Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise /
Türk Spor ve Egzersiz Dergisi
http://dergipark.gov.tr/tsed
Year: 2024 - Volume: 26 – Issue 3 - Pages: 434-450
10.15314/tsed.1501708

Turkish Journal of
Sport and Exercise
Türk Spor ve Egzersiz Dergisi
ISSN: 2147-5652
https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tsed

# Evaluation of Security Measures Taken in Stadiums from the Perspective of Spectators (Security in Sport Study)

Erhan BUYRUKOĞLU [1A], Kemal KIZILKAYA [2B],
Abdulkadir EKİN [3C], İsmail VAROL[4D]

[1] *Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Department of Sport Management Sciences, Aydın, TURKEY*
[2] *Siirt Governorate, Siirt Governor, Siirt, TURKEY*
[3] *Siirt University, BESYO, Department of Sports Management, Siirt, TURKEY*
[4] *Akdeniz Univeristesi, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Department of Sport Management, Antalya, TURKEY*
*Correspondence Address: Erhan BUYRUKOĞLU e-mail: erhanbuyrukoglu@gmail.com*

** This research was presented as an abstract paper at the 10th International Science, Culture and Sports Congress in Montenegro / Budva between 26-30 May 2024.*

*Conflicts of Interest: The author(s) have no conflicts of interest to declare.*

*Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed while conducting and writing this study and that all sources used were properly cited.*

*(Date Of Received): 15.06.2024 (Date of Acceptance): 22.08.2024 (Date of Publication): 31.12.2024*
A: Orcid ID:0000-00002-8459-9270 B: Orcid ID: 0009-0007-4103-7992
C: Orcid ID: 0000-0001-9421-711X D: Orcid ID: 0009-0006-3690-6949

**Abstract**

The safety of the spectators watching the competitions in the stadiums is of great importance in terms of the security measures taken in the competition area. In this context, the aim of our research is to examine how the security measures taken in stadiums are evaluated by the spectators. The population of our research consists of fans in professional football league competitions in the 2022-2023 season. The sample group consists of a total of 1540 fans, 406 women and 1134 men, who were randomly selected from the universe and who voluntarily agreed to participate in our research. As a data collection tool, the personal information form created by the researchers and the "Security in Sport Scale" were used to measure the evaluation of the security measures taken in the stadiums by the spectators. As a result of the normality analysis of the scale and its sub-dimensions, it was determined that the significance values were $p > 0.05$ and accordingly, nonparametric tests (Mann-Whitney U Test, Kruskal-Wallis H Test) were applied. As a result, it was determined that gender, marital status, educational status, participation in away competitions, self-identification as a football spectator, responsibility for violence in stadiums and frequency of going to the stadium had statistically significant effects on the sub-dimensions of the scale and general security perception.

**Keywords:** Stadium, Security Measures, Spectators.

Erhan BUYRUKOGLU Orcid ID: 0000-00002-8459-9270 / Kemal KIZILKAYA Orcid ID: 0009-0007-4103-7992
Abdulkadir EKIN Orcid ID: 0000-0001-9421-711X / Ismail VAROL Orcid ID: 0009-0006-3690-6949

**Stadyumlarda Alınan Güvenlik Önlemlerinin Seyirciler Acısından Değerlendirilmesi (Sporda Güvenlik Çalışması)**

**Özet**

Stadyumlarda müsabakaları izleyen seyircilerin güvenliği, müsabaka alanında alınan güvenlik önlemleri açısından büyük önem taşımaktadır. Bu bağlamda, araştırmamızın amacı, stadyumlarda alınan güvenlik önlemlerinin seyirciler tarafından nasıl değerlendirildiğini incelemektir. Araştırmamızın evrenini 2022-2023 sezonunda profesyonel futbol ligi müsabakalarındaki taraftarlar oluşturmaktadır. Örneklem grubu ise, evren içerisinden rastgele seçilen ve araştırmamıza gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul eden 406 kadın ve 1134 erkek olmak üzere toplam 1540 taraftardan oluşmaktadır. Veri toplama aracı olarak, araştırmacılar tarafından oluşturulan kişisel bilgi formu ile stadyumlarda alınan güvenlik önlemlerinin seyirciler tarafından değerlendirilmesini ölçmek amacıyla "Sporda Güvenlik Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Ölçek ve alt boyutlarına ilişkin normallik analizi sonucunda anlamlılık değerlerinin $p > 0.05$ olduğu saptanmış ve bu doğrultuda parametrik olmayan testler (Mann-Whitney U Testi, Kruskal-Wallis H Testi) uygulanmıştır. Sonuç olarak, cinsiyet, medeni durum, eğitim durumu, deplasman müsabakalarına katılım, futbol seyircisi olarak kendini tanımlama, stadyumlarda yaşanan şiddetin sorumluluğu ve stadyuma gitme sıklığı değişkenlerinin ölçeğin alt boyutları ve genel güvenlik algısı üzerinde istatistiksel olarak anlamlı etkileri olduğu belirlenmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Stadyum, Alınan Güvenlik Önlemleri, Seyirci.

## INTRODUCTION

The participation of spectators in sportive competitions is shown as an effective role of the competitions. It is stated that the areas where sportive competitions have the highest number of spectators are stadiums (16). It is included in the literature studies that the competitions held in stadiums are generally hooliganised in fan groups around the world, safe areas in stadiums are restricted as a result of hooliganism and individuals do not want to come to watch competitions in stadiums (1; 17; 24; 12).

Hooliganisation and the quarrels between fan groups have led to the restriction of security areas in sports. It is explained in the literature studies that there are many aspects of violent incidents in the competitions played in stadiums. In the stadium, the provocative actions and insults of the fans in the opposite groups against each other, the media's reflection of bad events, the harsh interventions of the athletes during the competition, the critical decisions of the referees, the cheerleaders' provocation of the fans, the opposing discourses of the sports administrators against each other, the wrong and faulty design and public order deficiencies of the security officers in their duty places (11).

As a result of the incidents of violence in the stadiums, the TFF announced the security instruction in the stadiums. In the circular, in order to minimise the incidents of violence in stadiums and to prevent violent incidents, the authority to take security measures in stadiums has been given to the general directorate of security, the general directorate of gendarmerie and private security units in accordance with the regulation on the prevention of violence and irregularity in sports numbered 2012/4018, the law on the prevention of violence and irregularity in sports numbered 6222 and the instruction published by the TFF. A security committee has been established by TFF in stadiums. This committee evaluates the incidents of violence in the stadiums and imposes financial penalties on individuals and sports clubs, and it is stated that if the stadiums comply with the articles in the security instructions published by the TFF that there will be no weakness in terms of security in the stadiums, a certificate of conformity is given, and if this certificate of conformity is obtained, competitions can be played in the stadiums (28).

When the studies in the literature were analysed, it was seen that there are almost no security studies in sports and no project related to security areas in sports has been put into operation (30). When the researches conducted in general are examined, it is stated in the research results that the incidents of violence in the stadium have increased over the years and that the violent incidents in the stadiums cause material damages as well as moral damages (27). Considering the researches in the literature and the TFF security instruction, it was aimed to evaluate the security measures taken in the stadiums from the perspective of the spectators.

## METHOD

### Materials and Methods

In this part of the study, explanations about the research model, population and sample size, data collection process and data analysis are given. During the current research, the Directive on Scientific Research and Publication Ethics of Higher Education Institutions was followed.

### Research Model

In our research, the descriptive survey model, which is within the scope of the survey model, was used. In general, researches aiming to determine any situation in a subject are defined as descriptive research model (21).

### Research Group

The study group of our research consists of a total of 1540 (n=406 women, n=1134 man) volunteer fans who came to the professional football league competitions in 2022-2023.

### Data Collection Tools

The data collection tools in our study consist of two parts. In the first part, the personal information forum created by the researchers), and in the second part, the "Safety in Sport" scale developed by Taştan and Ataman Yancı (2016) was used.

*Personal Information Forum*

A personal information forum consisting of 11 questions such as gender, marital status, age, education level, which team are you a fan of, do you have a season-pass, do you go to away matches, how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator, with whom do you go to the stadium to watch a match, how often do you go to the stadium to watch a match, who do you think is responsible for the violence in stadiums was used.

*Safety in Sport Scale*

The "Safety in Sport" scale developed by Taştan and Ataman Yancı (2016) was graded in 5 stages as (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) undecided, (4) disagree and (5) strongly disagree. The scale of safety in sport consists of 20 questions and 4 sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions are as follows: Perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken: 12, 10, 13, 11, 20 (Dimension 1), Perception of prevention of violent incidents by security forces: 16, 15, 18, 14, 17, 19 (Dimension 2), Perception of the use of security systems in stadiums: 5, 4, 8, 9, 6 (Dimension 3), Perception of controls at the entrance to the stadiums: 1, 2, 3, 7 (Dimension 4). According to the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient analysis to determine the reliability of the scale, Cronbach's Alpha value was calculated as .880 in the whole scale (27). The Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale in this study was found to be .815.

### Data Analysis

The data of our research were collected face-to-face. Within the scope of the research, a total of 1564 participants were reached and the outliers in the data set and whether the multivariate normality assumption was met were examined with the help of Mahalanobis distance values and 24 data showing outlier outliers were removed from the data set and statistical analysis of 1540 participants was performed.

In this study, SPSS 25.0 package programme was used to analyse the data. Outliers in the data set and whether the assumption of multivariate normality was met were analysed with the help of Mahalanobis distance values and 24 data showing outlier outliers were removed from the data set. The kurtosis-skewness

coefficients were found to be between +2-2 and non-parametric tests were used in the analysis (21). Statistically, frequency, percentage and reliability coefficient calculations, Kruskal Wallis H Test and Man Witney U Test were performed. The analyses were performed according to 95% confidence interval.

**FINDING**

**Tablo 1.** Demographic Variables

| **Variables** | | **f** | **%** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Woman | 406 | 26,4 |
| | Man | 1134 | 73,6 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| Marital Status | Married | 658 | 42,7 |
| | Single | 882 | 57,3 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| Age | 18-25 age range | 364 | 23,6 |
| | 26 to 33 years old | 602 | 39,1 |
| | 34-41 age range | 294 | 19,1 |
| | 42- 49 age range | 280 | 18,2 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| Education Status | High School Graduate | 1316 | 85,5 |
| | University Graduate | 224 | 14,5 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| Which team are you a fan of | Sivas spor | 396 | 25,7 |
| | Kayseri spor | 369 | 24,0 |
| | Konya spor | 387 | 25,1 |
| | Antalya spor | 388 | 25,2 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| Do you have a season ticket? | Yes | 210 | 13,6 |
| | No | 1330 | 86,4 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| Do you go to away competitions? | Yes | 252 | 16,4 |
| | No | 1288 | 83,6 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| How would you define your spectatorship as a football spectator? | Very Bad | 154 | 10,0 |
| | Bad | 154 | 10,0 |
| | Centre | 504 | 32,7 |
| | Good | 434 | 28,2 |
| | Very Good | 294 | 19,1 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| With whom do you go to the stadium to watch a match? | Alone | 252 | 16,4 |
| | With My Friends | 1064 | 69,1 |
| | With My Family | 224 | 14,5 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| Who do you think is responsible for the violence in stadiums? | Hooligans | 896 | 58,2 |
| | Athletes | 644 | 41,8 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |
| How often do you go to the stadium to watch a match? | Every Two Months | 434 | 28,2 |
| | Once a Month | 154 | 10,0 |
| | Two Weeks One | 112 | 7,3 |
| | Every Week | 840 | 54,5 |
| | Total | 1540 | 100 |

Table 1 shows that most of the participants were in favour of male participants (73.6%). When we examine the highest variables in the categories, single participants (57.3%) in the marital status variable, 26-33 age range

participants (39.1%) in the age variable, high school graduate participants (85.5%) in the education status variable, Sivas sport participants (25.7%) in the variable of which team are you a fan, participants who said no in the variable of do you have a season-pass (86.4%), do you go to away competitions? (83,6%), how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator? (32,6%), who do you go to the stadium to watch a competition with? (69,1%), who do you think is responsible for the violence in stadiums? (58,2%) and how often do you go to the stadium to watch a competition? (54,5%).

**Tablo 2.** Descriptive Values Related to Scales

| Variables | Minimum | Maksimum | $\bar{x}$ | Ss | Cronbach alpha |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | 5,00 | 25,00 | 14,3455 | 4,48260 | ,776 |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | 6,00 | 30,00 | 14,0818 | 4,79764 | ,753 |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | 5,00 | 23,00 | 12,3818 | 4,10007 | ,781 |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | 4,00 | 20,00 | 8,1273 | 3,32074 | ,795 |
| Safety Scale in Sport | 23,00 | 98,00 | 48,9364 | 13,50407 | ,815 |

According to the descriptive statistics results of the scales in Table 2, it is seen that the Cronbach Alpha values of the scale total score and scale sub-dimensions are high.

**Table 3.** Safety Scale in Sport Normality Analysis

| | Kolmogorov-Smirnova | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | ,082 | 1540 | ,000 |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | ,089 | 1540 | ,000 |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | ,084 | 1540 | ,000 |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | ,194 | 1540 | ,000 |
| Safety Scale in Sport | ,070 | 1540 | ,000 |

In Table 3, as a result of the normality analysis of the scale and its sub-dimensions, it was seen that the significance values were greater than 0.05 and it was decided to use nonparametric analyses in the analysis.

**Tablo 4.** Participants' Views on "Gender" Man Witney U Test Results According to Variable

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | Gender | n | Sequence Centre. | Ranking Total | U Value | z | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Woman | 406 | 26,4 | 755,64 | 213346,000 | -2,199 | **,028*** |
| | Man | 1134 | 73,6 | 812,02 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Woman | 406 | 26,4 | 805,02 | 190414,000 | -5,190 | **,000*** |
| | Man | 1134 | 73,6 | 672,50 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Woman | 406 | 26,4 | 776,72 | 305767,000 | -,921 | ,357 |
| | Man | 1134 | 73,6 | 753,12 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Woman | 406 | 26,4 | 761,25 | 863261,000 | -1,380 | ,168 |
| | Man | 1134 | 73,6 | 769,33 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Woman | 406 | 26,4 | 773,18 | 309785,000 | -,395 | ,693 |
| | Man | 1134 | 73,6 | 763,02 | | | |
| p<0.05* | | | | | | | |

When the results of the Man Witney U Test results of the participants' opinions according to the "gender" variable in Table 4 are examined, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference (p<0.05) in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1) and the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces (dimension 2), while the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3), the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and the SSI were found to be statistically insignificant (p>0.05).

**Tablo 5.** Participants' Views on "Marital Status Man Witney U Test Results According to Variable

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | Marital Status | n | Sequence, Centre. | Ranking Total | U Value | z | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Married | 658 | 42,7 | 800,50 | 263718,000 | -3,034 | **,002*** |
| | Single | 882 | 57,3 | 730,29 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Married | 658 | 42,7 | 770,39 | 290080,000 | -,011 | ,991 |
| | Single | 882 | 57,3 | 770,65 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Married | 658 | 42,7 | 765,17 | 285474,000 | -,547 | ,585 |
| | Single | 882 | 57,3 | 777,65 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Married | 658 | 42,7 | 770,83 | 289884,000 | -,034 | ,973 |
| | Single | 882 | 57,3 | 770,05 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Married | 658 | 42,7 | 779,83 | 281946,000 | -,954 | ,340 |
| | Single | 882 | 57,3 | 757,99 | | | |
| p<0.05* | | | | | | | |

When the results of the Man Witney U Test results of the opinions of the participants according to the "marital status" variable in Table 5 are examined, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference ($p<0.05$) in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), while there is no statistically significant difference ($p>0.05$) in the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces (dimension 2), the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3), the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and the SSI ($p>0.05$).

**Tablo 6.** Participants' Views on "Age" Kruskal Wallis H Test Results According to Variable

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | Age | n | Sequence Average | Chi-square Value | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | 18-25 age range | 364 | 23,6 | 12,292 | 3 | ,006 |
| | 26 to 33 years old | 602 | 39,1 | | | |
| | 34-41 age range | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| | 42- 49 age range | 280 | 18,2 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | 18-25 age range | 364 | 23,6 | 26,895 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | 26 to 33 years old | 602 | 39,1 | | | |
| | 34-41 age range | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| | 42- 49 age range | 280 | 18,2 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | 18-25 age range | 364 | 23,6 | 30,736 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | 26 to 33 years old | 602 | 39,1 | | | |
| | 34-41 age range | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| | 42- 49 age range | 280 | 18,2 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | 18-25 age range | 364 | 23,6 | 62,591 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | 26 to 33 years old | 602 | 39,1 | | | |
| | 34-41 age range | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| | 42- 49 age range | 280 | 18,2 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | 18-25 age range | 364 | 23,6 | 27,148 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | 26 to 33 years old | 602 | 39,1 | | | |
| | 34-41 age range | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| | 42- 49 age range | 280 | 18,2 | | | |

$p<0.05$*

When the Kruskal Wallis H Test results of the opinions of the participants according to the "age" variable in Table 6 are examined, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference ($p>0.05$) in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), while there is a statistically significant difference ($p<0.05$) in the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by security forces (dimension 2), the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3), the perception of controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and SSI.

**Tablo 7.** "Education Status" of Participants' Opinions Man Witney U Test Results According to Variable

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | Education Status | n | Sequence, Centre. | Ranking Total | U Value | z | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | High Scholl Graduate | 1316 | 85,5 | 742,20 | 110152,000 | --6,070 | **,001*** |
| | University Graduate | 224 | 14,5 | 936,75 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | High Scholl Graduate | 1316 | 85,5 | 760,74 | 134554,000 | -2,093 | **,003*** |
| | University Graduate | 224 | 14,5 | 827,81 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | High Scholl Graduate | 1316 | 85,5 | 751,36 | 122206,000 | -4,106 | **,001*** |
| | University Graduate | 224 | 14,5 | 882,94 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | High Scholl Graduate | 1316 | 85,5 | 790,46 | 121128,000 | -4,320 | **,001*** |
| | University Graduate | 224 | 14,5 | 653,25 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | High Scholl Graduate | 1316 | 85,5 | 753,52 | 125048,000 | -3,634 | **,001*** |
| | University Graduate | 224 | 14,5 | 870,25 | | | |

p<0.05*

When the results of the Man Witney U Test results of the participants' opinions according to the "education status" variable in Table 7 are analysed, a statistically significant difference (p<0.05) was found in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces (dimension 2), the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3), the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and SSI.

**Tablo 8.** Participants' Opinions on the Question "Which Team Are You a Fan of? Kruskal Wallis H Test Results According to Variable

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | Which Team Are You a Fan Of? | n | Sequence Average | Chi-square Value | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Sivas spor | 396 | 25,7 | 4,021 | 3 | ,259 |
| | Kayseri spor | 369 | 24,0 | | | |
| | Konya spor | 387 | 25,1 | | | |
| | Antalya spor | 388 | 25,2 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Sivas spor | 396 | 25,7 | 5,801 | 3 | ,122 |
| | Kayseri spor | 369 | 24,0 | | | |
| | Konya spor | 387 | 25,1 | | | |
| | Antalya spor | 388 | 25,2 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Sivas spor | 396 | 25,7 | 11,336 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | Kayseri spor | 369 | 24,0 | | | |
| | Konya spor | 387 | 25,1 | | | |
| | Antalya spor | 388 | 25,2 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Sivas spor | 396 | 25,7 | 6,151 | 3 | ,105 |
| | Kayseri spor | 369 | 24,0 | | | |
| | Konya spor | 387 | 25,1 | | | |
| | Antalya spor | 388 | 25,2 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Sivas spor | 396 | 25,7 | 1,287 | 3 | ,732 |
| | Kayseri spor | 369 | 24,0 | | | |
| | Konya spor | 387 | 25,1 | | | |
| | Antalya spor | 388 | 25,2 | | | |

P<0.05*

When the Kruskal Wallis H Test results of the opinions of the participants according to the variable "which team you are a fan of" are examined in Table 8, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces (dimension 2), the perception of controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and SSI ($p>0.05$), while a statistically significant difference was found in the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3) ($p<0.05$).

**Tablo 9.** The Opinions of the Participants According to the Variable "Do You Have a Combined Card? Man Witney U Test Results According to Variable

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | Do You have a Combined Card? | n | Sequence, Centre. | Ranking Total | U Value | z | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Yes | 210 | 13,6 | 822,77 | 128674,000 | -1,838 | ,066 |
| | No | 1330 | 86,4 | 762,25 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Yes | 210 | 13,6 | 867,57 | 119266,000 | -3,414 | **,001*** |
| | No | 1330 | 86,4 | 755,17 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Yes | 210 | 13,6 | 772,83 | 139160,000 | -,082 | ,935 |
| | No | 1330 | 86,4 | 770,13 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Yes | 210 | 13,6 | 664,10 | 117306,000 | -3,775 | **,001*** |
| | No | 1330 | 86,4 | 787,30 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Yes | 210 | 13,6 | 803,63 | 132692,000 | -1,162 | ,245 |
| | No | 1330 | 86,4 | 765,27 | | | |

p<0.05*

In Table 9, when the results of Man Witney U Test are analysed according to the variable "Do you have a season-pass?", it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1), Perception of Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) and SSI (p>0.05), while there is a statistically significant difference in the Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) and Perception of Controls at the Entrance to the Stadiums (Table 4) (p<0.05).

**Tablo 10.** Participants' Opinions on "Do you go to away competitions? Man Witney U Test Results According to Variable

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | Do you to Away Competitions | n | Sequence Centre. | Ranking Total | U Value | z | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Yes | 47 | 46,5 | 942,78 | 118874,000 | -6,744 | **,001*** |
| | No | 24 | 23,8 | 736,79 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Yes | 47 | 46,5 | 922,56 | 123970,000 | -5,953 | **,001*** |
| | No | 24 | 23,8 | 740,75 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Yes | 47 | 46,5 | 692,33 | 142590,000 | -3,061 | **,002*** |
| | No | 24 | 23,8 | 785,79 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Yes | 47 | 46,5 | 777,50 | 160524,000 | -,276 | ,728 |
| | No | 24 | 23,8 | 769,13 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Yes | 47 | 46,5 | 855,67 | 140826,000 | -3,326 | **,001*** |
| | No | 24 | 23,8 | 753,84 | | | |

P<0.05*

In Table 10, the views of the participants according to the variable "Do you go to away competitions? " variable, a statistically significant difference ($p<0.05$) is observed in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces (dimension 2), the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and the SSI, while no statistically significant difference is detected in the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3) ($p>0.05$).

**Tablo 11.** Participants' Opinions on "How Would You Define Your Spectatorship as a Football Spectator? Variable According to Kruskal Wallis H Test Results

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | How Would You Define Your Spectatorship as a Football Spectator? | n | Sequence Average | Chi-square Value | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Very Bad | 154 | 10,0 | 109,005 | 4 | **,001*** |
| | Bad | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Centre | 504 | 32,7 | | | |
| | Good | 434 | 28,2 | | | |
| | Very Good | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Very Bad | 154 | 10,0 | 41,751 | 4 | **,001*** |
| | Bad | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Centre | 504 | 32,7 | | | |
| | Good | 434 | 28,2 | | | |
| | Very Good | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Very Bad | 154 | 10,0 | 46,864 | 4 | **,001*** |
| | Bad | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Centre | 504 | 32,7 | | | |
| | Good | 434 | 28,2 | | | |
| | Very Good | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Very Bad | 154 | 10,0 | 113,902 | 4 | **,001*** |
| | Bad | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Centre | 504 | 32,7 | | | |
| | Good | 434 | 28,2 | | | |
| | Very Good | 294 | 19,1 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Very Bad | 154 | 10,0 | 110,270 | 4 | **,001*** |
| | Bad | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Centre | 504 | 32,7 | | | |
| | Good | 434 | 28,2 | | | |
| | Very Good | 294 | 19,1 | | | |

P<0.05*

When the Kruskal Wallis H Test results of the participants' opinions according to the variable "How would you define your spectatorship as a football spectator?" are analysed in Table 11, a statistically significant difference was found in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces (dimension 2), the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3), the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and SSI ($p<0.05$).

**Tablo 12.** Participants' Opinions on the Question "With whom do you come to the competitions in the stadium? According to Variable Kruskal Wallis H Test Results

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | With Whom do You the Competitions in the Stadium | n | Sequence Average | Chi-square Value | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Alone | 252 | 16,4 | 6,708 | 3 | ,035 |
| | With My Friends | 1064 | 69,1 | | | |
| | With My Family | 224 | 14,5 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Alone | 252 | 16,4 | 29,336 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | With My Friends | 1064 | 69,1 | | | |
| | With My Family | 224 | 14,5 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Alone | 252 | 16,4 | 5,536 | 3 | ,006 |
| | With My Friends | 1064 | 69,1 | | | |
| | With My Family | 224 | 14,5 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Alone | 252 | 16,4 | 22,887 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | With My Friends | 1064 | 69,1 | | | |
| | With My Family | 224 | 14,5 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Alone | 252 | 16,4 | 24,075 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | With My Friends | 1064 | 69,1 | | | |
| | With My Family | 224 | 14,5 | | | |
| P<0.05* | | | | | | |

When the Kruskal Wallis H Test results are analysed in Table 12 according to the variable "with whom do you come to the competitions in the stadium" of the participants' opinions, no statistically significant difference was found in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3) (p>0. 05), while a statistically significant difference was detected in the perception of preventing violent incidents by security forces (dimension 2), perception of controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and SSI (p<0,05).

**Tablo 13.** Participants' Opinions "Who do you think is responsible for the violence in the stadiums?" Man Witney U Test Results According to Variable

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | Who dou Think is Responsible for the Violence in the Stadium? | n | Sequence Centre. | Ranking Total | U Value | z | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Hooligans | 896 | 58,2 | 829,24 | 250684,000 | -4,4007 | **,001*** |
| | Athletes | 644 | 41,8 | 728,28 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Hooligans | 896 | 58,2 | 828,48 | 251174,000 | -4,351 | **,001*** |
| | Athletes | 644 | 41,8 | 728,83 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Hooligans | 896 | 58,2 | 747,37 | 273616,000 | -1,736 | ,083 |
| | Athletes | 644 | 41,8 | 787,13 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Hooligans | 896 | 58,2 | 844,61 | 240786,000 | -5,610 | **,001*** |
| | Athletes | 644 | 41,8 | 717,23 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Hooligans | 896 | 58,2 | 820,41 | 256368,000 | -3,736 | **,001*** |
| | Athletes | 644 | 41,8 | 734,63 | | | |

P<0.05*

In Table 13, when the results of the Man Witney U Test are analysed according to the variable "Who do you think is responsible for the violence in the stadiums? " variable, a statistically significant difference (p<0.05) is observed in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by security forces (dimension 2), the perception of controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and the SSI, while no statistically significant difference (p>0.05) is detected in the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3).

**Tablo 14.** Participants' Opinions on the Variable "How Often Do You Go to the Stadium to Watch a Competition? Variable According to Kruskal Wallis H Test Results

| Scale and Subscale Dimensions | How Often do You go to the Stadium to Wach a Competition? | n | Sequence Average | Chi-squar Value | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perception of Adequacy of Security Measures Taken (Dimension 1) | Every Two Months | 434 | 28,2 | 94,189 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | Once a Month | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Two Weeks One | 112 | 7,3 | | | |
| | Every Week | 840 | 54,5 | | | |
| Perception of Prevention of Violent Incidents by Security Forces (Dimension 2) | Every Two Months | 434 | 28,2 | 27,607 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | Once a Month | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Two Weeks One | 112 | 7,3 | | | |
| | Every Week | 840 | 54,5 | | | |
| Perception of the Use of Security Systems in Stadiums (Dimension 3) | Every Two Months | 434 | 28,2 | 14,831 | 3 | **,002*** |
| | Once a Month | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Two Weeks One | 112 | 7,3 | | | |
| | Every Week | 840 | 54,5 | | | |
| Perception Of Controls at Entrances to Stadiums (Dimension 4) | Every Two Months | 434 | 28,2 | 114,342 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | Once a Month | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Two Weeks One | 112 | 7,3 | | | |
| | Every Week | 840 | 54,5 | | | |
| Safety Scale in Sport | Every Two Months | 434 | 28,2 | 75,335 | 3 | **,001*** |
| | Once a Month | 154 | 10,0 | | | |
| | Two Weeks One | 112 | 7,3 | | | |
| | Every Week | 840 | 54,5 | | | |

p<0.05*

When the Kruskal Wallis H Test results of the participants' opinions according to the variable "how often do you go to the stadium to watch the competition?" are examined in Table 14, a statistically significant difference was found in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken (dimension 1), the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces (dimension 2), the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums (dimension 3), the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums (dimension 4) and SSI ($p<0.05$).

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

In this research, the results of the evaluation of the security measures taken in the stadiums in terms of the spectators in terms of gender, marital status, age, educational status, which team are you a fan of, do you have a season-pass, do you go to away matches, how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator, with whom do you go to the stadium to watch a match, how often do you go to the stadium to watch a match, who do you think is responsible for the violence in the stadiums are explained below.

When demographic variables were analysed, it was seen that male participants were in the majority. When the highest variables are examined in our research; in the marital status variable of singles, in the age variable of 26 -33 age range, in the educational status variable of high school graduates, in the variable of which team are you a supporter of Sivasspor, in the variable of do you have a season-pass for those who do not have a season-pass, in the variable of do you go to away competitions for those who do not go to away competitions, When the level of football spectatorship was evaluated by the individual himself/herself, it was seen that the level of football spectatorship was at a moderate level, in the variable of with whom do you go to the competitions in the stadiums, it was seen that the participants who said with friends, hooligans were evaluated as responsible for the violence experienced in the stadium, and the frequency of going to the competitions in the stadiums every week (Table 1).

When the gender variable is examined in Table 4, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken and the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces, while there is no statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums, the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums and the SSI. When the studies conducted in the literature are examined, as seen in the demographic variables in our research, there is a statistical difference in the perception of security adequacy in the sub-dimensions of the scale in which male participants are at a higher level than females in the researches, and in the perception of the adequacy of preventing the violent incidents by the security forces, and this difference is the result that the security guards working in the stadiums are sufficient in number and that the security forces are insufficient in preventing the violent incidents (7; 5; 10; 3; 6; 2; 23).

When the marital status variable is analysed, a statistical difference is observed in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken, while no statistical difference is observed in the total score of the scale and other sub-dimensions (Table 5).

When the results of the age variable of the participants are analysed in Table 6, a statistically significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by security forces, the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums, the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums and the SSI. However, no statistically significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken in the same variable. In the research conducted by Taştan (2019), Yücel et al. (2018), statistical difference was not observed in the age variable. When the studies in the literature are examined, there are results that there is a statistical difference in the sub-dimensions of the perception of being prevented by security forces, the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums, and the perception of controls at the entrance to stadiums (9; 29; 20; 19; 18; 14; 13; 30).

In Table 7, it was seen that there was a statistical difference in all sub-dimensions of the scale and in the total score of the scale. When the studies in the literature are examined, it is seen that there are statistical differences in individuals with higher education level in the education level variable (25; 22; 15).

In Table 8, while there is a statistical difference in the sub-dimension of the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums, there is no statistical difference in the total score of the scale and other sub-dimensions. When the results of the studies in the literature are examined, it is stated that there is a statistical difference in the sub-dimension of the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums and this difference is related to technological sports devices (4; 5; 8; 10).

When the results of the variable "Do you have a season ticket?" are analysed in Table 9, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken, the perception of the use of security systems in the stadiums and the perception of the use of security systems in the stadiums, while there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces and the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums.

When the results of the variable "Do you go to away matches?" are analysed in Table 10, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of the adequacy of the security measures taken, the perception of the prevention of violent incidents by the security forces, the perception of the controls at the entrance to the stadiums and the SSI, while there is no statistically significant difference in the perception of the use of security systems in the stadiums.

When the variable "How would you define your spectatorship as a football spectator?" is analysed in Table 11, a statistical difference was found in the sub-dimensions and total score of the scale.

In Table 12, a statistically significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of the perception of prevention of violent incidents by security forces, perception of controls at the entrance to the stadiums and SSI according to the variable of who you come to the competitions in the stadium.

When the results of the variable "Who do you think is responsible for the violence in stadiums?" are analysed in Table 13, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the sub-dimension of the perception of the use of security systems in stadiums, while there is a statistically significant difference in the total score of the scale and other sub-dimensions.

When the results of the variable "How often do you go to the stadium to watch a competition?" are analysed in Table 14, a statistically significant difference was found in the scale sub-dimensions and the total score of the scale ($p<0.05$).

As a result; in dimension 1 of the scale sub-dimensions, gender, marital status, educational status, do you go to away matches, how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator, who do you think is responsible for the violence in stadiums, how often do you go to the stadium to watch competitions, in dimension 2 of the scale sub-dimensions, gender, educational status, do you have a combine card? do you go to away matches, how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator, with whom do you go to matches, who do you think is responsible for the violence in stadiums, how often do you go to the stadium to watch a match, in dimension 3, age, education level, which team do you support, how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator? in dimension 4, age, educational level, do you have a combine card, do you go to away matches, how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator, who do you come to the matches in the stadium with, who do you think is responsible for the violence in stadiums, how often do you go to the stadium to watch a match? Statistical differences were found in the variables of age, education status, do you go to away matches, how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator, how do you define your spectatorship as a football spectator, who do you go to the matches in the stadium with, who do you think is responsible for the violence in the stadiums, how often do you go to the stadium to watch a match?

Based on the findings of this research, several recommendations can be proposed:

The study identified significant differences in perceptions of security measures based on gender and age groups, suggesting that different demographic groups have distinct security needs. Security measures should therefore be tailored to address the specific concerns of these groups. For instance, specific arrangements could be made to ensure that female spectators have easier access to security personnel and are more informed about security protocols.

Given the observed differences in security perceptions based on educational background, it would be beneficial to implement educational campaigns and programs aimed at informing spectators about the effectiveness of security measures and stadium regulations. These programs could help increase trust in security measures by ensuring that spectators better understand how these systems function.

The research highlights that some groups perceive the technological security systems in stadiums as inadequate. This perception may indicate that current systems are not meeting expectations. Therefore, it is crucial to upgrade these technologies and enhance their effectiveness. Additionally, educating spectators on how these systems work and their role in ensuring safety could improve their perception and trust in these systems.

Findings related to the frequency of attendance and how spectators define their level of engagement suggest the need for strategies to strengthen fans' connection to the stadium experience. Such strategies could include supporting fan groups, organizing special events, and developing loyalty programs to encourage more frequent attendance and deeper engagement with the sport.

The study indicates that security forces are perceived as insufficient in preventing violence in stadiums. In response, it is recommended to increase the number of security personnel, develop more effective intervention techniques for handling violent incidents, and address the root causes of violence through comprehensive preventative measures.

These recommendations aim to enhance the effectiveness of security measures in stadiums and improve spectators' perceptions of safety, ultimately contributing to a more secure and enjoyable spectator experience.

## REFERENCES

1. Yücel, A. S., Çiftçi, İ., Karataş, Ö., Tan, Ç., Karataş, E. Ö. (2018). Stadyumlardaki güvenlik önlemlerine ilişkin taraftar algılarının incelenmesi. Journal of Educational Researchers, 9(5), 46-51.
2. Waitt, G. (2003). The social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. Annals of Tourism Research, 30(1), 194–215. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00050-6
3. Türkiye Futbol Federasyonu Stadyum ve Güvenlik Komitesi Talimatı (2009) https://www.tff.org/Resources/TFF/Documents/TALIMATLAR/Stadyum-ve-Guvenlik-Komitesi-Talimati.pdf Erişim Tarihi:11.03.2024
4. Taştan, H.Ş., Ataman Yancı, H.B. (2016). Stadyumlarda alınan güvenlik önlemlerine ilişkin seyirci algıları ölçeği: bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 10(3), 386-394.
5. Taştan, H. Ş. (2019). Niğde ilinde stadyuma maç izlemeye gelen seyircilerin alınan güvenlik önlemlerine ilişkin algıları. Milli Kültür Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3(1), 52-65.
6. Rahimi, G., Amirtash, A., Khabiri, M. (2003). A study of effective factors in safety management of soccer stadiums in Iran. Research on Sport Science, 1(4), 39–52
7. Palmiotto, M. J., Vejnović, D., Lalić V. Policing (2012) Football Violence And Ethnic Hatred In Bosnia And Herzegovina.
8. Naderian-Jahromi, M., Poorsoltanzarandi, H., Rohani, E. (2013). Recognizing security ındicators and standards of sport facilities. Journal of Sport Management, 5(3), 21-36. Doi: https://doi.org/10.22059/jsm.2013.35707
9. Naderian-Jahromi, M., Akhavan, E. (2021). The study of fear of crime and its impact on fans' abnormal behavior at stadiums (a case study of soccer fans at Fooladshahr Stadium in Isfahan, Iran). Journal of New Studies in Sport Management, 2(2), 179-184. Doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.22103/jnssm.2021.17332.1025
10. Marder, M.P. (2012). Research methods of science. Cambridge University Press, England, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139035118
11. Maksum, A. (2010). Spectators' violence at soccer matches: A complex psycho-social phenomenon. Anima, Indonesian Psychology Journal, 25(3), 159-171.
12. Madensen, T., Eck, J.E. (2008). Spectator violence in stadiums. U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
13. Lhotsky, G.J. (2006). An analysis of risk management at NCAA Division I-A football stadiums. The Florida State University
14. Konter, E. (2006) Sporda karşılaşma psikolojisi, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
15. Kerr, J.H., Kock, H. (2002). Aggression, violence and the death of a dutch soccer holigan: a reversal theory explenation, Aggressive Behavior, 28, 1- 10.
16. Kazemi, R., Sheykh, M., Shahbazi, M., Rasekh, N. (2008). The study of effective factors in hooliganism of football fans after Iran Darby (Fans' points of view). Research on Sport Science, 5(17), 101–114
17. Kayacan, F. (2019). Futbol maçlarında alınan güvenlik önlemlerinin taraftar gözüyle değerlendirilmesi. (Doktora Tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi. Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü. İstanbul.
18. Kara, S. (2020). Planlama kararları ve kullanıcı memnuniyeti açısından timsah arena/bursa büyükşehir belediye stadyumu'nun değerlendirilmesi. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi. Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Bursa.
19. Hall, S., Cooper, W.E., Marciani, L., McGee, J.M. (2011). Security management for sports and special events: An interagency approach to creating safe facilities. Human Kinetics.
20. Gültekin, H., Soyer, F. (2010). Examining police practices, as part of the regulations, oriented towards preventing violence in Turkish football. Journal of Human Sciences, 7(1), 1219–1243.
21. Farrell, A., Fink, J.S., Fields, S. (2011). Women's sport spectatorship: an exploration of men's influence. Journal of Sport Management, 25(3), 190-201. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.25.3.190
22. Dellaserra, C.L., Crespo, N.C., Todd, M., Huberty, J., Vega-López, S. (2018). Perceived environmental barriers and behavioral factors as possible mediators between acculturation and leisure-time physical activity among Mexican American adults. Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 15(9), 683-691. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2016-0701
23. Cleland, J., Cashmore, E. (2018). Nothing will be the same again after the Stade de France attack: Reflections of association football fans on terrorism, security and surveillance. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 42(6), 454-469.Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723518797028
24. Cere, R. (2002). Witches of our age: Women ultras, Italian football and the media. Sport in Society, 5(3), 166-188. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/911094210

25. Brooks, D.J. (2010). What is security: Definition through knowledge categorization. Security Journal, (23), 225- 239. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2008.18
26. Biscaia, R., Correia, A., Yoshida, M., Rosado, A., Marôco, J. (2013). The role of service quality and ticket pricing on satisfaction and behavioural intention within professional football. International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship, 14(4), 42–66. doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-14-04-2013-B004
27. Bauer, H.H., Stokburger-Sauer, S.E., Exler, S. (2008). Brand image and fan loyalty in professional team sport: A refined model and empirical assessment. Journal of Sport Management, 22, 205-226. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.22.2.205
28. Ahmadi, F., Boroumand, M., Ramezaninejad, R. (2020). An investigation of factors influencing women spectators' presence in football stadiums. Sport Physiology and Management Investigations, 12(1), 121-135.
29. Abbott, J.L., Geddie, M.W. (2000). Event and venue management: minimizing liability through effective crowd management techniques. Event management, 6(4), 259-270. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3727/152599500108751417
30. Abalasei, B., Cojocariu, A. (2012). "The socıal representatıon of vıolence of sports events spectators" Revısta De Cercetare Sı Interventıe Socıala, 17-39.