

VU University Amsterdam - Faculty of Social Sciences
Culture, Organization and Management – *Master Thesis*

Stadium security

*A study on the influence of the tensions which arise when creating and implementing safety policy
during football matches in the Amsterdam Arena*

Date: Amsterdam June 27, 2014
Name: Marloes van der Linden; 2523142
m.p.g.vander.linden@student.vu.nl
Supervisor: Dr. Ir. K. Boersma
Second reader: Dr. C.H. Roessingh



PREFACE

Pretty soon after finishing my study Sports management, pretty soon I had decided to follow a Master at a university. First, I had one in mind that sports policy predominates. Finally, I decided to choose for a more general study and that is why I signed myself up for the Master Culture, Organization and Management at the VU University Amsterdam. After following a pre-master I could finally start my Master.

Halfway through the year it was time to start thinking about my thesis topic. I quickly decided that I wanted to implement this within the sport business and when Kees Boersma came to explain during a lecture where the focus in his studies lays, it was clear to me. I wanted to write my thesis about safety within the football industry. Because I work in this world myself, I was going to establish contact with different employees of Ajax. This seemed easier than it eventually turned out to be. Pretty soon I had permission from Bas van Rossum and Joris de Lange from Ajax to conduct my research within Ajax, but due to circumstances Joris could not accompany me. So I made several appointments with him about what was possible from then on. I would like to thank Joris for the opportunity he has given me through offering documents, making it possible to join one day of training, a match preparation and ultimately the opportunity he gave me to conduct the interviews. In addition, he put me in contact with Mark Oudejans and Karin den Iseger who gave me more information regarding the security organization in the Amsterdam ArenA. Partly this is why my thesis became a success.

Next to them, I also want to thank my supervisor Kees Boersma for his help during framing the research and the time he has made for helping me. Despite the few contact moments, I experienced the collaboration as very pleasant. It appealed to my independence, but when I had questions, I could always ask them. The information he gave me during the thesis trajectory gave me a positive feeling and gave me new energy and motivation to bring the thesis to a success.

Now that I'm typing this, I realize that there has almost come an end to seven years of a student life. I've always enjoyed it, but now it's time to go see the world and eventually to start a career.

Marloes van der Linden
Amsterdam, Juni 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
INTRODUCTION	4
1. Research background	4
1.1 AFC Ajax and Amsterdam ArenaA	5
1.2 Research question.....	5
1.3 Research relevance.....	6
1.3.1 Societal relevance.....	6
1.3.2 Scientific relevance.....	7
1.4 Reading guide.....	7
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	8
2. Safety.....	8
2.1 Physical & social safety	8
2.2 Subjective & objective safety.....	9
2.3 To conclude	10
3. Determinants	11
3.1 Individual context.....	11
3.2 Situational context.....	12
3.3 Social-cultural context.....	13
3.4 To conclude	14
4. Risk management	15
4.1 Enforcement	15
4.2 Reputation	16
4.3 Panopticon.....	16
4.3.1 Effects of using cameras.....	17
4.4 To conclude	18
METHODOLOGY	20
5. Research approach.....	20
5.1 Research design.....	20
5.2 Research strategy.....	20
5.2.1 Desk research.....	20
5.2.2 Case study.....	21
5.3 Data-collection techniques	22
5.3.1 Observation	22
5.3.2 Literature study	22
5.3.3 Semi-structured interviews	23
5.4 Data analysis.....	23

5.5 Reliability and validity	24
RESEARCH RESULTS	25
6. Stewarding in Amsterdam ArenA	25
6.1 Amsterdam ArenA	25
6.2 Stewards	26
6.3 Characteristics	27
6.4 Training days	28
6.5 Schedule of a 12.30 match	30
6.6 To conclude	31
7. Implementing safety	33
7.1 Rules	33
7.2 Facilities	34
7.3 Control.....	36
7.4 Confidence.....	38
7.4.1 Organization.....	39
7.4.2 Colleagues	41
7.5 To conclude	42
ANALYSIS	44
8. Theory versus empiricism	44
8.1 Influencing factors.....	44
8.1.1 Individual context	44
8.1.2 Situational context	45
8.1.3 Social-cultural context.....	46
8.2 Making use of cameras.....	48
8.3 Controlling by compliance and deterrence.....	49
CONCLUSION	51
9. Conclusion.....	51
9.1 Recommendations	54
REFERENCES	56
ATTACHMENTS	64
Attachment I. Topics list stewards	64
Attachment II. Topics list employees Crowd Services.....	66
Attachment III. Codebook	67
Attachment IV. ArenAPoort.....	69
Attachment V. Floor plan Amsterdam ArenA	70

“Nothing is a risk in itself; there is no risk in reality. But on the other hand anything can be a risk; it all depends on how one analyses the danger, considers the event.”

(Francois Ewald, 1991)

INTRODUCTION

To understand the aim of the research, this section starts with a research background. After this, the organizations Ajax and the Amsterdam ArenA will be explained. Paragraph two will discuss the research question and the chapter will conclude with the societal and social relevance.

1. Research background

Last months, more and more posts appear in the news about violence and intimidation to the Ajax employees and board members. According to the Volkskrant (2014), in the present and the past directors and/or employees were threatened by the hard core supporters of Ajax. Most of these threats would not be reported because of the fear of worsening the problems. Sometimes employees of the club had even prior knowledge of a planned threat. This was the case in January 2012. That night, supporters were in the garden of former director Sturkenboom. Several club employees knew of the plans of the fans, but did nothing to avoid the visit to the house of the director. They called neither the police nor Sturkenboom himself. Ten days after the threat the director resigned.

Despite Ajax and Ajax Supporters Delegation (ASD) said they do not recognize themselves in this resulting image, the security of Ajax seems to be harmed (Volkskrant, 2014). Within Ajax, many fans of the F-Side and VAK 410 are seen as part of the club. They often do good things, but there is a downside. A small part of the group does not turn the hand to threats and, in extreme cases, violence. Employees of Ajax and the Amsterdam ArenA are involved in the interests of these hard core supporters, but also of all other supporters in the stadium. For example, this applies for the stewards of the Amsterdam ArenA. These stewards provide safety and hospitality for supporters during football matches of Ajax. They are aware of the fact that they practice a profession with a risk, because football matches themselves are social phenomena that disrupt normal social patterns. They are risky events, not least because of the possible unpredictable behavior of the supporters. The matches attract people who want to break away from everyday life in order to experience a kind of solidarity that is stronger than in normal situations (Boersma, 2013). An example of unpredictable behavior happened in 2011 during a match of Ajax in the Amsterdam ArenA. During the match between professional football organizations Ajax and AZ, Ajax supporter Wesley van W. tried to kick the keeper of AZ (Volkskrant, 2011). He ran onto the field and beleaguered the keeper. A steward of the Amsterdam ArenA has been able to stop him eventually. This incident was not the only one in which the safety of the Amsterdam ArenA became subject. More recently is the fall of a supporter of the F-side during the match between Ajax and FC Barcelona on November 26, 2013 (Parool, 2013).

1.1 AFC Ajax and Amsterdam Arena

Ajax is a professional football club founded in 1900 and since the founding of the Dutch Premier League, the club is continuously engaged in this league. The organizational structure of AFC Ajax consists of an Executive Board and a Supervisory Board. The Ajax Executive Board is formed by CEO Michael Kinsbergen, financial director Jeroen Slop, director football affairs Marc Overmars and marketing director Edwin van der Sar.

Since 1998, the limited liability company Ajax is the only Dutch football club listed on the Euronext Amsterdam. The club, as a company, is trying to make profit through ticket sales and revenue from European football. Half of the revenue comes from merchandising, advertising and income from television rights. Ajax has a 51% stake in South Africa Ajax Cape Town, and a 13% interest in Stadium Amsterdam, which operates the Amsterdam ArenA.

The Association of Owners Amsterdam ArenA is composed of the municipality of Amsterdam and Stadium Amsterdam. The municipality of Amsterdam (Parking Amsterdam) operates the Transferium and other parking areas in the environment of the stadium. Stadium Amsterdam owns the stadium and the entrance building and exploits the Amsterdam ArenA. The organization is focused on continuity by taking account of the interests of the municipality of Amsterdam, the founders of the Amsterdam ArenA and the other certificate holders. Stadium Amsterdam exploits the stadium in close cooperation with the main tenant AFC Ajax, catering organizations and other partners, by providing all kinds of large and small-scale multicultural events, whereby a high level of public service and friendliness is offered.

Limited partners are eight major companies. These have paid a total of € 2.27 million per company (Philips invested the double amount) and are referred to as 'founder'. The money is not inserted in the form of equity, but as a limited partner in the limited partnership assets. The founders have a number of rights, including the right to use a lounge with view at the field for ten persons, exclusive publicity rights and the supply of goods or services.

1.2 Research question

Ajax and the Amsterdam ArenA have done a lot of research related to safety and security in the Amsterdam ArenA. For example, the ArenA studied the feeling of safety of the visitors of the stadium (MVO Nederland, 2012). They are also studying the security situation in the stadium, following the fall of the supporter from the stands in December 2013 (Telegraaf, 2013). All these studies are important to get clear information about the physical and social security in and around the Amsterdam ArenA. In my opinion one study is still missing, namely a study of the tensions that arise during the creation and mostly during the implementation of the safety policy. To make a safety policy work, it is

important everyone involved in this security acts according a uniform and ambiguous safety policy and in smooth cooperation between the various groups (Binkhorst & Kingma, 2012). Stewards of the Amsterdam ArenA have to implement the safety policy and are also part of the involved groups. To get a clear picture of the tensions and the influence of them, the following main question is formulated:

'How do the employees of the Amsterdam ArenA, and in particular the stewards, make sense of possible tensions during the home matches of AFC Ajax and how does that affect their feeling of safety?'

To answer this main question, the following questions will be answered first:

- How does the Amsterdam ArenA organize their safety department?
- In what way are stewards of the Amsterdam ArenA selected and trained?
- Which conditions are important to increase the feeling of safety of the stewards?
- Which tensions occurs amongst stewards during applying the safety policy?
- What can be the influence of all taken safety measures for stewards?

1.3 Research relevance

The relevance of the research is divided in societal and scientific relevance.

1.3.1 Societal relevance

Despite research showing that the number of incidents during football matches steadily decreased (CIV Voetbal, 2013), the stadium security of the Amsterdam ArenA is still in the news. For example, last year a person fell from the stands during Ajax-FC Barcelona (Parool, 2013) and the security had to be tightened during the classic match Ajax-Feyenoord (Nu.nl, 2014). Due to these different incidents, a lot of attention is paid to the safety of the stadium, both by the media and the government.

Ajax, Amsterdam ArenA and the other involved parties, try their best to make the area of the stadium as safe as possible. This research is therefore of interest to the parties concerned, especially the ones who make the safety protocols. It is important that everyone who takes care of the safety and security, including the stewards, have the same vision about it. Employees of the Crowd Services department who make the security protocols and provide the training days for stewards have to know what difficulties prevails by implementing the safety policy. By emphasizing the meaning stewards have about the safety policy, new insights can emerge. If the Crowd Services department wants the protocols to work, it is important to know how stewards experience these in the Amsterdam ArenA during football matches so they can match the policy to this experience. Another reason why the research is societal relevant is that much research has been done on how to prevent incidents, for

example by the government, the Royal Dutch Football Association and the professional football organizations. But nobody did any research to measure the influence the policy has had on the feeling of safety of the people who provide this safety.

1.3.2 Scientific relevance

The research conducted at the Amsterdam ArenA is interesting for several scientifically reasons. In this study, the emphasis is placed on social safety in and around the Amsterdam ArenA. Boutellier (2005) assessed in his study how safe people feel themselves in their own country, but with regard to social safety in the football world, there is not much written in literature. Furthermore, in this study the tensions which occur caused by the safety policy are illustrated. So the focus in this study is not on the behavior of the supporters, but on the feeling of employees, in particular the stewards and to what extent the practice matches theoretical models. New insights regarding social safety and football have to emerge. This should lead to an expansion of the scientific theory of stadium security.

1.4 Reading guide

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: in the first section the theoretical framework is worked out in detail. The term safety is discussed and also the different types of safety and the influencing factors on the feeling of safety will be clarified. At the end of the theoretical framework, risk management will be exemplified. It examines what risk management is, the different approaches of enforcement policy and also how an organization can control their reputation. At the end of this chapter the panopticon principle will be illustrated. Section three presents the methodology and elaborates on the research approach, -design and -strategy. It also shows the data collection techniques, data analysis and the reliability and validity of the research. In the next section, the findings of the research are presented in detail and after this the results will be combined with the theory. In the final section a conclusion of the research question is formulated, followed by recommendations.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this part the theoretical framework will be explained. First the term safety is clarified. After this, the different types of safety will be discussed. At the end, the differences between objective and subjective safety will be explained.

2. Safety

Safety is a wide and difficult to define umbrella concept. It is not about how safe one feels, but how unsafe one feels (Boers, 2008). It touches an area that deals with the unwanted deviations from an ideal state of the world and the people who live in it (Stol, 2011). Safety is more than protection, risk management and control, and contributes to the economic confidence of society (Boutellier, 2006).

In this chapter three concepts are central to the problematic question. Most studies divide safety into two concepts: physical and social safety (Tonnaer & Duyvis, 2008), but the new insight is that these two concepts are closely related and closely together (Stoll et al, 2006).

2.1 Physical & social safety

The concept of safety can be divided into two components: physical and social safety. These two components overlap each other and that is a reason why safety is a complex concept. People may feel unsafe (social safety) following an incident in which their physical condition (physical safety) has been at risk. Distinction between these two types of safety can be created by the interpretation of safety. People can give different meanings to safety and this may make it hard to use one description for each sort of safety to distinguish them from the other one (Van Steden, 2008). Many different descriptions exist about physical safety, but for this research the following descriptions applies best.

'Physical safety concerns the absence of all forms of impairment of physical integrity. Such damage can include violence in 'heavy' (for example, hitting and kicking) and 'light' (for example pushing) forms. Similarly, openly or concealed threaten with violence is counted as a form of violation of the physical integrity (Stol et al., 2008).'

In addition to this, Diprose (2007) argues that physical safety has to deal with incidents involving violence that bring the physical condition of people in danger. These incidents also ensure that people feel unsafe. This has to do with the psychological damage that people suffer after they have experienced an incident. According to Helbing et al. (2007) disasters such as earthquakes, fires or floods can also ensure that the physical condition of people is endangered, so it does not only arise from actions by people.

'Social safety means protection or feeling protected from danger causing or threatening by the side of human action in public space (Encyclo, 2014).'

Having confidence in an organization - in terms of safety - is an important factor. When people have no confidence in an organization, they quickly feel less safe (Boutellier, 2005). Social safety covers not only the extent to which people are protected, but also the extent to which they feel protected. The feeling of safety is determined by the meaning people give to a situation and the conversations people have about it among themselves (Gherardi et al, 1998). An unsafe feeling does not only come through psychological damage, but can also be caused by physical damage (Bauwens et al, 2011). Social safety concerns the extent to which people are protected and feel protected against personal suffering by crime, violation and nuisance by others (Elffers & De Jong, 2004). The intent and seriousness behind hurting other people does not matter (Stol et al., 2006).

2.2 Subjective & objective safety

Besides the concept safety, social safety can also be divided into two components. On the one hand you have the factual component and on the other hand the perception component, in other words objective and subjective safety. Objective safety depends on the reality of the situation. It concerns incidents and occurrences, such as theft, burglary, violence and destruction. Objective safety is easily measurable and comparable, if declaration is done (CCV, 2010).

On the other hand, people's sense of safety plays an important role. This feeling is called subjective safety because the feeling is liable to all sorts of personal experiences, perceptions and facts from the immediate environment. Subjective safety is concerned with the sense of people and is not be traced of recorded incidents, but is measured by actively approaching citizens and ask them for their sense of safety (Ibid.).

Despite the fact that there is a relation between subjective and objective safety, the degree of perceived safety (subjective safety) does not necessarily agree with reality; the presence or absence of crime (objective safety) (Zedner, 2003). The more secure a situation is, the worse we experience an infringement and the harder we want more measures. This is called the security paradox; people who have less to do with crime, feel less secure (Boutellier, 2011). So there is certainly not a one-to-one relationship between crime and safety perception (CCV, 2010). This can be explained by much more than just crime. These influencing factors will be illustrated in the next chapter.

Subjective safety is highly dependent on demographic factors such as age and gender. A simple example of this is the fact that young men are more at risk to become victims of crime than older women, while older women are much more likely to feel unsafe than young men (Zedner, 2003). In

addition, factors such as ‘earlier crime victimization’, ‘personal experiences with crime’, ‘living in urban areas’, ‘environmental factors’ and ‘imaging media crime’, also affect feelings of insecurity (Walklate, 1997; Livingstone et al., 20001). Environmental factors refer to vandalism, poor lighting and signs of a hostile environment (Ibid.). Even crime prevention methods used by police, government and media campaigns can stimulate feelings of insecurity (Zedner, 2003).

2.3 To conclude

The descriptions of physical and social safety show that there are aspects that overlap each other. People may feel unsafe following an incident in which their physical condition has been compromised. It shows that safety is a complex concept and that it is impossible to explain this in one sentence. Different researchers have different opinions about what physical and social safety mean exactly, and also within an organization different meanings can be given to it. Because several people in an organization are engaged in the creation and implementation of the safety policy, different meanings can arise. For example, one person may think in the form of a repressive approach for violence, another may just find the sense of safety of people important and someone else can think both approaches are important. This overlap can cause misunderstandings or disagreements in the making and implementation of a safety policy, because not everyone always have to agree with the meaning of the others. This disagreements may have implications for the risk management of an organization, because this can result in using different strategies. Therefore, it is important that organizations take into account the fact that stakeholders can give different meanings to physical and social safety in the safety process.

3. Determinants

Much research has been done to the influencing factors of subjective safety (i.a. Grabosky, 1995; Oppelaar & Wittebrood, 2006). All these studies show that unsafe feelings have many different causes and feelings of anxiety can increase by the vulnerability, the victim experiences and the social environment of an individual (Hale, 1996). So, the feeling of safety of a person is caused by all sorts of personal experiences, perceptions and facts from the (immediate) environment, called determinants. To reduce the unsafe feeling of a person, you have to start with optimizing these determinants. Oppelaar and Wittebrood (2006), argues that to reduce the unsafe feeling of a person, you have to start with optimizing these determinants. For this research, it is relevant to emphasize these determinants, because they may have influence on the sense of safety of a person. Just as Oppelaar and Wittebrood (2006) did, this research makes a distinction between explanations focused on characteristics of the individual (individual context), the immediate surroundings (situational context) and the socio-cultural context in which people live.

3.1 Individual context

Personal characteristics often determine the extent to which individuals feel anxious as a result of certain signals. In certain situations one will feel anxious, while another person will not.

Personality

Anxiousness can be part of the personality of an individual, and depend on the subjective estimation of their own vulnerability and helplessness. In this context is also referred to dispositional fear (Gabriel & Greve, 2003), which means the tendency to react fearfully in certain situations. This is a relatively stable characteristic, which varies between individuals.

Vulnerability

Broadly speaking differences in fear of crime can be explained by differences in the estimation of the probability to become crime victims, the estimation of possible psychological and physical consequences, as well as the estimation of the degree to which one is helpless against the risks (Killias 1990; Hale 1996). The more people assess their vulnerability higher, the stronger their feelings of fear will be. This also explains why certain groups feel more anxious than others. Women, the elderly and people from lower socio-economic classes feel more anxious. The chances of them falling victim to crime is relatively low, but when a crime is actually taking place, they cannot defend themselves that easily.

Individual lifestyle and routine activities

Individual lifestyle and activities determine how often a person is exposed to threats. People who often go to a bar or nightclub will be more exposed to threats than someone who is inside every night.

Lifestyle and routine activities may also affect the estimate that an individual makes of their own vulnerability to victimization, and this may affect anxiety.

Victim experiences

Various studies have shown, that people who have rather been a victim, estimate the opportunity higher to being a victim once again. That's the reason why they also feel more fearful of crime than people without the victim's experience. Situation characteristics can be decisive: someone who has been in a particular situation will feel rather unsafe than someone in the same situation in similar circumstances. Exceptions are the victims who know how to neutralize their experiences (Agnew, 1985).

In addition to these direct victim experiences, indirect experiences with victimization can affect feelings of insecurity. Reports of victimization can come to the attention of someone through various channels, such as through personal networks or the media. The social proximity of the victim and the extent to which one can identify with that person can determine the influence of indirect victims to feelings of anxiety.

3.2 Situational context

In addition to individual characteristics, describing the immediate area can change the fear of danger. Oppelaar and Wittebrood (2006) indicate that previous research has been found that some characteristics serve as important signals for anxiety. The most important for this research are the design of the public space, the social cohesion and the degree of nuisance, degradation and criminality.

Design of public space

Certain places and situations can get the connotation 'dangerous' by cultural or social stereotyping. Furthermore, at some places and/or situations there can be inherent signals that indicate the (possible) presence of malicious people. Darkness and/or the extent to which one has a good overview of the immediate environment rely additionally on the design of the public space. Research has shown that the design of the public space plays an important role in feelings of anxiety (Wilcox Rountree et al., 2003). Besides this, the function of public space does influence the feeling of anxiety. For example, people will find themselves a lot safer in a shopping mall on Saturday during the day, while they rather will not come there on Saturday night. So, the function of the public space (at a specific time) has an impact on the social activity of people. Finally, civic amenities are important in an area because they cater to the needs and wishes of the residents. The presence and quality of these facilities largely determine the quality of livability and sense of safety in the area (Peterson et al., 2000; Morenoff et al., 2001).

Social cohesion

The social bonds between people are of great importance to explain the fear of crime. In an environment where people know each other, they will generally feel safer (Van Dijk et al., 2000; Maas-de Waal & Wittebrood, 2002). It is also important that people in a certain area have a mutual trust and shared expectations. Assumed may be that the more mutual trust and shared expectations among people living in a particular environment, feelings of unsafety are less strong. In addition, individuals who receive little social support when they become crime victims will feel isolated and therefore anxious. People with no friends in their immediate environment will have more fear of crime. They think they cannot manage potential victimization, because of lack of support (Hartnagel, 1979).

Nuisance, degradation and criminality

The broken windows theory of Wilson and Kelling (1982) assumes that disturbance and degradation have a direct impact on crime. By seeing nuisance and degradation, potential offenders would get the idea that there's little social control in the area and no interest to intervene, and they would be encouraged to criminal behavior. Disorderly behavior that is not controlled and not regulated causes the signal to people that an area is not safe. Previous research also shows that nuisance, deterioration and crime affect the fear of crime (Oppelaar & Wittebrood, 2006). So inter alia loud parties, graffiti, loitering youths, public drunkenness, tramps and trash ensure that many persons feel that the area is deteriorating and because of this it is disorderly, unpredictable and threatening (Wilson & Kelling, 1982).

3.3 Social-cultural context

According to Oppelaar and Wittebrood (2006), besides the immediate area, signals that may stir up feelings of fear also come in a broader social context. These stimuli were not central to their research, but were appointed. These include developments in the media and individualization and changed social relations.

Developments in the media

On the one hand media has a direct influence on feelings of safety of people. More popular news seems contributing to more insecure feelings (Hale, 1996). A personal portrait of the victim in the media raises broader possibilities of identification with the victim and because of this identification it raises more fear than when for example people read newspapers that put the news in a more neutral (less personal and detailed) way.

Individualization and changed social relations

Individualization is the growing autonomy of the individual in relation to its immediate surroundings. In the twentieth century, cohesion on an interpersonal level has increasingly given way to a more abstract form of cohesion: the welfare state. More is expected of the government, including in the field of social control. The ongoing individualization also seems to be associated with an increase of anonymity (Maas-de Waal, 2002). People want to be protected by the government, but at the same time they want to remain an individual and keep anonymity.

3.4 To conclude

In the literature, a multitude of emotions, beliefs and opinions that would have to be crime related can be found. These include the fear of being a victim, the estimation of the risk of victimization and the concerns about the way in which crime develops. In this research, the effect of the discussed nine factors on the perception of safety will be studied. To describe the feelings of insecurity the research makes a distinction between individual and social factors. At some feelings the personal situation is central (eg the fear of being a victim), while other feelings have more to do with crime as a social phenomenon. The nine factors explain the fear of crime and this fear can affect the sense of safety of a person. The factors that fall under the personal context are included because these affect the person himself. They cannot be influenced from outside, but they can demonstrate a difference of the sense of safety between people. The factors that are subject to the situational context and the social-cultural context are included in this study because they seem to be influenced from outside. This means that organizations can influence these factors and thus can influence the sense of safety of their employees.

The research assumes that a person's personality, vulnerability, lifestyle and (in)direct victim experiences are important determinants of his or her feelings of anxiety. It also assumes that the design of the public space, social cohesion, degradation, pollution and crime affect feelings of anxiety. These characteristics of the social context may relate to the environment or on other contexts, such as public transport, shopping centers and nightspots. The socio-cultural context is particularly relevant for explaining trends over time or differences between areas. The separate individual characteristics and contextual features are interdependent; it is also likely that the contextual characteristics have an influence on certain individual characteristics.

4. Risk management

The purpose of risk management is to prevent incidents (Jennings, 2009). Prior to an event, all possible risks are mapped by the organizer and other interested parties (Leopky & Parent, 2009). This allows them to take safety measures so that no incidents can occur before, during and after an event. When making risk management, coordination and communication of safety measures between the parties concerned is essential to tune all aspects. To create a good safety policy, the different stakeholders have to relate their understandings of safety to their specific organizational practice, i.e. their position, tasks, and interests within the network (Binkhorst & Kingma, 2012). The stakeholders involved in policy making must find coherence between the structural conditions of the 'risk-society' and the 'culture of fear' on the one hand, and the institution of safety standards on the organizational level on the other hand (Ibid.).

4.1 Enforcement

The issue risk management can be dealt with by taking different steps (Prinsen, 2011). The first step is starting with service. Enforcement is integrated through prevention, an equitable approach and clear information about rights and obligations. Through a number of steps, including the removal of the occasion and reasons for poor compliance record and the performance of preventive supervision, you will end up at the last step: repressive surveillance and giving a sanction in extreme cases.

Laws and regulations must be complied, preferably spontaneously. An opportunity to let people take the rules for granted and let them behave according the rules is to achieve normalization. Normalization is a process that aims to create something into a 'normal' issue (NEN, 2014). This usually means that it is conformed to the regularity, rule or standard or that it is reduced from an existing abnormal state. It is therefore important to ensure that people agree with the rules of the organization. If they do not behave according the rules, organizations can stress the soft side of safety as a friendly atmosphere and a positive feeling of safety based on mutual trust (Binkhorst & Kingma, 2012). A focus on the soft side of safety may also explain the reluctance of organizations towards the hard sides of safety as implied in protective measures, safety policies and punishing when someone is breaking the rules (Ibid.).

The soft side of safety can also be translated as 'compliance'. Within the context of the research the best translation of compliance is 'seduce' (Van Stokkom, 2004). This expression means activities that the persons entice, persuade or encourage to comply with the law. This can be done through education, consultation or granting favors. In any case, coercion does not arise. By maintaining close ties with persons an organization tries to increase informal social control. Besides seduction, an organization can also choose to make use of the hard side of safety. This suits the term deterrence (Van Stokkom,

2004). After an offense, tough measures will be taken to show persons that undesired behavior has direct consequences.

If an organization does choose for the soft or the hard side of safety is dependent upon the circumstances and subjective interpretations, but also upon the reputation an organization wants to have.

4.2 Reputation

Reputation is a complex relational concept – a quality of social actor's perceptions, and perceptions of perceptions. Perceptions may or may not be true, but they are social facts that generate actions and reactions (Power, 2009). Reputation as a construct is a multifaceted nature, its different sources and 'languages' (Fombrun & Van Riel 1997; Deephouse 2002) spanning inter alia different departments of an organization.

There are specific sources that have their focus on reputation. A particularly important variable is the occurrence of mediatized events, such as high-profile disasters or accidents, which contributes to general discourse of reputational risks (Power, 2009). A danger, vulnerability or opportunity is transformed into a risk when it is articulated as a social fact, as a 'risk object', to be managed and made into the responsibility of an organization or organizations (Hilgartner, 1992). So something is burdened by the transformation of events which might have been regarded as 'natural' or 'acts of God' into risks to be managed and accounted for (Bernstein, 1996). Including by mediatized events, organizations are now responsible and accountable for managing reputational risk as part of their risk management more generally, and this is a change in register for existing practices of reputation management (Power, 2009).

4.3 Panopticon

To control the environment and people in this environment, organizations are making use of surveillance. By using surveillance they will reduce incidents and create a safer environment. Jeremy Bentham (1791) developed a way of surveillance called the 'panopticon'. The panopticon makes it possible to control, discipline, monitor, examine, compare and improve groups. It was mainly used in a prison. The building consists of a tower with rings of cells. A cell has two windows: one to the outside and one to the tower. A supervisor in the tower is sufficient to monitor, know and dominate all residents (Heerink, 2014).

Five principles that the panopticon applies (Schinkel, 2009):

- Individualization: Each resident has a permanent place, sees no inmates and has no contact with others.

- Full visibility of the isolated individual: This individual is seen without seeing itself. He is the object of information and knowledge, never a subject that can communicate.
- An asymmetrical power relationship with the superintendent: The building is constructed the way that the supervisor can see the cell occupants, but they cannot see the supervisor. They only suspect his presence.
- Power Maximization: It is unnecessary to have an overseer permanent in the building. The realization that one can be checked ensures peace and order. People adapt their behavior, because they can be seen.
- The panopticon hardly feels as oppressive.

According to Bentham (1791) the fact the prisoner knows he is being watched continuously, is enough to keep him under control. It is unnecessary, and at the same time not enough to keep an eye on the prisoner continuously. Not enough, because he must feel that he is being watched, and unnecessary, because he is not actually being viewed, as long as the prisoner has that assumption.

Philosopher Foucault was inspired by Bentham's panopticon, and he involves it on more than only a prison. He uses it as a metaphor for modern society and how discipline plays a role in it. The psychology of the panopticon works just as well in the prison, as it functions in society. Not only prisons, but also hospitals, schools, factories, every part of the society in which power is of importance has evolved toward a panopticon over the centuries. There is certainly not someone who constantly looks to all camera images at once, but still you modify your behavior because you do not know whether if someone is seeing you at a certain moment (Heerink, 2014).

4.3.1 Effects of using cameras

To achieve the effect of the panopticon, an organization can make use of camera-surveillance. Through cameras, you can check people whether they perform their work or behave according the rules, while they do not see who is checking them. As Foucault says people will adjust their behavior anyway, because they do not know whether they will be checked.

Making use of cameras can also give people a greater sense of safety. However, it is important to recognize that perceptions of feeling safe and an actual increase in the safety of an individual are very different (Taylor, 2011). Sarno et al. (1999) say that camera-surveillance indeed does give people a safer feeling, but it is important people know the cameras are monitored by persons. Conversely, some studies have shown that camera-surveillance has little discernable impact on feelings of safety among the general public.

Another effect of keep an eye on persons with cameras is that the presence of the cameras did not always promote ‘habituated anticipatory conformity’ as outlined by Norris and Armstrong (1998). What would it mean when persons comply with power through ‘anticipatory conformity’? They would certainly try to act according to what power expects from them, but they would only do so because they would be aware of the possibility of being observed. They would act differently if given the opportunity to escape power’s eye (Vaz & Bruno, 2003). They would internalize power’s eye but they would not identify with its values.

It is also possible that an individual may decide not to commit a criminal or deviant act in an area covered by cameras, but rather than being completely deterred they simply move to a location where there is no coverage (Taylor, 2011). The use of cameras can displace criminal and deviant activities, rather than prevent them. Evidence of displacement have been reported in numerous evaluation studies, like the one from Armitage et al. (1999).

4.4 To conclude

The reputation of an organization can be affected by the media. The media can put down a small risk or danger as something very big through which people can feel themselves less safe than actually needed. Mediatized events are difficult to control for an organization, that is why it is important to reduce the possibility of the occurrence of an incident as much as possible. A way to reduce this possibility is to create normalization. An organization wants that persons see their rules not as ‘rules’, but as normal behavior. Once this happens, there will occur fewer incidents and this will result in a safer feeling of a person.

To achieve this normalization, an organization have to find a balance between two approaches of enforcement. On the one hand, an organization must show that they want to invest in people, this ensures that the persons will be cooperative when it comes to following the rules of the organization. Next time, they will behave according to the rules without them being controlled. But it also can have its downsides. Giving too much freedom to people can result in making own rules so that the organization ultimately has little influence. On the other hand, it is also possible to show that undesirable behavior is immediately punished. For the organization this results as a kind of power, thereby persons do not dare to behave against the rules of the organization. This can scare people so next time they will behave according the rules. But it can also have their downsides. This time people only adhere to the rules because they should, not because they do agree with the rules. Next time, when they will not be controlled they will behave the same as they did before.

To achieve normalization, organization can also make use of tools like cameras. It is important for an organization to find a good balance within the use of cameras. Making too much use of cameras can

make people behave differently than originally intended. By means of cameras, the feeling of safety of people can be ensured, but they can also be used to scare people because the fact a person knows he can be controlled can cause them to behave according to the rules. On the other side, making use of cameras can encourage people to go to other places to perform undesirable behavior. It can also have the effect that people only adhere to the rules when they should, not because they want it themselves. By contrast, too little use of cameras may compromise the safety (feeling) of people.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology that is used in the study will be accounted in this section. The chapter consists of five paragraphs that should give a good picture of how the research is conducted.

5. Research approach

The first paragraph discusses the research design. Paragraph two describes the research strategy and in paragraph three the data collection techniques are explained. After this the way of analyzing data is illustrated. Finally, the chapter concludes with the reliability and validity of the research.

5.1 Research design

The research will be carried out in the form of a qualitative case study. Chosen is the qualitative case study, because it is possible to do research of a specific phenomenon (Robson, 2011). By making use of this case study, you can create a detailed view of this phenomenon (Miles, 1979) and you can find out what meaning people give to the phenomenon (Martin, 2002). In this research, the phenomenon is stadium safety with in particular the tensions that arise during the creation and implementation of the safety policy. The main purpose is to show these tensions and to understand what influences these tensions can have on the feeling of safety of the stewards. Because little research is done (‘t Hart et al., 2009) about this subject, an exploratory study has been used. Additionally, the epistemological perspective is interpretivism. Since social sciences are about people (Ibid.), it is important to, in addition describe existing relationships and pursue comprehension. The research objects are considered from a first person perspective, also called the life world perspective. That means that an attempt was made to look through the eyes of the stewards and see the world as they see it. To create the comprehension of others, it is important to use thick description. This makes it possible to describe the influences on the feeling of safety. People make reality by giving meaning to a phenomenon (Ritchie & Lewis, 2012). That is why the idealism is selected as the ontological perspective.

5.2 Research strategy

The research consists of two parts. This approach was taken, in order to make a distinction between the theoretical part and the operative part, because with this design it is obvious what the research data is. By dividing them into two separate parts, it is clear what information is gathered from literary sources and what information was gathered through practical research. Interviews and the observation can be understood as forms of practical research.

5.2.1 Desk research

Desk research can consist of (a combination of) various activities, namely: literature study, secondary analysis, administrative investigation, external information gathering and interviews. The common

denominator in these activities is the use of secondary empirical sources. To lay down the theoretical framework, a literature study is done. This theoretical framework will help me with analyzing research results. In addition, internal secondary data are gathered because it is important to give a clear view of the developments from the organization. This method is chosen because most of the relevant information can be collected this way.

5.2.2 Case study

A case study is a comprehensive study of a phenomenon. Almost always it is a person, group or organization with special properties or who are in a special situation. In this study the group that is studied is the stewards of the Amsterdam Arena.

With case studies, a wide variety of data collection methods can be used, such as observation, questionnaires and content analysis of documents. The choice of a case study in this research stems from the fact that a case study is about a group or organization with special properties or those in a particular situation. Hereby the stewards are the group with special properties as they ensure safety during a football game. Through non-participant observation during a football game I can form a good picture of the steward organization in the practical situation. They were non-participant observations since I was introduced to the stewards concerning my research. To carry out the research, two research groups are formulated with which an interview was conducted. The first formulated research group are the stewards, the second group are the two employees of the Crowd Services department. Below there is a brief description why this choice was made and how these two groups have been studied.

Stewards

The stewards are the primary and most visible group when it comes to safety at football matches in the Amsterdam Arena. They ensure safety during the games. To gain a clear picture about their feelings of safety during their work, twelve stewards were interviewed. The method of research is an oral, open interview. This type of research is chosen, since there may be a deep draft because it is possible to ask more and deeper questions based on the given answers. By asking these supplementary questions socially desirable answers may be minimized. Advantages of this method are that there may be a greater depth because of the follow-up questions and there is guidance whereby questions can be reformulated when they create ambiguity. Disadvantages are that there is no anonymity, and that the researcher can have big influence.

Crowd Services Amsterdam Arena

The two persons who work at the Crowd Services department of the Amsterdam Arena are responsible for the organization around security and such around the stewards. These two people are interviewed simultaneously by means of an oral, open interview. Again, this method was chosen

because much depth can be obtained and when something is not clear, supplementary questions can be asked.

5.3 Data-collection techniques

This research will use three different data-collection techniques. First some different observations will be done. In between these observations different studies about the subject and documents which relate to safety in the Amsterdam ArenA are analyzed. Besides the observations and document analysis some interviews with different stewards and the employees of the Crowd Services department of the Amsterdam ArenA are conducted.

5.3.1 Observation

First I observed one of the two training days of new stewards. I did this as a participant as observer (Saunders et al, 2009). The future stewards are hired by employment agency Triple A and they have to follow two training days. Triple A is a cooperation between Ajax and Amsterdam ArenA and during the two training days the stewards will learn everything about the profession of a steward. The first day consists of an introduction and service modules. The main subjects on this day are communication and aggression. The second day consists off how to ensure safety as a steward. Subjects like evacuation and emergencies, including body search and legal frameworks are treated. I did an observation during the first of the two training days, because after this observation I gathered enough research material for my thesis.

Besides this training day I also observed a match preparation of the stewards. I walked along with a head steward and I attended the meeting of all of the head stewards. In this meeting they are prepared with the latest information for the match. After they have received the information, they will pass it on to their group of stewards through a briefing. This observation took place during the match Ajax-SC Cambuur, because the prediction was that there was little chance of irregularities.

5.3.2 Literature study

The literature study consisted of several issues like safety in general, the influencing factors of a(n) (in)secure feeling and the tensions that arise when organizing safety measures. To clarify the significance of security, literature on the definition is studied. Also the various forms of safety are investigated. In addition, literature about the determinants that affect the sense of safety of a person is studied. Much research has been done about this subject. The determinants that are most important for this study are highlighted. Also the purpose and effects of risk management are treated. The tensions that arise during the organization of security measures are studied after conducting the interviews. This created a directive to search for literature. All these subjects have been searched for in the library and on the Internet.

Besides all this theoretical studies, also some documents from the Amsterdam ArenA are studied. The first document is the recruitments in the job profile of a steward. Also, the script of security issues during a football game and the presentation of the security policy of Ajax are taken by.

5.3.3 Semi-structured interviews

The third used data collection technique is conducting semi-structured interviews. I chose for semi-structured because I wanted to work with some standard questions, see attachment I and II. Through these questions I can ask for detailed information at key moments. The semi-structured interviews are not the same for each respondent. I made a questionnaire for the stewards and a different one for the employees of the Crowd Services department of the Amsterdam ArenA. I made this difference because I want to get the most meaningful information from the two groups. The interviews will have similarities, but not every question is important for both groups. The topic list is divided into different topics. To create a good relationship and to give the interviewee a comfy feeling, the interview will start with the question if they want to describe a day at work. The topics that are broached hereafter will have to deal with what the requirements are in terms of safety, how to tune safety, what role the interviewees have in the organization and what impact the supporters and colleagues have on their own sense of safety. The literature says that with at least twelve interviews you can get saturation (Guest et al., 2006). Accidentally, after twelve interviews I thought I had enough information about the experiences of the stewards.

5.4 Data analysis

After conducting the interviews, the collected data was analyzed. Analyzing qualitative data starts with segmentation of raw data into different categories and giving them corresponding codes (Boeije, 2010). The interviews were recorded and after that all of them were transcribed. Secondly, the raw data of the transcripts are broken up and segmented into different fragments. The method of coding used was the one of Strauss and Corbin (2007). This method consists of three steps: open coding, axial coding and selective coding.

During the open coding, the raw data is divided into different meaningful fragments. In the first step, keywords are assigned to the different fragments. In attachment III the codebook is written down. There are three main categories, 'social control', 'effect on acting' and 'satisfaction in work'. These three categories came back in almost all interviews. During the axial coding, these categories led to the subcategories. A category is imaged by grouping all relevant research material together. Then it examines if the elements are part of it and how they are related. During the selective coding phase, categories and codes were written down on different tangible cards. When the cards were organized, the codes were listed in an excel spreadsheet. This gained insight to the collected data and there was already thought of preliminary answers.

5.5 Reliability and validity

Because within qualitative research less standardized methods are used than those in quantitative research, the reliability and validity can be compromised. The reliability can be summarized as the absence of random errors. Validity involves systematic errors that lead to a systematic bias in the results.

Validity

A qualitative study is valid if it has studied what it intended to study (Bergsma, 2003). The focus is mainly on the validity of the interpretations. In other words, are the conclusions of the researcher valid in relation to the underlying data obtained? When participants give socially desirable answers, there is no question of validity. The interviewer may increase the validity by carefully asking questions during an interview and to ensure that the personal opinion does not show through. The interviewee should also feel at ease and have the idea that everything is told is confidential. If the validity of the research is threatened, means that it can be the results and conclusions are wrong. For example, it is possible, that there are alternative explanations. Qualitative research can respond to this with testing interim interpretations of the study and look to the data after this. Qualitative research is therefore more to plausibility instead of about validity. In this research, it is done by analyzing the results after conducting eight interviews and see what conclusions could be drawn. It then became clear more information was needed to create a good picture, which is why later on four extra interviews were conducted. After these interviews, no new facts were told. Validity supposes reliability, if a measurement is not reliable it is often not valid (Boeije, 2010).

Reliability

The reliability issue in qualitative research focuses on the question whether the research results are 'disturbed' by assumptions and prejudices. The relationship between the interviewer and interviewee plays an essential role in the research process (King et al., 1994). In this study, the interviewer and interviewees have many common characteristics capable to take, whereby it can be difficult for both to adopt a professional and independent attitude. As well the stewards, as the interviewer, fall in the same age group and everyone is a student. Also, the interviewer is working within the same organization as the interviewees, Amsterdam ArenA, and therefore has to be careful to not go into the 'going native' phenomenon. This means losing one's own perspective and judgments by adopting opinions and interpretations of the other. To increase reliability, it is important to make use of existing procedures. It is also important to describe the best possible way how the data collection and analysis is done (Boeije, 2010). Another way to increase the reliability is making use of triangulation. The information from the observations, document analysis and semi-structured interviews is mainly more reliable and valid by a methodological triangulation (Robson, 2011; Ritchie & Lewis, 2012). There is a methodological triangulation, because several data collection techniques are used.

RESEARCH RESULTS

This section describes the data collected during the investigation. All quotes used in this section are processed anonymously as this was promised to the interviewees.

The first chapter of this section explains more about the Amsterdam ArenA and stewarding. This is important for understanding the context of this research. The first paragraph gives an image of what the Amsterdam ArenA and the environment looks like. Paragraph two tells what the profession stewarding really means and in paragraph three the characteristics of a steward are addressed. Before becoming a steward, they have to follow an extensive training. This is explained in the fourth paragraph. After the stewards have successfully completed this training, they can begin with working in the Amsterdam ArenA. At the end of this chapter, the fifth paragraph explains how a workday of a steward looks like.

The second chapter of this section identifies the measures taken by the Amsterdam ArenA to ensure safety or a feeling of safety. Paragraph one illustrates the effect of the rules on the sense of safety of the stewards. The second paragraph describes the facilities which have to increase the sense of safety and paragraph three discusses the control of these facilities and compliance of the rules, by making use of cameras. Paragraph four shows what kind of influence confidence in the organization and in the colleagues on the sense of safety stewards has. The chapter ends with a concluding paragraph.

6. Stewarding in Amsterdam ArenA

In the Amsterdam ArenA, ensuring safety does not only find place during a match. Instead, there is much in advance what is also important to create a safe feeling. First the environment of the Amsterdam ArenA will be explained. Then the characteristics of a steward will be mentioned. After this the training days and the work schedule will be discussed.

6.1 Amsterdam ArenA

The Amsterdam ArenA is a multifunctional stadium in the Southeast of Amsterdam, within 200 meters west from train station Amsterdam Bijlmer ArenA. With 53.052 seats, it is the largest stadium in the Netherlands. Since August 14, 1996 the Amsterdam ArenA is the home of the football club AFC Ajax. In addition to the home games of AFC Ajax, European football matches and the matches of the Dutch national team, is the Amsterdam ArenA also used for various pop concerts and other major events.

Since the arrival of the Amsterdam ArenA in 1996, much has changed in the Southeast of Amsterdam. The environment of the Amsterdam ArenA, called the Arena Poort, is the central area of Amsterdam

Southeast, adjacent to the shopping center Amsterdamse Poort. At the Arena Poort are, next to the football stadium, many more companies established like the Ziggo Dome, Heineken Music Hall, cinema Pathé ArenA, living mall Villa ArenA and various office buildings, hotels, shops and restaurants. In attachment IV an overview can be found with all available facilities in the environment of the Amsterdam ArenA.

The Amsterdam ArenA is divided into several sections. Attachment V shows the plan of the Amsterdam ArenA. In sections 125 t / m 129, located on the 1st ring behind the goal at the south side of the stadium and in boxes 424 and 425, located on the southeast side of the 2nd ring, fanatical Ajax supporters take place. Standing on the stands in the middle part of this section will be tolerated, there are no fixed seats. The so-called hard core have places for these boxes. The compartments 402, 403, 408, 409, 418 and 423 are the boxes in which parents/companion with children can take place. The supporters of the opponent are sitting in boxes 416 and 417. These supporters are separated from the Ajax supporters through special lexan walls. At some matches, Ajax will hang some nets above the boxes where the supporters of the opponent take place, because they want to avoid throwing stuff from as well towards these boxes. Some opponents bring few supporters along, in which case Ajax may decide these supporters can only take place in box 417. Box 416 is then available for Ajax supporters. This box is naturally separated from box 417. On the main stand, the board of Ajax, the opponent, as well as the members, partners and sponsors of Ajax have their seats. These boxes are generally not available for regular sales.

6.2 Stewards

The security organization of the Amsterdam ArenA and Ajax is divided into two functions, stewards and stadium security guards. Both the stewards and stadium security guards are responsible for maintaining the house rules and the Royal Dutch Football Association Standard Conditions. However, there is a difference in their tasks and responsibilities.

Stewards / head steward

The job responsibilities of stewards are mainly focused on service and safety and partly focused on security tasks. It is therefore expected that (minor) incidents can be resolved by the stewards themselves. If this has not the desired result, the head steward will take over. If the head steward cannot resolve the problem, support may be requested via the command room.

Security

The stadium security has partly focused the work on service tasks. But their main tasks are focused on ensuring safety and security. The security will give the final warning to a concerning supporter, or will

expand or persist a supporter, when an offense is committed. The stadium security is always in contact with the command room and will always inquire the command room about the situation.

Through the utilization of the integrated command center, the police are always aware of the incidents that take place in the Amsterdam ArenA. At the moment the stadium security cannot control the incident and the (public) order is in danger, there are always different police units present in the stadium. These units can support the security organization when the situation demands on it. However, not the police but the safety organization remains primarily responsible for peace and order in the Amsterdam ArenA. That is why the police are not visibly present.

6.3 Characteristics

Stewards in the Amsterdam ArenA are selected by foundation Stewarding Triple A. This is a foundation set up by Ajax and the Amsterdam ArenA together. An employee of the department Crowd Services of the Amsterdam ArenA is responsible of foundation stewarding Triple A. The most important activities of foundation Stewarding Triple A take place in the industry of private security.

The training which stewards have to follow is organized from Triple A and is accredited by the Royal Dutch Football Association. All in the Amsterdam ArenA active stewards are after successful completing the training in the possession of the blue pass from the Royal Dutch Football Association.

To become a steward, a person has to go through a selection process organized by Triple A in cooperation with employment agency Randstad. Also the head stewards are involved in this selection process. The employment agency is responsible for the pre-selection, while the head stewards of conduct an interview with candidates who are selected after the pre-selection. If this interview is positive, a screening process will start. If there are no objections come forward, the stewards have to follow a three-day training, which will be finished with a test.

A steward must meet several requirements. So says the job profile (Randstad, 2013) that they must speak fluent Dutch and have been available for at least two years. Characteristics which they should have are being social, proactive, convincing, representative and they must have pride. If a person meets these conditions, it is possible to apply to the job. But when a steward meets all these characteristics, it does not mean that he or she can work on each sector in the Amsterdam ArenA. For each sector other characteristics are important.

'Every sector has its own characteristics and tactics on how to deal with the target group. For example, sector South H requires a more assertive / proactive steward while a stewards at the main building or the family sector should have proper communication skills.'

In the main building, most of the people pay a lot of money for a football game and they are often more assertive and have higher expectations than the hard core that comes in through the South H entrance. To get the right steward in the right sector, main stewards of different sectors will conduct the interview with future stewards during the selection process. These head stewards decide if they find you suitable for his / her sector. The future stewards invited for this day always get a job as a steward in the Amsterdam ArenA. They cannot decide on which sector they want to work, this is due to the different demands of each sector. After they are assigned to a sector the stewards have to follow the mandatory training days.

6.4 Training days

Within the safety policy of the Royal Dutch Football Association, one of the key points is the training of the stewards. For each stadium in the Netherlands, the same rules about training stewards apply. These rules are made by the Royal Dutch Football Association and during the season they come along to check if the rules are observed. The Dutch Football Association requires that any person who want to become a steward must own the by the association granted accreditation for stewards. To get this certificate the steward must at least have knowledge of topics such as: crime prevention, how to recognize aggressive behavior, arrest and seizure and supervision. In addition, to work as a football steward there is permission needed from the Ministry of Justice. By al-than-not granted such permission, they examine any criminal antecedents (whether they have a criminal record) and other personal circumstances. If permission is granted, the football steward receives a blue accreditation. Stewards should always carry this accreditation with them. According to the text of the Law on Private Security and Investigation Agencies, they must be able to show it immediately on every reasonable request, like inspections by the police (Ministry of security and justice, 2011).

The Amsterdam ArenA wants to be number one when it comes to the most secure stadium of the Netherlands. It is even so that, in cooperation with Ajax, the Amsterdam ArenA has an advising role to the Dutch Football Association as regards the rules for making safety policy in stadiums in the Netherlands.

‘For us, the influence of the Dutch Football Association to the rules of the steward training is not that big. This is because we are at the forefront when it comes to safety and training for this.’

The Royal Dutch Football Association has appointed a number of competencies (skills) to which a football steward should meet. These competencies are processed and described in detail in a course map which the theoretical part explains in a simple way. Besides the theoretical part, the course

consists of practical exercises in the stadium. Thus, stewards will have to demonstrate that they can perform proper body search and/or visitation by the access control. Also, the steward will face a number of common situations in which he or she must take action.

In the Amsterdam ArenA stewards are trained by the staff from the Crowd Services department, but the safety manager of Ajax has also a large share in this training. During these training days information will be given about the work, the important characteristics of a steward, and what is expected of them. In addition, common practice situations are trained through role playing.

In addition to the practical information, the organization also wants to teach the stewards a particular message. They show that the organization wants to be accessible to everyone. They think this can be a success when stewards learn to focus on the safety of people.

'Safety First. The most important thing is that the visitor feels safe because if a visitor does not feel safe, he is not coming back. And the same feeling exists amongst employees. So creating a safe environment for visitors and yourself as a steward must be of paramount importance.'

It is important supporters and employees of the Amsterdam ArenA feel protected against the danger which can be caused by other people in the stadium. The stewards are mainly trained on ensuring social safety. They must do this by checking the area, showing that they are present when there are problems and by opening up to questions from supporters or colleagues. Besides ensuring safety hospitality is also one of the spearheads in the safety policy of the organization. Stewards are seen as the face of the organization and should therefore be helpful to both the supporters and their colleagues.

'There are three keywords you have to keep in mind during your work as a steward. Service, safety and security. That is to say that we as an organization want to come across as friendly and safe.'

These three keywords can lead to tensions for a steward. Sometimes, it is difficult to be friendly and take care of the safety at the same time. They have to make a choice if they think the situation is threatening enough so they cannot be hospitable anymore, or if they remain being hospitable in the hope the situation will solve by taking this position. During an incident, these thoughts continuously play a role in the heads of the stewards.

Another tension which arises is that all stewards follow the same training, but some stewards never have to implement the trained situations in real work life. They are hardly in contact with unpleasant situations. For example, an incident with or between supporters occurs sporadically in the main building or in the family sectors. Despite these stewards almost never experience a bad situation, they

do not always feel safe during their work in the Amsterdam ArenA. This is dependent of their feeling. They are afraid that if something happens they will not be able to act correctly, because they never had to.

‘Basically I know what I need to do if something happens, but I have never had to intervene. So I do not know how I will react if something happens and I’m afraid I cannot act right on that moment.’

Despite the training the stewards followed, stewards in some sectors who never experience an incident have a greater sense of insecurity. They know that they must have the knowledge but they are afraid that they cannot bring it in practice as soon an incident occurs. If you do not have to implement the theory in practice, the feeling of insecurity will grow. The Crowd Services Department is aware about this, but they do not think this is an important threat for the safety in the Amsterdam ArenA.

‘Of course it is something they are trained on in the course [dealing with aggression]. Only in practice it doesn’t occur that often that something happens and if something happens, then yes, it can be tricky for a steward.’

The organization hopes that stewards take responsibility to maintain their knowledge up-to-date, for example through the folder they have to take home. This folder describes everything handled within the training days and the stewards can take a look in it in their own time. Whether this happens is not to control, but it is the responsibility of a steward who thinks not to have enough knowledge anymore.

6.5 Schedule of a 12.30 match

Every match, the stewards of the Amsterdam ArenA follow the same schedule. Below the schedule of a 12.30 match is displayed.

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>
09.30	Attendance and briefing head stewards by Crowd Services Coordinator of the Amsterdam ArenA and the Security Affairs Coordinator Ajax.
10.15	Opening Command Room; Exchange of information with stakeholders.
10.30	Attendance and briefing stewards by the head stewards.
11.00	Opening stadium for supporters.
12.30	<i>Start match</i>
13.15	Half-time. If necessary a consultation between referee, opponent, observer KNVB and safety coordinator of Ajax takes place.

14.20	End match.
14.45	Evaluation conversation in the command room between opponent, observer KNVB and safety coordinator of Ajax. If necessary, the commissioner of police may give additions to the events.
14.45	Logout and debriefing stewards at their head stewards. The job of the stewards is over and they should go home.
15.15	Logout and debriefing head stewards by coordinator Crowd Services and safety coordinator of Ajax. The head stewards write on a debriefing form all salient issues in their sector.

As mentioned in the schedule, the steward briefing takes place multi-staged. First the head stewards receive a clear and professional briefing of the coordinator Crowd Services of the Amsterdam ArenA, in the presence of the safety coordinator Ajax. Key points and lessons of the previous match are discussed. The details for upcoming match are mentioned and details of the next match are discussed. Examples are the random image of the match, the opponent and match characteristics. Also focus points for the stewards, like active action against rule violation or actively enforce smoking policy, are called. Also general information will be provided such as what the occupation is in terms of numbers of supporters and when the stadium opens his doors.

After this, the stewards also receive a professional briefing of their head steward. The focus points in the briefing for the head stewards are repeated. Also, any steward can tell if there are problems or other comments which are important for good performance of the work or for their colleagues. Furthermore, new stewards are presented and indicated who has not yet received the official blue steward accreditation and therefore is still in training.

At the end of the match a debriefing of every sector takes place and after this the head stewards may complete a debriefing form and hand this in by the coordinator Crowd Services. The resulting input of the debriefing forms is shared during the briefing before the next home match.

6.6 To conclude

As the above text illustrates, the Amsterdam ArenA is placed in an area with different other facilities who have different interests. In addition to the stadium also companies, shops, hotels and entertainment venues are present. Once a football match takes place and about 50.000 people enter the area, the social environment will be disturbed. This can affect the sense of safety of people because their familiar environment is accessible by people who may exhibit unpredictable behavior. By organizing the environment of the stadium the way it is, the involved stakeholders attempted to limit this to a minimum.

Besides creating a safe environment outside the stadium, the stakeholders, especially the Amsterdam Arena and Ajax, pay their attention to safety inside the stadium. They did this by the design of the stadium, but they also do this by hiring and training people who conform the requirements. Stewards are important elements in ensuring the safety inside the stadium and to be able to ensure this safety, training is mandatory. During this training, the focus is on safety because the Amsterdam Arena thinks this is the first step to increase the feeling of safety of stewards and supporters inside the stadium. Yet, during the training days, service and security turned out to be important as well. Therefore, stewards are expected to ensure both safety and hospitality. Because of this, stewards do not always know how to act in a given situation. They want to come across as helpful, but sometimes it is important for the safety to show less hospitality. This tension in the minds of stewards is difficult to avoid. The choice of the steward may also cause disagreement between steward and supporter, steward and organization or between stewards themselves.

Standardization is another influencing factor on the sense of safety of a steward. Because stewards have to follow every match the same schedule in the same environment, it is clear for them what their tasks are. Through the standardization of the work stewards do perform the same tasks every match again. After some time, they know what to do and they will perform these tasks properly. The danger is that it may become a habit and stewards will no longer perform the duties concentrated.

7. Implementing safety

During a season, several factors can influence creating a safe environment. It starts with making rules and providing facilities. Also controlling both supporters and stewards is important, but on the other hand for an organization is it also important to gain confidence.

7.1 Rules

Because there are almost 50.000 fans present at a football match in the Amsterdam ArenA, it is important to have clear rules. These rules are known to the fans because they can be seen when they buy their ticket and they can also read them on the website and in the stadium. The rules provide more security, but at the same time they can cause uncomfortable situations for the stewards. An example: In some cases it will be useful or even necessary to intervene immediately, for instance if someone passes out or has a heart attack. Also once supporters suddenly end up in a fight some stewards find it useful to still be able to intervene physically.

'Yes, in some situations it might be useful if you would be allowed to intervene, because than you can act more quickly rather than when you have to wait for security or first aid.'

Stewards are often the type of persons who wants to be very helpful and wants to solve every problem. As soon as something happens and stewards should not intervene because this is not in their job description, the stewards do not feel at ease because they are in a dilemma between following their job description and being helpful. Also most of the fans think it is the duty of the stewards to intervene in a situation. Because the stewards are not always able to intervene, it causes tension. Moreover, it often takes a long time for stewards to get in contact with the right person.

'If a supporter does not adhere to the rules or something is happening, I have to say to it the head steward first, the head steward reports it through his radio to the command room and the command room will ultimately decide if a person should be banned from the stadium or not.'

Stewards would feel safer if they can and may provide the first help by themselves. In some cases, they even would like to have the ability to broadcast a signal or to call someone so they do not have to walk away from the place the incident occurs.

'Yes, it would be the easiest if we could just have a radiotelephone and could squeak the head steward or command room directly.'

Stewards also feel responsible when someone gets a medical accident. But the fact that they do not get first aid course offered from the Amsterdam ArenA, stewards often feel uncomfortable in such a

situation. Unrest arises and bystanders expect the steward to offer medical assistance. However, usually this is not the case and they have to wait to for the first aid responders. Despite the fact that first aid responders are often quickly on the place of the incident, some stewards would appreciate it to be trained to carry out the first medical procedures.

Another problem which arises by the rules which apply in the Amsterdam ArenA are that basically the same rules apply to every supporter, but there are exceptions on the rules. During the observation it was remarkable that some fans get a special treatment. For instance, a female supporter only wants to be searched by a particular steward.

'As soon as she arrives she always asks directly to [name of the steward]. Today she [the steward] is not working, so hopefully it's not a problem for this lady when I have to frisk her. I think she is going to resist at first and hopefully she finally accepts it.'

Because this woman comes every match to the stadium and stewards do not want unnecessary trouble, they ensure that this lady gets the special treatment. As stated earlier, the Amsterdam ArenA thinks safety and hospitality are two important pillars in the safety policy. By giving this lady a special treatment everything will play out quietly and it will not cause trouble. The stewards show that the organization is there to keep the fans happy and it is a hospitable organization. The tension which arises is that the stewards must make a choice what they do and do not allow. If they make too many exceptions on the rules, the stewards show that the rules are not taken seriously by the organization. Also it is not possible to accommodate the specific requirements of everyone. It is important to think about the tension which arises between when you give a special treatment to someone and when do not.

7.2 Facilities

Besides the training of stewards and the rules of the organization, the design of the stadium is also helping to ensure the safety. Numbered seats, a command center, surveillance cameras and a by the organization professionalized steward organization created a safe environment for both supporters and employees. In addition, the access procedures and -controls are tightened. These facilities make it possible to follow the crowd closely and identify individual lawbreakers. That these security measures are effective appeared during one of the observations.

'At the entrance, stewards have a scanner and therewith they should scan the tickets of supporters. As a supporter has a stadium ban, this scanner gives a code 5, so he cannot enter the arena. Supporters also may be asked for an ID card, identification is mandatory.'

The stewards do not have to argue with the fans, because the code on the scanner indicates why they may not enter the stadium. If fans are not aware that they are not allowed to go inside the stadium, the stewards can send the fans to the supporter affairs department. They have a desk in the Amsterdam ArenA and can exactly explain why the scanner shows the particular code.

The technical tools are experienced as very pleasant. Because of these tools, the stewards feel supported in their work and this gives them a feeling of safety. Besides the scanners at the entrance, the numbered seats in the stadium are also a good development. Once there is disagreement between supporters about seats, stewards can calmly explain who should take place at which seat. Because people have tickets with seating numbers on it, they can never debate who is sitting on the wrong place. The numbered seats are an example of an invisible safety measure, facilitated by the organization. The stewards are not aware that this is intended to increase safety of supporters and staff. It is good that the stewards are not always aware of the safety measures. Too much visible security measures can scare the stewards. They can get the idea that they are working in a very unsafe environment, so their sense of safety will decrease.

The offered facilities play an important role in the safety policy in the Amsterdam ArenA. Besides this, it is very important the facilities are in order, because broken stuff in a stadium can lead to aggressive behavior. The organization is aware of this. An example was mentioned during the interview with the staff of the Crowd Services Department.

'We have to take care that the facilities are always in order. Supporters pay money for a game and it is not possible that they cannot sit because their seat is broken. This can cause irritation for the supporters.'

To prevent this and to ensure the safety of the supporters and also that of themselves, stewards always check their entire sector on broken or strange objects during the match preparation. During the observation it turned out that this is necessary.

'Upstairs a steward has found a metal tube. We have to remove this, as this can cause problems. Supporters can pick it up and if they can throw or hit someone with it. So you see it is good we do this inspection before each match.'

When the stewards find something that is not correct or is broken, they make a note to the facility management so they can fix it directly. When it does not directly affect the safety of the supporters or stewards, they mention it during the debriefing. In this debriefing, everything that went good and

wrong is written down on a debriefing form. The most important points of this debriefing will be discussed during the match preparation of the head stewards before the next match.

7.3 Control

There are different ways of controlling people. For the Amsterdam ArenA, the use of cameras is an important element when it comes to ensure safety. The stadium features indoor and outdoor 128 (digital) cameras. All recorded images are digitally stored and images are being watched live by employees of Ajax and the Amsterdam ArenA; they are supported by police officers.

The control room is the room where the camera images are viewed. This control room consists of two compartments. The first space is reserved for the stadium speaker and the radio room, the other space is available to the police and the security organization. In addition there is a separate area for emergency consultations. All images of the stadium can be displayed in this room, so that everybody is kept informed of the current situation in and around the stadium during any consultations.

During a match, approximately eight people are present in the control room. First there is the *safety coordinator of Ajax*. As the organizer of the match, Ajax is responsible for the match organizers. The safety coordinator of Ajax ensures the actual execution of the by Ajax formulated (and agreed by Amsterdam ArenA and other partners) policy. Next to him, the *event manager of the Amsterdam ArenA* is in the control room. He is responsible for integrated services, stadium facilities and safety in the stadium and the related emergency. The event managers control the security organization operational. This organization consists mainly of the steward and the security organization. If there are problems, consultation of the measures that must be taken takes place with the safety coordinator of Ajax and the police representative. Also the *commissioner of the police* is present in the room. In the position of general commander, the commissioner of police is ultimately responsible from the police organization. He has a radio connection with the police units outside and sometimes also inside the stadium. Between the safety coordinator Ajax, event manager Amsterdam ArenA and the general commander of the police, a continuous exchange of information takes place so that they can anticipate quickly and decisively to the expected conditions or the situation.

Next to these persons, the *coordinator of the GG / GD* ensures the control of the first aid posts and two ambulances. The *video operators* set the camera system so that the cameras give a clear picture of the circumstances. After an incident they rewind the, to the incident related, received images and put it on tape. They also make prints of suspicious persons or offenders of the house rules. They are working closely with a detective of the football investigation team when reading the images during the match. They have to anticipate directly on the reported incidents by zooming in with the cameras on relevant

locations. At matches also a *public prosecutor*, a *representative on behalf of the City of Amsterdam* and an *officer of the fire brigade* are present.

Because the organization wants to come across as an open and welcoming organization, they do not want to take any action like big fences in and around the stadium or much visible police. Yet they have to find a way to control the crowd and they think that the use of cameras is the best working manner.

'If you are talking about normalization and being a football club for everybody, aggressive behavior of supporters does not really work with you then! We hope to avoid this behavior as much as possible by the measures we take.'

The cameras are everywhere in the stadium and they are visible to anyone who enters the Amsterdam ArenA. The cameras can zoom in on every detail and they are manned continuously during the opening of the stadium. Supporters are aware that can being watched by the cameras. The organization believes that this ensures that supporters behave according to the rules. The supporters will think several times before they undergo a stupid action, because they know that they can always get caught with the evidence from the camera images.

Stewards see different sides of the cameras-surveillance. When asked, the stewards were all aware that there are cameras in the Amsterdam ArenA. However, there were varying responses regarding whether the presence of the cameras keep them busy. The first group of stewards is very aware of the presence of the cameras. They know that the cameras are there for their own safety. They think the cameras will have a positive impact when something happens to them. The persons behind the cameras in the command room will soon see that something is going on and they can send help immediately. They also feel safe because they know that the footage can be rewinded as soon as something has happened. This implies that although stewards may not be fully conscious of the cameras at all times, they have internalized the presence of the cameras. For some stewards, the use of cameras has also a downside.

'Yes, it is a little double-sided [the cameras]. They can keep an eye on me and how I perform my work, but at the same time it is nice that they can help me when I need them.'

This second group thinks the use of cameras is also regarded as a tool of discipline and control to prevent deviant or delinquent behavior among stewards. Once they enter the Amsterdam ArenA they can be monitored at any time and they do know that.

'During one of the training days we saw camera images of a steward who was smoking during his work. They showed this to us to let us see how clearly they can get people in picture. I

found it on the one hand very nice to know that they can recognize everyone exactly, but on the other hand I feel now that they are checking up on me all time.'

On the one hand, this group thinks it is a benefit the cameras are there because they know that this is necessary to ensure safety. On the other hand, they feel it as a kind of control from the organization. They have the idea that the command room keeps an eye on them constantly and that they are not trusted in their work. Because they have this feeling they are afraid to do something wrong. They feel they should consider when they do or do not certain things, and this limits them in carrying out the work properly. Because of the presence of the cameras, there are stewards who start showing displacement behavior. Although they do not know exactly where a camera is hanging, they know which places are and are not visible to the cameras.

'I know a place that cannot be checked by cameras. Sometimes my telephone goes off quite often and I would love to check it, maybe it is important... I'll then go stand at that place and quickly look at my phone.'

However, not every steward has in mind that they can be monitored by the cameras during work. The third group consists of stewards who know that they can be watched, but this does not play a role in the performance of their work. They do not continuously think about the cameras, and do also not think they provide more safety to the environment. The cameras have no impact on their feeling of safety.

The organization indicates that the cameras are not primarily used to monitor their employees. This supports the argument that cameras are used in the stadium to ensure compliance with the rules of the organization. But they make good use of it as strange behavior of a steward is accidentally noticed. The feeling of stewards that are being watched by the organization is therefore not completely out of the blue.

'Ultimately cameras are not to monitor employees but some behavior does ask our attention. We do not specifically check employees, but only the positions. If something is not right in a position then attention is paid to that position and the responsible steward will be held accountable.'

7.4 Confidence

Confidence seems an important issue in the feeling of safety of a steward. They work with their colleague stewards, but they are also dependent on the organization.

7.4.1 Organization

To keep the feeling of safety of stewards high, confidence in the organization is of major importance. This confidence can be created by organizing informal meetings. During these informal meetings work is a forbidden subject, mainly it is to get to know each other better and see each other in a different environment. The Amsterdam ArenA also organizes such informal events.

'Every year a steward football day is organized. Stewards of the Amsterdam ArenA may join this and you can form a team with your sector. I always find this a fun event, just as the staff parties!'

Besides these informal events to create confidence, it is important that stewards have the idea the organization has knowledge of the facts and that they are supported by the organization. The command room and the head steward belong to the part of the organization with which the stewards have the most contact. The interviews showed that the stewards generally have confidence in them. They have the idea that the Amsterdam ArenA knows what they are doing when it comes to ensuring safety. However, if a little incident is happening, the confidence of a steward in the organization will be harmed.

'The feeling that you are really supported in your decisions by the organization. Well... with the two threats, nothing happened. The threatening supporters were well monitored, but not deported. I asked them five times or something if they want to behave themselves... well, normally four times is too much. But the command room did nothing to support me.'

Once the above situation occurs more frequently, the sense of safety of the steward will decrease. In this situation, the steward does not feel understood by the organization. He or she performs the work as requested, and hopes to receive support from the organization. For some reason the call of the steward is not honored, but in the eyes of the steward, the only solution to counter the threats is an expansion of the supporter. The organization can have different reasons for not honoring the expansion of a supporter. For instance, the football match is almost finished or the security is busy with another expansion or incident. In spite of these reasons, it can be annoying to the steward who has direct contact with the supporter and gave him different warnings, when permission for the expansion is not given. That is why the command room has to communicate clearly why they make a particular decision, because otherwise the trust in the organization by the steward will decrease.

'I felt helpless when the command room did not allow for expansion. You stand there with your good behavior and an angry supporter, but nothing happens. I do not feel unsafe though, because I know that if anything happens, the cameras are focused on the supporter and me.'

Besides trusting the command room, it is also important to trust the head steward of the sector.

'Head stewards are free to make their own classification of staff. They are actually personnel manager and it is their job to know what is going on in the heads of the stewards. This is also a reason to work in sectors with a fixed group of stewards.'

It is important a steward feels at ease during working. Besides the immediate colleagues, the head steward also has a major influence in this feeling. Stewards want them to be taken seriously and feel that they can tell everything to the head steward. The openness of head stewards is very important, especially to keep private situations separated from work. When stewards had an unpleasant experience in their private life, it is not the intention that supporters notice this. The head steward wants to know what goes on in the head of a steward so he / she can arrange the best fitting function at that time. It is not the intention that the response to a supporter is affected by something in their private life. This may reduce the safety of the stewards, colleagues and supporters.

Working with fixed sectors is not only intended to create a good relationship of trust between the stewards, but also to create a bond between supporters and stewards. Most places in the Amsterdam ArenA are occupied by season ticket holders. This means that almost every match every supporter is on the same seat in the stadium. Because the stewards also work every match in the same sector, over time the stewards and supporters are going to recognize each other. Stewards can show their hospitality to greet them personally and to show that they recognize the supporters. Supporters feel themselves welcome and special, which results in better behavior.

'We work with fixed groups because we think knowing and be known is very important. Primarily, because of the hospitality, but also because it can be practical in some situations. Supporters are afraid to be recognized or they want to help a steward in trouble.'

Besides the fact that supporters are going to behave better when they are sued personally, working with stewards on fixed sectors also has another advantage. Supporters feel a bond with the steward and subconsciously social control occurs. Once a steward is in trouble his supporters will be inclined to help him/her. This shows that the steward can count on the help of the head steward or colleagues, but also of the help of supporters.

The sense of safety of stewards is not only created by the organization, colleagues and supporters, but also the media plays a role in it. Incidents that take place in the Amsterdam ArenA appear in the media as something very big. The media puts the Amsterdam ArenA sometimes down as unsafe, as they did after the incident when the supporter could run on the field or when the supporter fell from the stand.

'The media always wants to create spectacular news. They only show the negative things in the news because the fact that research has shown that almost everyone in the stadium feels safe is not interesting for them.'

Although the department Crowd Services is satisfied about how they properly deal with the messages that are placed in the media, the organization is experiencing the impact of the media as unpleasant. Once the media has reported an incident, the organization has to brief stewards on what exactly really happened. The stewards are often worried if an incident in the media appears, because it then immediately seems a big issue. Once created what was actually the case, stewards become more reassured and unsafe feelings reduce.

7.4.2 Colleagues

Besides of the confidence in the head steward and some other departments in the organization like the command room, it is important that there is a bond of trust between stewards. Because the stewards always work with the same colleagues they get to know each other well. At most sectors, this results in a kind of friendship between the stewards. Stewards experience it as pleasant to have a good relationship with colleagues because they have the idea they can trust each other. If there arises an irregularity, they know that a colleague will help when it is needed. An important requirement for this trust appears that they have the idea that their colleagues are good in the work they perform.

'Yeah, I do not know if I may say so, but it is not always safe. I do experience this. I mean we have colleagues who are not very careful. They are more concerned with the match than with the performance of their work or their colleagues.'

Each steward has had the same training and therefore the same knowledge. This does not mean that everyone is applying this knowledge in the right way. Some stewards are more football fan than others and they seem faster distracted by an exciting match. Also, personal characteristics are of impact on the implementation of the work. For example, one is more attentive than the other, or one will be more proactive than others. In addition, the relationship between colleagues is important, because once there is a good bond, a colleague will assist the steward earlier than when this bond is weaker. Because of this relationship, stewards will also keep an eye on each other. This is about how they do their work, but also whether they are in a safe situation. This social control gives the stewards a greater sense of

safety. Creating this bond starts with the selection of the stewards for the sector, and after that the head steward must be the one who takes care of all stewards feel comfortable in the group.

‘Collaboration between me and my colleagues is very good, but everyone has his preference to work with specific colleagues. Some people are just better than the rest, and I know who they are so I would rather cooperate with them. But it is not that I do not trust them or that I feel unsafe immediately.’

7.5 To conclude

As written in the text above, a lot of tensions occur when it comes to creating and implementing a safety policy. Firstly because the rules introduced by the organization ensure the feeling of safety, but at the same time they take care of awkward situations. For instance, some supporters expect a special treatment, while the rules cannot be followed then. It is difficult for stewards to decide if they will or will not accept this exception.

Also during controlling the area different tensions arise. One is that the organization wants to appear open and welcoming, but they also want to control the area inside the Amsterdam ArenA and the people walking around here. This controlling is done by the presence of head stewards, colleagues and working with fixed sectors, but also by means of cameras that are staffed in the command room. These cameras are hanging throughout the whole stadium and have different effects on the behavior of stewards. The first group is aware of the camera images and sees this as something positive for their own sense of safety. The other group is also aware of the cameras, but they see them as a form of control over their work. They think the cameras are used to ensure good performance of stewards. This can make them afraid to make mistakes or on the other hand displacement behavior occurs. This means that stewards look for places where they cannot be controlled by the cameras. Besides these two groups, there are also stewards who are not conscious of the cameras and their performance of work are not affected by the cameras.

Besides the use of cameras, the Amsterdam ArenA makes use of other different technical tools to enhance the safety. Still, it is good that stewards are not aware of all safety measures, because this can cause them to think that these precautions are necessary because they are working in an unsafe environment. These thoughts can also give them a feeling of unsafety.

Aside from all the technical tools, having confidence turned out as an important influencing factor on the feeling of safety of a steward. Once stewards have confidence in the organization, their sense of safety will also increase. This can be caused by a good relationship with the head steward, but also by experience support from the command room. The tension that occurs is the choice when the command

room agrees or does not agree with what the steward asks. If they do not go along with the steward, it is important to clearly communicate why the command room made this choice. If they do not communicate it well, the trust in the organization can reduce and the feeling of safety of a steward decrease. The head steward can create trust by making the stewards of ease. This is done by selecting the appropriate stewards, but also by taking an open attitude towards the stewards. They should get the idea that they can tell the head steward anything that is bothering them. The last group that is important for the sense of safety of a steward are the colleagues. By working with fixed sectors, they create a friendship and this creates a form of social control. Stewards keep an eye on each other and this makes them feel safe. They know that they will never be alone in certain situations.

ANALYSIS

During the research, various interesting findings about making and implementing safety policy in the Amsterdam ArenA arose. In this section these findings will be linked to the discussed theory.

8. Theory versus empiricism

In this chapter the main aspects of the empirical part are compared with the main aspects of the theoretical part. Paragraph one describes the influencing factors on the feeling of safety. The second paragraph is about making use of cameras and the chapter concludes with the different approaches of control, compliance and deterrence.

8.1 Influencing factors

As the results showed, the Amsterdam ArenA wants the stewards to feel at ease and give them a safe feeling. This feeling of safety of a person is caused by all sorts of personal experiences, perceptions and facts from the (immediate) environment, called determinants. To reduce the unsafe feeling of stewards, the Amsterdam ArenA has to start with optimizing these influencing factors. The organization therefore mainly emphasizes on subjective safety (Elffers & De Jong, 2004). Their concern is that stewards who feel safe in their work can perform their tasks well and wisely. They have to have the idea that nothing can happen to them and if still something happens, they must have confidence that the organization, colleagues as well as the supporters will support them. This is important, because having confidence in the organization ensures that the stewards feel safe (Boutellier, 2005).

8.1.1 Individual context

For creating a safe feeling, it is important to pay attention to the individual context of a steward, because the characteristics of a person are crucial in the sense of safety. Some people will react more fearful in a situation than others. Hence, during the selection of stewards the Amsterdam ArenA should consider who fits the best on which sector. For each sector, different qualities are needed, and if a person does not fit in this sector, he will have no confidence in themselves and the sense of safety will decrease.

After selection of the stewards, the Amsterdam ArenA and Ajax organizes training days to learn the stewards everything they have to know for creating a safe environment. But unless each steward has had the same training and therefore the same knowledge, it does not mean everyone is applying this the right way. Personal characteristics are of impact, but also the relation between stewards. The research shows that the feeling of safety of a steward can increase by a good relation between stewards

themselves. The organization helps to create this by the choices they make during the selection procedure, working in fixed sectors and the employment of a head steward.

Before they start with working in the Amsterdam ArenA, stewards know that they choose to work in an environment where the risk of violence is higher than when they choose another job. However stewards know they will be exposed more to threats than when they practice another job, stewards do not see this as a threat. The research shows that they often feel less vulnerable in situations that may be experienced as anxious by some. Because they assess their vulnerability not that high, their feelings of fear are less stronger (Killias, 1990). They do not react fearfully in certain situations, because they have learned how to avoid being a victim in future again by means of training days and/or previous experiences, so their dispositional fear (Gabriel & Greve, 2003) is low. This low dispositional fear is caused by the feeling of the stewards that they are well trained, know what to do and that they can rely on their direct colleagues in such a situation. Stewards that work in sectors where fewer incidents occurs, do feel more anxious. They do feel safe as long as nothing happens, but are afraid that they do not have enough knowledge or experience when there would happen something. The safety paradox (Boutellier, 2011) applies; stewards who have less to do with crime, do feel less secure while their environment is actually very safe.

8.1.2 Situational context

In addition to the individual context, the situational context is also important for understanding the sense of safety of stewards. Football matches are social phenomena that disrupt the normal social patterns (Boersma, 2013) and as soon as a football match takes place, people who want to break away from their everyday life appear in the area of the Amsterdam ArenA. People who normally would not come to the area will now enjoy their free time and go see a football match. This can entail unpredictable behavior. Because the environment of the Amsterdam ArenA is also a place that functions as a shopping, business and living area the combination of people, who continue their daily life and people who want to break away from everyday life in order to experience a kind of solidarity that is stronger than in normal situations, can cause danger. To reduce this danger in the environment of the Amsterdam ArenA, it may be important that there are enough civic amenities in the environment. In the area of the Amsterdam ArenA different shops and hospitality establishments are build, but the area is also well located in terms of public transport or highways. All these precautions in the environment are important, because the presence and quality of these facilities largely determine the satisfaction of supporters. This ensures that the design of the space is no reason for complaining or criminal behavior. This will result in a safer environment whereby a greater sense of safety will arise amongst persons in the area.

Also the facilities inside the stadium such as camera surveillance, numbered seats, fences and the presence of security, do provide a safer feeling for supporters and stewards. Besides the facilities, also the classifications of the boxes inside the stadium and the season cards are tools to reduce incidents. Because the Amsterdam ArenA had been thinking about what places to which supporters are intended, precautions can be adjusted to them. This makes it possible to meet the requirements of supporters, but also the safety standards. Another example is that many supporters know each other by the permanent stadium seats and season tickets. They recognize and know each other and that ensures them to not be afraid to approach one another on their behavior. Supporters feel a relation with each other and subconsciously social control occurs which can help stewards.

Because of the technical tools as well as the offered facilities, the stewards feel supported in their work and this increases the feeling of safety. Near the presence of these facilities, the broken window theory of Wilson and Kelling (1982) says it is very important the facilities are in order. Disturbance and degradation have a direct impact on crime. By seeing nuisance and degradation, potential offenders would get the idea that in the area is little social control and no interest to intervene, and they would be encouraged to criminal behavior. Examples are the long queues or broken chairs. This can irritate supporters and they will point their frustration to the persons working for the organization, in this case the stewards.

The research shows that all the offered facilities and measures in de Amsterdam ArenA can also create an unsafe feeling. Because of all these visible safety measures, stewards can get the idea that they are working in a very unsafe environment, while this is precisely not the case. For the Amsterdam ArenA it is an important contradiction to keep in mind. It seems that there is certainly not a one-to-one relationship between crime and safety perception, because even though the area is very safe because of the measures taken, the sense of safety is decreasing anyway. So for the Amsterdam ArenA a tension is created; they have to meet the safety standards, but they also have to keep in mind that stewards can react different to the taken measures. It is important to find a balance between the safety standards and the culture of fear which occurs amongst stewards (Binkhorst & Kingma, 2012).

8.1.3 Social-cultural context

As the research shows, the employees of the department Crowd Services said that they want the Amsterdam ArenA to be seen as the safest stadium in the Netherlands and become an example for other stadiums. They do this by providing facilities, working with a command center, surveillance cameras and with a by the organization professionalized steward organization. Also two employees are working in the Crowd Services department. They keep themselves fully engaged in the safety policy.

Although the Amsterdam ArenA is trying everything to create a safe environment, they cannot determine the sense of safety at all. One influential factor is the media. The media has a great influence on the sense of safety of stewards. Everybody can read in the newspaper if an incident occurred during a football match. Stewards can also read in the newspaper, for example, that it states that (former) stewards are afraid of the Ajax fans (Telegraph, 2014). It was just one steward who claimed this, but the media brought it like no one is safe anymore in the stadium. The media can transform a danger or vulnerability into a risk, while this does not have to be the case. Then it becomes the responsibility of an organization (Hillgartner, 1992) and the organization has to manage it. If they do not, it can affect their reputation and this can also influence the feeling of safety of the supporter and the stewards. If the Amsterdam ArenA is portrayed in the media as a dangerous stadium, stewards and supporters can get the feeling that they enter an unsafe environment. They may think that they have to deal with aggressive behavior, or whether something can happen to themselves once. Positive news which may improve the reputation of the organization is almost never brought into the media because the media does not see it as news. The Amsterdam ArenA must therefore refute the messages and that is why they perceived the media impact as annoying.

To reduce the influence of the media, it is important that the Amsterdam ArenA sees everything as a risk and made it into the responsibility of the organization. By leaving nothing to chance, the reputational damage will remain as low as possible, but sometimes they cannot do anything to refute the damage. It is all about perceptions and they may or may not be true, but they are social facts which generate actions and reactions (Power, 2009). People often only get to see the negative news and it is therefore important that the newspaper articles about the safety of the stadium are managed properly. It reflects a degree of managerial powerlessness in the face of reputation effects which can travel in accidental and contingent ways, and which can affect entire fields (Ibid.).

Nowadays, another social-cultural factor is that people feel less responsible for others. Individualization is the growing autonomy of the individual in relation to its immediate surroundings (Oppelaar & Wittebrood, 2006). The tension which arises is that stewards as well as supporters want to be protected, but they also want to be anonymous. They do not want to make contact with others, so it is difficult to create a relationship and that is why through this individualization, the sense of safety may be reduced. As that culture continues to exist, especially when people approach each other as an object and do not (dare to) appeal to each other, many existing and planned measures ultimately will have no effect.

A solution to keep this individualization as low as possible is working with fixed sectors. Because the same stewards work every match in the same sector, a relation arises between stewards within a sector. Taking the step to get to know each other is smaller because stewards see each other every match

again. Because of the fixed sectors, a relation between supporter and stewards can also occur. Stewards will recognize the supporters and supporters know they can be recognized and therefore caught if they break the rules. Despite anonymity will decrease, it allows for a certain degree of social control and so safety will increase.

Despite of working with fixed sectors can be positive because it creates a relation, it can also provide a tension for the Amsterdam ArenA. Because of the good relationship between persons, stewards can be distracted from their work faster. People know each other too well, want to chat with each other and this can cause distraction of the work. For the Amsterdam ArenA is it important to decide how far they want to go with creating a confidential environment, because it does not have only benefits. By working with fixed sectors, which results in social control, normalization occurs that ensures a safe feeling amongst the stewards.

A good relationship between stewards, organization and supporters are of great importance to increase the sense of safety of the steward. Also, the relation between a steward and the head steward is of great importance. The head steward is appointed as contact person for stewards. They are often seen by the stewards as 'one of them'. This causes a lot of trust in each other and that is why they dare to be open and honest. This openness and honesty is encouraged by the Amsterdam ArenA, because it is intended that private life and work remain separate. They want that the stewards are fully engaged and do not think about their private problems during work. If this is not, it may have an impact on the performance of the work. This may evoke aggressive reactions by the supporter and this does not benefit the safety.

8.2 Making use of cameras

One way the Amsterdam ArenA uses to exert control is by making use of cameras. These cameras can see many places in the stadium and both supporters and stewards are aware of this. Persons in the command room are not specifically focusing on the task performance of the stewards, but they keep an eye on places where most of the time stewards are located. The research shows that it is important for the organization to gain the confidence of the stewards, whereby the tension arises that the Amsterdam ArenA has to guarantee safety, but on the other hand the stewards should not have the idea of being controlled. The organization should make clear that the cameras are installed for guaranteeing safety and not for controlling the stewards. As stewards are always made aware of their attitude, they know that they are being monitored. This can result in unpredictable behavior or the feeling that the organization does not trust them.

Through the use of the cameras, the organization hopes to achieve the panopticon effect (Bentham, 1791). Stewards know that the cameras can keep an eye on them and if they exhibit remarkable

behavior it can be observed, but they do not know if there is someone on the other side of the cameras on that moment. According to the organization, the fact that stewards know they are being watched is enough to keep them under control. Nevertheless, the research shows that other effects arise through the use of cameras. Some stewards are aware of the camera images and see this as something positive for their own sense of safety. Other stewards are also aware of the cameras, but they see them as a form of control over their work. They think the cameras are used as a tool of discipline and control to prevent deviant behavior of stewards. They would act docile, but their docility would only be apparent, a mask that they carried as long as they thought they were being observed (Vaz & Bruno, 2003). The organization indicates the cameras are not primarily used to monitor their employees, the use of camera can make them afraid to make mistakes or on the other hand displacement behavior occurs (Taylor, 2011). This means that stewards look for places where they cannot be controlled by the cameras. These stewards would always check to see if there is a camera in the vicinity before engaging in any deviant behavior. This implies that although stewards may not be fully conscious of the cameras at all times, they have internalized their presence to the extent that they would remember to look for them (Taylor, 1999). Besides these two groups, there are also stewards who are not conscious of the cameras and their performance of work is not affected by the cameras. They do not think about the presence of the cameras and did also not think the cameras provide more safety to the environment. The cameras have no impact on their feeling of safety. This provides support for the argument presented by Graham (1998) that the use of cameras becomes normalized over time.

If an incident occurs in the stadium and a steward demands help, the command room can see if they can satisfy this demand. When they decide not to listen to the demand of the steward, it is important that the reason for this decision is clearly communicated to the steward. The research showed that in particular, trust is created by good communication. The steward is the one who is in the threatening situation. If the steward is not supported by the organization in this situation, confidence in the organization reduces. Confidence decreases rapidly by small incidents, while confidence in the organization ensures stewards feel safe (Boutellier, 2005).

8.3 Controlling by compliance and deterrence

Controlling with cameras is a form of consistency and scaring. This suits the term deterrence (Van Stokkom, 2004). In this research, deterrence is only spatial. Within the border of a stadium, acts being displaced from one area to another do not provide real reductions in deviant acts as they still occur in or around the stadium (Taylor, 1999). During training, camera images of a smoking steward were shown and it was told that he was fired. They made clear that everybody in the stadium can be monitored, including the stewards. This is a form of deterrence. Stewards that do not do their job properly or do not comply with the rules will be punished. For instance by hard measures such as firing the steward. Some stewards experience this as pleasant because they feel safer as they know

stewards who fail to properly execute their job can be addressed. The research shows that stewards feel safer when they know they are working with colleagues who properly perform their work, but too much deterrence also has its downside. It can scare stewards and this can result in unpredictable behavior. This is just what the Amsterdam ArenA wants to prevent, so for them the tension arises how much deterrent measures they want to use and which measures they want to communicate to the stewards.

In order to gain confidence in the organization, they can also use the method of compliance (Van Stokkom, 2004). An example of the method of compliance is giving stewards chance for promotion, for instance they can become an assistant or head steward. Informal meetings such as a steward football day or a staff party are also suitable for this method. Because the Amsterdam ArenA wants to be an open organization that should be accessible to everyone, it is also important that the physical appearance also cooperates with that vision. They make little use of police, the SWAT is not in sight and there are few large visible fences. These are tools to not scare supporters, but rather to make people feel welcome. The organizations stress the soft side of safety by creating a friendly atmosphere and a positive feeling of safety based on mutual trust (Binkhorst & Kingma, 2012). The open attitude from the stadium, but also from the trainers, shown during the training days, has a positive effect. They introduced themselves as one of them, hold informal discussions with the stewards and put them at ease. This is exactly the same vision which the organization expects from the stewards to radiate to their colleagues and the supporters. The Amsterdam ArenA will be seen in the first place as a safe organization and in addition to this vision, they want to radiate hospitality. It is a good way to build trust with employees and create a good relationship. With giving stewards a comfortable feeling in the organization, the stewards will strive to work hard and create a safer environment.

CONCLUSION

The research showed that creating a safety policy depends on many factors. In this section the conclusion will be illustrated. At the end of the conclusion some recommendation will be made.

9. Conclusion

The focus in this study was on what impact the safety policy had on the sense of safety of the stewards in the Amsterdam ArenA. That is why the following main question is applied:

'How do the employees of the Amsterdam ArenA, and in particular the stewards, make sense of possible tensions during the home matches of AFC Ajax and how does that affect their feeling of safety?'

Safety is a wide and difficult to define concept and so is the feeling of safety of stewards in the Amsterdam ArenA. Controlling the feeling of safety turns out to more than protection, risk management and control, it is caused by all sorts of personal experiences, perceptions and facts from the (immediate) environment.

The safety policy of the Amsterdam ArenA starts with the professionalism of the organization. The Amsterdam ArenA chooses to work with two employees on the department Crowd Services and in good cooperation with the stakeholders. The two employees are persons with knowledge of almost everything when it comes to stadium security. They also make the selection of suitable stewards. This selection is made in cooperation with the head stewards of the sectors. The difficulty in selecting the stewards is that every sector needs other requirements. So not every steward is suitable for every sector, it is important to fit the characteristics with the steward and turn the best fitting steward in the right sector, because otherwise he or she cannot perform the way the organization ask for.

Working with the same stewards in the same sectors creates different benefits. The research shows that trust is important for the feeling of safety of the stewards. Working with the same colleagues and head steward creates a good feeling under the stewards. They see the head stewards as 'one of them' and the stewards from their sector are seen as friends. This is important, because trust creates a feeling of safety, but on the other hand it can be disadvantageous. Once stewards build a good relationship with each other, they can be distracted from their work faster. This ensures that other stewards do not trust them during the work and thus get an unsafe feeling. The choice to be made is on the one side encourage creating a bond, but on the other hand not to overdo the friendship.

Trust in the command room is also very important for the feeling of safety of a steward. When an incident occurs and the steward asks the command room for help, but they do not agree, the steward can get the feeling that the organization is not supportive. This, while the steward has the feeling he or she is in a precarious position. The reason why the command room does not support the steward is not relevant at the moment, but it is important that the command room does understand that a steward has this uncomfortable feeling, so they should communicate the reason very well. After the event, the stewards usually understand why the choice was made. This is important so the confidence is not harmed.

As said before, the Amsterdam ArenA also organizes training days for future stewards. During these days they tell the stewards the main point of the safety in the stadium. Three keywords are important: service, safety and security. The organization wants the stewards to make the right choice between the uses of these proceedings. According to the organization, safety is the most important thing. Supporters as well as stewards need to feel safe because if a visitor does not feel safe, he is not coming back. But on the other hand, the organization also expects the stewards to be open and hospitable to the supporters and colleagues. Within the security sector, it is always a debate; at what point do you choose to use 'violence' and to not only resolve it with talking. In practice, sometimes it is difficult for stewards to make the choice what is more important on that moment. It can be difficult to be friendly and take care of the safety at the same time. They have to make a choice if they think the situation is threatening enough so they cannot be hospitable anymore, or if they remain being hospitable in the hope the situation will solve by taking this position. During an incident, these thoughts continuously play a role in the heads of the stewards.

This tension also plays a role when we talk about handling the rules. The rules are there with a reason and the stewards learned that they have to uphold themselves to these rules, but sometimes it is important to make an exception. Sometimes it is better to give a supporter a special treatment, because everything will play out quietly and it will not cause trouble at that moment. The tension which arises is that the stewards must make a choice what they do and do not allow. With the special treatment, the stewards show that the organization is there to keep the fans happy and it is a hospitable organization, but on the other hand it is not intended to do this too often.

Because of the training days, stewards know what is expected from them. These days provide more security, because everybody knows what their tasks are and how they have to act in certain situations. The research shows, however, that at the same time it can cause uncomfortable situations for the stewards.

Stewards are not trained in giving first aid, but supporters think they are. When a medical incident happens, most of the stewards cannot do anything else than report it to the head steward, who has to

report it to the command room. Stewards would feel more at ease if they can and may provide the first help by themselves until the first aid arrives. In some cases, they even would like to have the ability to broadcast a signal or to call someone so they do not have to walk away from the place the incident occurs and the medical assistance is present faster.

Another tension which arises is that all stewards follow the same training, but some stewards never have to implement the trained situations in real work life. They are hardly in contact incidents, and that is why they do feel more anxious. They do feel safe as long as nothing happens, but are afraid that they do not have enough knowledge or experience when there would happen something. There is talk of a paradox, because you with think that stewards who often have to deal with incidents feel more insecure. The research shows that it is just the other way around, stewards who have less to do with crime, do feel less secure.

Besides this, the organization makes use of the best possible facilities. The technical tools are experienced as very pleasant by the stewards. Because of these tools, the stewards feel supported in their work and this gives them a feeling of safety. But the downside of all these safety measures is that too much visible safety measures can scare the stewards. They can get the idea that they are working in a very unsafe environment, so their sense of safety will decrease. Aside from this, it is very important the facilities are in order, because broken stuff in a stadium can lead to aggressive behavior. That is why they choose to let the stewards control their section before each match. The tension which arises is what security measures you need to take as an organization and mainly, which one do you communicate with the stewards. Sometimes it is better not to show the use of certain facilities. The example of checking stewards with the cameras stated that communicating this doesn't always turn out positive.

The use of the cameras is immediately the next subject which causes a tension. The organization indicates that the cameras are not primarily used to monitor their employees, but not every steward does experience it this way. It is important to use the cameras to ensure safety in the Amsterdam ArenA, but it is important for an organization to think carefully how to deal with the camera images, because not every steward does experience the cameras only as a tool to ensure the safety.

When asked, the stewards were all aware that there are cameras in the Amsterdam ArenA. However, there were varying responses regarding whether the presence of the cameras keeps them busy. Although most studies show that security cameras does not contribute to increasing the feeling of safety, this research shows that most stewards will feel safer because the cameras are present in the stadium. Most stewards do believe camera-surveillance has a deterring effect upon perpetrators of crime and deviance within the stadium, but not all stewards do think this way.

The first group of stewards is very aware of the presence of the cameras. They think the cameras will have a positive impact when something happens to them. This implies that although stewards may not be fully conscious of the cameras at all times, they have internalized the presence of the cameras. For some stewards, the use of cameras also has a downside. They think on the one hand that it is a benefit the cameras are there because they know that this is necessary to ensure safety. On the other hand, they feel it as a kind of control from the organization. Because of this, they feel they should consider when they do or do not do certain things, and this limits them in carrying out the work properly. The research also showed that it causes displacement behavior. The third group consists of stewards who know that they can be watched, but the cameras have no impact on their feeling of safety.

This research gives a good overview of the tensions that arise when creating and especially the implementing the safety policy. Because now it is clear what impact these tensions have on the feeling of safety of the stewards, it can help the organization to optimize the safety policy of the Amsterdam ArenA.

9.1 Recommendations

The results of the research and the analysis show that the safety of the stadium Amsterdam ArenA is professionally addressed. Following this research, there are a number of recommendations that can ensure that the sense of safety of stewards can be even more optimized. These recommendations are drawn from the described results.

- *First Aid course.* The training days for new stewards are experienced as very informative. After the training days, stewards have enough knowledge to deal with situations during their work. However, it is advisable to also teach the basic principles of first aid during the training days. While an accident happens, stewards that can perform a basic form of first aid will feel more comfortable.

- *Refreshment course.* Despite the stewards being properly trained, after a while some stewards have the idea that their knowledge is no longer up-to-date. It would be pleasant for some stewards if they get offered a refresher course. Because some stewards do not often experience incidents, the extra trainings will give them the feeling that they can better intervene when an incident occurs. When they have more confidence about their knowledge how to handle in certain situations, they will feel safer.

- *Alerting.* Some stewards indicate that they would appreciate it when they own a particular tool so they can sound the alarm. Sometimes they end up in oppressive situations, for example because of a threat or incident. The tool will involve a sort of alarm button that may only be used in extreme situations, for example if a supporter has a heart attack or as a steward is being physically abused.

- *Communication.* The security organization of the Amsterdam ArenA works with many different layers. The steward is on the bottom layer, and sometimes it takes a very long time before it is clear why a particular decision is made. Also, it may take a very long time before someone intervenes during certain situations. It is important that the Amsterdam ArenA remembers that indistinctness may occur in communication because of the many layers that it has to endure. Once stewards have the idea that the organization does not understand them or they do not understand a decision made by the organization, confidence in the organization can reduce and this results in decreasing of the feeling of safety.

- *Relationships.* Confidence among stewards is important, therefore they feel better protected and it enhances the feeling of safety. However, there is a difference between a trusty and a friendly relationship. This friendly relationship can ensure that stewards are too busy with each other and have too little attention to their work. This results in a less safe feeling of colleagues who are not involved in this friendship. It must therefore be ensured that the friendship between stewards is not too strong.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, R. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social forces*, 64(1), 151-167.
- Armitage, R., Smyth, G. and Pease Burnley, K. (1999). CCTV Evaluation. In: *Surveillance of Public Space: CCTV, Street Lighting and Crime Prevention*. K. Painter and N. Tilley, eds, Monsey New York: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 225–249.
- AZ (2011). *AZ in de media (Ajax – AZ, KNVB beker)*. Retrieved on May 24, 2014 from [http://www.az.nl/nieuws/az-in-de-media-\(ajax-az,-knvb-beker\)1/1](http://www.az.nl/nieuws/az-in-de-media-(ajax-az,-knvb-beker)1/1)
- Bauwens, T., Enhus, E., Ponsaers, P., Reynaert, H., & Assche, J. van. (2011). *Integraal veiligheidsbeleid tussen pragmatisme en idealisme: Het complexe samenspel van lokale en bovenlokale bestuurlijke actoren*. Brussel: VUBPRESS.
- Binkhorst, J., and Kingma, S.F. (2012). Safety vs. reputation: risk controversies in emerging policy networks regarding school safety in the Netherlands. In: *Journal of Risk Research*, 15:8, 913-935.
- Bentham, J. (1791). *Panopticon, or the inspection house*. Idea of the inspection principle. Retrieved on May 20, 2014 from <http://books.google.nl/books?hl=nl&lr=&id=NM4TAAAAQAAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=bentham+panopticon+1791&ots=Y0hLvUPK4y&sig=c5qK6PiGRlIXcj17yDHeDyvYwo#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Bergsma, M. (2003). *Betrouwbaarheid en validiteit van kwalitatief georiënteerde operational audits*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit.
- Bernstein, Peter (1996). *Against the gods: The remarkable story of risk*. London: Wiley.
- Boeije, H.R. (2010). *Analysis in qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Boers, J (2008). *Veiligheid en Burgerschap. Angst en vertrouwen. Het effect van positieve en negatieve factoren op veiligheidsbeleving*. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Boersma, F.K. (2013). *Liminal Surveillance*. An ethnographic control room study during a local event, *Surveillance and Society*, 11(1/2): 106-120.

- Boutellier, H. (2005). *Leven in de risicosamenleving*. Amsterdam: Japes.
- Boutellier, J.C.J. (2006). 'Een nieuwe ordening: Een verkenning van de relatie tussen veiligheid, recht en vertrouwen', *Recht der werkelijkheid*. 26 (3), 29-45.
- Boutellier, J.C.J. (2011). *De improvisatiemaatschappij; over de sociale ordening van een onbegrensde wereld*. Den Haag: Boom/Lemma.
- Bruinsma, G.J.N. & Bernasco, W. (2004). *De stad en sociale onveiligheid. Een state of the art van wetenschappelijke kennis in Nederland*. Leiden. NSCR.
- CCV (2010). *Integraal veiligheidsbeleid 2012-2013. 'Veiligheid, onze zorg, uw zorg'*. Retrieved on April 16, 2014 from http://www.hetccv.nl/binaries/content/assets/ccv/dossiers/veiligheidsplan/schinnen_nota_integrale_veiligheid2010-2013.pdf
- CIV Voetbal (2013). *Jaaroverzicht 2012-2013*. Retrieved on January 21, 2014 from http://www.civ-voetbal.com/sites/default/files/CIV%20Jaaroverzicht%202012-2013_0.pdf
- Deephouse, D. (2002). 'The term "reputation management": Users, uses and the trademark. Corporate Reputation. Review 5/1: 9-18.
- Diprose, R. (2007). *Safety and Security: A Proposal for Internationally Comparable Indicators of Violence*. Retrieved on April 21, 2014 from <http://www.ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/OPHI-wp01.pdf>
- Encyclo.nl (2014). *Nederlandse encyclopedie*. Retrieved on May 12, 2014 from <http://www.encyclo.nl/begrip/sociale%20veiligheid>
- Elffers, H. and de Jong, W. (2004). "Nee, ik voel me nooit onveilig". *Determinanten van sociale onveiligheidsgevoelens*. Leiden. NSCR.
- Ferwerda, H. & O. Adang (2005) *Hooligans in Beeld: Van informatie naar aanpak*. Zeist: Kerkebosch.
- Fombrun, C., and van Riel, C. (2003). *Fame and fortune: How successful companies build winning reputations*. London: Prentice Hall/Financial Times

- Gabriel U. and Greve W. (2003). 'The Psychology of Fear: Conceptual and Methodological Perspectives'. In: *British Journal of Criminology*, (43) 3, p. 600-614.
- Garland, D (2001). *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Gherardi, S., Nicolini, D., Odella, F. (1998). Toward a social understanding of how people learn in organizations. The notion of situated curriculum. *Management Learning*. September 1998; vol. 29, 3: pp. 273-297.
- Grabosky, P.N. (1995) "Fear of Crime, and Fear Reduction Strategies," In: *Criminal Justice*, 7(1):7-19.
- Graham, S (1998). Towards the fifth utility? On the extension and normalisation of public CCTV. In: *Surveillance, Closed Circuit Television and Social Control*, C. Norris, J. Moran and G. Armstrong, eds, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough?: An experiment with data saturation and variability. In: *Field Methods*, 18 (1). 59-82.
- Hale, C. (1996). 'Fear of Crime: A Review of the Literature'. In: *International Review of Victimology* (4) 2, p. 79-150.
- Hartnagel, T. F. (1979). *Changing social roles and female crime in Canada: A time series analysis*. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 16, 96–104.
- Heerink (2014). *Leven in een panopticum*. Retrieved on May 12, 2014 from <http://mens-en-samenleving.infonu.nl/filosofie/124997-leven-in-een-panopticum.html>
- Helbing, D., Johansson, A., & Al-Abideen, H.Z. (2007). Dynamics of crowd disasters: An empirical study. *Physical Review*, 1, 1-7.
- Helbing, D., Johansson, A. Zein Al-Abideen, H. (2007). Dynamics of crowd disasters: An empirical study. In: *the American Institute of Physics for the American Physical Society*, Vol. 18, nr. 1 (1978) - vol. 56, nr. 24 (1997).

- Hilgartner, Stephen (1992). 'The social construction of risk objects: Or, how to pry open networks of risk' in *Organizations, uncertainties and risk*. J. F. Short and L. Clarke (eds), 39–53. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Jennings, W. (2009). Governing mega-events: Tools of security risk management for the London 2012 Olympic games and FIFA 2006 world cup in Germany. In: *London school of economics and political science*, 1-19.
- Killias, M. (1990). 'Vulnerability: Towards a Better Understanding of a Key Variable in the Genesis of Fear of Crime'. In: *Violence and Victims*, (5) 2, p. 97-108.
- King, G., Keohane, R., Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Livingstone, S., Allen, J., and Reiner, R. (2001) The audience for crime media 1946-91: A historical approach to reception studies. In: *Communication Review*, 4(2): 165-192
- Leopky, B., & Parent, M.M. (2009). Risk management issues in large-scale sporting events: A stakeholder perspective. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 9 (2), 187-208.
- Maas-de Waal, C. and K. Wittebrood (2002). 'Sociale cohesie, fysieke buurtkenmerken en onveiligheid in grote(re) steden'. Zekere banden: sociale cohesie, leefbaarheid en veiligheid (p. 279-315). Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain*. California: Sage.
- Miles, M.B. (1979). Qualitative data as an attractive nuisance: The problem of analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24 (4). 590-601.
- Ministry of Security and Justice (2011). *Kader voor beleid voetbal en veiligheid*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Veiligheid en Justitie.
- Moore, M. & Trojanowicz, C. (1988). *Policing and the fear of crime*. Perspectives on policing. National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

- Morenoff, J.D., R.J. Sampson en S.W. Raudenbush (2001). 'Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence'. In: *Criminology*, (39) 3, p. 517-560
- MVO Nederland (2012). *Duurzaamheidsverslag 2011/2011 Amsterdam Arena. Vanzelfsprekend duurzaam*. Retrieved on March 22, 2014 retrieved from http://www.mvonderland.nl/sites/default/files/duurzaam_jaarverslag_2011-2012.pdf
- NEN (2014). *Wat is normalisatie?* Retrieved on May 24, 2014 from: <http://www.nen.nl/Normontwikkeling/Wat-is-normalisatie.htm>
- Nu.nl (2014). *Politie werkt samen bij Feyenoord aanhang in Arena*. Retrieved on January 21, 2014 from <http://www.nu.nl/binnenland/3680129/politie-werkt-samen-bij-weren-feyenoord-aanhang-arena.html>
- Norris, C. and Armstrong, G. (1999). *The Maximum Surveillance Society; The Rise of CCTV*. Oxford: Berg.
- NOS (2011). *Ajax-AZ gestaakt na bizar incident*. Retrieved on January 19, 2014 from <http://nos.nl/artikel/324405-ajaxaz-gestaakt-na-bizar-incident.html>
- Oppelaar, J. and K. Wittebrood (2006). *Angstige burgers. De determinanten van gevoelens van onveiligheid onderzocht*. Den Haag, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2012). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London: Sage.
- Parool (2013). *Supporter zwaargewond na val van tribune in Arena*. Retrieved on April 21, 2014 from <http://www.parool.nl/parool/nl/3924/CHAMPIONS-LEAGUE/article/detail/3551846/2013/11/27/Supporter-zwaargewond-na-val-van-tribune-in-Arena.dhtml>
- Peterson, R.D., L.J. Krivo en M.A. Harris (2000). 'Disadvantage and Neighbourhood Violent Crime: Do Local Institutions Matter?'. In: *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, (37) 1, p. 31-63.
- Power, M., Scheytt, K. Soin, and K. Sahlin (2009). Reputational risk as a logic of organizing in late modernity. *Organisation Studies*, 30, 2&3: 301-324.

- Prinsen, M. (2011). *Repressie of preventie. Wat werkt wel en wat niet?* Retrieved on May 18, 2014 from http://www.divosa.nl/system/files/SPR1104_handhaving.pdf
- Randstad (2013). Gastvrouw/-heer (steward). Retrieved on March 17, 2014 from www.randstad.nl/vacatures/1168950
- RMO (1998). *Verantwoordelijkheid en perspectief: geweld in relatie tot waarden en normen*. Den Haag: Raad voor Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling.
- Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research*. Padstow: TJ International Ltd.
- Sampson, R.J. and S.W. Raudenbush (1999). 'Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods'. In: *American Journal of Sociology* (105) 3, p. 603-651.
- Sarno, C., Hough, M., and Bulos, M. *Developing a Picture of CCTV in Southwark Town Centres: Final Report*. Crime Policy Research Unit. South Bank University.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students: Fifth edition*. Edingburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Schinkel, W. (2009). De nieuwe preventie. Actuariële arheadsystemen en de nieuwe technologie van de veiligheid. In: *Krisis. Tijdschrift voor actuele filosofie*, 2009, p. 10.
- Spaaij, R. (2008). *Hooligans, fans en fanatisme. Een internationale vergelijking van club- en supportersculturen*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press
- Stol, W., Rijpema J., Tielenburg, C., Melching, G. and Roest, M. (2006). *Basisboek integrale veiligheid*. Boom Lemma uitgevers.
- Stol, W., (2008). Veiligheid en cyberspace. In: *W.Ph. Stol, J.A. Rijpma, C. Tielenburg, H. Veenhuysen & T. Abbas (red.), Basisboek Integrale Veiligheid* (pp. 35-46). Bussum: Coutinho,.
- Strauss, A., Corbin, J.M. (2007). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. London: Sage publications.

- Taylor, E. (2011). *Awareness, understanding and experiences of CCTV amongst teachers and pupils in three UK schools*. IOS Press. Retrieved on May 24, from <http://iospress.metapress.com/content/c3x4630112r47n0u/fulltext.pdf>
- Telegraaf (2013). *ArenA onderzoekt veiligheid*. Retrieved on April 21, 2014 from http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/22092457/_Onderzoek_ArenA_.html
- Telegraaf (2014). *Stewards sidderen voor Ajax-fans*. Retrieved on April 24, 2014 from http://www.telegraaf.nl/reportage/22539193/___Stewards_bang_voor_fans___.html
- Tonnaer, C., & Duyvis, M.G. (2008). *Verkenning beleidseffectanalyse fysieke veiligheid*. Arnhem: Nibra.
- 't Hart, H., Boeije, H. & Hox, J. (2009). *Onderzoeksmethoden*. Den Haag: Boom-Lemma
- Vaz, P., and Bruno, F. (2003). Types of Self-Surveillance: from abnormality to individuals 'at risk'. *Surveillance and Society* 1 (3). Retrieved on May 25, from <http://www.pos.eco.ufrj.br/docentes/publicacoes/pvaz10.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T., Flight S. and Oppenhuis E. (2000). *Voor het beleid, achter de cijfers: de uitkomsten van de gsb-monitor veiligheid en leefbaarheid nader geanalyseerd*. Hilversum: Intomart.
- Van Steden, R. (2007). *Privatizing Policing: describing and explaining the growth of private security*. Den Haag: Boom Juridische Uitgevers
- Van Steden, R. (2008). Samenleving en veiligheid. In: *Handboek lokaal sociaal beleid Amsterdam* (pp. 1-26). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Van Stokkom, B., (2004). *Handhaven: eerst kiezen, dan doen. Sociaal-wetenschappelijke mogelijkheden en beperkingen*. Den Haag: Expertisecentrum Rechtshandhaving, ministerie van Justitie
- Volkkrant (2006). *Het staafincident, een zwarte dag voor Ajax*. Retrieved on January 27, 2014 from <http://www.volkkrant.nl/vk/nl/2698/Sport/article/detail/788212/2006/11/02/Het-staafincident-een-zwarte-dag-voor-Ajax.dhtml>

Volkskrant (2011). *Ajax - AZ gestaakt na aanval van dronken supporter op Esteban*. Retrieved on April 21, 2014 from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2844/Arhead/arhead/article/detail/3089016/2011/12/22/Ajax---AZ-gestaakt-na-aanval-van-dronken-supporter-op-Esteban.dhtml>

Volkskrant (2014). *Hoe intimidatie en geweld de Ajax-familie beheersen*. Retrieved on May 4, 2014 from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/10788/Eredivisie/article/detail/3645890/2014/05/01/krant.volkskrant.nl>

Volkskrant, de (2014). *Harde kern houdt al jaren cultuur van angst rond de club in stand. Politie weet van bedreigingen Ajax*. Retrieved on May 4, 2014 from <http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/10788/Eredivisie/article/detail/3645890/2014/05/01/Harde-kern-Ajax-houdt-cultuur-van-angst-rond-club-in-stand.dhtml>

Walklate, S. (1997). Risk and criminal victimization – A modernist dilemma? In: *British Journal of Criminology*, 1997, Vol.37(1), pp.35-45. Retrieved on May 4, 2014 from: <http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Page?page=35&handle=hein.journals%2Fbjcrim37&collection=journals#43>

Wilcox Rountree, P., N. Quisenberry en S. Jones (2003). 'The Built Environment and Community Crime Risk Interpretation'. In: *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, (40) 3, p. 322-345.

Wilson, J.Q. and G. Kelling, G.L. (1982). 'Broken Windows'. In: *The Atlantic Monthly*, (249) 3, p. 29-38.

Zedner, L. (2003). *Too much security?* International Journal of the Sociology of Law. Vol.31(3), pp.155-184. Retrieved on April 26, 2014 from http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0194659503000388/1-s2.0-S0194659503000388-main.pdf?_tid=3c0cf156-db4f-11e3-ac06-00000aab0f02&acdnat=1400062090_06c3c2d233189cd7e14c8c2f0d5a69e0

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment I. Topics list stewards

Motives

- Hoe en waarom ben je terecht gekomen in deze functie?
- Hoelang voer je dit beroep al uit?
- Welke karaktereigenschappen zijn volgens jou belangrijk voor een steward?
- Wat vind je leuk (en minder leuk) aan je werk?
- Hoe heb je de eerste werkdagen ervaren (angstig/leuk, moeilijk/makkelijk)?

Duties & responsibilities

- Welke taken vervul je precies?
- Hoe verloopt de voorbereiding voor een thuiswedstrijd in de ArenA?
- Wanneer heb jij voor jouw gevoel je werk perfect gedaan?
- Hoe haal je voldoening uit je werk?
- Heb je het gevoel dat je goed bent in je werk?

Organization

- Heb je het gevoel dat je nog veel kunt leren in de organisatie?
- Heb je het idee dat jouw capaciteiten maximaal benut worden in de organisatie?
- Als je mag kiezen, welke functie binnen Ajax/ArenA zou je dan willen hebben?

Experiences

- Wat houdt je functie precies in / wat zijn jouw werkzaamheden?
- Heb je weleens een (groot) incident meegemaakt?
- Welke gebeurtenissen binnen jouw werk zijn jou het meest bijgebleven? (leuke en minder leuke ervaringen)
- Wat doe je tijdens...? Situatieschets (Vuurwerk, uitschelden, fysiek geweld, supporters die ruzie maken, mensen die geholpen moeten worden)

Environment

- Als je op het terrein van de ArenA gelopen komt of de ArenA betreedt, wat voor gevoel krijg je dan?
- Heb je het idee dat supporters snappen waarom jij in het stadion aanwezig bent? (luisteren ze naar je, negeren ze je?)
- Hoe is de omgang met je collega's?
- Hoe ervaar jij de club Ajax? (open/gesloten, formeel/informeel, sportief/onsportief)

General information

- Waar kom je vandaan?
- Met welke activiteiten houd je jezelf bezig in het dagelijks leven?
- Wat voor soort opleiding volg je/ heb je gevolgd?

Attachment II. Topics list employees Crowd Services

Selection & motives

- Wie is er betrokken bij de selectie van stewards?
- Wat zijn voor jullie belangrijke karaktereigenschappen voor een steward?
- Waarop wordt een beslissing gebaseerd of iemand wel of niet wordt aangenomen?
- Waarom denk jij dat mensen voor het vak 'steward' kiezen?
- Wat zijn de voor-/nadelen van het werken met Triple A ipv. een externe partij?

Duties & responsibilities

- Zijn er goede doorgroeimogelijkheden voor stewards?
- Wanneer doet een steward het werk perfect?
- Wat is belangrijker, het waarborgen van fysieke of van sociale veiligheid?
- Wat voor invloed hebben de stewards op het imago van de ArenA?

Experiences

- Welk incident heeft de afgelopen jaren de meeste impact gehad en waarom?
- Waar haal jij jouw energie uit tijdens je werk?
- Wat was jouw meest/minst leuke ervaring tijdens je werk?

Security

- Welke voorbereidingen worden getroffen voor de veiligheid bij thuiswedstrijden in de ArenA?
- Hoe worden de stewards voorbereid op het voorkomen van incidenten?
- Hoe zou je veiligheid in de Amsterdam ArenA omschrijven, wat is belangrijk?
- Wat merk je van de voetbalwet?
- Wat vind je van de regels die vanuit de KNVB worden opgelegd voor het opleiden van stewards?

General information

- Waar kom je vandaan?
- Met welke activiteiten houd je jezelf bezig in het dagelijks leven?
- Wat voor soort opleiding volg je/ heb je gevolgd?

Attachment III. Codebook

- Social control Theory: Oppelaar & Wittebrood (2006) Social-cultural context.

Supporters

* *Dealing and/or bond with supporters*. Deserve respect. A good relationship makes them better listen to you (steward) and they will help you if you need help. When something happens, they will understand why a steward is in de stadium.

Colleagues

* *Trust in colleagues / colleagues rely on you*. When you can rely on colleagues, you dare more because you know someone keeps an eye on you. The same is true, colleagues have to have confidence in you. Renewal of colleagues is not good for the confidence.

Organization. Theory: Bouttellier (2005) confidence in organization is important.

* *Gain confidence from the organization*. Once you realize the organization agrees with your acting, you will be more confident in what you do or want to do. The organization in this case is not always seen as reliable.

- Effect on acting. Theory: subjective safety. What can a person do to feel themselves safe?

Supporters

* *Dependent on the person*. If someone is behaving annoying, stewards will behave annoying too.

Own acting. Theory: Oppelaar & Wittebrood (2006) individual context.

* *Emotions*

Experiences in private live. If you have experienced something fun, you'll also have more fun at work and supporters will recognize this. If you have experienced something less pleasant, you will be more irritable.

Find ways to spell out not to be noticed after work. After work, you make sure that all the features of being a steward aren't visible. If you have been threatened in the stadium, they therefore no longer recognize you. This can give you a safer feeling when you say something to a supporter during your work.

Don't take it personal. Don't think the supporters are yelling at you as a person, but most of the time they don't agree with the rules of the organization.

Being a women

* As a woman, you can get more done. Men find it difficult to respond aggressively to a woman.

Colleagues

* *Feeling of safety at work*. Not every colleague is good in the job so they do not always feel safe.

Organization. Theory: Oppelaar & Wittebrood (2006) situational context.

* *Tensions*. Rules from ArenA. The rules/protocols provide restrictions, but they also take care for the assurance of safety.

* *Tasks*. You have different tasks as a steward. So you host, but at the same time you should also ensure safety. Sometimes, it is difficult to find in here the right way.

- Satisfaction in work

Getting responsibilities. *Some stewards like it to get more responsibility, others don't.*

Collaboration and interaction with colleagues. *Colleagues are very important to make the work fun. Stewards are not always looking forward to the job, but rather to seeing their colleagues.*

The work atmosphere is important to get satisfaction in the work.

Good communication, problems are solved flawlessly. *She takes her energy from solving problems and make people happy.*

Attachment V. Floor plan Amsterdam Arena

