularly run such programs to insure the continuity of competitive performance as this performance is the key behind expanding fans' numbers. These two factors are interrelated and can never be separated.

These results indicated that most sports clubs are interested in initiating well-planned youth development programs as a crucial standard for qualifying to premier league in Egypt.

**The Second Axis: "Standards  
of Courts and Facilities"**

Table (9) indicated that  $\text{CHI}^2$  values were between 120 and 3.90. These values were higher than its table value on

$P \leq 0.05$  (5.99) except for only two items that were below statistical significance and concerned doping identification.

These results indicated that Egyptian sports clubs participating in Egyptian premier league for soccer are interested in providing both teams (host and visitor) with all means of comfort. In addition, they are interested in receiving media men, businessmen and public figures with suitable respect as they play crucial role in generating valuable investment and sponsorship opportunities. Nevertheless, the researchers think that the lack of doping identification measures may be due to the lack of financial resources necessary for them and their novelty to Egyptian sport but not for trying to hide doping activities in their teams.

These results are in agreement with Plumley & Flint (2015) who indicated the importance of quality courts and facilities in the club as this provides teams with good training atmosphere. In addition, they indicated the importance of a main court that is big enough to host the

largest possible number of both teams' fans to generate more revenues from selling match tickets.

Diejomaoh et al (2015) and Lacriek (2015) think that it is important to prepare special halls for media men and broadcast as good media coverage generates more revenues through selling broadcast rights in addition to satisfying the need of fans who could not watch the match on court.

Francioni et al (2016) think that having medical rooms for massage, physical therapy and anti-doping activities increases the good reputation of the club as these measures comfort both teams' players towards the quick responses to emergency medical situations during the match.

Mijatovic et al (2015) think that inviting businessmen and public figures is a major marketing activity for attracting more investment opportunities in the form of live investment, sponsorship offers and direct donation. These activities provide clubs with good financial resources for their activities.



The researchers think that all clubs concentrate on this particular axis due to the general awareness of its importance as good facilities mean good investment opportunities and good attractive brand name for all clubs.

### **The Third Axis:**

"Administrative Standards"

Table (10) indicated that  $CHI^2$  values were between 120 and 18.30. These values were higher than its table value on  $P \leq 0.05$  (5.99). The researchers think that sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer seek to fulfill the administrative standards to be eligible for participating in the national, continental and international competitions according to the Egyptian Federation of Football, CAF and FIFA. In addition, these clubs are considered as dignified sports organizations with good administrative systems since its beginning.

Jang & Lee (2015) and Kesenne (2015) indicated that it is important to control the administrative performance of sports organizations to achieve high level of efficiency for its activities without any

administrative barriers or expensive administrative costs. In addition, this control is meant to prevent any violation or administrative rules and regulations.

Pijetlovic (2015) thinks that it is important to depend on specialized professionals in managing sports activities, especially professional ones. Using highly qualified administrators prevents conflict of interests and unclear responsibilities in addition to establishing sound legal connections with other associations, organizations and individuals.

Mourao & Cima (2015) indicated that successful and punctual administrative work enables sports organizations—clubs in this case – to appear in an attractive shape for investors. This supports the club's opportunities to win a good market share of investment and sponsorship activities.

Pache (2015) indicated that professional sports teams need good, efficient and punctual administrative systems to achieve its goals without any administrative

barriers that may hinder such activities.

The researchers think that sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer seek efficient administrative systems to fulfill its audience's needs and insure good interaction with other organizations in addition to attracting more investment and sponsorship opportunities.

### **Conclusions:**

In the light of this research aim, methods and results, the researchers concluded the following:

- Sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer seek to fulfill the standards of youth development programs.
- Sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer seek to fulfill the standards of courts and facilities.
- There are clear limitations concerning anti-doping activities.
- Sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer seek to fulfill the administrative standards.
- Sports clubs of the Egyptian premier league of soccer are willing to fulfill all

standards of qualification for premier league as a professional league.

### **Recommendations:**

According to these conclusions, the researchers recommend the following:

- It is very important to survey all premier league clubs for fulfillment of standards of qualification for the premier league.
- The Egyptian federation of football should issue general regulations for qualification to the premier league and distribute it to Class A clubs before qualification.
- It is important to monitor the commitment of sports clubs to qualification standards before being officially qualified to the premier league.
- Egyptian clubs should be aware of the CAF and FIFA standards for premier (professional) leagues.
- It is important to perform future research works about the legal and legislative aspects of sports clubs qualified to premier (professional) league in Egypt.

### **References:**

- 1- Andreff, W. (2015): Governance of Professional

Team Sports Clubs: Agency Problems and Soft Budget Constraints. *Disequilibrium*

*Sports Economics: Competitive Imbalance and Budget Constraints*, 175.

**2- Diejomaoh, S. O. E., Akarah, E., & Tayire, F. O. (2015):** Availability of Facilities and Equipment for Sports Administration at the Local Government Areas of Delta State, Nigeria. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4 (2), 307.

**3- Eddosary, M., Ko, Y. J., Sagas, M., & Kim, H. Y. (2015):** Consumers' Intention to Attend Soccer Events: Application and Extension of the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Psychological reports*, 117 (1), 89-102.

**4- Ferrari, L., Rossi, G., Ricci, F., & Tamburino, T. (2009).** The Effects of „Feet Drain“ on the Italian Football Academy System. *Birkbeck Sport Business Centre Research Paper Series*, 88.

**5- Francioni, F. M., Figueiredo, A. J., Lupo, C., Conte, D., Capranica, L., & Tessitore, A. (2016).**

Preseason Strategies of Italian First League Soccer Clubs in Relation to their Championship Ranking: A Five-Year Analysis. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 50(1), 145-155.

**6- Francis, T., Norris, J., & Brinkmann, R. (2016).** Sustainability initiatives in professional soccer. *Soccer & Society*, 1-11.

**7- Gedvilaite-Moan, A., & Laskiene, S. (2015).** Organisational Management Peculiarities of the Public Sector Referring to Sports as a Public Sector Example. *Engineering Economics*, 66(1).

**8- Grossmann, M. (2015).** Evolutionarily Stable Strategies in Sports Contests. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 16(1), 108-121.

**9- Ismail, n.** The relationship between decision-support-systems and the quality of administrative decisions in certain Egyptian sports federations. *Science, Movement and Health*, Vol. XV, ISSUE 2 Supplement, 2015 September 2015, 15 (2, Supplement): 482-487

- 10- Jang, H., & Lee, Y. H. (2015).** Outcome Uncertainty, Governance Structure, and Attendance: A Study of the Korean Professional Football League. In *The Sports Business in The Pacific Rim* (pp. 59-81). Springer International Publishing.
- 11- Kacirek, R. (2015).** Soccer stadiums as tools of economic development (Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University).
- 12- Kesenne, S. (2015).** 12 The growing gap between small-and large-country football teams in Europe. *Ethics and Governance in Sport: The Future of Sport Imagined*, 113.
- 13- Kesenne, S. (2015).** Revenue sharing and absolute league quality; talent investment and talent allocation. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 62(1), 51-58.
- 14- Morgan, O. A., & Whitehead, J. C. (2015).** Willingness to Pay for Soccer Player Development in the United States. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 15(270025156114)
- 15- Mourão, P. R., & Cima, C. (2015).** Studying the Golden Generations' Effects and the Changes in the Competitive Balance of the Portuguese Soccer League. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 10(1), 42.
- 16- Nahm, J. (2016).** Comment on "Professional Asian Football Leagues and the Global Market". *Asian Economic Policy Review*, 11(1), 41-42.
- 17- Paché, G. (2015).** Governance of Professional Sport Leagues. *International Journal of Conceptions on Management and Social Sciences*, 3(4).
- 18- Pijetlovic, K. (2015).** Breakaway Leagues and Governance Issues in European Football. In *EU Sports Law and Breakaway Leagues in Football* (pp. 47-98). TMC Asser Press.
- 19- Plumley, D., & Flint, S. W. (2015).** The UEFA Champions League: maintaining the status quo?. *Team Performance Management*, 21(5/6), 247-258.

- 20- Radoman, M., & Voia, M. C. (2015).** Youth training programs and their impact on career and spell duration of professional soccer players. *Labour*, 29(2), 163-193.
- 21- Silva, T. D., Almeida, T. S., & da Silva, R. C. (2015).** Politics and Sports Finance in Brazil: An Analysis about the National System for Sport and leisure. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, 2(7).
- 22- Smolianov, P., Murphy, J., McMahon, S. G., & Naylor, A. H. (2015).** Comparing the practices of US Soccer against a global model for integrated development of mass and high-performance sport. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 20(1), 1-21.
- 23- Sodiya O. O. (2016).** The Effects of Youth Sports Investment on Economic Development. *Development: What Now? Past, Present and Future Challenges in International Development*, 346.
- 24- Viciana, J., & Mayorga-Vega, D. (2015).** Influence of the pre-service training program on coaches' instructions delivered to youth soccer players. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 46 (1), 18-38.