

# Real madrid, manchester united and barcelona football teams

[Finance](#), [Investment](#)



In 1966 the gate ticket revenues mainly paid for player's wages and with the commercial television of America global audiences and fan bases grew. In 2009 clubs such as Real Madrid, Manchester United and Barcelona became lucrative deals for investors. However, the investment model for football clubs changed and many investors started leveraging the investments through massive amounts of debt. Many clubs in the UK were public limited companies and were listed on the stock exchange but recently many have been brought into private ownership again through private equity.

Bankruptcies and corruption scandals have raised questions to whether many football clubs have been able to have a smooth transition into the repressions business world. A club's livelihood is directly related to their fan base (spectators, TV audiences, or consumers of merchandise) but over the past decade the average attendance to the English Premier League matches has stagnated and younger people have been wary to attend.

With high prices for tickets, fans have been feeling alienated by the players' wages and TV scheduling has greatly fuelled the feeling that football is no longer a fan's game but a business oriented way of generating revenue for owners. Between 1996 and 2006, the seventy-two clubs of the English Football League add a pre-tax loss of £100m; in comparison, the other leagues clubs, that were predominantly owned by fans, made £10m operating profit through higher attendance at lower ticket prices.

Recently initiatives, such as Supporters Direct, have addressed the fans' interests more directly. They have also been involving themselves in various social projects in the community (usually addressing social exclusion,

unemployment, or anti-social behavior). These clubs have created community schemes that often partner with fans, police, and local council. However, clubs such as Real Madrid and FCC Barcelona are member-owned, democratic, and not-for-profit organizations and have leaderships that are accountable to the people who watch and pay.

The All party Parliamentary Football Group published three recommendations to improve governance in the industry, these included: A 'fit and proper persons test' for the management and ownership of clubs Supporter-led governance and, Nurture Eng domestic talent. With these recommendations given, a Stewardship Scorecard, developed by CAR think-tank tomorrow's company, ranked clubs on various criteria such as putting the club first' and " engagement with fans and the community'. Overall football is still dependent on a constant fan base since they are far less likely to switch allegiances due to poor performance.

Ethical Dilemma: Who cares whose shares? 1. What is the main ethical issues in this case? The main issue is whether or not you should tell Freddie to sell his shares of Parchment (PC) because there will be a report published in BigSciencemagazine that could effect that shares negatively. This is considered insider trading and is illegal. There are four main ethical arguments that used against insider: fairness, misappropriation to property, harm to investors and the market and undermining of fiduciary relationships (Crane & Matted, 2010).

By telling Freddie, you would be giving himself and his clients an unfair advantage over other investors, he would also give up information of PC's privately documented information and knowledge without PC knowing meaning that he is BPCS property is being shared without knowledge. Harm would come to investors and the market because if everyone of Fireside's clients decide to sell their shares then other investors' stocks would decrease and leave others, including the company, wondering why the stocks dropped so much before the release of the report.

Your fiduciary responsibility to the company and other shareholders should be one of the most important things since you are an employee of PC as well. 2. Who are the main stakeholders here, and how would you compare the relative importance of their stakes? The main stakeholders in the company are the shareholders the employees that don't have shares and the product users. From a humanitarian perspective, the product users, whose health and safety are at risk by using product, would be considered the most important stakeholder, and then followed by the employees and then shareholders.

From the business aspect the shareholders are the main stakeholders and then the employees and the product users would equally important. This is because the company will most likely not notice a change if a small amount of customers stop using the product. 3. Explain how you would ultimately decide and why. Would not tell Freddie about it because I would rather have a friend mad at me than to end up going to jail/be fined for insider trading by the company. I would also not tell him because if it were to get out then my reputation for good work habits and judgment would be affected if I ever

looked for another job or wanted to be promoted within PC. 4. Is there a difference between acting yourself on the information you were given and passing this information on to Freddie. Yes there is a difference because you aren't sharing company information with anyone so if you do end up selling your shares, and the stocks do not go own, then you would only be hurting yourself and not effecting other investors.