



Safety and Service Quality Along With Technology in Mega-Sport Events

Khouloud Oueslati^[a]; Dhouha Baklouti Hayani^[b]; Zakaria Nemsis^[a]; Moez Baklouti^[c]*

^[a]Human Sciences Department, ISSEP, University of Jandouba, Tunisia.

^[b]ERMA Research Laboratory, University of Tunis El-Manar / Faculty of Economics, Law and Management of Jandouba, Tunisia.

^[c]Research Unit of Kinesiology-Department of Sport Management; Canada Sports Academy, British Columbia, Canada.

*Corresponding author.

Received 24 January 2017; accepted 18 March 2017

Published online 26 April 2017

Abstract

The manuscript was focused on a literature review of the technology aspect within the topic of safety and service quality in mega-sport events. As far as managers try to expedite full protection through sport events using high technology, this last strikes human rights when spectators treated similar to criminals.

Key words: Mega-sport events; Safety and service quality; Technology in event organization

Oueslati, K., Hayani, D. B., Nemsis, Z., & Baklouti, M. (2017). Safety and Service Quality Along With Technology in Mega-Sport Events. *International Business and Management*, 14(2), 43-49. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/ibm/article/view/9417> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/9417>

INTRODUCTION

Mega-Sport Events (MSEs) as an industry that participates in the economy of each hosting city or a hosting country, somewhere Roche (2000) suggests pro developing critical perspectives on mega-events provides insight into the structure, change, and agency in contemporary society. The temporal and spatial aspects of mega-events provide encapsulated images of cities and cultures that are intended to be internalized and consumed by locals, tourists, and a host of political and financial interests. The driving mantra of mega-events is “accelerated development”—a mantra that uncritically places public

money in the service of private profit creating “neo-liberal dream worlds” (Davis & Monk, 2007) wherein democratic processes are suspended, public space militarized, and urban space restructured in the image of global capital. From socio-spatial perspective (Foucault, 1995) beheld social, material, and representational practices are inseparable from their spatial contexts or referents. The shapes, textures, meanings, uses, and functions of bounded and unbounded spaces are products of particular economic, political, and social rationales.

The security legacies that track from Sport Mega-Events (SMEs), such as new surveillance technologies, new security-focused social policies; delicate interest to safety management and public concern about terrorism threats and perception of risk has now become a fundamental component of the planning and strategies for sport events; “a legacy of September 11, 2001, and subsequent terrorist attacks such as the Bali (2002), Madrid (2004) and London (2005) bombings, is evidenced in the increased security measures put in place at major sport events” (Taylor & Toohey, 2007). Giulianotti and Klauser (2010) stated: “In the post-9/11 context, security issues have become increasingly central to the hosting of sport mega-event (SMEs)”.

Fussey et al. (2012) analyzed the modalities of Olympic safety and security practices within the Olympic Park itself and their wider impact, while also connecting this research to theorization and debates in urban sociology and criminology.

Gaffney (2010) examined the social impacts of hosting the London 2012 Olympic Games and its “legacy” ambitions in East London, emphasizing securitization as an inbuilt feature of the urban regeneration project. “Event organizers have acted to realize a balance between effective risk management measures that offers appropriate security while not unduly deterring from spectators’ enjoyment of the event” (Taylor & Toohey, 2005).

Enhancing customer service by event managers (EMs) is now included in the requirements of human rights institutions, for spectators may not be treated as criminals when attending a sport show. The moment of entering a game venue is one of the most sensitive sensations for spectators. This feeling amplifies with the size of the event; therefore, the more important the event is, the greater its historical dimension becomes for the spectator. That is why; dealing with this situation is delicate, because EMs aim at delivering excellent customer service while ensuring strict security rules. (Baklouti & Namsi, 2012)

Technology in the event should be introduced to ensure more security, which reassures us not having terrorist incidents that may disrupt the process in complete, unveil people arm themselves and reduce the time to enter the stadiums; but, there is concern to the dignity of viewers when they treat uncomfortably and expose the achievement of their private lives.

The context of the event and the atmosphere of the show do not accept individual search portals. We use technology to try to change the world to suit us better. The changes may relate to survival needs such as food, shelter, or defense, or they may relate to human aspirations such as knowledge, art, or control. But the results of changing the world are often complicated and unpredictable. (AAAS, 1990)

1. CUSTOMER SERVICE

1.1 Service Quality and Team Loyalty

Customer satisfaction plays an important role to gauge organizational success in service marketing and sport management research. Satisfaction has been conceptualized as an overall attitudinal outcome following a series of consumption experiences with a good or service (Anderson, Fornell, & Mazvancheryl, 2004). The fast-growing competition in the service sector in our modern times was a motive for managers to re-define their strategies, to acquire advantages over their competitors and to focus their attention on service quality (Gronroos, 1984; Parasuraman et al., 1994; Zeithaml et al., 1996).

The fast-growing competition in the service sector in our modern times was a motive for managers to re-define their strategies, to acquire advantages over their competitors and to focus their attention on service quality (Gronroos, 1984; Parasuraman et al., 1994; Zeithaml et al., 1996).

Dwyer et al. (2015) acknowledged that developing loyal sport consumers is a fundamental goal of spectator sport organizations. As a result, a great deal of sport management academic research has focused on the concept of sport team loyalty. The motivation stays a loyal fan to a team is the reason that standards the entertainment value of team sports is also valuable to communities in general. The question arises as to what other forms of loyal fan behavior should be considered beyond traditional behaviors such as attending events and consuming sport media broadcasts, that have been the

focus of sport managers (Dwyer et al., 2015). Attitudinal loyalty to a team has been conceptualized as a variety and as both a one-dimensional and multidimensional construct, often considered by awareness, allegiance, attachment, and psychological commitment (cf. Backman & Crompton, 1991a, b; Funk & James, 2001, 2006; Kwon & Armstrong, 2004; Robinson & Trail, 2005; Heere & Dickson, 2008).

The attendance of many international sport events, based on the number of tickets sold or given away, rather than people actually present. Live attendance, media usage, and merchandise acquisition are behaviors associated with spectator sports that have been reported (Bauer, Stokburger-Sauer, & Exler, 2008; Fink, Trail, & Anderson, 2003; Funk & Pastore, 2000; Stevens & Rosenberger, 2012). Du et al. (2015) delighted the role of personal performance, an internal assessment of time-goal achievement, on participants' event satisfaction that would contribute to positive outcomes.

1.2 Human Rights

Security has become the most important condition for hosting the Olympic Games and other large-scale sporting events. For any country, winning the right to host the Games is accompanied by the promotion of human rights and liberties.

Since Baron Pierre de Coubertin revived the Olympic Games of the modern era in 1894 upon ideals of harmony between nations, solidarity and fair play, the Olympics have not only succeeded in bringing together athletes from all continents to participate in regular festivals of sport and culture, they and other MSEs have also played an important symbolic role in promoting human rights. (IHRB, 2013)

In relationship with Mega-sport Events (MSE), the Institute for Human Rights and Business (2013) was concerned about Human rights issues linked to MSE sponsors and commercial partners and during the event alarmed many issues, such as, criminalization, harassment or removal of homeless people and street vendors, in one hand; and human trafficking and forced labor, temporary contract worker exploitation, in the other hand.

The World Cup in South Africa saw media reports of police harassment of the homeless and squatters, and forced removal of street vendors from commercial exclusion zones that reportedly resulted in lost livelihoods. Media revelations during the 2012 London Olympics surfaced cases of wage and migrant worker exploitation among temporary agency staff working at two hotels used by Olympic delegations and referees. Equally, during the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics and London 2012, civil liberties groups and journalists complained of limits on free speech and assembly imposed by host authorities and event organizers ostensibly to safeguard brand rights. (IHRB, 2013)

Events are important occasions to press on dictatorships improving their human rights situation, because the customer service provided by event managers (EM) has developed into a requirement of human rights

institutions, spectators may not be treated as criminals when attending a sports event. For spectators, the moment of entering a game venue is one of the most sensitive experiences. “The growing emphasis countries hosting major sporting events place on the implementation of security and counterterrorism measures and the impact this approach has on the civil liberties of their citizens” (Hassan, 2016). This feeling becomes amplified with the increasing size of the event, as the importance of the event (e.g., Olympics and World Championships) provides people a sense of the historical dimension of their attendance. As a result, the EM must deliver excellent customer service while also adhering to strict security rules (Baklouti et al., 2012). “Therefore, the major concern of spectators is no longer the way they have been welcomed, nor the security check time, it is rather that civilians have to do with officials while attending a show” (Baklouti & Namsi, 2012). Hassan (2016) explained that the implementation of security and counterterrorism measures and the impact this approach has on the civil liberties of their citizens.

At the same time, MSEs—including the Beijing 2008 Olympics, the South Africa 2010 FIFA World Cup, the New Delhi 2010 Commonwealth Games, the London 2012 Olympics, and forthcoming FIFA World Cups and Olympics in Brazil and Russia—have come under repeated scrutiny from human rights experts and campaigners over a gamut of concerns. (IHRB, 2013)

2. SECURITY IN THE EVENT

Consistent with risk theory, communities and financial commitment to safety at the Games was evident, with the organizers undertaking wide-ranging significant risk management plans. Along with Coaffee and Wood (2006) contemporary security as a concept, practice and commodity is undergoing a rescaling, deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation, with previously international security concerns penetrating all levels of governance. More importantly, protecting Critical Infrastructures must endure with the effective training of staff members and provide the necessary training to enhance performances in skill development processes. “Training should frame incidents’ management, risk management and practices of protective measures, safety and security strategies, and business continuity and recovery principles” (Baklouti et al., 2012).

Security is becoming more civic, urban, domestic and personal: Security is coming home. The findings are discussed in the context of sport event management, concluding with consequences for the future organization of sports events, with the impact of an act of terrorism, risk management measures taken by the event organizers impacted on the tourists’ level of enjoyment.

“Since the 1970s, security planning has become an integral and required part of bidding documents and

preparation for hosting sporting mega events, most notably the summer Olympic and Paralympic Games” (Coaffee, Fussey, & Moore, 2011). Terrorists use SMEs as a springboard to resonate with their causes using the broadcasting range.

The Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) 2002 Football World Cup. In particular, it investigates the terrorism-related issues that affected the event and the possible implications for future mega sporting events in Australia. It seeks to contribute to awareness of spectator experiences of this event by understanding perceptions of safety and responses to security measures. (Toohey et al., 2010)

“Vancouver Winter Games opted for what we call a ‘mild security model’ because the security company charged in flowing spectators to the venues (Contemporary Security Canada) and used civilians to perform mag-and-bag and X-Ray machines” (Baklouti & Namsi, 2012).

3. THE TECHNOLOGY POWER

Sport event technology grew up quickly among the intensification of the media and the concept of event marketing; however, sport managers, and specially, before the 9-11 New York bombing were focused on the development of the perfect picture outgoing to television’s spectators around the world. A specific media technology and commercial advertising provide the structure through which the public accesses media sports; Boyle and Haggerty (2009) accentuated: we detail emerging features of contemporary mega-events that shape and are shaped by shifts in the field of security and surveillance more broadly. Three dynamics in particular warrant consideration: the move toward a precautionary logic among security planners, a “semiotic shift” wherein security iconography is integrally bound up with the production of contemporary urban spectacles, and various forms of security and surveillance legacies that circulate beyond the spatial and temporal frame of the event itself.

The specific media technology and commercial advertising afford the structure through which the public accesses media sports. So, interest in interorganizational relationships in sport has become more focused in the past few years (Babiak, 2007; Cousens & Slack, 1996; Crompton, 1997; Frisby, Thibault, & Kikulis, 2004; Shaw & Allen, 2006; Thibault & Harvey, 1997; Turner & Shilbury, 2008).

“Although the sophisticated technologies might emerge without these massive international sport spectacles, the size of audience and the resulting television monies usher in these technologies more quickly and with specific configurations” (Real & Mechikoff, 1992). The technology for transmitting mass sports events tends to be with no return, not interactive, and very expensive.

A second step of technology in sport events set off on separation between spectacle and supervision through an analysis of urban mega-events, “we detail emerging features of contemporary mega-events that shape and are shaped by shifts in the field of security and surveillance more broadly” (Boylen & Haggerty, 2009). “It does so from three interrelated perspectives, focusing on separation and access control, the management of circulations, and the internal organization and monitoring of specific spatial enclaves” (Klauser, 2013). Public Safety and Security solutions help meet the formidable challenges of a mega event by using the network as a platform to transform communications and break down the barriers that separate multiple organizations (CISCO, 2010).

In this last decade, the importance of venues protection and people safety enforced event organizers to build up with sophisticated technology to counter terrorism acts; we notice the transferability of sporting mega-event strategies across time and place. In doing so, it presents a number of arguments highlighting the progressive global standardization of sporting mega-event counter-terrorism strategies comprising continually reproduced security leitmotifs referred to Fussey and Coaffee (2012). It is necessary to understand that these criminal ways not only develop in traditional forms, but that they now show technological innovations, resulting in new tort dynamics (Zúñiga et al., 2014). Such orthodoxies are drawn from a range of experiences at both sporting and non-sporting mega-events. By contrast to these globalized models, the terrorist threats of sporting mega-event chase for to counter in diverse local settings and for counter-terrorism strategies.

Beginning with the Los Angeles Summer Olympics in 1984, new forms of financing, marketing, and communications technology combined to alter the form and function of mega-events (Roche, 2000). “The 2008 Beijing Organizing Committee for the Games of the XXIX Olympiad set security concern as a top priority” (Yu, Klauser, & Chan, 2009). “Such expenditures are realized through the mobilization of more security personnel, such as 60,000 additional police officers to be drafted in for London 2012, as the implementation of high-tech security technologies” (Giuliannoti & Klauser, 2011).

From the seminal, and ultimately tragic, events of the Munich Olympics in 1972 until the most recent terrorist attack witnessed at a major sporting event—that which marred the close of the Boston marathon of April 2013—this piece reflects on the full extent of the impact counterterrorism measures have had on the activities of wider society, including the creation of an abnormal host setting prior to and during the sporting event (Hassan, 2016).

Zúñiga et al. (2014) affirmed that the states should consider the overcrowding and off shoring of technologies. Crime has no boundaries, which sets a new

scenario in terms of policy control and crime prevention (Bello-Montes, 2012), giving rise to a security paradigm “among” states, generating a “intrastate” safety mode (Prince & Jolias, 2011). This implies the challenge of opening to international cooperation, because of the transnational nature of such criminal figures.

Such events also provide a chance to transform the national safety and security apparatus. The host nation can manage the complex logistics of the event impeccably and lay firm foundations for improvements in the future protection and welfare of its people. (CISCO, 2010)

Dunn and Posey (2011) clarify the minimum standard of technology must be used to manage major sporting events for planning major events today requires at least as much attention to homeland security issues.

1	Stadium Security Command Post
2	Stadium Map
3	Traffic Management System
4	Traffic Management Center
5	Signal Priority Control
6	Traffic Camera
7	Stadium Cameras
8	SUSPICIOUS PERSON BOLO
9	Stadium Camera System Interface
10	HAZMAT Chemical Sniffers
11	In Stadium Text Messaging
12	Automated External Defibrillators
13	Smart Phones
14	Radio Communication
15	Communication Center
16	Mobile Communication Vehicle
17	Computer Aided Dispatch
18	CAD Screen
19	Mobile CAD Map
20	Mobile CAD Calls for Service
21	Droid App CAD Calls
22	Droid App CAD Map
23	Droid App Call Details
24	Decontamination
25	Aviation
26	Aviation Unit Video Downlink
27	Aviation Unit FLIR
28	ON-FIELD / MEDIA WRISTBAND
29	PLAINCLOTHESPERSONNEL

Figure 1
Technology Used to Manage Major Sporting Events
(Dunn & Posey, 2011)

4. METHOD

Supported by the literature review a total of ten questions survey will be generated to represent two items: (a) customer service & security in the event and (b) technology apparatus in the event, we look for the survey validity, which is concerned with the accuracy of our measurement, and it is often discussed in the context of sample representativeness; and the survey reliability, which is concerned with the consistency of our measurement, that’s the degree to which the questions

used in a survey elicit the same type of information each time they are used under the same conditions.

4.1 Participants

The study sample will cover around 500 respondents during the Rio 2016 Olympics, divided on 150 journalists and 350 spectators. Journalists will be contacted before the Games start at Media Center, during the competitions in the venues (Indoors or Outdoors), and after the Games. Spectators will be contacted on the opening and closing ceremonies, and during the competitions in the venues (Indoors or Outdoors).

4.2 Procedures

Respondents will be informed that they are helping a scientific research regarding the service and the technology of security in the event. Trained volunteers will conduct the survey by contacting spectator after he/she takes seat and before the game starts to guide respondent, and as tested before the tête-à-tête takes six to seven minutes. An extra information will be taken above the survey content is the citizenship of the respondent and the gender. The respondents will be randomly assigned for the following venues, Estádio do Maracanã, João Havelange Stadium, Sambódromo, National Equestrian Center, Lagoa Rodrigo de Freitas, Rio Olympic Arena (HSBC Arena), Maracanãzinho Arena, Marina da Glória, Riocentro, Maria Lenk, National Shooting Center Aquatic Center, Deodoro Modern Pentathlon Park, Copacabana Stadium, Future Arena, Pontal, Fort Copacabana, Olympic Mountain Bike Park....

The response format for all questions was five-point Likert scale of the following values: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Agree), and 5 (Strongly agree), other five-point summated rating scale used the format (i.e.): 1 (Insecure), 2 (Somehow not secure), 3 (Don't know), 4 (Somehow secure), and 5 (Secure).

DISCUSSION

Individual inventiveness is essential to technological innovation. Nonetheless, social and economic forces strongly influence what technologies will be undertaken, paid attention to, invested in, and used. Such decisions occur directly as a matter of government policy and indirectly as a consequence of the circumstances and values of a society at any particular time. In the United States, decisions about which technological options will prevail are influenced by many factors, such as consumer acceptance, patent laws, the availability of risk capital, the federal budget process, local and national regulations, media attention, economic competition, tax incentives, and scientific discoveries. The balance of such incentives and regulations usually bears differently on different technological systems, encouraging some and discouraging others. (AAAS, 1990)

Our outcomes will response on the problematic of the main hypothesis that “technology reinforces security

in mega-sport events, but turns worse on spectators” dignity and strikes unenthusiastically Human Rights values.

REFERENCES

- (AAAS) American Association for the Advancement of Science. (1990). *The nature of technology. Science for all Americans—Chapter 3*. Retrieved from <http://www.project2061.org/publications/sfaa/online/chap3.htm> on February 2, 2016.
- Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Mazvancheryl, S. K. (2004). Customer satisfaction and shareholder value. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4), 172-185.
- Babiak, K. (2007). Determinants of interorganizational relationships: The case of a Canadian nonprofit sport organization. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21, 338-376.
- Backman, S. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1991a). Differentiating between high, spurious, latent, and low loyalty participants in two leisure activities. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 9, 1-17.
- Backman, S. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1991b). The usefulness of selected variables for predicting activity loyalty. *Leisure Sciences*, 13, 205-220.
- Baklouti, M., Namsi, Z., & Zouaoui, R. (2012). Security Measures in Mega-Events, are there any dissimilarities between the Olympics & the Paralympics? (Case of Vancouver 2010). *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(4). Retrieved from <http://journal-archives22.webs.com/298-328.pdf>
- Baklouti, M., & Namsi, Z. (2012). Security models in mega sport events between safety and human rights (case of vancouver 2010). *The Sport Journal, United States Sports Academy*, 16(1).
- Bauer, H. H., Stokburger-Sauer, N. 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.
- Bello-Montes, C. (2012). Nuevos desafíos de los cuerpos policiales en un mundo globalizado. *Revista Criminalidad*, 133-147.
- Boyle, P., & Haggerty, K. D. (2009). Spectacular security: Mega-events and the security complex. *International Political Sociology*, 3(3), 257-274.
- CISCO. (2010). *Mega events: Transforming safety and security for lasting benefits: Sports security and improved public safety*. Retrieved 2016, January 7 from: http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en_us/solutions/industries/docs/sports/sports_sec_insights.pdf
- Coaffee, J., & Wood, D. M. (2006). Security is coming home: Rethinking scale and constructing resilience in the global urban response to terrorist risk. *International Relations*, 20, 4503-517.

- Cousens, L., & Slack, T. (1996). Emerging patterns of inter-organizational relations: A network perspective of North American professional sport leagues. *European Journal for Sport Management*, 3(1), 48-69.
- Crompton, J. L. (1997). Partnering with business: What's in it for them? *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 15(4), 38-60.
- Davis, M., & Monk, D. B. (2007). *Evil Paradises*. New York: The New Press.
- Dunn, T., & Posey, E. (2011). *Technology used to manage major sporting events*. IACP LEIMS Conference San Diego, CA, University of Florida Football.
- Du, J., Jordan, J. S., & Funk, D. C. (2015). Managing mass sport participation: Adding a personal performance perspective to remodel antecedents and consequences of participant sport event satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29, 688-704.
- Dwyer, B., Greenhalgh, G. P., & LeCrom, C. W. (2015). Exploring fan behavior: Developing a scale to measure sport eFANgelism. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29, 642-656.
- Fink, J. S., Trail, G. T., & Anderson, D. F. (2003). Environmental factors associated with spectator attendance and sport consumption behavior: Gender and team differences. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 11, 8-19.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The Birth of the prison* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.
- Frisby, W., Thibault, L., & Kukulis, L. (2004). The organizational dynamics of undermanaged partnerships in leisure service departments. *Leisure Studies*, 23, 109-126.
- Funk, D. C., & Pastore, D. L. (2000). Equating attitudes to allegiance: The usefulness of selected attitudinal information in segmenting loyalty to professional sports teams. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 9, 175-184.
- Funk, D. C., & James, J. (2001). The Psychological Continuum Model (PCM): A conceptual framework for understanding an individual's psychological connection to sport. *Sport Management Review*, 4, 119-150.
- Funk, D. C., & James, J. (2006). Consumer loyalty: The meaning of attachment in the development of sport team allegiance. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(2), 189-217.
- Fussey, P., & Coaffee, J. (2012). Balancing local and global security leitmotifs: Counter terrorism and the spectacle of sporting mega-events. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 47(1), 268-285.
- Fussey, P., Coaffee, J., Armstrong, G., & Hobbs, D. (2012). The regeneration games: purity and security in the Olympic city. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63(2), 260-284.
- Gaffney, C. (2010). Mega-events and socio-spatial dynamics in Rio de Janeiro, 1919-2016. *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 9(1).
- Giulianotti, R., & Klauser, F. (2010). Security governance and sport mega-events: Toward an interdisciplinary research agenda. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 34(1), 49-61.
- Giulianotti, R., & Klauser, F. (2011). Security and surveillance at sport mega events. *Urban Studies Journal Limited*, 48(15), 3157-3168.
- Hassan, D. (2016). *Surveillance by proxy: Sport and security in a modern age*. American Behavioral Scientist.
- Gronroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing*, 18, 36-44.
- Heere, B., & Dickson, G. (2008). Measuring attitudinal loyalty: Separating the terms of affective commitment and attitudinal loyalty. *Journal of Sport Management*, 2, 227-239.
- (IHRB) Institute for Human Rights and Business. (2013). *Striving for excellence: Mega-sporting events and Human rights*. Occasional Paper Series, Paper Number 2.
- Klauser, F. (2013). Spatialities of security and surveillance: Managing spaces, separations and circulations at sport mega events. *Geoforum*, 49, 289-298.
- Kwon, H. H., & Armstrong, K. L. (2004). An exploration of the construct of psychological attachment to a sport team among college students: A multidimensional approach. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13(2), 94-103.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1994). Alternative scales for measuring service quality: A comparative assessment based on psychometric and diagnostic criteria. *Journal of Retailing*, 70(3), 201-230.
- Prince, A., & Jolias, L. (2011). *Las TIC y su relación con la seguridad ciudadana: un marco de análisis a la problemática*. Cuadernos de Seguridad N°14. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Estratégicos para la Seguridad (INEES).
- Real, M. R., & Mechikoff, R. A. (1992). Deep Fan: Mythic Identification, Technology, and Advertising in Spectator Sports. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 9, 323-339.
- Roche, M. (2000). *Mega-events and modernity: Olympics and expos in the growth of global culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, M. J., & Trail, G. T. (2005). Relationships among spectator gender, motives, points of attachment, and sport preference. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 58-80.
- Shaw, S., & Allen, J. B. (2006). "It is basically is a fairly loose arrangement... and that works out fine, really." Analysing the dynamics of an interorganisational partnership. *Sport Management Review*, 9, 203-228.
- Stevens, S., & Rosenberger, P.J. (2012). The influence of fan involvement, following sport and fan identification on fan loyalty: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 13, 220-234.
- Taylor, T., & Toohey, K. (2005). Impacts of terrorism-related safety and security measures at a major sport event. *Cognizant Communication Corporation, Event Management*, 9(4), 199-209.

- Taylor, T., & Toohey, K. (2007). Perceptions of terrorism threats at the 2004 Olympic Games: Implications for sport events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 12(2).
- Thibault, L., & Harvey, J. (1997). Fostering interorganizational linkages in the Canadian sport delivery system. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11, 45-68.
- Toohey, K. M., & Taylor, T. L. (2008). Mega events, fear, and risk: Terrorism at the Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(4), 451-469.
- Toohey, K., Taylor, T., & Lee, C.-K. (2010). The FIFA World Cup 2002: The effects of terrorism on sport tourists. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 8(3).
- Turner, P., & Shilbury, D. (2008). Broadcasting technology and its influence on sport broadcaster inter-organisational relationship formation. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 3, 167-183.
- Yu, Y., Klauser, F., & Chan, G. (2009). Governing security at the 2008 Beijing Olympics. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 26(3).
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioural consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60, 31-46.
- Zúñiga, C. V., Mena, A. S., Herrera, P. V., Barahona, M. V., & Dammert, L. (2014). *Technological Innovation for Security in Latin America*. University de Chile.