



Breaking boundaries and creating inclusion-based organization through critical performativity and dialogical accountability: The case of FC United Manchester

Journal:	<i>Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	AAAJ-01-2022-5645.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Keywords:	Critical performativity, Critical dialogical accountability, Alternative organizations, No-profit sport organizations, Inclusion, Boundaries

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Breaking boundaries and creating inclusion-based organization through critical performativity and dialogical accountability: The case of FC United Manchester



Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to extend research on boundary making and breaking through alternative football clubs. These entities have borne out of the disappointment caused by the neoliberal turn of the football industry, which excluded traditional fans from being active actors and therefore call for study and generalization of specific forms of alternative accountability.

Design/methodology/approach – The study looks at emerging trends in the accounting and sport literature by drawing on two concepts that emerged in critical scholarship: critical performativity and critical dialogical accountability, with the aim of better understanding how these elements are developed and shaped within an alternative form of football organization. The focus on Football Club United of Manchester drives the ethnographic approach with data collected via participant observation, field-notes, documental analysis and semi-structured interviews.

Findings – The research shows that the pillars of the club's ethos, pushing its critical performative interventions towards setting new boundaries, are democratic governance and accountability, favoring participation and inclusion, and strictly linked to this, a responsibility to local communities. However, the study also highlights the difficulties of maintaining these boundaries when core values are threatened by degeneration.

Originality – The study makes a novel contribution to the field of accounting and sport, showing how an alternative football club adopts inclusive accountability systems that go beyond mainstream neoliberal practices. Such an inclusive approach can stimulate critical performativity, moving away from means-end rationality.

Keywords – Football, Critical dialogical accountability, Critical performativity, Boundaries, Alternative organizations, Democracy, Community, Participation, Inclusion, No-profit sport organizations

Paper type – Research paper

1. Introduction

This ethnographic study looks at how existing boundaries in football (and more generally in sport) can be challenged and transformed by alternative organizations, to promote different accountability and accounting practices. The study pushes forward the argument made by Cooper and Johnston (2012) on accountability issues at Manchester United and the progressive disconnection among the club and part of its fanbase. The context is Manchester United's most radical organizational evolution, FC United of Manchester (henceforth FC United), a 'rebel club' born in 2005 by disenfranchised Manchester United fans seeking an alternative way for football to be run. As Kennedy and Kennedy (2015, p. 499) remark '(a) revolt against the neoliberal model of football was required to re-engage with football in a democratic sense'. The trend of breakaway clubs started in England with AFC Wimbledon in 2002, which was formed against the proposed relocation of Wimbledon FC to Milton Keynes. AFC Wimbledon was also one of the main inspirations behind FC United and one of the main supporting organizations in the formation and early days of the club. Currently, in England there are six breakaway clubs¹, and over sixty clubs that feature some form of supporter-ownership. The phenomenon is not limited to England, as many protest clubs can be found all over the world, especially in Ireland, Scotland, Poland, Austria, Spain and Italy.

FC United took the legal form of an Industrial and Provident Society, then renamed as Community Benefit Society in 2014. The club was set up as a democratic non-profit organization, which relies on unchangeable principles of inclusion, affordability, strives to encourage young people's participation and acts towards the betterment of surrounding communities. The club has a founding manifesto that outlines its principles and highlights the club's political inclination, accessible on the official website (FC United of Manchester, 2023):

- The Board will be democratically elected by its members.
- Decisions taken by the membership will be decided on a one member, one vote basis.
- The club will develop strong links with the local community and strive to be accessible to all, discriminating against none.
- The club will endeavor to make admission prices as affordable as possible, to as wide a constituency as possible.
- The club will encourage young, local participation - playing and supporting - whenever possible.
- The Board will strive wherever possible to avoid outright commercialism.
- The club will remain a non-profit organization.

The club is very proud of its one-member, one-vote structure to democratically elect board members, who oversee the club's distinct functions (currently, there are four board members). The club mostly relies on volunteers, but also employs full-time and part-time staff: along with the CEO, several people work in the management, others in the community team, or involved with match-day operations and others in managing the facilities². The club's history is made of great achievements on and off the football³ pitch. On the football side, the first team secured four promotions and currently plays in the 7th tier of English football, the Northern Premier League, but the club also has other squads, such as the Academy and the Women's team. Off the football pitch, FC United has maintained a very considerable membership and spectators, both peaking in the 2015/16 season (5381 members and 3395 average home spectators), when the club-owned stadium, Broadhurst Park was opened. Broadhurst Park must be regarded as one of the club's biggest achievements, as it was funded for a large part by

¹ As of 2023, breakaway football clubs in England are: A.F.C, Liverpool; AFC Wimbledon; Clapton Community FC; F.C. United of Manchester; Enfield Town F.C. and 1874 Northwich F.C.

² For a full organizational chart, see <https://fc-utd.co.uk/organisational-charts>.

³ In this paper we refer to 'football', as opposed to the American/Australian term 'soccer', to better align with the nature of our ethnographic study conducted in Manchester, UK.

1
2
3 members themselves and through funds arising from partnerships with public sector
4 organizations that recognized the immense potential that the facilities could have for
5 community development.

6 FC United can be seen as the reaction to the state of ‘hypercommodification’
7 (Giulianotti, 2002; Walsh and Giulianotti, 2001) of modern football, which began in English
8 football since the 1980s. This was favored by the corporatization of football clubs and the
9 adoption of neoliberal principles. Rich investors gained control and power, creating new
10 binding structural boundaries (Llewellyn, 1994), and ownership structures that were once more
11 democratic and rooted in the local community got replaced by corporations. Walsh and
12 Giulianotti (2001) imply that new settings displaced (or even replaced) traditional fans, often
13 seen instead as have been damaged by the neoliberal turn of football, as custodians of core
14 sports communities (Giulianotti, 2002). This led primarily to establish market accountability
15 systems, based on a buyer-seller relationship (Grant and Keohane, 2005), which fails to account
16 for the emotional commitment and identity that fans have with their football club.

17 The emergence of FC United invites us further to rethink the role of accounting in sport
18 organizations, by conceptualizing them as ‘nexus of passionate interests’, rather than ‘nexus of
19 contracts’ (Baxter et al., 2019a), therefore highlighting their peculiarity. By doing so,
20 accounting should not only include different metrics, capable of speaking to multiple actors
21 with multiple values (Campanale et al., 2021), but it should also be coupled with
22 accountabilities that demonstrate awareness of the impact of our actions on others (Cooper and
23 Johnston, 2012), both internally and externally to the organization (Janin, 2017). We explore
24 how the adoption of (less managerial) inclusive and dialogical forms of accounting and
25 accountability, can push a radical alternative football club to express its critical performative
26 potential (Spicer et al., 2009), while trying to break free from the neoliberal boundaries of its
27 Manchester United’s core. We analyze how the club aspires to become a ‘critically performative
28 engine’ (Leca et al., 2014) for other alternative organizations in football and other sectors,
29 through accountabilities based on inclusion, participation, community outreach (Jones et al,
30 2017) and a democratic approach to governance that encourages constructive dissent
31 (Kokkinidis, 2015) and agonistic pluralism (Mouffe, 2013). We outline this complexity through
32 the development of a multi-layered critical dialogical accountability system as the main goal of
33 transparency for any organization (Dillard and Vinnari, 2019).

34 The principles that drive this research are well expressed by Parker and Lightfoot (2014,
35 pp. 36-37), who argue that it is worth exploring alternatives capable of preserving the
36 individual autonomy, of affirming principles of solidarity, cooperation, community, and finally
37 that bear a responsibility to build a better future. Inclusiveness becomes a boundary setting
38 activity in opening to the ‘Other’ (Bauman, 2000), which demarcates alternative organizations
39 in football from the dominant models. An in-depth exploration of these practices can shed light
40 on whether the club attends to these principles from an accountability perspective, or if they
41 become part of the organizational rhetoric instead, which could undermine the club’s status of
42 alternative. Extending the work of Westphal and Zajac (2001) and Boxenbaum and Jonsson
43 (2008), Heras-Saizarbitoria (2014) notes that alternative organizations can experience a
44 decoupling of founding principles from the organization’s daily activities. He claims that this
45 detachment happens when the rhetoric at a macro-organizational level, in the communications
46 of principles, clashes with the every-day accountability activities of the organization. This is
47 particularly relevant because, when the organization drifts from its founding principles, it can
48 potentially lead to disengagement or, even worse, degeneration (Cornforth et al., 1988;
49 Cornforth, 1995, 2014; Cheney, 1999; Webb and Cheney, 2014; Jones 2007; Langmead, 2017).
50 Similarly, Bousalham and Vidaillet (2018) explore how, even in alternative organizational
51 forms, solidarity principles can succumb to competition or, even worse, can be used rhetorically
52 and instrumentally to sell an image, using a weak form of reputational accountability (Grant
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and Keohane, 2005). However, as demonstrated by Langmead (2017), there are alternative organizations capable of resisting degeneration or able to regenerate, appealing to and further reinforcing their core values, as it happened at FC United following a turbulent period after the club moved to the new stadium.

The paper makes the following contributions. First, it contributes to the literature on accounting and sport, by focusing on a countermovement that has been so far neglected, namely fully member-owned football clubs, which operate and compete in leagues where governance structures and (generally) financial resources are different. Second, it provides ethnographic evidence on how alternative ways of organizing in sport, and specifically football, emerge to challenge the status quo, shaking the established neoliberal boundaries in which many of these organizations operate (Kennedy and Kennedy, 2015; Misener and Misener, 2017; Adams et al., 2017; Jones et al., 2017; Svennson and Seifried, 2017). This contribution can be partly extended to alternative organizations in general, at least for the utopian spirit of subversion and disruption of existing boundaries and practices (Parker, 2002a, 2002b, 2017; Parker et. al, 2007; Parker, 2014, Parker and Parker, 2017; Fournier, 2013). Third, we attempt to advance the understanding of critical dialogical accountability (Vinnari and Dillard, 2016; Dillard and Vinnari, 2019), by linking it to critical performativity and exploring it empirically on FC United.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The theoretical section (2) is divided in two subsections, one covers the main recent literature in accounting and sport, and the other discusses critical performativity and critical dialogical accountability in relations to accounting and sport. Then, the following section (3) deals with the methodology of this study. The results of the ethnographic studies are presented in three following subsections (4). The discussion section (5) is divided in two subsections that link back to the literature review, while the final section offers some concluding remarks and future directions for research.

2. Theoretical background

This section follows the structure proposed by Lukka and Vinnari (2014). Subsection 2.1 constitutes our domain theory, where we look at standing issues in accounting in sport organizations. Subsection 2.2 introduces our theoretical framework that links critical performativity and dialogic thinking, and it constitutes our method theory, as the lens through which we study the issues at hand discussed in the domain theory. It must be highlighted that the distinction is not as clear-cut as it might appear, and that there is degree of interaction among the two, but this is an accepted convention when applying perspectives that come from different disciplines (Lukka and Vinnary, 2014).

2.1 Accounting and Sport

Sport organizations are still a relatively unexplored phenomenon from an accounting and accountability point of view, although they are progressively receiving more attention in the academic literature (Clune et al., 2019). Andon and Free (2019), in their review, point out that sport has generally become a 'big business' but still remains a very peculiar sector due to the intersection of different elements and logics, where cultural and communitarian values coexist with, for instance, commercialization.

The tension among those different, and often competing values, is explored in different studies. Cordery and Davies (2016) look at New Zealand rugby, stressing that commercialism goes hand in hand with professionalization. They note that the effect of increasing professionalization in the sport is reflected in several areas beyond the actual playing, especially in the governance and management of the club, as well as in how sport operations are conducted. Building on this, Clune et al. (2019), focus on the Gaelic Athletic Association, an internationally very famous amateur sport organization, showing the difficult role of accounting

1
2
3 practices in mitigating or exacerbating conflict among different (and often incompatible) logics.
4 Other scholars (Carlsson-Wall et al., 2016) shift the attention to football to show how, in a
5 Swedish club that competes in the first league, sport and business logics are difficult to balance
6 and they are kept apart in the organizational structure of the club, in the budgeting process as
7 well as in the metrics used to measure performance. Cooper and Joyce (2013) look at insolvency
8 rules and practices in the UK, presenting the case of dissolved Scottish football club Gretna FC.
9 They highlight how often football clubs' business models are unsustainable, with imbalanced
10 expenditures on players' wages and a great dependence to wealthy owners who inject lots of
11 cash into the club, and to good sport performances for survival (as they bring additional
12 funding).
13

14
15 The fear of economic jeopardy is one of the reasons why FC United came into existence:
16 in this sense, the work of Cooper and Johnston (2012) is seminal to define the Glazers' takeover
17 of Manchester United as an example of vulgate (managerial) accountability, which could not
18 be prevented by fans, despite several financial and managerial warning signs. It is worth
19 pointing out that, to date, the accounting and sport literature has had limited engagement with
20 football clubs with alternative governance structures to 'mainstream' ones, where clubs are
21 owned and controlled by few people. Although this form of private ownership can be
22 considered as the most common in senior football, several leagues and clubs adopt some form
23 of member-ownership. For instance, in Germany, beside some exceptions, clubs are run with
24 the 50+1 rule, meaning that members own 50% plus one share, as a form of protection from
25 external investors, whose demise could lead to the quick disappearance of the club, as in the
26 aforementioned case of Gretna FC in Scotland. Swedish clubs are often organized as sports
27 limited liability companies, where the majority of shares are owned by (member-owned) sport
28 associations (Carlsson-Wall et al., 2016).
29

30
31 Along with Carlsson-Wall et al. (2016), Baxter et al (2019a), take FBALL, a top-flight
32 Stockholm club, to analyze the role of accounting in negotiating boundaries by acting as a
33 valuemeter. This helps quantifying passionate interests, coordinating actions and building a
34 sense of community and solidarity. Their research stresses the transformative and/or
35 constitutive capacity that accounting exerts over individuals and organizations, in shaping the
36 world and its institutions (Miller and Power, 2013). Specifically, they suggest that sport
37 (especially football), is a cultural phenomenon in which accounting is called to produce
38 different financial and non-financial metrics to express the complex emotional forces that drive
39 it. However, this creates further difficulties because of the different values at play, which are
40 exacerbated also by the peculiar organizational structure of the club.
41

42
43 The pivotal role of accounting in drawing boundaries is analyzed in Baxter et al.,
44 (2019b), they mobilize Puxty et al. (1987) to delineate the intricate relations between
45 accounting and sport, highlighting the often-competing dynamics of market, state and
46 community actors, and the challenges and impact of this entanglement for accounting practices
47 and accountability mechanisms. Specifically, the authors appeal to the capacity for accounting
48 to create calculable spaces, thanks to the territorializing effect (Miller and Power, 2013),
49 through which accounting can establish boundaries of what is internal or external to the
50 organization (Puxty et al., 1987). For FBALL, this came after its transformation into a sport
51 limited liability company, which also meant drawing new (legal, market/commercial, and
52 social) boundaries between voluntary organizations and limited liability companies. This
53 resulted in a controversy to determine if FBALL or the Swedish state were responsible for
54 policing payments. Calculations became seminal to demonstrate the club's commitment to
55 safety during games and the cooperation with state institutions to make expenditure transparent
56 leading, ultimately, for policing costs not to be borne by the football club. The rise, or we could
57 argue, the return, of more communitarian forms of sport organizations (Jones et al., 2018;
58 Kennedy & Kennedy, 2015; Torchia, 2016, 2020), which often emerge from increasingly
59
60

blurring boundaries among different sectors (Misener & Misener, 2017), further dignifies accounting beyond a mere technical activity; rather, it sits at the center of the market, state and community nexus, allowing organizing to be ‘thinkable and actionable in a particular way’ (Miller and Power, 2013, p. 558).

The accounting and sport literature analyzed above shows that there is still wide room for a deep exploration of how radical sport organizations, such as fan-owned football clubs, are continuously involved in negotiating their boundaries, through identity-making processes that accounting can regulate and facilitate. The internal and external competing logics at play call for critical, in-depth ethnographic studies of alternative sport organizations, where researchers are immersed in the daily life of the culture they study. While most studies mentioned in this section contain some observational elements, it is important to provide first-hand accounts of organizational life.

In the next section, we illustrate our method theory, constructing a theoretical framework to critically question the potential emancipatory force of fan-owned football clubs against established models of ownership and governance in football.

2.2 Theoretical framework

The framework we are proposing has its roots in Critical Management Studies (CMS) and Critical Accounting, and it aims to provide a space where organizational settings can be changed by transforming boundaries and opening up new outlets for dialogical exchanges. The first element of our framework is critical performativity, a concept that is growing in CMS, but that still lacks wide practical implications. Critical performativity has been originally theorized by Spicer et al. (2009) as a critical response to Fournier and Grey’s (2000, p. 18) claim that, to ‘denaturalize’ (Alvesson and Willmott, 2014), namely deconstructing the ‘reality of organizational life, or the truthfulness of organizational knowledge’, a non-performative intent is needed (see also Grey and Willmott, 2005). To justify their claim, Fournier and Grey (2000) build on Lyotard’s (1984) concept of performativity, arguing that mainstream management literature encourages, and even celebrates, knowledge that leads to the production of maximum output with the minimum input, basically reducing knowledge to means-ends calculations. While understanding, and partly sharing Fournier and Grey’s point, Spicer et al. (2009) try to move away from a lot of the negativity that, in their opinion, pervades much of the critical literature, to cast a new and more positive light to performativity. In doing so, they propose five steps of a critically performative intervention, ‘through affirmation, care, pragmatism, engagement with potentialities, and a normative orientation’, which are, as Wickert and Schaefer (2015, p. 111) argue, an invitation to ‘step beyond the generation of insight and critique and towards the process of transformative redefinition’. Building from Fournier and Grey (2000), critical performativity was originally conceived as a scholarly intervention on managerial practices (Spicer et al., 2009), both through theory and practice and it has been explored, in its original form, by several scholars. For instance, Leca et al. (2014, p. 684) look at how scholars can ‘engage in the incubation and diffusion of worker cooperatives in deprived communities to improve the living conditions and favor emancipation’. King (2015) offers an autoethnographic account of the challenges and possibilities for scholarly engagement, showing how difficult it can be, at times, to be critically performative in practice. Finally, Esper et al. (2017) analyze the role of academics in creating and sustaining alternative organizations within a system of capitalism, using Argentinian worker-recuperated enterprises as examples. These authors take literally Spicer et al.’s (2009) work, highlighting how, to be critically performative, scholars need to directly intervene in organizations.

While not neglecting the role of academics in trying to bring about solutions for a more just world, more recently it has been implied that alternative organizations do not need necessarily a strong scholarly intervention to be critically performative, because they can

1
2
3 autonomously display its elements. This is indirectly addressed by Paranque and Willmott
4 (2014) in their analysis of the John Lewis Partnership, where they question if the organization
5 can be considered a critically performative alternative to capitalist enterprises. Accordingly,
6 their article show that organizations, especially alternative organizations, can manifest their
7 inner critical performativity, even without a strong intervention from critical scholars. It is also
8 possible for those organizations to become 'critical performativity engines' (Leca et al., 2014),
9 reshaping organizational boundaries by setting the example for other organizations that aspire
10 to be impactful alternatives to dominant systems of management. It can be argued, however,
11 that the five steps towards a critical performativity are not prescriptive in nature, but only give
12 a general orientation. This, on one hand amplifies the possibilities of testing organizations
13 whose ethos might lead to redefine organizational and socioeconomic boundaries, as seen in
14 the great variety of critical performative interventions in the literature; on the other hand, it
15 invites scholars to further add elements to what a critical performative organization might look
16 like.
17

18
19 For this purpose, we look at dialogic thinking, to stimulate processes of critical
20 performativity that entails engagement, in which social institutions are 'held accountable for
21 their actions and how this process may lead to their actions being less socially and
22 environmentally damaging' (Bebbington et al., 2007, p. 357) and bring about emancipatory
23 change. Dialogic thinking has informed a number of studies in accounting and accountability
24 (for instance, Bebbington et al, 2007; Brown, 2009; Brown and Dillard, 2013a; Brown and
25 Dillard, 2013b, Brown et al., 2015; Dillard and Brown, 2012, 2014, 2015, Dillard and Yuthas,
26 2013; Dillard et al., 2016; Dillard and Vinnari, 2019), informed by critical scholars like Freire
27 (1970, 1985, 1994, 1998), Mouffe (1993, 1995, 1999, 2000) and Latour (1996, 2004a, 2004b).
28 These studies have explored pluralistic democracies and agonism as the basis to redefine the
29 role of accounting in socially constructing realities. As Brown (2009) points out, new forms of
30 accounting are needed, which move away from technocratic approaches and encourage
31 participatory decision-making and accountabilities. In agreement with Puxty et al. (1987),
32 Brown (2009) argues that accounting has the power to be malleable and redefine the boundaries
33 of what is 'in and out' (p. 316), but to do this, it should not be monologic, but rather 'receptive
34 of the needs of a plural society... multi-voiced and attuned to a diversity of stakeholders' values
35 and interests' (p. 317). Brown provides some suggestions to move from a monologic to a
36 dialogic accounting. First, it is fundamental to acknowledge pluralism, and this is reflected in
37 the way different people would produce different accounts for different things and in different
38 manners, while also considering the power differences among stakeholders. Second, avoiding
39 monetary reductionism in the production of accounts, but to provide different types of data that
40 can speak to different groups. Third, building on the previous point, calculations should be
41 contestable, allowing for subjectivity and reducing technocratic approaches that could prevent
42 transparency, suffocating divergent interests. Fourth, in line with the principles of critical
43 performativity, information should be accessible to non-experts too, instead of being conveyed
44 in purely technical form, which can exclude certain stakeholders from the debate. Fifth, decision
45 making should be the result of a democratic participation and an early involvement of all the
46 stakeholders. Sixth is the attention to, often imbalanced, power relations, where those in power
47 can filter information, whereas dialogic thinking also values counter-accounts or anti-reports.
48 Seven, a dialogic approach to accounting promotes critical reflections and the exchange of
49 different perspectives. Finally, dialogic thinking should never be a new form of monologism,
50 but rather a tool to preserve democracy as a process made of different nuances, not only as
51 agreement, but especially as contestation, agonism and disagreement.
52

53
54 More recently, critical accounting scholars have started looking at dialogic thinking in
55 terms of accountability, which can be seen as a natural consequence of principles of dialogic
56 accounting. In line with these studies, we propose that organizations capable of moving beyond
57
58
59
60

mainstream accounting-based accountability towards an accountability-based accounting (Dillard and Vinnari, 2019), could initiate a democratizing dialogical accountability process receptive of the different and pluralistic societal needs (Brown, 2009). The scholars argue that, by embracing this shift, effective accountability systems can be developed and, as a consequence, also effective accounting systems, rather than the other way round. Very importantly, the resulting accounts can include data of different nature that are suited to represent the accountability systems put in place to represent a plurality of constituencies, as in the case of FBALL (Baxter et al., 2019a). By advocating the need for critical dialogical accountability systems, we are not looking for ‘a panacea for future demands for accountability and the addressing of power imbalances’ (Yates, 2020, p. 99), but rather for a way to develop more inclusive and democratic organizational boundaries, as explicitly advocated by Manchester United fans in the study led by Cooper and Johnston (2012). Building on Rached (2016), and coherently with previous studies on dialogic accounting, Dillard and Vinnari (2019) underline that accountability systems emerge from a plurality of views and usually conflicting needs and ends, therefore as a multi-dimensional, agonistic process. Reflecting on this, they contend that accountability cannot be the result of a unidirectional system imposed by those in a position of power (see also Brown and Dillard, 2013a), but rather they see it as a democratic tool towards a collective decision making. For these reasons, it is important to recognize that, in general, but especially for alternative organizations (not built on neoliberal principles), accountability systems must go beyond market and legal accountabilities (Grant and Keohane, 2005). Dillard and Vinnari (2019) consider several dimensions under which accountability systems are constructed, which analyze to what extent asymmetrical power relationships between power holder and account holder are formally determined; the relationship between power holder and account holder; the characteristics of power and account holders; the standards and evaluation criteria for the power holder, stressing the dialogic engagement with the account holders; the procedures to give the account, which concern transparency and mechanisms to evaluate the actions of the power holder; the timing of giving the account and the timing to react to it; finally, the consequences that can be enforced on the power holder by the account holders. In critical dialogical accountability, context-based and multi-dimensional dialogue can help affirming pluralism and engaging with potentialities, carrying emancipatory goals, along with assisting the development of meaningful accounts for all parties involved. We contend that these practices can help releasing the critical performative potential of (especially alternative) organizations.

Therefore, the aim of our ethnographic study is to:

- Explore how alternative organizations in the sport sector can challenge or transform the boundaries imposed by dominant neoliberal forces.
- Identify the set of values at the base of these transformations, and address the circumstances under which specific accounting, and accountability practice can contribute to radical forms of management.
- Critically discuss the characteristics of the accounting and accountability dialogue to protect organizations from a degeneration of their core principles.

3. Methodology

Our critical analysis is based on extensive ethnographic research directly conducted at FC United for two years, and then continued with interviews, documental analysis, online interactions on their forum and social media across six years. As Van Maanen (1988) argues,

1
2
3 fieldwork is a practice in which the researcher gets involved full time for an extended period
4 and consists of an ongoing interaction with the targets of the study, on their living or working
5 ground. Fieldwork was therefore organized in four phases. During the first one, which lasted
6 for about six months, one of the authors visited the field on several occasions, attending home
7 and away matches. This helped gaining an initial understanding of the organization and
8 witnessing first-hand the ritualistic practices pictured by Poulton (2009, 2013) and Porter
9 (2011). For instance, this phase was important to see the integration among paid staff and
10 volunteers, in managing match ticketing, selling fanzines and raffle tickets, as well as food and
11 drinks. Moreover, traveling with fans to away matches and socializing with them on the terraces
12 and in bars also contributed to create the first relationships with the culture studied,
13 progressively moving away from an outsider position. FC United has actively sought
14 involvement from the academic community to shed lights on issues such as atmosphere at
15 matches (Poulton, 2009), social activism (Shafto, 2013), the articulation of fans authenticity
16 within English football (Porter, 2011, 2015), the club's politics of inclusion through community
17 (Kiernan and Porter, 2014) and the political-economic framework in which fans decided to join
18 FC United (Poulton, 2013). The club representatives, especially former board member (and
19 fellow academic) Adam and former General Manager Andy, became interested in having a
20 business scholar studying the club and giving them an evaluation and advice on the club's
21 business and management practices, especially at a time when FC United faced change and
22 expansion, while striving to retain and display its founding principles. The second phase started
23 when access to the organization was secured, which took months of negotiations, often
24 recognized as one of the most difficult steps for any ethnographer (Bryman and Bell, 2007).
25 Given his academic background, Adam served as the main gatekeeper (Atkinson and
26 Hammersley, 2007) at first, but later turned into the main sponsor, for the perceived mutual
27 benefits of collaborating with a business and management scholar. In exchange for the access
28 to the organization, the researcher offered voluntary work and was assigned to assist former
29 Community and Education Officer, Robin in his duties. Coherent with the principles of
30 academic engagement behind critical performativity, Bebbington et al. (2007) stress how
31 important it is for critical scholars to assist organizations as volunteers, and help them realizing
32 their visions, as well as intervening in corporate governance processes and debates, by relying
33 on their somewhat privileged position. Such privileged position and high degree of access,
34 allowed the researcher to take an active role in the organization, participating in staffs' meetings
35 and working both in the office and on the pitch with community coaches. The third phase of
36 the research was made of occasional visits to the field to conduct interviews and to provide help
37 on community projects started during the full-time involvement with the club. Finally, in the
38 fourth and longest phase, we studied the evolution of the club, by analyzing the most updated
39 club's documents, speaking to the board, conducting new interviews and investigating the
40 members' forum for news and debates.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47 The definition of the research problem was constructed inductively, by letting the field
48 and the culture speak in the process. Van Maanen (2011) suggests avoiding big theoretical
49 claims before entering the field, but to see the latter as an opportunity for discovery, also in
50 terms of the theoretical framework and research questions, and to use the research process to
51 get an understanding of what we are actually researching (Atkinson and Hammersley, 2007).
52 As ethnographers, we maintain an openness to critical questioning and we turn to Willis (2000),
53 who argues that 'the ethnographic craft...is about merging the messiness of everyday life with
54 some specific concepts (theory) as a way of dealing with a complex puzzle (research questions)
55 (in Friberg, 2016, p. 350). Willis's ethnographic imagination helps us distancing from 'the
56 notion of ethnography as images of reality' (2000) and from the ethnographic omnipotence
57
58
59
60

(Van Maanen, 1988) typical of early ethnographers like Malinowski⁴ and to maintain our reflexivity in terms of our position within the social world that we study (Atkinson and Hammersley, 2007). Therefore, we approached the field with a general awareness of the history of the club and the process that led many Manchester United fans to perceive their club as unaccountable to them, as detailed in Cooper and Johnston (2012), to even lead them to set up a new breakaway club. The definition of the accounting and accountability problem derived from the anthropological curiosity to analyze how this culture practiced the values expressed in the Club Manifesto, reconfiguring the boundaries among the club and its fans and members. The degree of access to the club allowed us to analyze the effect of calculative and non-calculative practices on the accountability processes and to what extent these are dialogic and biunivocal as in the club's ethos.

As such, both primary and secondary data were collected. The main bulk of data came from field notes, in the attempt to produce reflexive accounts of the life with the culture studied, which would then result in thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973). Most field notes were written at the office, either at the end of the working day or during breaks, but also at football matches, parties and social events. Several tools were used to record the data, like notebooks, diaries and even a notes app on the smartphone, which proved to be convenient and very portable, especially to type keywords, cues and short sentences. Seventeen semi-structured interviews with office staff, community coaches and volunteers were also conducted, which often seemed rather informal chats for the degree of closeness reached with the interviewees, a dynamic that Heyl (2007, p. 369) calls 'ethnographic interviewing' and that Hammersley (1992, p. 117) labels instead as 'reflexive interviewing'. Whenever possible, interviews were recorded with the smartphone and then transcribed by the authors or by professional transcribers. Three high-profile interviewees were instead reached by email, with specific questions that mirrored those asked during in-person interviews. The interview details are provided in Table 1 below.

No.	Date	Recording Mode	Name	Role	Duration (hrs:mins)
1	19/06/2014	Audio recorded	Andy	General Manager	00:33
2	11/07/2014	Audio recorded	John	Office Manager	00:48
3	17/09/2014	Audio recorded	Lindsay	Club Secretary	00:37
4	25/09/2014	Audio recorded	Michael	Office Volunteer (Memberships)	00:40
5	30/10/2014	Audio recorded	Jennifer	Office Volunteer (Accounting)	00:34
6	11/12/2014	Audio recorded	Pat	Office Volunteer (Accounting)	00:37
7	13/02/2015	Notes taken	Peter	Office Volunteer	00:35
8	17/03/2015	Audio recorded	Adam	Board Member	00:47
9	22/04/2015	Notes taken	Robin and John	Community Office and Office Manager	00:45
10	15/05/2015	Audio recorded	Andy	General Manager	00:47
11	19/06/2015	Audio recorded	Christine	Accounting Manager	00:28
12	30/07/2015	Audio recorded	Ben	FCUM Radio Editor	00:55
13	11/01/2016	Audio recorded	Adam	Player and Community Coach	00:32
14	13/01/2017	Audio recorded	Robin	Community Officer	00:58
15	22/02/2017	Audio recorded	Jack and Gary	Community Coaches	00:29
16	20/04/2017	Audio recorded	Kate	Women's Team Match-Day Secretary	00:34
17	31/01/2018	E-mail Interview	Damian	Chief Executive Officer	
18	23/02/2018	E-mail Interview	Paul	Board Member	
19	04/05/2022	E-mail Interview	Adrian	Board Chair	
20	08/06/2022	Audio recorded	Michael	Office Volunteer (Memberships)	01:35

Table 1 – Schedule of interviews and email interactions (table by authors)

⁴ Malinowski argued that 'it is I who will describe them or create them' (Stocking, 1987, p.101)

1
2
3
4 In addition, fanzines, internet fora, Facebook pages and other narratives about the club
5 constituted a major source of secondary data, especially to understand and analyze the club's
6 past, to make sense of the here and now.

7
8 The writing up phase aimed at 'construct(ing) a systematic explanation of one's group's
9 culture for another group to read and understand, given the inextricable limitations of
10 understanding of understandings' (Rosen, 2000, p. 64). This phase, which Kunda terms as
11 'coding' (2013, p. 17), really helped making sense of the great deal of data and field notes
12 accumulated, often represented by reports of everyday life at the club. The coding phase was
13 conducted manually, by creating categories to which meanings are attached (Basil, 2003) and
14 they are at the same time a precious tool to organize the data, but also an outcome of the analysis
15 (Tesch, 1990). The macro-categories to which the material has been assigned to are those that
16 make up the findings: democracy, participation and inclusion and community outreach.

17
18 Finally, in creating discourse, this research seeks forms of inclusiveness from a
19 multitude of different readership, going beyond 'some cryptic exchanges between intellectuals,
20 conducted behind the closed doors of academic conferences', to avoid 'becoming a forum for
21 the exercise of academic indulgence' (Fournier and Grey, 2000, p. 22). This approach follows
22 the call by proponents of critical performativity, who invite to avoid *authoritarianism* and
23 write reflexively to 'address audiences who are not just other academics working within their
24 field' (Spicer et al., 2016, p. 234), engaging with pressing issues of public importance.

25 26 27 28 **4. Findings**

29 *4.1 Practicing Democracy*

30 The struggle for FC United sits in trying to practice democracy and affirm its self-
31 governance ethos within a football context that operates in a very different way, and from which
32 the club cannot be completely abstracted. So, FC United becomes an organizational and
33 political exercise to run a club democratically and against the idea of personal profitability,
34 while avoiding pursuing a naïve program of anti-capitalism.

35 For FC United, adopting a one member, one vote structure only seemed logical, if seen
36 from the point of view of fans who try to fight the alienation and powerlessness (Cleland and
37 Dixon, 2015) they experienced at Manchester United over the years. Therefore, the assembly
38 is the most important element of practicing democracy. Among several informal meetings,
39 introduced in recent years to keep members up to date on issues like the stadium, the main arena
40 for dialogic democratic exchanges is the Annual General Meeting (AGM). The assembly, in
41 the form of the AGM is a space 'where participants come together to make decisions and
42 maintain relationships... a negotiable space in which horizontal democracy is practiced and
43 activism organized' (Reedy et al., 2016, p. 1558). The assembly comes into existence through
44 shared leadership, ideologies and rituals (Fominaya, 2010), and it also signals the willingness
45 by members to achieve a sense of collective identity (Reedy et al., 2016; McDonald, 2006).
46 Prior to the AGM, members can put forward resolutions, which need to be backed up by a
47 minimum of five members when forwarded to the board. Resolutions can be proposed on any
48 matter concerning the club, from sponsorship, to community work, to governance and are then
49 voted in favor or against at the AGM, with the board providing their non-binding suggestions
50 to members. One of the most intense moments in the AGM is certainly the election of board
51 members, who are periodically replaced. Sometime before the AGM, candidates present their
52 program on the website, making clear how they intend to contribute to the club, if elected as
53 board members. The AGM provides candidates with a chance to strengthen their position by
54 answering questions and openly debating with fellow members. AGMs are attended by three
55 hundred people on average but, to allow more members to express their choice for their favorite
56 candidates, there is a postal vote to be submitted prior to the meetings, where board members

1
2
3 finally get elected. The COVID-19 pandemic has also speeded up the process of making the
4 meetings and the voting online, using this opportunity to increase accessibility. In the following
5 excerpt it is described how members at the AGM directly interact with candidate board
6 members, investigating their potential contribution to the club and questioning what, as
7 candidates to run the club on behalf of the members, they see as FC United's ultimate goal:
8
9

10 'What can you offer as a board member if elected?', asks a member, prompting responses of all the best
11 candidates' skills. Another theme that gets explored is what matters the most for the club, with candidates
12 agreeing that winning is important to grow as a club and to give visibility for the community program,
13 but they all emphasize that winning should not come at the cost of jeopardizing the club's core values.
14 Finally, the candidates reflect on the role of the board within FC United: the first candidate argues that
15 the board should drive the club forward in a sustainable manner, collectively, with reasonable and
16 constructive arguing; whereas others underline that the board should stay true to the principles and act
17 ethically, representing fairly the membership by giving them clear options that people can decide on.
18

19 FC United tries to practice democracy through a direct confrontation on a variety of
20 themes among board members, members and management. The club strives to be a participative
21 democracy, an entity that governs itself (Fournier, 2002), although within a well-limited
22 framework of competitive football leagues. To allow not only for consent, but for constructive
23 dissenting voices within the club, resolutions are a valuable confrontational tool for members,
24 also useful to highlight issues that could be dealt more transparently by the club's
25 representatives, calling the board or even the CEO into account, if someone believes that the
26 club is not operating democratically. One of the main dialogical and confrontational tools for
27 board, management and members is the online members' forum, which contains all the official
28 documents available to members, but it also constitutes a platform for exchanges for anything
29 related to FC United, from matches, to travels to away games, to governance, community,
30 volunteering etc. The document section has grown over the years to increase disclosure of
31 financial and non-financial data to members, in a conscious effort to increase transparency
32 following the major governance crisis that club experienced in 2016 (see section 4.4). As Board
33 Chair Adrian explains:
34
35

36
37 Following the 2016 AGM there was a conscientious effort from the board to increase financial
38 transparency for the members. From late 2016 we publish a detailed summary of all board meeting
39 discussions and decisions as well as the official minutes. Although the club had always published the
40 minutes to members, these could take months to come out, by which time any issues were often no longer
41 'live'. A detailed summary report of each meeting is published to members within days of the meeting
42 taking place although there are closed sessions (...) which are not covered by the summary, these are
43 restricted as much as possible to HR and Commercially sensitive info and as such most of the financial
44 discussions are covered. On the same note, at that time the board introduced that three members could
45 attend any board meeting with a ballot held if more than 3 applied.
46

47 Therefore, the forum is a vital outlet to go beyond the formal moments of the AGM, as
48 accountability of the club towards its members is not only discharged through the provision of
49 financial and non-financial information. The forum gives the chance for a direct interaction
50 with virtually anyone at the club on any topic, including dialogic exchanges among members
51 themselves, allowing for the necessary pluralism and agonistic dissent to be expressed. The
52 following excerpt (presented in Figure 1) comes from a conversation among members and the
53 board over a recent redundancy in the club, which left many unsettled, given the central role
54 this employee has had over the years. The board is accountable to the members and provides
55 an explanation for this, leaving some satisfied and others a bit baffled. Nevertheless, it shows
56 the dialogic accountability to and from the club, and how the forum becomes a key tool for
57 daily exchanges.
58
59
60



Figure 1 – Excerpt from the members' forum on employee matters. Source: forum.fc-utd.co.uk (figure courtesy of FC United of Manchester)

What FC United is building, to use Parker's framework (2002b) goes against management as much as it leans on it, aware of the constraints of being an alternative club in a competitive football league. To achieve engagement and support, FC United relies heavily on members to participate in any capacity, financially and physically, devoting time and resources to the club's activities, as analyzed in the next subsection.

4.2 Participation and Inclusion, the Keys to the Club's Success

'This is our club, belongs to you and me, we're United, United FC'. By singing on the notes of 'Dirty Old Town', a popular song about the city of Salford by Ewan MacColl, FC United fans express their sense of ownership and belonging during every match, parade and social event. The attachment to the club has been a source of pride since the very beginning, even when skeptical Manchester United fans who did not follow 'the rebels' addressed FC United with irony by saying that the club 'won't last until Christmas'.

As said above, members have tools at their disposal to democratically participate in running the club, leaving the day-to-day management to the CEO, the board and the employed staff, who carry those functions on behalf of the membership. Members and fans enjoy the opportunities to contribute to the everyday life of the organization and feel included within the organizational settings. The ways members can participate is multi-dimensional: beside being fans who attend matches and purchase season tickets, many of them help during match-day, some work in the office, and others participate financially, to sustain and preserve the existence of the club. As per rule 4 and 5 of the Manifesto, FC United is committed to encourage participation and inclusion. It is about the oppressive and exclusive boundaries of the English Premier League (EPL) model and high-ticket prices that make games inaccessible to many. As an answer to this, FC United is committed to ensure accessibility to games, keeping ticket prices reasonably low and tailoring them to various categories of people, even if 60% of the total income comes from match-day revenues. The full price for a single match is £12, but it drops to £7 for concessions (students, over 60 and people on income support/ job seekers) and only £3 for young people under the age of eighteen. Moreover, the club makes a bold political statement and a potentially emancipatory practice regarding season tickets: they are sold on a 'pay what you can afford' basis, with a minimum selling price of £100, as well as the freedom to pay more. Poulton (2013, p. 123) reports that the initiative is particularly appreciated by fans, who in return pay on average £70 more than the minimum price, at times even matching the price they would pay for a season ticket at Old Trafford, as a sign of goodwill and support to the club. Attendance figures support this argument, as on average 2280 people attended home games in the first twelve seasons, despite some fluctuations due to missed promotions at playoffs in four straight seasons, which caused some sporadic disengagement. Membership, season ticket holders and average home attendance (depicted in figures 2, 3 and 4) are important metrics and valuemeters (Baxter et al., 2019a) for the club, which are forecasted, budgeted and presented in the business plan and in the integrated annual report.

Membership / Co-owners




Figure 2 – Membership trend for the last 10 seasons (updated February 2023). Source: <https://fc-utd.co.uk/co-owners> (figure courtesy of FC United of Manchester)

Season Ticket (& TMTB) Holders




Figure 3 – Season ticket trend for the last 7 seasons (updated February 2023). Source: <https://fc-utd.co.uk/co-owners> (figure courtesy of FC United of Manchester)




Figure 4 – Home matches attendance for all seasons. Source: data provided by FC United (figure courtesy of FC United of Manchester)

Praising the inclusive ticketing policies, Scott, a fan one of the authors used to travel to the stadium with, stresses how they can help newer generations to grow in an inclusive environment and cultivate values such as love for the sport and friendships. In Scott's view, this is in stark contrast to the current ticketing policies of EPL club, and especially Manchester United:

How much would a trip to Old Trafford cost to a family? £200 maybe? Or perhaps even more... It's just f** awful, mate. What they are doing is preventing a whole generation of kids to go and watch football. These kids can come here instead, with their mates or families, get in for a couple quid, have a fab time, stay off the streets and make new friends. This is what it means to be FC United. And this will carry on to the next generation, and then the one after and so on.

Participation is not only fueled by inclusive practices for ticketing, but is fundamentally linked to volunteering, a theme also closely related to community. Volunteers are part of those fan-communities that dedicate time and resources to affirm their sense of ownership and belonging, cementing individual identities around FC United. When attending the first match of the season, outside of the stadium, a little army of volunteers, dressed in high-visibility jackets, run pre-match operations. The first stall on the right sells memberships, and other volunteers sell fanzines, match-day programs and tickets. By taking a volunteering position at the club to assist Robin in his duties, one of the authors had the chance to get in contact with other volunteers and understand their reasons, and how this gave structure to their lives. Jennifer, for instance discusses how providing accounting and finance help in the office, has given her comfort and support to overcome the loss of her beloved husband:

I've been working in the office for three years now, that was a case of...I'm widowed now, and FC United were a great support to me when I lost my husband. It was the summer, no football going on; I was bored at home, so I rang the office to see if I could help in any way. John asked me if I could help with the accounts, which is what I do. As a result of doing that, obviously you get to know other people.

Other people even managed to turn their volunteering experience into a paid job, becoming key figures for the club. However, despite becoming full-time paid staff, their commitment is not money driven, but rather a matter of involvement, as explained by John, Office Manager:

So, I got involved with the club whilst I was still teaching, by working on match days... I did team sheets, and liaised with the referees, and with opponent secretaries who did the match sheets, started writing the reports on the referee, and doing the statistics, historical statistics, for the club, which I still do, even though since I retired, I've become more involved here in the office. After volunteering for twelve months here, I was asked to become office manager too. I run the day-to-day administration of the club, using mainly volunteers, and over the last, nearly, four years that I've been doing that, it has become almost a full-time job, even though I still get paid what I was being paid four years ago when I started!

Similarly, Robin, starting from a volunteer position, turned his vision into a key role for the club, not hesitating to take a substantial pay cut when the club was mostly in need:

What makes this club different is that it can be the vehicle for your dreams: I had an idea, a vision that I discussed with the staff, and that I progressively turned into a full-time job. I quit my old job and became a full-time Community Manager at FC United.

Volunteering offers an intrinsic gratification to those who take part in the club's activities, it is a source of pride and helps forming communalism: selling tickets; or helping with the accounts; or cooking pies to be sold at the bar, every effort is appreciated. Volunteering is also an essential element which ensures the survival of the club, whose operations would come to a halt without the significant effort of fans. Therefore, it constitutes a vital part of the club's operations, and it is presented as such in the business plan, the most recent of which (2022/25) reports that volunteers contribute on average to 25,000 hours of work annually, allowing the club to save around £247,500 per year (against the employment of paid staff). This is at the same time a strength and a weakness of FC United's organizational model, but it has so far worked well. There is one exception though: volunteers do not have the same prominent role in community work, as it will be explained in the next subsection. Along with promoting new volunteering opportunities, the club's website now shows figures of the estimate monthly and yearly savings from volunteers' work over paid staff, as shown in figure 5.

Current Volunteering Opportunities

At FC United, volunteering is placed at the very heart of the club. Our volunteers very generously donate their time and efforts to help the club be the best that it can be. Our volunteers contribute thousands of hours and save the club hundreds of thousands of pounds whether that's by selling our pound for the ground tickets, running turnstiles, or non-match day roles; without volunteers we would not have a club.

We're always on the lookout for new volunteers and our roles are constantly evolving. We offer a range of opportunities ranging from one-off tasks to help improve our ground, to a more longer-term role you can really put your stamp on. We believe volunteering at FC United is a two-way thing; we gain enormously from your contribution, yet we want you to benefit also. Our opportunities can be a great way to learn new skills and meet new people, so why not get involved, have fun and help your supporter-owned football club!



Figure 5 – Volunteering opportunities, description and metrics. Source: <https://fc-uid.co.uk/current-opportunities> (accessed 22 January 2023) (figure courtesy of FC United of Manchester)

The club sees members and fans' participation as essential. With almost three hundred volunteers involved in several activities, a sense of unity and community develops and helps bringing back some of the dynamics typical of traditional fandom. By promoting inclusion on and off the pitch, the club has also managed to stimulate participation to games, tailoring ticketing policies especially towards young people and less affluent individuals and, in return, it has obtained affection and engagement from supporters, who have been receptive to the club's invitation to donate. In a further acknowledgment of the crucial role played by volunteers and in the attempt to provide further structure to them, in January 2023 the club has appointed a Volunteer Co-Ordinator for the first time in its history and announced it on its LinkedIn page.

1
2
3 In praising the continuous efforts of the volunteers, the post states that volunteers want to give
4 something back to both members and the community.

5
6 Finally, fans and members participate by financially sustaining the club with donations,
7 by purchasing merchandise and through other fundraising tools devised by the club.
8 Fundraising has been especially targeted to gather money to cover the expenses of the club-
9 owned stadium. The club gathered almost £3 million from fans and members in two main ways:
10 through the 'Development Fund' and through the 'Community Shares Scheme'. Contributing
11 towards the Development Fund is cash collected at match-day, in strategically placed barrels;
12 a half-time draw named 'A Pound for the Ground' and an online system of donations paid by
13 card (one-off) or direct debit (regular donations). The Community Shares Scheme has turned
14 to be very successful in raising money, stimulating participation and strengthening the sense of
15 ownership and purpose. FC United successfully submitted a proposal to Coop UK, which was
16 launching a scheme aimed at raising funds for projects beneficial to different communities. The
17 club was put on the pilot project, which lasted just over a year, alongside other very
18 heterogeneous initiatives like, for example, the refurbishment of a derelict pier in Hastings. The
19 principle behind the community shares is relatively simple: an adult member can purchase
20 shares from a minimum of £200 to a maximum of £20000, which qualify for tax relief and
21 operate with a rate of interest of 2%. Shares can be withdrawn for the first time after three years
22 from the stadium opening, subjective on the boards' decision, and only for a maximum of 10%
23 a year. As of the end of the financial year 2020 only £94000 out of over £2 million in
24 Community Shares have been withdrawn/repaid, in a process that started in 2018, with several
25 members manifesting the intention to never withdraw their shares, effectively acting as a
26 donation to the club. However, in compliance with the club's structure and principles of the
27 one-member, one-vote rule, becoming a shareholder does not grant any more stake than other
28 members who are not. This was done to avoid creating tensions among members: by keeping
29 the Community Shares Scheme and regular membership strictly separate, no issues of
30 ownership were raised, as those who took part in the scheme knew from the beginning that it
31 was a selfless act towards the club, seminal to raise finances. In celebrating one of the most
32 successful initiatives run by the club, former GM Andy defined the scheme as:

33
34
35
36
37 A real game changer for football... Developing a Community Shares Scheme became a great enabler,
38 and we raised £2 million. Both the Development Fund and the Community Shares have demonstrated our
39 members' commitment to what we're trying to achieve.

40 41 *4.3 Community Outreach*

42
43 FC United makes explicit statements of being an organization by the community and
44 for the community. As Robin states, '(the club) cannot be split into a football and community,
45 one would not exist without the other'. The bond with community is one of the strongest forces
46 that, along with anti-commodification and commercialization discourses, have led to the
47 formation of FC United. While it is probably impossible to provide a universal definition of
48 'community', for FC United it means essentially two things: nurturing fan communities and
49 establishing reciprocal ties with them, as seen in the previous section, and providing help to the
50 (geographical) communities of Manchester and beyond. In the community section of the club's
51 website⁵, it was once written:

52
53
54 FC United members believe it is possible to create and sustain a successful, fans-owned, democratically
55 run football club that creates real and lasting benefits for supporters and local communities. The
56 commitment to be of benefit to our local communities is enshrined in our club rules and constitution...

57
58
59 ⁵ A previous version of what is currently the Community section, available at: [http://www.fc-
60 utd.co.uk/community.php](http://www.fc-utd.co.uk/community.php) (Accessed 18 November 2016)

1
2
3 Since the early days of the club, we have striven to give something back to our city, our supporters and
4 our communities.
5

6 A lot of merit for bringing forth this proposal should go to Robin who, as seen before,
7 quit his job to commit entirely to designing and leading FC United's community work.
8 Community work started already in the 2006/07 season on a very small scale, delivering
9 football sessions for children, but it has progressively grown to incorporate projects at
10 international level too. Despite being an integral part of the ethos of the club, community work
11 is budgeted separately from the other operations, but it contributes to the profit and loss account.
12 This is not meant to undermine the scope of community work, but it simply means that the
13 money available for community activities depend on how much external funding can be
14 obtained. Specifically, its success rests a lot on the creativity (to design projects) and the ability
15 to gather funds of the Community Officer and his collaborators. Differently from other cases,
16 less is in members' hands when it comes to community work, which follows a more top-down
17 approach, over a distributed one. However, generally this is not seen as significantly hindering
18 the democratic ethos of the club, because members feel rather confident to entrust this to the
19 Community staff. It must also be said that, due to the structure of community work, it has proven
20 to be difficult promoting integration with members on such activities, especially when members
21 themselves try to take the lead by organizing events. On some occasions, this disconnection
22 with fans and members provided some discontent and discouragement. For instance, when one
23 of the authors joined a two-day community event organized by fans, he was asked, with a certain
24 surprise, how he knew that the event was running in the first place. This was reported to the
25 Community Officer, and acknowledged as an area for improvement, especially after seeing that
26 some initiatives organized by members had limited impact, as they were lacking real inputs
27 from the club in terms of promotion and supervision.
28

29
30
31 Community work covers a wide range of activities and categories of people, ranging
32 from youths to elderly people, to more common work with local schools. Attention is provided
33 to kids, engaged through the means of sports, and to vulnerable adults, to whom are dedicated
34 courses that do not just cover sport activities, but also use radio and photography as other ways
35 of raising confidence and skills. Moreover, given the great ethnic variety in Manchester, FC
36 United also organizes sessions to help parents who do not have enough linguistic and numerical
37 skills, to be able to help their children with homework. In recent years, the scope of community
38 work has grown sensibly, and FC United has even won funding for several international projects
39 within the European program Erasmus+.
40

41
42 Community work has been and continues to be one of the keys to raise FC United's
43 profile nationally and internationally. However, it can be argued that, over the years, this area
44 of operations has seen a progressive increase in managerialism, bureaucracy, and control. As
45 John and Robin explain, in the early days of the club most community activities were run by
46 volunteers, but they argue that many of these did not take the job very seriously and were asked
47 to quit. Some members took this dismissal rather personally and left the club embittered, but
48 the point made by the club staff was that being accountable to the community meant treating
49 those activities with professionalism. There is a widespread feeling that, at the beginning, fans
50 and member enjoyed the ride, probably not being fully aware of the responsibilities that would
51 come with running a football club and community provider. As the club matured and increased
52 aims and scopes of its community program, it progressively had to comply with higher
53 standards of delivery, due to wider implications and responsibility towards funders (mostly in
54 the public sector, which paid for a good part of the stadium) and other stakeholders, whose
55 expectations for high-quality results need to be met. This has pushed the club to hire external
56 employees over fans and volunteers to deliver community work, was then willingly accepted
57 by members, but at the same time, also called for the adoption and tracking of metrics and KPIs.
58 Not only community is presented in financial and non-financial terms in the integrated report,
59
60

1
2
3 but monthly reports to the board detail it each month. The board has recently asked that these
4 reports contain a much greater analysis of KPIs than the past. As Adrian highlights, the club's
5 ambition is to break even in terms of community budget, something which was made more
6 complicated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite the club admits that there is room for
7 improvement in terms of performance indicators, fans and members appreciate the existing
8 disclosure and metrics for assessing community work. For instance, the 2020 consolidated
9 financial statement details that 'once again our Big Coat Day was a huge success with a record
10 6 tons of warm clothing collected'; or that 'we continued to expand our work with Sporting
11 Memories, using sport to combat social isolation, and our 3G pitch was used by over 1,500
12 participants a week; and finally that, despite the halt to many community activities caused by
13 the pandemic, 'the furloughed staff combined with club members, supporters and the local
14 community to set up a volunteer food hub in the SMRE space servicing the lockdown needs of
15 the local population. Up to 200 households at a time received vital support from our hub'.

16
17 To conclude, community work has always been conceived as an integral part of FC
18 United's grand vision. However, given its structure and exclusive reliance on external funding,
19 its development required savvy managers to take over its administration in ways that could
20 potentially create discontent for parts of the membership. As Robin argues, certain decisions
21 had to be taken for the greater good of the club. This is part of FC United's macro-emancipatory
22 vision, of a club that, through the operationalization of its inclusive and communitarian
23 principles, acts towards a radical (albeit progressive) transformation of society (Alvesson and
24 Willmott, 1992a; Huault et al., 2014), serving as an example for other people and organizations
25 with a similar ethos.
26
27
28

29 *4.4 Resisting Degeneration: how accountability failures can lead up to oppressive boundaries*

30
31 Are cooperative forms of organization deemed to reproduce the defects of the
32 capitalistic system they fight against, as argued by Marx (1981)? In other words, is degeneration
33 inevitable? Building the stadium was a tremendous achievement for the club: it required
34 engagement, unity of intents and great financial sacrifices from members, who really made an
35 incredible effort. The growing enthusiasm of finally having a home, temporarily hid the fact
36 that the club's officials often had to take important decisions without having the time or the
37 possibility to consult with the wider membership. Additionally, up to that point, many members
38 trusted the decisions taken by the club because, under that management, the once utopian dream
39 of owning a stadium finally became reality. As is often the case, a small incident led to the
40 crisis. The price of the match-program for the stadium inaugural friendly match against
41 Portuguese team Benfica B was raised by 50p (selling for £2.50, instead of the usual £2, on the
42 basis that it was a special edition). This was the catalyst for some members who had previous
43 disagreements with the GM to start discussions and create two very polarized factions, with
44 some members more neutral. As Michael recalls, working in the office was very difficult at that
45 time:
46
47
48

49 My loyalty was always to the football club. So, the important thing to me was making sure that club was
50 still operating on a daily basis, while the board almost hid away and started to refuse engaging with
51 people. There was also a lot of information there that they didn't tell people about, which might change
52 things. There were people in the office who seemed to be more interested in those things, rather than just
53 concentrating on the job (...).
54

55 A seemingly minor thing quickly exploded in its proportions during the first season
56 played in the new stadium (2015/16) when differences became very evident, leading to
57 infighting, in the attempt to push people out of the club. Part of the membership accused board
58 members and Andy of nepotism, lack of transparency and betrayal of the principle of
59 democracy the club was founded on. To prevent degeneration from being completed, the strong
60

1
2
3 infighting at the club led the whole board and GM to stand down. A few years later, certain
4 issues remain, both financially (arising from the costs of running a stadium and worsened by
5 the pandemic), and in terms of the transparency and accountability that members expect from
6 the club. Although the club is still somewhat recovering from this crisis, this historical mass
7 resignation offered chances of regeneration and renewal of the founding principles (Storey et
8 al., 2014; Langmead, 2017). New board members were elected, with a new CEO and changes
9 in the staff, which slowly led the club towards more disclosure and engagement with members.
10 As Michael puts it, the club has fallen, gotten back on its feet to adapt and evolve.
11
12

13
14 To me it's the same club that I joined back in 2005, but at the same time, it's almost a different animal
15 because it has to be. Because we've got to adapt in a sense to survive. It's just whether that adaption sticks
16 to the club's founding principles. In most people, the optimism it's starting to come back. It's a nervous
17 time, but also exciting: can we finally make the best of what we've got?
18
19

20 5. Discussion

21 Critical scholarship has so far given little attention to fan-ownership in sport and
22 especially in football. Alternative football clubs such as FC United seek to offer other ways of
23 conceiving the accountability relationships between fans and the club, as well as striving to
24 potentially achieve more humane and emancipatory forms of management through agency,
25 collectivism, and inclusiveness. We wanted to investigate these values to analyze if the club
26 can be seen as a critically performative alternative to more established ownership and
27 governance structures typical, for instance, of the EPL. The club developed following a lengthy
28 period of fan struggles, consequence of the changes in the socioeconomic conditions of English
29 football first, and from accountability failures at Manchester United that were deemed beyond
30 repair (Cooper and Johnston 2012), leading many supporters to proactively create a different
31 scenario. Our ethnographic study looks at how FC United modifies the boundaries of the
32 relationship between football club and its fans, by focusing on its accountability practices not
33 only about football and financial performance (still, very important for the club's survival) but
34 mostly on issues of democracy, participation/inclusion and community outreach. The research
35 also shows the ongoing struggle to affirm and sustain its core principles beyond rhetoric (Heras-
36 Sazarbitoria, 2014). The club has not been immune to a weakening of dialogical accountability
37 between the membership/fans (the account holders) and the elected representatives (the power
38 holders), but the threat of degeneration can be transient, and the original values can be restored
39 and even strengthened, as opposed to what is argued by Marx (1981).
40
41
42
43

44 5.1 *Discussing FC United in light of the Accounting and Sport Literature*

45 The accounting and sport literature has, more or less openly, debated how boundary
46 issues are emerging in sport organizations. Conceptualizing organizations as the nexus of
47 market, state and community (Puxty et al., 1987), allows for boundaries to be negotiated,
48 especially in the case of different, and at times competing logics at play that need some
49 accommodation. The example of the Swedish football clubs FClub and FBALL (Carlsson-Wall
50 et al., 2016; Baxter et al., 2019a, b) can be directly applicable to FC United, which however has
51 an even more radical governance structure, being a fully fan-owned club. FC United does not
52 necessarily represent unity; actually, members themselves view it as a 'broad church'. The club
53 has an overarching ethos of an organization that strives for football to be run differently, but
54 members might act on slightly different logics (Carlsson-Wall et al., 2016) and passionate
55 interests (Baxter et al., 2019a) that have increasingly become a matter of accounting. Many fans
56 and members are concerned with the match-day experience, emphasizing affordable ticket
57 prices, food and drinks, and the chance to support the club alongside their mates and/or families;
58 others want their club to make a difference for the community, while several members are
59
60

1
2
3 simply trying to make a stand against modern football and its neoliberal principles that made
4 the game inaccessible or less interesting to many. This means that accounting assumes a
5 fundamental role in catering the very diverse needs for information by fans and members, as
6 well as in the discharging of accountability by those entrusted to run the club. Since accounting
7 has the power to define what is in and what is out (Puxty et al., 1987; Brown, 2009), it is not
8 surprising that the demand from members for greater disclosure and transparency, especially
9 after the deep governance crisis that the club experienced in 2016, has resulted in more frequent
10 and more detailed accounts. On one side, we could argue that this reinforces the idea of
11 'passionate interests' (Baxter et al, 2019a), as FC United members surely find relief in knowing
12 that the club is not running into financial troubles, but very often the measures and metrics to
13 define success and good performance can emerge from non-financial elements. On the other
14 hand, reprising the arguments made by Cordery and Davies (2016) and Clune et al. (2019), not
15 even a fan-owned club like FC United can escape the nexus of market, state and community in
16 its operations, and must continue to push towards more professionalism, while progressively
17 leaving behind the amateurish features that characterized it in its first years of existence. As
18 Michael puts it:
19
20
21

22
23 What some members still have not totally clear is that professionalism does not mean being corporate, it
24 means doing things properly, something we did not always do, for a series of reasons, among which
25 inexperience played a good part.

26
27 We proceed to discuss accountability and critical performativity at the club, addressing
28 the issues raised in the method theory part.

29 30 *5.2 Dialogic Thinking for a Critical Performativity at FC United*

31 The progressive greater availability of financial and non-financial information, coupled
32 with the frequent debates on the online forum and during meetings, allow not only to move
33 towards an accountability-based accounting (Dillard and Vinnari, 2019), but to better express
34 the critical performative and emancipatory potential of the organization. With the idea of the
35 club as a 'broad church' in mind, democracy should not look for consensus at all costs, but it
36 can value 'agonistic pluralism' instead (Mouffe, 2000; Kokkinidis, 2015). In this way, dissent
37 can be interpreted constructively and create spaces for members to express their views by
38 providing room for negotiation until an agreement is reached.

39
40 A dialogic accounting process should help constructive conflict to become
41 institutionalized, minimizing exclusion in the decision making. Brown (2009), Vinnari and
42 Dillard (2016) and Dillard and Vinnari (2019) all agree that such agonistic approach is useful
43 to the identification and proper representation of all the parties concerned, towards dialogical
44 accountability systems that go beyond mere accounting and disclosure. The one-member, one-
45 vote structure, the dialogic exchanges that happen daily in the online forum, and the possibility
46 to propose resolutions and questioning the management, give room for pluralistic views to be
47 expressed and debated. The growing dialogic debate helps to fight degeneration threats (typical
48 of growing football clubs) by providing a platform to collectively express dissent. This plurality
49 of values and interests, although expressed while acting under a common purpose, necessarily
50 requires the abandonment of a monologic accounting, to ultimately favor dialogic systems of
51 accountability within the club (Brown, 2009).

52
53 In addressing how, more liquid and open boundaries can enhance semi-professional and
54 professional football and sport, FC United's inclusion and participation practices are the key
55 elements to focus on. The very existence of the club is something to be continuously celebrated:
56 as Rosen (2000) argues, this reiterated self-celebration acts against self-determinacy, but most
57 of all helps keeping members engaged and willing to participate to the club's activities. It is not
58 coincidental that Andy's mantra was 'this club can only go as far as members want it to go',
59
60

1
2
3 meaning that without members' engagement and participation, the club would have no future.
4 Moreover, the no-profit structure of FC United imposes strict budgeting choices, for instance,
5 on how much players and employees can get paid and knowing that there is a very wide pool
6 of fans that vitally contribute to and towards almost every activity. Both volunteering and
7 donations provide a support without which the club would struggle to carry on its activities,
8 both financially and organizationally, and the budgeted savings due to volunteering work, as
9 well as the newly appointed volunteer coordinator exemplify this very well. Furthermore, for
10 many fans, FC United has become a 'structuring part of their 'real' lives (Brown, 2008), helping
11 them to feel belonging in the 'disorder of today's social formations' (Brown et al., 2008, p.
12 308). However, building and running the stadium, as well as navigating a pandemic, have made
13 the club even more reliant on unpaid work and donations, and calculative practices additionally
14 contribute to providing a detailed idea to what extent FC United has to focus on getting support
15 from members.
16

17
18 Despite the struggle, FC United has achieved a real solidification of fan communities
19 moving against the seemingly unstoppable individualization of current societies (Bauman,
20 2000, 2001). Moreover, membership, season tickets and attendance have been fluctuating but
21 kept at good level over the years, even in spite of some disappointing results on the football
22 pitch. These important metrics are both non-financial, showing attachment to the club for what
23 it represents as an alternative organization in football, and financial, as they can constitute
24 important sources of funding, and are clearly disclosed to members.
25

26 As discussed above, a very strong 'passionate interest' (Baxter et al., 2019a) widely
27 shared in the club, is community building. Community outreach was set as an objective from
28 the beginning, and then shaped by Robin. Growing from small local intervention in deprived
29 communities, mostly targeted to children, the club went as far as offering activities that expand
30 beyond Manchester, except returning to its local roots during the pandemic. In line with Misener
31 and Misener's (2017) argument of the progressive blurring of sector boundaries in which
32 football clubs operate, FC United's community work has been fundamental to attract partners
33 for the stadium, especially among public sector organizations that decided to fund the stadium
34 for the expected returns in terms of community benefit, having already witnessed the quality of
35 the work done by the club. The professionalization of community work has however bound the
36 club to operate more bureaucratically and managerially but, to the growing need of financial
37 KPIs, fans and members still enjoy knowing that impact can be evaluated also in non-financial
38 terms, looking at how many tons of warm clothes have been collected, or how many local kids
39 have graduated from the Academy, or even how many meals have been distributed to families
40 in need.
41

42
43 What are then the critical performativity credentials that FC United has as an alternative
44 organization operating in a flawed capitalistic industry of speculation and debt like professional
45 football (Kennedy, 2013)? It is undeniable that the FC United model it is still taking shape and
46 it has yet to reach its 'solidity' (Bauman, 2000). But if we look at the process of development
47 of the club, it encompassed all the elements of Alvesson and Willmott's (1992b, 2014)
48 emancipation diagram: it started with a questioning phase aimed at challenging the dominant
49 socio-economical arrangements with modern football and especially Manchester United, which
50 led to the decision to start a new club with different principles; a utopian phase, before the
51 inception and during the very early days, which served to create a broader vision of the club
52 and its potential goals; finally, over the years utopian elements have been alternated with
53 incremental undertakings, as part of the wider vision of the club. Just as Alvesson and Willmott
54 (2014) stress the heuristic value of their framework, for FC United too it is impossible to operate
55 a total separation, because the utopian and incremental elements change and progress as the
56 club goes on. FC United can be better understood as an organization that started with a grand
57 vision of a football where ordinary fans could actively participate and not feeling just as
58
59
60

1
2
3 customers. To getting close to achieve this vision, the club has embarked in a series of micro-
4 emancipatory projects (Alvesson and Willmott, 1992a) aimed at giving voice to fans and
5 helping local communities.
6

7 Dialogic thinking has helped FC United expressing its performativity also in a different
8 way: not only by increasing disclosure to members, but also the shift to an accountability-based
9 accounting has helped the club to come back from its lowest point, avoiding monetary
10 reductionism but allowing calculations to be contestable and open for scrutiny by the
11 membership. By doing this, FC United has demonstrated the ability to regenerate, even at a
12 time when many members believed that boundaries were again changing towards a closed
13 system (Llewellyn, 1994), where power was wielded by technocrat managers claiming their
14 superior expertise (Alvesson & Willmott 1992b; 2014). How dissensus was used as a form of
15 'emancipatory politics (that) involves transgressive and conflictual challenges being made to
16 consensus frequently defined by powerful groups' (Huault et al., 2014, p.32), signals the
17 organizational resilience of the club in giving credibility to its long-term survival. The very
18 existence of FC United that, approaching two decades from its formation, is still fighting for a
19 more inclusive and democratic way for football to be run, signals the continuous effort to be a
20 critically performative alternative. Nevertheless, the financial and organizational challenges to
21 sustain this radical example of fan-ownership are substantial. To avoid the chance of drifting
22 away from its core principles again, the club needs to further improve on its democratic
23 accounting and accountability systems. Providing online regular summaries of every board
24 meeting, which are also now attended by three regular members, and the will to set up clearer
25 KPIs also for community work, are likely to put the club on the right path. This research shows
26 that a lot of the critical performative credentials of the club lie on the ability to stay as
27 democratic and inclusive as possible, valuing and acting on the different values and perspectives
28 of its constituencies.
29
30
31
32

33 **6. Concluding remarks**

34 This ethnographic study additionally contributes to the emerging accounting and sport
35 literature. Specifically, we shed light on how boundaries in the football sector are re-shaped
36 through alternative organizations that express their critical performativity by mobilizing
37 dialogic thinking and producing accountability systems that embrace pluralism. Our focus is
38 FC United of Manchester, which resisted to oppressive and exclusive boundaries emerging
39 from the corporatization of football. We identify the main elements at the base of such boundary
40 re-shaping, namely the practice of democracy in the governance, the role played by inclusion
41 and participation in the operations, communication transparency and community outreach.
42

43 The study found that, despite some deficiencies in keeping faith to its founding
44 principles of democratic representation and in the financial viability of the model, the club
45 represents a working alternative to mainstream management models of football and other
46 organizations with specific community-centered core values. It is argued that, if it insists on its
47 open and dialogic accountability approach, FC United can elevate its potential to become a
48 'critical performativity engine' (Leca et al., 2014), that can spark the formation of other
49 alternative organizations, even outside the football sector.
50

51 As Leca et al. (2014) argue, even a good critical performativity engine like FC United
52 would struggle to make an impact if the organizational model is not 'translated' in the local
53 socio-political context where it aims to be implemented. The alternative elements of critical
54 performativity act as a solid foundation of dialogic accountability practices based on the
55 adoption of multi-layer communication depending on the different type of stakeholders. The
56 challenge is therefore to adapt the principles advocated by FC United to other contexts, without
57 having the presumption to think that every organizational feature would work equally
58 everywhere.
59
60

This study has critically used ethnography as an active research methodology in accounting (Dey, 2002) to analyze emerging accountability issues in the sport sector. We hope that this research can entice scholars to deeply embed themselves in the experiences of other alternative football clubs in different worldwide regions, or to focus on other sports or sectors where issues of accountability and representation are very pressing. This could further extend the understanding of the interconnections between critical performativity and dialogic accountability as boundary re-shaping practices. For instance, women's football suffers from limited investment and funding, which is constraining the development of the sport, despite recent efforts made to increase visibility. Furthermore, female players are very much underpaid, compared to their male colleagues. For instance, for incredible as it might sound, women's football in Italy has become a professional sport only in 2022, finally allowing players to have a minimum yearly salary that could help them focusing on making a career in football and not working two jobs, as well as other normal benefits for professionals, like social security and end-of-career fund contributions, pension, medical protections for accidents and maternity leave. Adding these to the long-standing issues of representation, discrimination and sexism, much remains to be done.

References

- Adams, A., Morrow, S., & Thomson, I. (2017). Changing Boundaries and Evolving Organizational Forms in Football: Novelty and Variety Among Scottish Clubs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(2), 161-175.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1992a). On the idea of emancipation in management and organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 432-464.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (Ed.). (1992b). *Critical Management Studies*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2014). *Making Sense of Management: a Critical Introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Andon, P., & Free, C. (2019). Accounting and the business of sport: past, present and future. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32(7), 1861-1875.
- Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (3rd ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Basit, T. (2003). Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis. *Educational research*, 45(2), 143-154.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *The Individualized Society*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Baxter, J., Carlsson-Wall, M., Chua, W. F., & Kraus, K. (2019a). Accounting and passionate interests: The case of a Swedish football club. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 74, 21-40.

- 1
2
3 Baxter, J., Carlsson-Wall, M., Chua, W. F., & Kraus, K. (2019b). Accounting for the cost of
4 sports-related violence: A case study of the socio-politics of “the” accounting
5 entity. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32(7), 1956-1981.
6
7
8 Bebbington, J., Brown, J., Frame, B., & Thomson, I. (2007). Theorizing engagement: the
9 potential of a critical dialogic approach. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability
10 Journal*, 20(3), 356-381.
11
12 Boxenbaum, E., & Jonsson, S. (2008). Isomorphism, Diffusion and Decoupling. In R.
13 Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Salhin, & R. Suddaby, (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational
14 Institutionalism* (pp. 78–98). New York: Sage.
15
16 Bousalham, Y., Vidaillet, B. (2018). Contradiction, circumvention and instrumentalization of
17 noble values: How competition undermines the potential of alternatives. *Organization*,
18 25(3), 401-427.
19
20
21 Brown, A. (2008). Our club, our rules: fan communities at FC United of Manchester. *Soccer
22 and Society* 9 (3), 346-358.
23
24 Brown, A., Crabbe, T., & Mellor, G. (2008). Introduction: football and community – practical
25 and theoretical considerations. *Soccer & Society*, 9(3), 303-312.
26
27
28 Brown, J. (2009). Democracy, sustainability and dialogic accounting technologies: Taking
29 pluralism seriously. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 20(3), 313–342
30
31 Brown, J., & Dillard, J. (2013a). Agonizing over engagement: SEA and the “death of
32 environmentalism” debates. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 24(1), 1-18.
33
34
35 Brown, J., & Dillard, J. (2013b). Critical accounting and communicative action: On the limits
36 of consensual deliberation. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 24(3), 176-190.
37
38
39 Brown, J., Dillard, J., & Hopper, T. (2015). Accounting, accountants and accountability
40 regimes in pluralistic societies: taking multiple perspectives seriously. *Accounting,
41 Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 28(5), 626–650.
42
43
44 Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford
45 University Press.
46
47
48 Campanale, C., Cinquini, L., & Grossi, G. (2021). The role of multiple values in developing
49 management accounting practices in hybrid organisations. *The British Accounting
50 Review*, 53(6), 100999.
51
52
53 Carlsson-Wall, M., Kraus, K., & Messner, M. (2016). Performance measurement systems and
54 the enactment of different institutional logics: insights from a football
55 organization. *Management Accounting Research*, 32, 45-61.
56
57
58 Cheney, G. (1999). *Values at Work: Employee Participation Meets Market Pressure at
59 Mondragon*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3 Cleland, J., & Dixon, K. (2015). Black and whiter: the relative powerlessness of 'active'
4 supporter organization mobility at English Premier League football clubs. *Soccer &*
5 *Society*, 16(4), 540-554.
6
7 Clune, C., Boomsma, R., & Pucci, R. (2019). The disparate roles of accounting in an amateur
8 sports organisation: The case of logic assimilation in the Gaelic Athletic
9 Association. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32(7), 1926-1955.
10
11
12 Cooper, C. & Johnston, J. (2012). Vulgate accountability: insights from the field of
13 football, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 25(4), 602-634.
14
15 Cooper, C., & Joyce, Y. (2013). Insolvency practice in the field of football. *Accounting,*
16 *organizations and society*, 38(2), 108-129.
17
18
19 Cordery, C. J., & Davies, J. (2016). Professionalism versus amateurism in grass-roots sport:
20 Associated funding needs. *Accounting History*, 21(1), 98-123.
21
22
23 Cornforth, C. (1995). Patterns of cooperative management: Beyond the degeneration thesis.
24 *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 16(4), 487-523.
25
26
27 Cornforth, C., Thomas, A., Lewis, J. and Spear, R. (1988). *Developing Successful Worker Co-*
28 *operatives*. London: Sage.
29
30
31 Dey, C. (2002). Methodological issues: The use of critical ethnography as an active research
32 methodology. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15 (1), 106-121.
33
34
35 Dillard, J., & Brown, J. (2012). Agonistic pluralism and imagining CSEAR into the
36 future. *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal*, 32(1), 3-16.
37
38
39 Dillard, J., & Brown, J. (2014). Taking pluralism seriously within an ethic of accountability.
40 In *Accounting for the Public Interest* (pp. 75-90). Springer, Dordrecht.
41
42
43 Dillard, J., & Brown, J. (2015). Broadening out and opening up: an agonistic attitude toward
44 progressive social accounting. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy*
45 *Journal*, 6(2), 243-266.
46
47
48 Dillard, J., & Vinnari, E. (2019). Critical dialogical accountability: From accounting-based
49 accountability to accountability-based accounting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*,
50 62, 16-38.
51
52
53 Dillard, J., Yuthas, K. (2013). Critical dialogics, agonistic pluralism, and accounting
54 information systems. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 14(2),
55 113-119.
56
57
58 Dillard, J., Yuthas, K., & Baudot, L. (2016). Dialogic framing of accounting information
59 systems in social and environmental accounting domains: Lessons from, and for,
60 microfinance. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 23, 14-27.
- Esper, S.C., Cabantous, L., Barin-Cruz, L., & Gond, J-P. (2017). Supporting alternative organizations? Exploring scholars' involvement in the performativity of worker-recuperated enterprises. *Organization*, 24(5), 671-699.

- 1
2
3 FC United of Manchester. (2023). *The Manifesto: Who We Are and What We Mean*. Retrieved
4 January 20, 2023, from <http://fc-utd.co.uk/manifesto.php>
5
- 6 Fominaya, C.F. (2010). Creating cohesion from diversity: The challenge of collective identity
7 formation in the global justice movement. *Sociological Inquiry*, 80(3), 377–404.
8
- 9 Fournier, V. (2002). Utopianism and the cultivation of possibilities: grassroots movements of
10 hope. In M. Parker (Eds.), *Utopia and Organization* (pp. 189-216). Oxford: Blackwell.
11
- 12 Fournier, V. (2013). Commoning: on the social organization of the commons. *M@n@gement*,
13 16(4), 433-453.
14
- 15 Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the Critical Moment: Conditions and Prospects for Critical
16 Management Studies. *Human Relations*, 53(7), 7-32.
17
- 18 Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
19
- 20 Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. London:
21 Macmillan.
22
- 23 Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York:
24 Continuum.
25
- 26 Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Lanham, MD:
27 Rowman & Littlefield.
28
- 29 Friberg, T. (2016). Generating ethnographic research questions: an anthropological
30 contribution to the study of higher education. *Ethnography and Education*, 11(3), 345-
31 358.
32
- 33 Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic.
34
- 35 Giulianotti, R. (2002). Supporters, Followers, Fans, and Flaneurs: A Taxonomy of Spectator
36 Identities in Football. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 26(1), 25-46.
37
- 38 Grant, R., & Keohane, R. (2005). Accountability and abuses of power in world politics.
39 *American Political Science Review*, 99(1), 29–43.
40
- 41 Grey, C., & Willmott, H. (2005). *Critical Management Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University
42 Press.
43
- 44 Hammersley, M. (1992). *What's Wrong with Ethnography? Methodological Explorations*.
45 London: Routledge.
46
- 47 Heras-Saizarbitoria, I. (2014). The ties that bind? Exploring the basic principles of worker-
48 owned organizations in practice. *Organization*, 21(5), 645-665.
49
- 50 Heyl, B.S. (2007). Ethnographic interviewing. in P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J.
51 Lofland, & L., Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnography* (pp. 369-383). London: Sage.
52
- 53 Hualt, I., Perret, V., & Spicer, A. (2014). Beyond macro- and microemancipation: Rethinking
54 emancipation in organization studies. *Organization*, 21(1), 22-49.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Janin, F. (2017). When being a partner means more: The external role of football club
4 management accountants. *Management Accounting Research*, 35, 5-19.
5
6 Jones, G.J., Edwards, M., Bocarro, J.N., Bunds, Kyle S., & Smith, J.W. (2017). Collaborative
7 Advantages: The Role of Interorganizational Partnerships for Youth Sport Nonprofit
8 Organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(2), 148-160.
9
10 Jones G. J., Edwards M. B., Bocarro J. N., Bunds K. S., & Smith J. W. (2018). Leveraging
11 community sport organizations to promote community capacity: Strategic outcomes,
12 challenges, and theoretical considerations. *Sport Management Review*, 21(3), 279-292.
13
14 Jones, M.B. (2007). The Multiple Sources of Mission Drift. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*
15 *Quarterly*, 36(2), 299-307.
16
17 Kennedy, P. (2013). Left wing supporter movements and the political economy of football.
18 *Soccer and Society*, 14(2), 277-290.
19
20 Kennedy, D., & Kennedy P. (2015). Grass-roots football, autonomous activity and the forging
21 of new social relationships. *Sport in Society*, 18(4), 497-513.
22
23 Kiernan, A., & Porter, C. (2014). Little United and the Big Society: negotiating the gaps
24 between football, community and the politics of inclusion. *Soccer & Society*, 15(6), 847-
25 863.
26
27 King, D. (2015). The Possibilities and Perils of Critical Performativity: Learning from Four
28 Case Studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31(2), 255–265.
29
30 Kokkinidis, G. (2015). Spaces of possibilities: worker’s self-management in Greece.
31 *Organization*, 22(6), 847-871.
32
33 Kunda, G. (2013). Reflections on becoming an ethnographer. *Journal of Organizational*
34 *Ethnography*, 22(1), 4-22.
35
36 Langmead, K. (2017). Challenging the Degeneration Thesis: the Role of Democracy in Worker
37 Cooperatives?. *Journal of Entrepreneurial and Organizational Diversity*, 5(1), 79-98.
38
39 Latour, B. (1996). *Aramis, or the Love of Technology*. Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University
40 Press.
41
42 Latour, B. (2004a). *Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy*. Cambridge,
43 Mass.; Harvard University Press.
44
45 Latour, B. (2004b). Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of
46 concern. *Critical inquiry*, 30(2), 225-248.
47
48 Leca, B., Gond, J.-P., & Barin-Cruz, L. (2014). Building ‘Critical Performativity Engines’ for
49 Deprived Communities. The Construction of Popular Cooperative Incubators in Brazil.
50 *Organization* 21(5), 683-712.
51
52 Llewellyn, S. (1994). Managing the boundary: how accounting is implicated in maintaining the
53 organization. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 7(4), 4-23.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lukka, K., & Vinnari, E. (2014). Domain theory and method theory in management accounting
4 research. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 27(8), 1308-1338.
5
6 Lyotard, J-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
7
8 Marx, K. (1981). *Capital, vol. 3* (trans. E. Mandel). Harmondsworth: Penguin
9
10 McDonald, K. (2006). *Global movements: Action and culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
11
12 Miller, P., & Power, M. (2013). Accounting, organizing, and economizing: Connecting
13 accounting research and organization theory. *The academy of management annals*, 7(1),
14 557-605.
15
16
17 Misener, K.E., & Misener, L. (2017) Grey Is the New Black: Advancing Understanding of New
18 Organizational Forms and Blurring Sector Boundaries in Sport Management, *Journal*
19 *of Sport Management*, 31(2), 125-132.
20
21
22 Mouffe, C. (1993). *The return of the political*. London: Verso.
23
24 Mouffe, C. (1995). Democracy and pluralism: A critique of the rationalist approach. *Cardozo*
25 *L. Rev.*, 16, 1533-1545.
26
27 Mouffe, C. (1999). Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism?. *Social research*, 66(3),
28 745-758.
29
30
31 Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. New York: Verso.
32
33 Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically*. London: Verso.
34
35 Paranque, B., & Willmott, H. (2014). Cooperatives—saviours or gravediggers of capitalism?
36 Critical performativity and the John Lewis Partnership. *Organization*, 21(5), 604-625.
37
38 Parker, M. (Ed.). (2002a). *Utopia and Organization*. Oxford: Blackwell.
39
40 Parker, M. (2002b). *Against Management*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
41
42 Parker, M. (2014). Alternatives: past, present and prospective. In M. Parker, G. Cheney, V.
43 Fournier, V., & C. Land (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*
44 (pp. 18-30). Oxon: Routledge.
45
46
47 Parker, M. (2017). Alternative enterprises, local economies, and social justice: Why smaller is
48 still more beautiful. *M@anagement*, 20(4), 418-434.
49
50 Parker, M., & Lightfoot, G. (2014). Imagining alternatives. In M. Parker, G. Cheney, V.
51 Fournier, V., & C. Land (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*
52 (pp. 31-41). Oxon: Routledge.
53
54
55 Parker, S., & Parker, M. (2017). Antagonism, Accommodation and Agonism in Critical
56 Management Studies: Alternative Organizations as Allies. *Human Relations*, 70(11),
57 1366-1387.
58
59 Parker, M., Fournier, V., & Reedy, P. (2007). *The Dictionary of Alternatives – Utopianism and*
60 *Organization*. London: Zed Books.

- 1
2
3 Porter, C. (2011). *Cultures of Resistance and Compliance: Football Fandom and Political*
4 *Engagement in Manchester* (Doctoral thesis). Manchester Metropolitan University,
5 Manchester, UK.
6
7 Porter, C. (2015). Loyal to what? FC United's 'shaping walk' through football's muck of ages.
8 *Sport in Society*, 18(4), 452-465.
9
10 Poulton, G. (2009). *Cultural Participation, the Making of Distinction and the Case of Fans of*
11 *FC United of Manchester*. Retrieved from
12 <http://hummedia.manchester.ac.uk/institutes/cresc/workingpapers/wp73.pdf>
13
14 Poulton, G. (2013). *FC United of Manchester: Community and Politics amongst English*
15 *Football Fans* (Doctoral thesis). Retrieved from
16 https://www.research.manchester.ac.uk/portal/files/54539991/FULL_TEXT.PDF
17
18 Puxty, A. G., Willmott, H. C., Cooper, D. J., & Lowe, T. (1987). Modes of regulation in
19 advanced capitalism: Locating accountancy in four countries. *Accounting,*
20 *organizations and Society*, 12(3), 273-291.
21
22 Rached, D. (2016). The concept(s) of accountability: Form in search of substance. *Leiden*
23 *Journal of International Law*, 29(2), 317–342.
24
25 Reedy, P., King, D., & Coupland, C. (2016). Organizing for Individuation: Alternative
26 Organizing, Politics and New Identities. *Organization*, 37(11), 1553 –1573.
27
28 Rosen, M. (2000). *Turning Worlds, Spinning Worlds: Chapters in organizational ethnography*.
29 Amsterdam: Hardwood Academic Publishers.
30
31 Shafto, C. (2013). *An Examination of Social Activism in Contemporary Fan Owned Football*
32 *Clubs: Investigating Football Club United of Manchester as a Case Study* (Bachelor's
33 dissertation). Retrieved from http://fc-utd.co.uk/documents/Dissertation_Shafto.pdf
34
35 Spicer, A., Alvesson, M. and Karreman, D. (2009). Critical performativity: The unfinished
36 business of critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 62(4), 537-560.
37
38 Spicer, A., Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2016). Extending Critical Performativity. *Human*
39 *Relations*, 69(2), 225–49.
40
41 Stocking, G. W. Jr. (1987). *Victorian Anthropology*. New York: The Free Press.
42
43 Storey, J., Basterretxea, I., & Salaman, G. (2014). Managing and resisting 'degeneration' in
44 employee- owned businesses: A comparative study of two large retailers in Spain and
45 the United Kingdom. *Organization*, 21(5), 626-644.
46
47 Svensson, P.G., Seifried, C.S. (2017). Navigating plurality in hybrid organizing: The case of
48 sport for development and peace entrepreneurs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(2),
49 176-190.
50
51 Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research—Analysis types and software protocols*. Hampshire,
52 UK: The Falmer Press.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Torchia, D. (2016). An alternative football club in a liquid modernity: FC United of Manchester.
4 *Culture and Organization*, 22(3), 203-220.
5
6 Torchia, D. (2020). Creating and managing community in a community football
7 club. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 25(1-2), 79-98.
8
9 Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: The University
10 of Chicago Press.
11
12 Van Maanen, J. (2011). Ethnography as work: Some rules of engagement. *Journal of*
13 *management studies*, 48(1), 218-234.
14
15 Vinnari, E., & Dillard, J. (2016). (ANT)agonistics: Pluralistic politicization of, and by
16 accounting and its technologies. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 39, 25–44.
17
18 Walsh, A.J., & Giulianotti, R. (2001). This sporting mammon: a normative critique of the
19 commodification of sport. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 28(1), 53-77.
20
21 Webb, T., & Cheney, G. (2014). Worker-owned and governed co-operatives and the wider co-
22 operative movement: challenges and opportunities within and beyond the global
23 economic crisis. In M. Parker, G., Cheney, V., Fournier, & C. Land, C. (Eds.), *The*
24 *Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization* (pp. 64-88). Oxon: Routledge.
25
26 Westphal, J.D., & Zajac, E.J. (2001). Decoupling Policy from Practice: The Case of Stock
27 Repurchase Programs. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 202–228.
28
29 Willis, P. (2000). *The Ethnographic Imagination*. London: Polity Press.
30
31 Wickert, C. & Schaefer, S.M. (2015). Towards a Progressive Understanding of Performativity
32 in Critical Management Studies. *Human Relations*, 68(1), 107–130.
33
34 Yates, D. (2020). Critical Dialogical Accountability: From Accounting-based Accountability
35 to Accountability-based Accounting. *Social and Environmental Accountability*
36 *Journal*, 40(1), 99-100.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgement:

This paper is dedicated to Daniel' mother Maria Angela, who passed away in March 2023, for her unconditional love, care and guidance. You live forever in our hearts.

We sincerely thank FC United of Manchester for allowing us to study their club, a constant source of inspiration and support for our project.

Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal