WELCOME & INTRODUCTION

PROF. DR. STEFANO CANEPPELE
LAUSANNE // 15 NOVEMBER 2021
EPOSM OBJECTIVES

1. **Raising awareness**
   about (the prevalence of) sporting-related match-fixing

2. **Stimulation moral judgment**
   regarding the fact that sporting-related match-fixing is wrong

3. **Sharing and transferring**
   knowledge on sporting-related match-fixing
EPOSM ACTIVITIES & OUTPUTS

1. Academic part
   ● online questionnaire on match-fixing in 7 European countries

2. Training part
   ● action plans and workshops

3. Dissemination part
   ● sharing and transferring results and outputs
EPOSM TEAM

Coordinator

GHENT UNIVERSITY

Associated partner

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Project partners

Utrecht University

IRIS

PLAY FAIR CODE

INTEGRITY WINS

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

CROATIA

ICES

Loughborough University

EPOSM
EPOSM INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM PROGRAMME

18h WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION
Stefano Canepele (UNIL) & Pierre Zappelli (PI)

18h15 GLOBAL OVERVIEW OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
Stef Van Der Hoeven (UGHENT)

18h40 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES ON MATCH-FIXING “HOW CAN WE MAKE ALL 3 LEVELS STRONGER?”
Maarten van Bottenburg (UU), Argyro Elisavet Manoli (LU), Severin Moritzer (PFC), Simon De Clercq (ICES)

19h30 Q & A

19h40 “LOOKING TO THE FUTURE: HOW TO MANAGE THE PREVENTION OF MATCH-FIXING”
Bram Constandt (UGHENT) & Paul Standaert (PI)

CONCLUSIONS
Annick Willem (UGHENT)

20h NETWORK RECEPTION
GLOBAL OVERVIEW OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

STEF VAN DER HŒVEN
LAUSANNE // 15 NOVEMBER 2021
1. Background

2. Online questionnaire

3. Results
1. BACKGROUND
“An intentional arrangement, act, or omission aimed at an improper alteration of the result or the course of a sports competition in order to remove all or part of the unpredictable nature of the aforementioned sports competition with a view to obtaining an undue advantage for oneself or for others.”

(Council of Europe, 2014, art. 3.4)
1.2 DIFFERENT TYPES

- **match-fixing**
  - non-betting-related match-fixing
    - no bribery or coercion
    - involving bribery or coercion
  - betting-related match-fixing
    - no bribery or coercion
    - involving bribery or coercion
    - match-fixing*
      - no bribery or coercion
      - involving bribery or coercion
    - spot-fixing
      - no bribery or coercion
      - involving bribery or coercion

"Clean Hands" / "Operation Zero" (2018)

Zheyun Ye (2004/05)

(Van Der Hoeven et al., 2020)
Sporting-related match-fixing

- non-betting-related match-fixing
  - no bribery or coercion
  - involving bribery or coercion

- betting-related match-fixing
  - match-fixing*
    - no bribery or coercion
    - involving bribery or coercion
  - spot-fixing
    - no bribery or coercion
    - involving bribery or coercion

(Van Der Hoeven et al., 2020)
1.3 HOW IT STARTED…

91,7% Sporting-related cases > 8,3% betting-related cases

- Flanders (Belgium)
- Sports: 🎾 ⚽ 🎾
2. ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE
### 2.1 ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Handball</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 METHOD

• Ran from May 2020 until November 2020

• Dissemination mainly through email and social media

• Duration: ± 15 minutes

• Completely anonymous

• **Target group:** respondents of 18 years or older who are/were involved in one of the selected sport disciplines (i.e., current and former athletes, coaches, board members, referees, and others)
2.3 CORE COMPONENTS

1. Characteristics of the respondents (in relation to their sports discipline)

2. Do you personally know anyone who has been approached to fix a game/match? → If yes, further details

3. Have you yourself ever been approached to fix a game/match? → If yes, further details about their last (or only) match-fixing proposal were examined

4. When 2. and/or 3. = yes → Have you ever reported your suspicions or experiences of match-fixing to anyone?

5. Still involved in a sport club? → If yes → Does your own club pay attention to match-fixing?
## 2.4 SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total (n = 5014)</th>
<th>Football (n = 2952)</th>
<th>Tennis (n = 749)</th>
<th>Basketball (n = 262)</th>
<th>Hockey (n = 545)</th>
<th>Handball (n = 170)</th>
<th>Cricket (n = 126)</th>
<th>Other (n = 210)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>13,6%</td>
<td>18,7%</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
<td>25,6%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>14,1%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>11,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>19,1%</td>
<td>26,9%</td>
<td>9,3%</td>
<td>28,6%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>10,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>9,3%</td>
<td>10,2%</td>
<td>10,4%</td>
<td>32,1%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7,2%</td>
<td>2,7%</td>
<td>4,4%</td>
<td>4,2%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>81,2%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>45,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>21,2%</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td>56,1%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>11,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4,1%</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
<td>2,8%</td>
<td>9,5%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>4,1%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>25,5%</td>
<td>35,2%</td>
<td>15,1%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Croatian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,2%</td>
<td>14,2%</td>
<td>15,4%</td>
<td>34,9%</td>
<td>9,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>35,6%</td>
<td>19,7%</td>
<td>13,0%</td>
<td>21,4%</td>
<td>10,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>15,6%</td>
<td>2,1%</td>
<td>6,8%</td>
<td>65,3%</td>
<td>10,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>6,5%</td>
<td>19,8%</td>
<td>24,0%</td>
<td>17,6%</td>
<td>32,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>99,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
<td>15,9%</td>
<td>82,9%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>15,7%</td>
<td>63,3%</td>
<td>18,6%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.4 SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total  (n = 5014)</th>
<th>Football (n = 2952)</th>
<th>Tennis (n = 749)</th>
<th>Basketball (n = 262)</th>
<th>Hockey (n = 545)</th>
<th>Handball (n = 170)</th>
<th>Cricket (n = 126)</th>
<th>Other (n = 210)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>84,2%</td>
<td>91,7%</td>
<td>65,6%</td>
<td>84,0%</td>
<td>72,5%</td>
<td>72,4%</td>
<td>97,6%</td>
<td>76,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>15,6%</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
<td>34,2%</td>
<td>15,3%</td>
<td>27,5%</td>
<td>27,6%</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
<td>23,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to say</td>
<td>0,2%</td>
<td>0,2%</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: M (SD)</strong></td>
<td>40,5 (15,5)</td>
<td>38,5 (15,2)</td>
<td>45,1 (15,7)</td>
<td>36,3 (14,7)</td>
<td>46,9 (13,5)</td>
<td>31,5 (9,4)</td>
<td>54,5 (14,3)</td>
<td>38,9 (15,0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How long have you been involved in this sport (in years)? M (SD)</strong></td>
<td>22,9 (14,1)</td>
<td>21,7 (13,7)</td>
<td>24,9 (14,1)</td>
<td>22,0 (13,1)</td>
<td>28,4 (15,2)</td>
<td>18,1 (8,9)</td>
<td>28,4 (18,3)</td>
<td>20,8 (12,8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.4 SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How are (were) you mainly related to this sport?</th>
<th>Total (n = 5014)</th>
<th>Football (n = 2952)</th>
<th>Tennis (n = 749)</th>
<th>Basketball (n = 262)</th>
<th>Hockey (n = 545)</th>
<th>Handball (n = 170)</th>
<th>Cricket (n = 126)</th>
<th>Other (n = 210)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>59,5%</td>
<td>54,4%</td>
<td>78,2%</td>
<td>53,4%</td>
<td>65,9%</td>
<td>51,2%</td>
<td>61,1%</td>
<td>61,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach / Trainer / Assistant coach</td>
<td>8,3%</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
<td>5,3%</td>
<td>12,2%</td>
<td>15,6%</td>
<td>4,0%</td>
<td>4,8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical staff</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee / VAR / (Fourth) official / Jury member</td>
<td>17,2%</td>
<td>21,0%</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
<td>19,8%</td>
<td>9,4%</td>
<td>44,1%</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
<td>22,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board member / Assembly member / Manager of a sport club</td>
<td>5,7%</td>
<td>5,9%</td>
<td>6,9%</td>
<td>8,4%</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
<td>4,8%</td>
<td>5,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7,3%</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
<td>5,9%</td>
<td>5,3%</td>
<td>6,1%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>19,8%</td>
<td>5,7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### At what level are you mainly involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total  (n = 4469)</th>
<th>Football (n = 2952)</th>
<th>Tennis (n = 749)</th>
<th>Basketball (n = 262)</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Handball (n = 170)</th>
<th>Cricket (n = 126)</th>
<th>Other (n = 210)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11,0%</td>
<td>9,3%</td>
<td>10,4%</td>
<td>29,8%</td>
<td>24,7%</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
<td>7,6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-professional</td>
<td>16,0%</td>
<td>16,1%</td>
<td>12,0%</td>
<td>25,6%</td>
<td>22,4%</td>
<td>7,1%</td>
<td>16,2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amateur</td>
<td><strong>73,1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,7%</strong></td>
<td>52,9%</td>
<td>90,5%</td>
<td><strong>76,2%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. RESULTS
3.1 NEARLY 20% OF PEOPLE IN SPORTS HAS BEEN CONFRONTED WITH (IN)DIRECT MATCH-FIXING PROPOSALS

- 17.5% (n = 876)
  “I personally know one or more persons who had been approached to fix a match”

- 8.4% (n = 419)
  “I have already been approached myself for a match-fixing proposal”
958 respondents indicated in(direct) match-fixing incidents

539 respondents knew one or more persons (not themselves) who had been approached for match-fixing

337 respondents knew one or more persons who had been approached for match-fixing & acknowledged to have been approached personally for match-fixing

82 respondents indicated to have been approached personally for match-fixing without knowing of anyone else who had also been approached
3.2 KNOWING SOMEONE PERSONALLY WHO HAD BEEN APPROACHED FOR MATCH-FIXING

This person was a: (n = 871)

Man 90.2%
Woman 5.9%
I prefer not to say 2.9%
Other 1%

How was he/she related to this sport at the moment of the proposal? (n = 864)

- Athlete 53.1%
- Referee / (Video) Assistant Referee / (Fourth) official / Jury member 19.4%
- Coach / Trainer / Assistant coach 7.8%
- Board member / Assembly member / Manager of a sport club 3%
- I don't know 1.2%
- Medical staff 3%
- Other 0.9%
- I prefer not to say 2.9%
3.3 PERSONALLY APPROACHED FOR MATCH-FIXING

How many times have you been approached to fix a game/match? (n = 407)

- Just once: 179
- 2-3 times: 155
- More than 3 times: 73

How were you related to the sport, at the moment of that proposal? (n = 400)

- 48.8%: Athlete
- 29.3%: Referee / (Video) Assistant Referee / (Fourth) official / Jury member
- 13%: Coach / Trainer / Assistant coach
- 6.5%: Board member / Assembly member / Manager of a sport club
- 6.5%: Medical staff
- 1%: Other

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union
3.3 PERSONALLY APPROACHED FOR MATCH-FIXING

Who approached you? (n = 388)

- Athlete(s)
- Board member(s) / Assembly member(s) / Manager(s) of a sport club
- Coach(es) / Trainer(s) / Assistant coach(es)
- Other
- Bettor(s) / Gambler(s)
- Referee(s) / (Video) Assistant Referee(s) / (Fourth) official(s) / Jury member(s)
- Agent(s) of an athlete
- Sponsor(s)
- Former athlete(s)
- Medical staff

27.3%
25.8%
28.1%
4.1%
4.4%
2.6%
2.1%
1.8%
1%
3.3 PERSONALLY APPROACHED FOR MATCH-FIXING

Betting- vs. sporting-related match-fixing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Only betting-related proposal</th>
<th>Only sporting-related proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n = 397)</td>
<td>9,8% (n = 39)</td>
<td>68% (n = 270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motive</strong></td>
<td>“To earn money by betting on the manipulated game/match”</td>
<td>Mainly approached to (1) prevent the relegation of a club or player, or (2) enable a club/player to win the championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money and/or inducements</td>
<td>82,1%</td>
<td>68,7% frequently inducements (e.g. beer – luxury gifts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened or pressured</td>
<td>38,5%</td>
<td>19,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>“because of money or inducements” “experienced financial difficulties”</td>
<td>27,4% Mainly as “a friendly gesture towards another club or athlete”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 PERSONALLY APPROACHED FOR MATCH-FIXING

Focus on the people who indicated **only** sporting-related match-fixing cases ($n = 270$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At what level were you involved at that time?</th>
<th>(n = 241)</th>
<th>+ 29 people involved in hockey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>14 (5.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-professional</td>
<td>42 (17.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amateur</td>
<td>185 (76.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What were these people seeking to influence?</th>
<th>(n = 270)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The outcome of the game/match (who wins/loses)</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exact result of the game/match (e.g. 2-0 in football, 0-6 in tennis)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific events during the game/match</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other things</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The sum of the figures exceeds 270, because multiple answers were possible to the question.*
3.4 REPORTING SUSPICIONS OR EXPERIENCES

- **48%** \((n = 455)\) of the people who indicated (in)direct match-fixing proposals in the questionnaire, had **never reported** their suspicions or experiences of match-fixing to anyone.

- **52%** \((n = 493)\) had **reported** their suspicions or experiences of match-fixing to anyone:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever reported your suspicions or experiences of match-fixing to anyone?</th>
<th>(n = 493)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to teammates</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to the coach / trainer / assistant coach</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to the board members of the sport club</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to the sport federation</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to someone else</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to an anonymous reporting line</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, to the police</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The sum of the figures exceeds 493, because multiple answers were possible to the question.*
3.5 PREVENTION IN SPORT CLUBS

3442 respondents were still involved in a sport club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>947</td>
<td>No, my sport club does not pay attention to match-fixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 6 missing values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| n = 740   | There is a code of conduct / ethics with statements on match-fixing in the sport club |
| n = 433   | The sport club provides information (sessions) / training about match-fixing |
| n = 337   | There is a ban to bet on matches within our own competition imposed by the sport club |
| n = 324   | The sport club gives explicit warnings on match-fixing                   |
| n = 239   | There is a confidential adviser in the sport club to whom cases and / or suspicions of match-fixing can be reported |
| n = 227   | Any suspicious acts are reported to the police by the sport club          |
| n = 114   | In another way                                                           |

*The sum of the figures exceeds 1286, because multiple answers were possible to the question.*
DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES ON MATCH-FIXING

“How can we make all 3 levels stronger?”
SYSTEMATIC CHALLENGES OF TACKLING MATCH-FIXING (MACRO-LEVEL)

PROF. DR. MAARTEN VAN BOTTENBURG
LAUSANNE // 15 NOVEMBER 2021
Introduction

• Bad apples
• Bad barrels
• Bad climate
Individual level (micro)
Match-fixing is caused by individual ethical or moral misbehaviour

Situational level (meso)
Subcultures and organisations can tolerate and incite individual misbehaviour

Systemic level (macro)
The institutional environment can enable or constrain subcultures and organisations to tolerate or incite individual misbehaviour
Systemic complexity

- **Intersectoral**
  - Match-fixing has developed from a sport problem into a public issue

- **Hybrid**
  - Match-fixing crosses the boundaries between public, private, and societal domains

- **Transnational**
  - Match-fixing transcends the jurisdictions of sports organisations and governments while a globally harmonised regulatory and judicial approach to this problem is (still) lacking
Organisational network collaboration

- Heterogeneous organisations
- Autonomous organisations
- Interdependent organisations
- Multipolar network
- Lack of coordinating authority
Systemic challenges

Sport policy and public policy are unintentionally enabling match-fixing

Sport policy and public policy are insufficiently constraining match-fixing
Unintentionally enabling match-fixing

Governments: legalisation and liberalisation of the gambling market

Sport organisations: sponsorship contracts with betting companies
Insufficiently constraining match-fixing

The network governance design does not match the requirements of the problem and the multiplicity of actors involved in the organisational collaborative network.
• Olympic values
  • Coordinated by a leading network organisation
  • Lead organisation governance

• Anti-doping
  • Coordinated by a separate, not operationally participating entity
  • Network administrative organisation governance

• Match-fixing
  • Coordinated by all (or none or some?)
  • Shared governance
### Efficiency, effectiveness, and legitimacy of network governance design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Participant-governed network (shared governance)</th>
<th>Tackling match-fixing network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network participants</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Participant-governed network (shared governance)</th>
<th>Tackling match-fixing network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network goal consensus</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High, with conflicting interests and internal inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust among participants</td>
<td>Widely shared</td>
<td>Increasing, but accompanied with transparency and accountability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of interdependent task requirements</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for formalisation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legitimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Participant-governed network (shared governance)</th>
<th>Tackling match-fixing network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(internal) participant satisfaction</td>
<td>Widely distributed</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(External) need for policy successes</td>
<td>Relatively low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITUATIONAL CHALLENGES OF TACKLING MATCH-FIXING (MESO-LEVEL)

PROF. DR. ARGYRO ELISAVET MANOLI
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SPORT ORGANISATIONS’ INVOLVEMENT IN MATCH-FIXING

Passively tolerate
• ‘Turn the blind eye’ and allow match-fixing

Actively participate
• Active participation by organising or participating in match-fixing
SPORT ORGANISATIONS ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN MATCH-FIXING

– Symbiosis of greed, aspiration and need
– Ferocious market dynamics
– Lack of regulation and wider control
– Exploitation of power
– In order to survive
SPORT ORGANISATIONS ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN MATCH-FIXING

– Betting-related match-fixing
  – Use of position and power
  – Aim to profit
  – Need or greed
    – Reward or punishment
SPORT ORGANISATIONS ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN MATCH-FIXING

- Sporting-related match-fixing
  - Use of position and power
  - Aim to profit long-term - exogenous price
  - Insufficient income sources
    - Declining income
- Need to survive
SPORT ORGANISATIONS PASSIVELY TOLERATE MATCH-FIXING

– Heterogeneity of sport organisations
  – Multiple stakeholders
  – Different types of legal entities
  – Variety of structures, processes and actors
– Fit and proper tests are non-existent or enforced
  – Involvement for financial and non-financial issues
SPORT ORGANISATIONS PASSIVELY TOLERATE MATCH-FIXING

– Accentuated and uncontrolled growth and commercialisation
– Organisations and events vulnerable to manipulation (supply-demand)
– Adaptability and creativity of corruptors
– Sophistication of methods
– Re-acting and not acting enough
SPORT ORGANISATIONS PASSIVELY TOLERATE MATCH-FIXING

– Lack of transparency
– Resistance to change
– Established culture of exclusivity
  – ‘Do not rock the boat’
– Illusion of innocence – inherent integrity of sport
– Lack of power, control and tools
EVIDENCED BASED PREVENTION OF MATCH-FIXING

Action plans:
The design and dissemination of carefully created, evidenced-based action plans, tailored for each sport in each participating country.
INDIVIDUAL CHALLENGES OF TACKLING MATCH-FIXING (MICRO-LEVEL)

SEVERIN MORITZER & SIMON DE CLERQ
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Steps into Manipulation...

1. Contact
2. Offer
3. Acceptance
4. Delivery
Prevention

- Do not Fix.
- Do not Bet.
- Do not use inside Information.
- Do Report.

Intervention

- Disciplinary
- Law Enforcement

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union
CONSEQUENCES

- **Criminal Law (Fraud)**
- **Labour Law (Dismissal)**
- **Sport Federation Law (Suspension & Penalties)**
- **Financial Consequences (Litigation costs, income)**
- **Social Reputation**
The 3 R’s

EREKENNEN
RECOGNIZE

WIDERSTEHEN
RESIST

BERICHTEN
REPORT
WHY INDIVIDUALS DECIDE TO ENGAGE IN MATCH-FIXING?

- Financial advantage
- Sporting advantage
- Compulsion
ENFORCED BY …

– They think they wouldn’t get caught
– ‘We don’t harm anybody’
– Safe energy
PREVENTION

- Sensitize on the individual level
- Build it up around
  • Recognize
  • Resist
  • Report
- 3R’s → EPOSM workshops
1) RECOGNIZE

- Cases
- Macolin convention
2) RESIST

– Why don’t engage
  – You do harm people and the sport
  – Sanctions
  – Resist firmly
3) REPORT

– Importance
– EPOSM figures
CASES

- Roll plays
- Debate
EPOS M - INDIVIDUAL

- Sensitize
- Workshop -> further enrol
MICRO → MESO

Discussion (MICRO) → Information → Integrity officer (MESO)
LOOKING TO THE FUTURE: HOW TO MANAGE THE PREVENTION OF MATCH-FIXING

DR. BRAM CONSTANDT
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1. The current state of match-fixing research
2. A critical perspective on existing approaches
3. Fix the fixing? Ways forward
1. THE CURRENT STATE OF MATCH-FIXING RESEARCH
1.1 MATCH-FIXING RESEARCH


– **Distinction** between betting-related and non-betting-related match-fixing

– Numerous **prevalence** studies

– Dominance of **rational choice perspective** → overestimation individual agency (Tak et al., 2018)
1.2 AN EXPANDING FIELD OF STUDY

- Definition and types (what?)
- Prevalence (how widespread?)
- Background (why?, how?, when?, where?, ...)

EXPLORING MAPPING UNDERSTANDING
1.3 COMING OF AGE: FROM DESCRIPTIVE TO ANALYTICAL

Definition and types (what?)

Prevalence (how widespread?)

Background (why?, how?, when?, where?, …)

DESCRIPTIVE & NORMATIVE

ANALYTICAL
2. A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE ON EXISTING APPROACHES
2.1 MATCH-FIXING AS A WICKED PROBLEM?

- Match-fixing → **complex and multifaceted** phenomenon → diverse and robust approaches needed

- Match-fixing as ‘**wicked problem**’? → social issue that is difficult to solve → managing instead of resolving?

- A **holistic approach** (Kihl, 2018), focusing on:
  - **micro** level: individual vulnerabilities
  - **meso** level: organizational vulnerabilities
  - **macro** level: systemic vulnerabilities
2.2 DECONSTRUCTING MATCH-FIXING MYTHS

- Critical discourse analysis required to deconstruct myths and false narratives such as:
  - “is always related with (illegal) betting”
  - “does not occur in our sport or on our level of play”
  - “is always linked with external criminals”
  - “there is nothing we can do as a sport organization”
  - “educating players will solve the issue”

Match-fixing → **systemic and shared responsibility**, not merely an individual responsibility of sport stakeholders (structural failure ≠ individual immorality)
3. FIX THE FIXING? WAYS FORWARD

#EPOSMSM
#BeFairDontFix
Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union
3.1 EXISTING COUNTERMEASURES

Fix the fixing? Not so easy:

1. **strengthening** and connecting all three types of **countermeasures**
2. **structural prioritization** and **international collaboration**
3. stop blaming **individuals** with window-dressing retorics

---

**Education**  
**Monitoring**  
**Legislation and regulation**
3.2 INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT TO THE RESCUE?

1. Determining and defining integrity
2. Guiding towards integrity
3. Monitoring integrity
4. Enforcing integrity

Maesschalck & Bertok (2009)
3.3 TOWARDS A BETTER UNDERSTANDING

“Understanding match-fixing in sport: Theory and practice” (Routledge, 2022); edited by Bram Constandt and Argyro Elisavet Manoli

EPOSM
Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union
POLICY TO PREVENT AND MANAGE THE (NON-)BETTING-RELATED MANIPULATION OF SPORT COMPETITIONS

PANATHLON INTERNATIONAL
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INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT IN SPORT

– Manipulation of sport competitions is a violation of sports integrity affecting most European countries and various sports

– Manipulation of sport competitions cannot be solved by a single organisation or country. In this perspective, it is crucial to strengthen cooperation between sport actors by helping them to develop their own networks and to coordinate their actions.
INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT IN SPORT

- **Who is accountable** for what in case of match-fixing?
- **Who can/should do something** to prevent and manage match-fixing? **Considering their legal status and decision making power:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sportorganisations</th>
<th>(Sport) Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On...</td>
<td>On...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual? Club?</td>
<td>- Local?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National federation?</td>
<td>- Regional?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International</td>
<td>- National?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Federation?</td>
<td>- International?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... level</td>
<td>... level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The attention was until now directed mostly to betting related match-fixing and has elicited unambiguous condemnation and appropriate reactions

- The Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions
- Macolin Convention September 2014 National Platforms Network
- Group of Copenhagen: Typology of sports manipulations June 2020
- An Interpol IOC integrity in sport initiative: Handbook on protecting sport from competition manipulation
- Eu Office and European Olympic Committees: Guidelines for single points of contact for integrity in sport
INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT IN SPORT

• EPOSM figures in 7 European countries reveal that the prevalence of sport related match-fixing is higher than betting related match fixing

  – Sport-related match-fixing: EPOSM revealed a conflict between judging it as morally wrong but in practise acting in self- or club interest

  – Betting-related match-fixing: More confronted with moral challenges related to external inducements and/or pressures.

  – Both types of match-fixing are different breaches of sports’ integrity that require different priority measures
A successful integrity management model should be prove its efficiency, flexibility and manageability.


The mentioned qualities depend on the models’ logic of comprehensiveness, interdependence and synergies between its two objectives and three pillars whatever their specific interpretation and application in each sport discipline and country.
INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT IN SPORT

- The “rules-based” objective emphasizes control and penalization; including formal and detailed rules and procedures.

- However! A zero tolerance policy may inhibit staff members, referees and players to report.

The “values-based” objective focuses on guidance, support, stimulation, training. Managers mustn’t let their staff members and players down and help them with a strong support element in their policy.
INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT IN SPORT

The **three pillars** of an efficient match-fixing management framework.

1. Managements’ **instruments** can be organized according to the **four functions** that they perform:
   - determining and defining Match-fixing,
   - guiding with info and training managers, referees, coaches, and players towards awareness for situations susceptible for match-fixing
   - monitoring competitions and risk-situations of match-fixing,
   - enforcing rules and procedures
2. **processes/roadmap** through which the framework can be gradually developed and maintained within the organisation.

3. **structures/organisational aspect**: ‘Who is responsible for what’ and ‘How to co-ordinate the initiatives of the various integrity officers’
INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT IN SPORT

–  **Conclusion:** The manipulation of sport competitions is a clear and present danger for sports integrity: it affects the core of sport

–  **All levels** in the complex sport landscape should assume their responsibility

–  A courageous leadership with a ‘balanced policy’ including both hard disciplinary measures and supporting, training and informative measures is most effective.

–  An **effective policy** should be more than a series of ad hoc good practices but should include in an interdependent way **instruments, structures and a roadmap** adapted to the specifics of each collaborating country and the targeted sport discipline
To avoid an implementation deficit, i.e. the threat that dealing with both gambling related and non-gambling related match-fixing will not go beyond lofty ambitions we suggests to stimulate sport managers to leave their defensive position, to challenge the critics from significant others to deal with the moral dilemmas when confronted with the contrast between the Olympic values and the current beliefs, attitudes, values and norms in today’s sport.
CONCLUSIONS
**GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

**Sporting-related relatively more present than betting-related match-fixing**
- also often present in combination
- as problematic
- present in different sports and countries

**Few reporting and low awareness**
- not reported
- not aware of the obligation to report or where to report

**Integrated approach**
- workshops for sport federation staff, club managers, board members, referees, athletes, …
- actions on the level of the individuals, the legislation, and management systems
- including sporting-related match-fixing as important fraud risk in sport fraud prevention actions
THANK YOU!

CONTACT
eposm@ugent.be