Predictors of Bullying Perpetration and Bullying Victimization among Semi-Professional Team Sport Players in North Cyprus

Denitsa Hristoforova Maydon

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
General Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2020
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in General Psychology.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in General Psychology.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Dilek Çelik Co-Supervisor	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar	
2. Asst. Prof. Dr. İlknur Hacısoftaoğlu Közleme	
3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Burcu Kaya Kızılöz	

ABSTRACT

This study explores the influence of contextual and individual predictors on bullying perpetration/ victimization among semi-professional team sports players in North Cyprus. Three variables reflect on personal determinants (e.g., gender, nationality, and personality traits), and another two, representing external contextual factors (e.g., negative coaching behaviour and the psychological climate of the team), which according to existing literature could predict the frequency of bullying dynamics in sports. A total of 193 sports players with an average age of 24.74 (SD = 5.15) were recruited via an online survey method to take part in the experiment. Sixteen teams (seven women's teams and nine men's teams) from four different team sports disciplines: handball, football, volleyball, and basketball filled out the questionnaires. The result revealed that the rate of bullying perpetration and victimization among men/women is equal in sports. Besides, it was also ascertained that gender, nationality, and the coach's negative pedagogy significantly predict bullying dynamics among athletes. Such findings shape the base for further ongoing works, which could underline the critical demand for more emphasis and analysis of nationality, gender, and coach's negative rapport on bullying perpetration/victimization later on.

Keywords: bullying perpetration, bullying victimization, sports, gender, nationality, coach's negative pedagogy

ÖZ

Bu tez çalışması, Kuzey Kıbrıs'taki yarı profesyonel takım sporları oyuncularıarasındaki zorbalık suçu / zorbalık mağduriyeti üzerindeki bağlamsal ve bireysel yordayıcı etkisini araştırmaktadır. Üç değişken kişisel belirleyicileri yansıtmaktadır (örneğin cinsiyet, milliyet ve kişilik özellikleri) ve diğer ikisi mevcut literatüre göre spordaki zorbalık dinamiklerinin sıklığını tahmin edebilen dış bağlamsal faktörleri (örneğin, olumsuz koçluk davranışı ve takımın psikolojik durumu) temsil etmektedir. Yaş ortalaması 24.74 (SD = 5.15) olan toplam 193 sporcu, çevrimiçi anket yöntemiyle çalışmaya katılmak üzere araştırmaya alınmıştır. Dört farklı takım spor dalından, hentbol, futbol, voleybol ve basketbol olmak üzere, on altı takım (yedi kadın takımı ve dokuz erkek takımı) anketleri doldurmuştur. Araştırma sonucu sporda erkekler / kadınlar arasındaki zorbalık ve mağduriyet oranlarının eşit olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca cinsiyet, milliyet ve antrenörün olumsuz pedagojisinin sporcular arasındaki zorbalık dinamiklerini anlamlı şekilde yordadığı da belirlenmiştir. Bu tür bulgular, milliyet, cinsiyet ve koçun zorbalık suçu / zorbalık mağduriyeti ile ilgili olumsuz ilişkisinin daha fazla vurgulanması ve analizi için kritik talebin altını çizebilecek devam eden çalışmaların temelini şekillendirmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: zorbalık suçu, zorbalık mağduriyeti, spor, cinsiyet, milliyet, koçun olumsuz pedagojisi

DEDICATION

In memory of Vasil and Hristofor

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

TABLES OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Several studies have indicated that bullying perpetration or victimizationepisodes have been taking place daily/monthly in areas outside the school premises (Collot d'Escury, & Dudink, 2010; Baar, 2012, Evans, Adler, Macdonald, & Côté, 2016; Vveinhardt, Komskiene, Romero, 2017, Vveinhardt, Fominiene, Andriukaitiene, 2019). Statistics suggest that about one-third of the bullying perpetration/victimization incidents may take place outside of the academic settings, for instance, in sports (Volk & Lagzdins, 2009). Such problematic issues and the interaction between athletes have been greatly stressed throughout recent years (Stirling, Bridges, Cruz, Mountjoy, 2011; Evans et al., 2016; Kerr, Jewett, MacPherson, Stirling, 2016; Vveinhardt et al., 2019). Besides, there is still a shortage of works in the field of sports (Baar, 2012; Kerr et al., 2016). This study has, therefore explored particular predictors that could forecast such hostile attitudes in the context of sport. For that purpose, the introduction below adopted a specific framework in order to emphasize all significant factors in detail. The definition of bullying perpetration and bullying victimization was first discussed. Then five theories associated with perpetration/victimization in the sense of school and sports were reviewed. Besides, several contextual and individual predictors that might increase the likelihood of bullying perpetration/ victimization was discussed in separate paragraphs. The study's goals and all nine hypotheses were deliberated at the end of that introduction.

1.1 Definition of Bullying Perpetration and Bullying Victimization

Bullying has been characterized by repeated aggressive acts in which anindividual in power (i.e. a bully) intentionally uses control and hostile behaviour over another person from vulnerable populations (i.e. victim) (Olweus, 1991; Olweus, 1993). In particular, bullying can be defined as well as a relational problem that could be observed in any situation in which inequality of strength and verbal/social aggressiveness are used to provoke distress in one individual (Craig & Pepler, 2003). Furthermore, it is also essential to be characterized that the term bullying victimization could refer to the frequency of how much someone was being bullied or exposed to violence (Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011). In terms of determining that one individual is being bullied or victimized, three components should be present: repetition, intention to harm, and power imbalance (Olweus, 1993). In this sense, research findings have revealed that bullying behaviours may be divided into two models of actions as direct bullying (i.e.open action/observable one) and indirect bullying (i.e., covert action as rumour-spreading, manipulation of a friend, cyberbullying, teasing) (Olweus, 1993). Notably, it has been documented that bullying included several types including: (a) physical bullying (i.e.hitting, bumping, etc.); (b) verbal bullying (i.e.name-calling, insulting, etc.); (c) social/relational bullying (i.e. spreading rumours, negative facial or physical gestures, etc.) and (d) cyberbullying (i.e.overt and covert disruptive bullying spread by technologies) which recently has been gaining popularity among the younger generation (Smith & Slonje, 2010).

1.2 Theories of Bullying

Dubin (1978) illustrates theories as a practical approach to interpret, understand, and predict given phenomena. Moreover, Evans and Smokowski (2016) introduced the use of multiple methods in order to fully comprehend what drives

2

bullying behaviour. Furthermore, the use of a theoretical framework could also operate effectively to determine the detrimental consequences towards the victims or in a situation to prevent/intervene in bullying dynamics (Evans & Smokowski, 2016). Therefore, the current work uses the frameworks of Social-Ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), Instinct theory (Lorenz, 1963), Dominance theory (Long & Pellegrini, 2003), Social dominance theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) and Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1978) to understand and explain the predictors of bullying/victimization in the context of sport.

Bullying is a complicated phenomenon, and it is not just an isolated, repetitive problem between the person in power (i.e.the bully) and his/her vulnerable "victim.". Furthermore, bullying can be present as a broad phenomenon where the interaction between individuals, peer groups, and social environment occurs as a kind of a complicated social exchange (Swearer & Espelage, 2004), although a study conducted by Lewin (1936) highlighted that human behaviour could be a result of one's intercommunication with the surrounding environment. In reflection on these assumptions, many authors have been employing the social-ecological theory (1979) in identifying factors that contributed to bullying and peer victimization (Swearer & Espelage, 2004; Bayraktar, 2012; Espelage, 2014). Bronfenbrenner's ecological framework (1979) is an excellent illustration of how other' impact can modify human behaviour. Besides, the theory and the research articles confirm the hypothesis that bullying perpetration/victimization is reciprocally affected by all the levels of social life (Espelage & Swearer, 2010). Bronfenbrenner's ecological system (1979) provides an open framework to comprehend one's multi-level elements that influenced a person's behaviour. Besides, there are five levels of environmental influences that interact with one another to impact an individual's actions:

1. Microsystem (e.g., parents, peers, etc.) (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

2. Mesosystem (e.g., the interaction between microsystems such as the meetings of parents and school staff, etc.)

3. Exosystem (e.g., educational system, mass media, legal services, parent's friends, etc.)

4. Macrosystem (e.g., cultural beliefs, and ideologies that exist in the culture as a whole)

5. Chromesystem (e.g., individual/contextual historical events)

Moreover, previous research done by Swearer and Espelage (2010) indicated that the information provided in their book chapter recommends that Social-Ecological Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) is significant for understanding bullying dynamics. Moreover, same authors pointed out that Bronfenbrenner's theory (1979) is based on reciprocal influence where for instance, individual factors (impulsiveness, anger, or anxiety) and family history/neighbourhood (parents in jail, unsafe environment) components can contribute to one's negative school performance or engagement in bullying actions. (Swearer & Espelage, 2010). In addition, the study of Bayraktar (2012) illustrates how effective that model could be in identifying risk factors related to bullying perpetration/victimization. Bayraktar (2012) used Bronfenbrenner's model (1979) to analyse "individual-, peer-, parental-, teacher-, and school-related predictors of bullying." (pp.1041). It was indicated that several components had a direct influence on bullying dynamics. For instance, a school's psychological climate , teacher behaviour, peer connection, familial acceptance-rejection, and one's social competence may impact the occurrence of bullying perpetration/victimization in a given moment. Therefore, the article developed by Bayraktar (2012) is another

example of how various elements can affect or trigger the frequency of bullying dynamics.

The Social-Ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977) is a framework that is applicable to investigating bullying dynamics in the sport context as well. Besides, there were several numbers of scientific articles that illustrated the importance of applying the same theory into the context of bullying in sports (Shannon, 2013; Espelage, 2014; Stirling & Kerr, 2014)

A study done by Shannon (2013) uses a social-ecological perspective based on Bronfenbrenner (1979) to illustrate the problematic aspect that affected the nature of bullying. Shannon (2013) aimed to investigate elements that promote bullying action in youth sports environments. Besides, this study stated that the characteristics, program components, and training of staff/coaches have a significant impact on bullying dynamics in sport settings. Furthermore, Shannon's work pointed out that sports administrators or coaches need to be adjusted to intervene when bullying happens. Shannon (2013) also stated that sports administrators need to evaluate what situational factors within their programs tend to trigger bullying accidents. Whereas through those preventive efforts, they can manage how to handle similar bullying conflicts in the future.

Instinct theory (Lorenz, 1963) could be another theoretical framework for understanding bullying in sports. This concept has clarified that aggressive action could be due to Darwinian's instinct for social dominance. It was stated that aggression (bullying) could happen spontaneously in any competitive setting. Also, Lorenz (1963) argued that the purpose of violence in any competitive context (such as a sports team) could be to determine each member's position/ranking within a given group.

Furthermore, it is essential to be noted that the next three theories below operate efficiently in explaining bullying in various settings. Dominance Theory (Long & Pellegrini, 2003) is another concept that efficiently in explains bullying in the context of sports. Dominance Theory mainly centres on "individual-based social hierarchies" within our societies (pp. 367). The need for supremacy and superiority is a vital driving force that drives bullying actions, and that is why bullies use repeated malicious behaviour as a way to obtaining power toward others (Evans & Smokowski, 2016). Besides, Dominance theory (Long & Pellegrini, 2003) offers an efficient way of understanding the nature of bullying. Therefore, according to this theory, the bullies use bullying perpetration to acquire individual-levels of control and social dominance over the others (Evans & Smokowski, 2016). Additionally, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) stated that personal characteristics/traits (e.g., intellect and leadership skills) could be present as grounds for someone to obtain a social status or power over individual-based social hierarchies. In such cases, according to Salmivalli (2010; p.113), bullies can be present as "ringleaders" who typically can be recognized in the context of bullying. For instance, such young people may use their personality traits such as magnetism/charisma and the ability of humiliation to bully less dominant students as a form of achieving social respect and creating supremacy/dominance. Of course, bullies cannot always be dominant and popular over others. However, it should be noted that such personal traits as physical appearance, athletic body type, and trendy clothes could enhance the opportunity for bullies to be considered as significant and popular by his/her schoolmates (Vaillancourt, Hymel, & McDougall, 2003)

Also, Social Dominance Theory (SDT; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) is another concept that genuinely works to address bullying mechanisms. This theory mainly centers on social hierarchies over groups, and it is closely connected with Dominance

Theory (Long & Pellegrini, 2003), whereas the targets of the feature (group-based/individual-based) could differentiate those two concepts from each other. Although the core principle of the SDT states that all cultures included group-oriented social hierarchies, whereas on the top dominant groups oppress less powerful ones. The examples of these hierarchies could be based on gender (ex: women are less powerful than men), age (ex: mature adults have higher power over children), or even social gaps between social classes/ethnicities could make one society more dominant over others usually through a method of discrimination, inequality, and force (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). SDT could also be linked to bullying dynamics because a bully uses repeated adverse behaviour in a way to develop and retain superiority/ dominance toward other groups (Long & Pellegrini, 2003).

Additionally, bullying is a group phenomenon where peer group might determine whether a bullying perpetrator will gain supremacy over other or not (Salmivalli, 2010). For instance, Long and Pellegrini's (2003) research highlighted that if the students admire and help the bully, then this bully achieves dominance and social influence over others. Moreover, if the bullying perpetrator starts to lead other individuals and forms a group of people who accept him/her, then those followers will also feel power on their shoulders based on their place within this bully's group. Furthermore, according to SDT theory, that kind of group could use bullying dynamics as a method to achieve or maintain dominance over other less powerful groups/individuals within a given context (Long & Pellegrini, 2003).

The last theory that could be fundamental for understanding the nature of bullying dynamics is called Social Cognitive Theory (SCT; Bandura, 1978). Usually, scientists use SCT to illustrate the essence of aggressive actions. However, the same approach could be employed as well in displaying how bullying as a process could be

learned (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961). Some research has indicated a correlation between observing bullying or other violent conduct with the use of bullying among young individuals (Baldry, 2003). According to Social Cognitive Theory, bullying can occur as a consequence of observational learning (Bandura, 1978). For instance, a young victim of domestic violence has a significantly greater chance of becoming a bullying perpetrator later on compared to children who are not experiencing domestic violence at home (Baldry, 2003). In this sense, children or teenagers who interact with aggressive individuals are more prone to perform offensive actions than individuals who do not socialize with that kind of peers (Mouttapa, Valente, Gallaher, Rohrbach, & Unger, 2004).

More further, reinforcement could be another reason to escalate bullying perpetration according to Social Cognitive Theory (SCT; Bandura, 1978). Hence, a bully may assume that through teasing actions (bullying) rewards such as higher social status or access resources could be accomplished. However, in some cases, adults, relatives, or peers could influence the bullying perpetration via such reinforcement as praise or approval (Craig & Pepler, 1995). Relatedly, others' reinforced responses could be crucial and teach an individual to consider that bullying could be rewarded/punished or acceptable/not acceptable (Craig & Pepler, 1995).

To sum up, the dynamics of bullying nature could be evaluated/understood by the given theories above. However, the current study prefers to use Bronfenbrenner's ecological system (1979) because that concept considered all multi-level elements that affected a person's behaviour and could work efficiently in explaining bullying in the context of sport more adequately/properly. Moreover, past studies did not apply any of the Dominance Theory (Long & Pellegrini, 2003), Social Dominance Theory (SDT; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), or Social Cognitive Theory (SCT; Bandura, 1978) into the

context of sports bullying. Therefore, this could be another advantage of using Bronfenbrenner's ecological system theory (1979) instead of others.

1.3 The Importance of Studying Bullying Perpetration/ Victimization in Team Sports

Schools are mainly the context where many researchers investigate bullying and bullying victimization (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Cummings, Pepler, Mishna, & Craig, 2006). According to Patton, Hong, Patel, and Kral (2017), classroom and workplace bullying have been continuing to be present as the most attractive areas for future studies. Nevertheless, some maltreatment incidents (e.g., abuse, harassment, or bullying) also arise in sport contexts (Stirling, 2009). Sports activities are extraordinarily competitive and masculine geared, which could be present as a cause that promotes/stimulate offensive behaviour among athletes (Coakley, 2009). As well as, the rate of peer violence and victimization should also be assumed to be somewhat less controlled and significantly higher in sports compared to classroom settings (Coakley, 2009). Therefore, it can be assumed that such violent dynamics as abuse, harassment (Stirling, 2009), bullying or hazing (Jeckell, Copenhaver, & Diamond, 2020) are kind of common within the sport. Besides, Jeckell et al. (2020) present that bullying and hazing could rapidly transform into risky, ill-adaptive activities with detrimental health implications. Of course, the emphasis of the present research was mainly on the bullying dynamics. Nevertheless, the audience should apprehend and do not confuse that bullying and hazing are two distinct concepts (Martens, 2012; Hernandez, 2015). For instance, hazing ends typically as soon as new members are welcomed into the community, whereas bullying is a constant phenomenon (Hernandez, 2015). Furthermore, over the past several decades, the topic of bullying in sports has been gradually discussed (Stirling et al., 2011; Evans et al. 2016; Kerr et

al.,2016; Vveinhardt, Fominiene, Andriukaitiene, 2019). Annematt, D'Escury, and Dudink (2010) investigated bullying in a sports context. In their work, a total of 14 football teams and 12 judo clubs were recruited to take part of the study in the Netherlands. The authors revealed that bullying in both contexts, sports, and school, did not display significant contrast. Following this outcome, the result of that investigation showed that bullying in sports does not seem to have less bullying episodes compared to school bullying (Annematt et al. 2010). Therefore, there is a still recognized fundamental importance, necessity and interest for studying bullying perpetration/victimization in sport contexts (Fasting, Brackenridge, & Knorre, 2010; Jimerson, Swearer, & Espelage, 2010; Vertommen et al. ,2016). Yet, there is a still insufficient amount of scientific studies carried out on bullying (Kerr et al., 2016) and victimization in sports clubs (Baar, 2012) and according to Jimerson et al. (2010), identification of bullying episodes in sports required great effort compared to school bullying.

To further illustrate the importance of this topic, it should be noted that there are a lot of negative consequences for one sports player who bullies others or one who is a victim of bullying in sports setting. For instance, bullying victimization in sports causes a lot of negative psychological/physical consequences for an athlete, and as a result, trauma, withdrawal from the sport or future psychological/physical health problems could be observed (Fasting et al. 2010; Vertommen et al. ,2016). Furthermore, one more negative consequence comes from the fact that bullying/victimization can affect an athlete's desire for sports development in an entirely negative direction (Vertommen et al. ,2016). Consequently, studying/investigating bullying in sports should become an essential and significant aspect of the current literature. In an attempt to understand another reason why

studying bullying/victimization in sports context is significant, Vveinhardt et al. (2017) have shown that preventing bullying/bullying victimization issues could lead to a safe environment for all sports players. Automatically, these findings indicated that the psychological health and personal stability of the players can increase, and even their athletic performance could be improved (Vveinhardt et al. 2017). Therefore, the ongoing evaluations demonstrated that studying bullying/victimization in a sports setting is still vital for the sake of all sports societies/athletes around the world.

A meta-analytic investigation done by Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, and Sadek (2010) displayed that there are specific predictors of bullying perpetration/ victimization across two common stages of life (e.g. childhood and adulthood). The current thesis then will addressed a number of factors that might raise the likelihood of that negative behaviour below. For example, gender can be present as one of that variable which could be associated with bullying interactions among individuals. (Ziegler & Pepler, 1993). Usually, literature related to bullying in the school context displayed a significant difference in the gender of the participants across bullying tendencies (Orue & Calvete, 2011). According to the literature, it has been stated that males more often hold roles of bullies or victims compared to females (Kepenekci & Cinkir, 2006; Weuve, Pitney, Martin, &Mazerolle, 2014). Furthermore, these findings were supported by various countries, including Brazil, Germany, Turkey, the United States, and Israel, which demonstrated that it is usually males who frequently take the role of bullying perpetrator or victim of bullying. (Felix & Green, 2010). However, contradicting to these outcomes, Craig and Harel (2004) pointed out that women usually reported equal or higher victimization levels compared to men. Even though, in 1993, Ziegler and Pepler stated that an equal number of youths reported victimization. Besides, two other studies also stand out that bullying perpetration

levels were similar across genders in a naturalistic classroom observation and playground settings, respectively (Atlas & Pepler,1998; Craig, 1993).

Recently, researchers who concentrate mainly on bullying dynamics in sports contexts have been examining genders independently. For instance, several authors explored only male sport participants (Nery, Neto, Rosado & Smith, 2019; Steinfeldt et al. 2012; Vveinhardt et al. 2017) or a singular group of female athletes in their studies (Volk & Lagzdins, 2009; Jewett Kerr, MacPherson, & Stirling, 2019). Of course, there are exceptions as well. For example, Evans et al. (2016) examined bullying perpetration and bullying victimization of both genders in sport context. Evans at al. (2016) recruited 359 participants and found that there were not any significant differences between female and male athletes, which means that both genders were equally likely to be the targets of bullying. Moreover, this conclusion was in line also with Adler (2014), who also claimed that no gender differences across bullying victimization were experienced by male and female sports players. In contrast, the outcomes related to bullying perpetration in sport contexts demonstrated different results. Specifically, Evans at al. (2016) claimed that male athletes are more likely to be in the position of bullying perpetrators compared to females. Besides, Vveinhardt -Fominienė, and Jeseviciute-Ufartiene (2018) recruited 337 amateur sports players with an age range of 19.4 years who were part of various sports in Lithuania. In particular, it was found by the participants' responses that male athletes were more likely to be in a bullying role position compared to females. Accordingly, the Lithuanian authors Vveinhardt et al. (2018) conducted a scientific study that was in line with the founding of Evans et al. (2016), which demonstrated gender differences in terms of bullying perpetration. However, by looking at the articles associated with bullying dynamics, it can be assumed that there is a lack of sources linked to the

frequency of bullying in terms of sport context across gender (Adler, 2014). Therefore, the current study will try to examine whether gender has a role in the bullying victimization dynamics and whether bullying perpetration rates differ across male and female athletes in team sports?

1.4 Bullying Perpetration/ Victimization and Nationality

The variables of race and ethnicity were already evaluated recently. However, less focus was given to the correlation between bullying victimization and foreign individuals (Maynard, Vaughn, Salas-Wright, & Vaughn, 2016). Several studies have demonstrated that nationality is directly linked to bullying victimization levels in academic contexts (Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2000; Pepler, Connolly, & Craig, 1999). Besides, scientific work done by Slovenian authors Pečjak and Pirc (2017) assumed that chronic victims of bullying feel that schools promote considerably more discrimination among students due to one's nationality. Throughout this sense, Maynard et al. (2016) have evaluated the disparities between immigrants and native-born American children (from 5the to 10th grades) with regard to victimization abuse. It was shown that foreigners faced more victimization and violence compared to local residents. Maynard et al. (2016) also evaluated that foreign residents who were exposed to bullying victimization become more prone to experience negative consequences later on (e.g. psychological issues, well-being concerns or drug/alcohol abuse).

Does nationality play a significant role in sport and bullying actions? Do immigrant sports players could have a higher chance of becoming bullies or victims of bullying? The answers to those questions have not been clearly stated yet. To the best of our knowledge, previous researches have not directly examined bullying perpetration/ victimization across nationality in sport settings. Adair and Vamplew's

(1997) published book highlights on Australian sport and history. In their work, the authors stated that especially football and rugby administrators did not do anything to avoid racial/national discrimination from occurring in their national leagues. In other words, sport managers have accepted systematically racist abusive actions to be allowed in their teams without a certain player to receive any penalty. Consequently, racial/national violence, coupled with bullying and other types of discrimination, has certainly discouraged or stopped, many Aboriginal and other non-white players from accessing and being promoted in a variety of sports arenas (Adair &Vamplew, 1997). Concerning bullying dynamics, Volk and Lagzdins (2009) conducted a study with a sample of adolescent girl athletes. In particular, their work aimed to explore the prevalence of bullying perpetration/victimization in both school and sport settings. The data to that survey was obtained by a "four-section self-report questionnaire" (Volk & Lagzdins, 2009, p.18). Furthermore, in addition to the demographic questionnaire, the authors also collected information related to the ethnicity of their participations. According to Volk and Lagzdins (2009), nationality/ethnicity was not significantly associated with sport or school bullying/victimization. However, the same study examined a sample of only 69 adolescent females, which could be present as a factor that limits the outcome. In this sense, another limitation related to the findings can come from the fact that Volk and Lagzdins' work (2009) did not purely focus on nationality and bullying dynamics. Therefore, the current study will explore whether nationality affects differently bullying victimization tendency in sports teams since there are limited and insufficient resources associated with the topic. Furthermore, understanding do nationality is fundamental element that could raise the engagement of peer victimization within the context of sport is essential for the

sporting community in order to prevent sport discouragement (Adair &Vamplew, 1997) or any other health-related negative impact (Maynard et al., 2016) for future.

1.5 Bullying Perpetration/ Victimization and Coaching Behaviours

According to Biggs, Vernberg, Twemlow, Fonagy, and Dill (2008), a child spends approximately six to nine hours per day at his/her school. In this sense, teachers' engagement and teachers' behaviour are essential for reducing bullying and bullying victimization. Besides, Paul & Smith (2000) argue that negative teaching styles, such as overestimating academic achievement, grouping the students, forcing the scholars to follow the rules, or using abusive power could increase the chance of bullying occurrences at school. Therefore, in the view preceding, the current study aims to understand what would happen if the coach in one team uses negative pedagogy through his/her athletes.

In Canada, the investigators Evans et al. (2016) carried out a study with athletes from various types of sports where bullying dynamics and coach-athlete relationships were observed. Consequently, it can be assumed that the coach characteristics is significantly vital within sports. Evans et al. (2016) noted that the gender of the coach and coach-athlete relationship could be considered as a predictor of victimization. It was found that athletes with a male coach and a weak bonding to the coach reported higher victimization and perpetration. (Evans et al. 2016). Another study pointed out that victimization was also negatively correlated with coach support (Nery et al. 2019) and coach encouragement (Volk & Lagzdins, 2009). In this sense, this means that less support or less encouragement from the coach will lead to a higher risk of victimization for a sports player (Nery et al., .2019; Volk & Lagzdins, 2009). Unfortunately, coaches do not always act in ethical manners, which can reflect player-coach interrelation and ethical standards within the team (Vveinhardt et al. 2018). It is estimated that about

40% of youth sport settings include negative coaching attitudes (Raakman et al., 2010). Balogh (2015) demonstrated that the trainer's negative attitudes and choices such as favoritism, incentive allocation of extra money during a match, and unequal player recognition could boost unfair circumstances within sports and, respectively, could influence athletes in the most adverse directions. Additionally, based on the recent works, it also can be presumed that if a sports players have a coach who uses negative pedagogy among his/her players, this could influence other athletes to bully their peers as he/she did it previously (Vveinhardt et al., 2017). Nevertheless, this view was presents as a suggestion and so a potential research analysis must be regarded.

According to Collot, d'Escury, and Dudink (2010), a significant amount of children claimed that their coaches bullied them. Additionally, recent reports (Fisher & Dzikus, 2017; Peltola & Kivijärvi, 2017) indicated that not only peer could bully the athletes, coaches also could be present as bullying perpetrator figures within the sport. Coaches aim so intensely to succeed, and as a result, they can act in negative manners by punching, shouting excessively, and pushing on their players even sometimes in front of others. Throughout Swigonski, Enneking, and Hendrix' view, "bullying behaviour by coaches is an under-acknowledged but frequent experience" (pp. 274, 2014). However, it is very challenging to address one's coach attitudes because in somehow he/she uses a spectrum of action from favourable to unfavourable. Therefore, determining whether a coach has "crossed the limit" is entirely subjective (Swigonski et al., 2014). Based on our knowledge, past studies have not directly examined the factor of negative coaching behaviour/ pedagogy as a predictor of bullying/victimization. As a result of this, the present study will investigate whether the coach's attitudes/style can influence the number of bullying/victimization episodes within his/her adults' sports team.

1.6 Bullying Perpetration/ Victimization and Psychological Climate of the Teams

A positive climate in one team could be created by social harmony, secure/integratedsports club environment, and free dialogue within the community. Another items that might build an efficient environment is a clear code of ethics and regulation (Baar, 2012). On the other side, school shared almost common characteristics with sports to build a positive climate within an academic setting. For instance, a safe and peaceful environment among all students (Eisenberg, Neumark-Sztainer, & Perry, 2003), management model, laws, legal procedure, instructor assistance, and physical condition characteristics (Orpinas & Horne, 2010) are the other significant components which can assure positive climate in the school. Therefore, those two contexts shared common characteristics that can help one school or team to have a positive climate. As well as, having a that favorable atmosphere can be considered as a huge advantage in sports and school. For instance, according to Bulgarian article done by Hristuilias and Popov (2003), the positive climate and cohesion within a team were identified as significant psychological factors aiming for progress/improvement during completion or camp among Europe's top sport shooting athletes. It has been extensively shown that a caring climate is related to players' passion and ongoing continuous dedication to the sports (Fry & Gano-Overway, 2010). Moreover, that kind of environment also drives athletes to utilizes more pro-social attitudes/manners towards their soccer teams and trainers (Fry & Gano-Overway, 2010). In comparison with school, for example such a positive atmosphere could also enhance students' and academic staff's motivation to study/work with a more energized feeling and, as a consequence, to perform even better academically. Furthermore, a favourable climate could also decrease the chance of aggressive actions among

students in the class, which is crucial to ensure a safe and peaceful environment among all students (Eisenberg et al. 2003). Nevertheless, as the reports on psychological climate in sport are limited, the present study used the school literature review to construct the team's climate-related hypothesis.

The literature review in terms of school context demonstrated that school climate could be a significant contextual predictor of bullying perpetration/ victimization (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Cook et al., 2010). Besides, Bayraktar (2012) showed that school climate and teachers' behaviour within the class setting were the strongest predictors of bullying. A recent meta-analysis conducted by Steffgen, Recchia, and Viechtbauer (2013) demonstrated a moderate correlation between school climate and violence, including bullying. Furthermore, Lee (2011) investigated and concerned a positive school climate as a variable that could reduce the amount of bullying victimization incidents within classroom settings. As a result, a positive classroom environment may minimize the frequency of bullying perpetrators' occurrence also (Klein, Cornell, & Konold, 2012). Therefore, it could be assumed that there is a negative correlation between positive school climate and bullying dynamics.

In sport a positive climate has been presented as a further preventive measure against peer harassment and victimization, which was in line with school's context founding (Beer, 2012). However, the author Baar (2012) did not purely investigate the correlation between a positive climate of a team and bullying perpetration/ victimization. Although, the past sport studies did not also explore whether one team's climate can be a strong predictor for both bullying/victimization. Therefore, the current study will try to examine those variables together.

1.7 Bullying Perpetration/ Victimization and Personality Traits

Lastly, the current work was designed to test whether the specific personality traits of one character assessed by virtue of the Big Five-Factor Model of Personality (Goldberg, 1992) can be presented as an individual predictor of bullying perpetration/ victimization. According to Tremblay and Ewart (2005), personality traits have demonstrated to have a significant relationship with aggression. Besides, bullying could also be presented as a form of aggression (Roland & Idsoe, 2001) because most of the time bullying perpetrator use proactive/reactive aggressive behaviour in a way to achieve particular goals or to fulfill personal desires to hurt someone for no specific reason (Jara, Casas, & Ortega-Ruiz, 2017). Therefore, it is necessary to consider to what degree the aspect of personality predisposes individuals to violent activities such as bullying (Tani, Greenman, Schneider, Fregaso 2003; Fossati, Borroni & Maffei, 2012; Duffy, Penn, Nesdale, & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2017).

According to Kerr et al. (2016), personality types of athletes were identified as factors that affect bullying perpetration/ victimization within sports. For instance, team captains explained that usually, victims of bullying were sports players who have a softer and more calm temperament, whereas bullying perpetrators were those who had a dominant and strong personality. Besides, past school studies (Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Zimbardo, 1996; Gleason, Jensen-Campell, & Richarson, 2004) demonstrated that the specific dimensions of the Big Five-Factor Model have a positive association with aggression. For instance, Sharpe and Desai (2001) pointed out that Big Five-Factor Model could predict aggressive behaviour, and individuals who score high on neuroticism and low on agreeableness had a higher possibility of showing violence.

Recent literatures too (Tani et al.,2003; Menesini, Camodeca, & Nocentini, 2010 Fossati, et al., 2012; Duffy et al., 2017) displayed bullying perpetrators and

victims of bullying demonstrated distinct personality traits, which made them different from others, and at the same time, their specific personality characteristics could predict bullying. For instance, Fossati et al., (2012) demonstrated that bullying perpetrator has been linked to high agreeableness, high extraversion, and low conscientiousness, whereas victimization has been associated with low agreeableness, high neuroticism, and low extraversion. Consequently, bullying perpetrators were portrayed to have antagonist personalities, be impulsive, and talkative most of the time. In comparison, victims were calmer, fewer autistic, moody, and introverted among individuals. Furthermore, it was also found that participants who obtained low score on agreeableness and a high score on neuroticism were more likely to take a role of impulsive and emotional instability bullies (Tani et al.,2003; Menesini et al. 2010); Duffy et al., 2017). Contradictorily, those individuals with high neuroticism and low conscientiousness scores were more likely to take the position of an anxious victim who is less goal-oriented (Tani et al.,2003; Menesini et al., 2010. However, except for Kerr et al. (2016), past studies did not show whether a character's specific traits could predispose one sports player to take the role of bully or victim within a team. The present research therefore aims to address these variables together and explore whether a particular characteristic of athletes could affect the bullying dynamics within teams.

1.8 Aims and Hypotheses of the Current Study

The current study has two primary aims: to explore (a) the contextual predictors and (b) individual predictors of bullying and bullying victimization among semi-professional team sport players in North Cyprus. In total, the current study uses five predictors. Three variables representing the characteristics of individuals (e.g., gender, nationality, and personality traits), and another two representing contextual factors (e.g., negative coaching behaviour and psychological climate of the team)

which according to existing literature could predict bullying perpetration or bullying victimization among athletes. Furthermore, while we observed all articles related to bullying and sport, it can be noticed that the researchers explore only a single sample of participants or a single type of sport. For instance, within a type of sport (individual/team), only female players or male ones are examined independently (e.g., Steinfeldt, Vaughan, LaFollette, & Steinfeldt, 2012; Volk & Lagzdins, 2009; Vveinhard, Komskiene, Romero, 2017) and still there are a limited number of studies which examined those variables jointly (Adler, 2014; Vveinhardt, Fominienė & Jeseviciute-Ufartiene, 2018). Therefore, it is significant for the current study to try to examine the frequency of bullying across gender/ethnicity and to explore gender differences between the different forms of bullying. By combining these two aims, we can conclude that the current study will try to provide an investigation connected to bullying/bullying victimization predictors within the sport context. Plus, there are at least two main arguments why the current study is significant. Firstly, this research aims to show the sports society specific predictors that can efficiently trigger bullying or victimization actions. Moreover, if the study demonstrate a significant result, that future prominent findings could be used in terms of creating a new bullying prevention system/policy and be distributed to all sport settings in North Cyprus. Therefore, in order to test our goals ten hypotheses were constituted.

H1: There will be no gender difference in bullying perpetration among athletes.

H2: There will be no gender difference in bullying victimization among athletes.

H3: The international players will be more victimized/vulnerable to victimization compared to the local players

H4: Negative coaching behaviours will be positively correlated with bullying perpetration of the players within the team

H5: Negative coaching behaviours will be positively correlated with bullying victimization of the players within the team.

H6: The positive psychological climate of the team will be negatively correlated with bullying perpetration.

H7: The positive psychological climate of the team will be negatively correlated with bullying victimization.

H8: High agreeableness, high extraversion, and low conscientiousness will be positively correlated with the bullying perpetration of the players within the team.

H9: Low agreeableness, high neuroticism, and low extraversion will be positively correlated with the bullying victimization of the players within the team.

Chapter 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

By utilizing the G-power program (G*Power 3.1) on an actual power value of 0.95 and alpha level/critical value of 0.05, a statistical test linear multiple regression with squared multiple correlations – 0.12 and an effect size of 0.14, generated a recommend total sample size of 151 subjects. A total of 193 athletes participated in the experiment. Besides, the percentage of male and female team sports players were 52.3% and 47.2%, respectively, with an average age of 24.74 (SD = 5. 15). One case was presented as missing data (0.5%). Also, individuals from North Cyprus and Turkey were categorized as native players, whereas other athletes from different nations were classified as international players. Therefore, in the current study, the percentage of native players was 85 %, and the rate of international ones was 14.9 %. Only team sports players were selected to take part in the current investigation. All participants were club team players who competed in 4 different sports (e.g., football, volleyball, handball and basketball). Six participants were eliminated from the current data since they do not fit the inclusion criteria (they were younger than eighteen years old).

It is essential to be considered that the investigators selected the teams not only from one town of North Cyprus. Respectively, the teams from Famagusta, Lefkosia, Lefke, Girne, and Esentepe were selected to take part in the study. In total, 16 teams (7 women's team and 9 men's team) took part in the current study. Besides, subjects

participated in a variety of sport disciplines: handball (18.1%), football (27.5%), volleyball (28%), and basketball (26.4%). The current study tested only athletes (men/women) who are competing in the first league in North Cyprus. Typically, in the first division, only professional sports players take part. However, most of the players within the teams in North Cyprus are semi-professional because they compete in the local sports lieges, and concurrently, they have another job. That was the main reason why the current study stated that "Semi-Professional Team Sport Players in North Cyprus" would be tested instead of professional players.

2.2 Measurement Tools

2.2.1 General Informative Sheet

The Demographic Questionnaire (Appendix A) was used to obtain personal information concerning each athlete. This questionnaire included six demographic items. Questions related to gender, age, nationality, sports discipline, type of sport, and name of the club team were part of the first measurement tool which was distributed to all participant. Furthermore, each athlete had an opportunity to choose the language in which he/she wants to fill the questions (English/Turkish). Besides, it must be noted that a professional translator has translated the Turkish version of this demographic questionnaire and all other questionnaires.

2.2.2 Bullying Within Sport Questionnaire (BSQ)

The Bullying Within Sport Questionnaire (BSQ); (See Appendix B) has been developed to assess the rate of bullying/victimization episodes among sports players. The Bullying Within Sport Questionnaire (BSQ) has been modified and adapted to measure bullying in sport from the Canadian version of the Health Behaviours in School-aged Children (HBSC) survey and Adolescent Peer Relations Instrument (APRI). In particular, a small word modification was constructed in term of making

The Bullying Within Sport Questionnaire (BSQ) valid to test athletes. The word "school" was modified to "team" and by this change, bullying frequency in sport settings were able to be examined (Adler, 2014; Evans, 2016). Besides, a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never been bullied) to 5 (bullied several time) aims to measure the level and types of bullying within sports teams. The frequency of bullying victimization and bullying perpetration were measured, respectively. Also, Bullying Within Sport Questionnaire (BSQ) was adapted to measure varieties of bullying victimization/perpetration by four constructs: physical, verbal, social, and cyber. Furthermore, the *BSQ* has three parts: a demographic section, an explanatory segment that distinguished bullying from hostile actions, and fragment (two items) linked to determine victimization and bullying scores (Adler, 2014). The Cronbach's alpha for all items of Bullying Within Sport Questionnaire (BSQ) was found to be between .82 to .91 (Evans et al., 2016). However, no one before adapted or translated this questionnaire into Turkish. Therefore, the initial translation, back-translation, revision by specialist were the actions which were obtained by us to adapt this questionnaire into Turkish. Furthermore, two inconsistent questions associated with school bullying have been eliminated because they were not appropriate for the aims of the current research (e.g., "How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of month"; "How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months"). Besides, in the current study we found that the Cronbach's alpha for both perpetration and victimization was .91

2.2.3 Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport questionnaire (CBS-S) (Côté, Yardley, Hay, & Sedgwick 1999).

Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport (CBS-S) (Côté, et al., 1999) (See Appendix C) assesses coaches' engagement in growing sports players' talents. However, the

current research applied only the subscale Negative Personal Rapport in terms of accessing negative coaching behaviour. Eight items were aims to measure the level of negative personal rapport between the sports player and the coach (e.g., "uses fear in his/her coaching methods"; "yells at me when angry"; "disregards my opinion"; "shows favouritism toward others"; "intimidates me physically"; "uses power to manipulate me"; "makes personal comments to me that I find upsetting"; and "spends more time coaching the best athletes") (Côté et al., 1999). Besides, a 7-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always) was incorporated to measure each item. The subscale Negative Personal Rapport has a reliable internal consistency (Cronbach's α = 0.85) for CBS-S. Also, test-retest again for the same item was evaluated and found as r = .49. Furthermore, all six dimensions of the Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport (CBS-S) demonstrated sufficient internal consistency (Cronbach's α between .85 and .97). It was displayed that Test-retest for all six subscales vary from .49 up to 90. (Côté et a., 1999).

In order to determine the local players' response, the Turkish version of that questionnaire was translated and adapted by Yapar and Ince (2015). The Cronbach's alpha was identified to vary between .79 and 87 for all seven dimensions of CBS-S. Moreover, the Turkish version of Negative Personal Rapport has demonstrated a reliable internal consistency (Cronbach's α = 0.79) again (Yapar & Ince, 2015). In comparison, the current study identified also a reliable internal consistency for Negative Personal Rapport (Cronbach's α = 0.77).

2.2.4 Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) (Carron, Brawley, & Widmeyer, 1985)

In the current study climate of a team were assessed by using the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) (Carron et al.,1985) (Please see Appendix D). A

9-point Likert scale was used to obtain participants' responses. In total GEQ included 18-item divided into four subscales: "constructs of group integration-task (GIT), group integration-social (GIS), individual attractions to group-task (ATGT), and individual attractions to group-social (ATGS)" (Carron et al., 1985, p. 244). In total, the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) included 18 questions in total: five items of group integration-task (e.g., "Our team is united in trying to reach its goals for performance."), four items of group integration-social (e.g., "Members of our team would rather go out on their own than get together as a team".), four items of individual attractions to group-task (e.g., "I'm not happy with the amount of playing time I get."), five items of individual attractions to group-social (e.g., "I do not enjoy being a part of the social activities of this team). The Cronbach's alpha was found to vary between 61 and .78 for all four dimensions (Carron et al., 1985).

The Turkish version of this questionnaire was translated and adapted byUnutmaz and Kiremitci (2014). The internal consistency for all four dimensions was found to vary between .61 and 67, and general Cronbach's alpha coefficient was noted to be as .82. Moreover, Cronbach's alpha coefficient in the current study was observed to vary between .82 up to .86 (ATGS - .82; ATGT - .86; GIS - .84; GIT - .86).

2.2.5 Big Five Personality Questionnaire (Goldberg, 1992)

The Big Five Personality Questionnaire (Goldberg, 1992) (Please, See Appendix E) was developed to access personality traits. The Big Five Personality Questionnaire (Goldberg, 1992) included a total of 50 items and five factors (elements) of personality. Each of the factors is then further split into personality facets. In total, there are five dimensions – Extraversion (e.g., "I Am the life of the party."; "I Don't talk a lot."; "I Feel comfortable around people/"; "I Keep in the background."), Agreeableness (e.g., "I feel little concern for others."; "I am interested in people.";"I

27

insult people.”; “I sympathize with other’. ”, Conscientiousness (e.g., “I get stressed out easily.”; “I leave my belongings around.”; “I pay attention to details”.) Neuroticism/Emotional stability (e.g., “I am relaxed most of the time”.; “I seldom feel blue”., “I get stressed out easily”.; “I worry about things”.) , Openness/Imagination (e.g., “I have a rich vocabulary.”; “I have a vivid imagination.”; “I have excellent ideas.”; “I am quick to understand things”.).

Tatar (2017) adapted and translated this questionnaire into Turkish. The Cronbach’s alpha was found to be vary between .68 and .79 for all dimensions of Big Five Personality Questionnaire. Also, test-retest coefficient was found to vary between 0.55 and 0.80. (Tatar, 2017). Furthermore, the current study identified also a reliable internal consistency for extraversion (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 86$), agreeableness (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.86$), conscientiousness (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .81$), neuroticism (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$) and openness to experience (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .63$ for five items).

2.2.6 COVID-19 Related Questions

Since, the current work was carried out during the COVID-19 pandemic some participants could suffer and experience pressure, stress, or depression due to the current circumstance of COVID-19, which might confound the outcomes. Therefore, a new section with two questions were added to the survey in terms of eliminating any confound. "Do you consider yourself to be negatively affected by the current situation due to COVID-19 (financially, emotionally, socially, etc.)" and "Do you think that the pandemic of COVID-19 affected your response in the current survey negatively" were the questions which was added in the end of the survey (Please, See Appendix G). Furthermore, the outcome of those participants who stated that they are affected and those who do not indicate that they experience adverse issues due to COVID-19 by

were compared by statistical analysis (Independent Sample t-test), in a case to prevent any confound outcomes.

2.3 Design

A survey research design was used in the study to describe/investigate contextual predictors and individual predictors of bullying and bullying victimization among semi-professional team sport players in North Cyprus. The independent variables were gender, nationality, negative coaching behaviour, the psychological climate of the team, and the scores of Big Five-Factor Model of Personality (Goldberg, 1992). Bullying and bullying victimization level were presented as dependent variables.

2.4 Procedure

The procedure of data collection began after a written approval obtained from Research Ethics Committee of Eastern Mediterranean University, (Please see Appendix H). A convenient sampling techniques was used in terms of reaching a faster-targeted group of only athletes who compete in the first league in North Cyprus. Besides, the pandemic of COVID-19 affected the survey method of the current study. Usually, the investigators of this work were planned to distribute the survey by hand. However, giving out the questionnaires by hand could increase the chance of the researchers to be infected with COVID-19. Therefore, distributing the question vie online survey were the right choice in terms of minimizing the spread of the virus. Moreover, the researchers contacted one male and female team from each branch (football, volleyball, handball, basketball, etc.) to obtain approval of distributing the survey to their sports players. In total, nine men's club team and seven women's club team took part of the study. After verbal/written permission, the link of the online survey was sent to each team that agrees to participate. Before starting to fill in the

questionnaire, all participants have read the informed consent where they understand that their participation is voluntary. After signing the informed consent, the questionnaires followed. The time frame of that survey were around 20 minutes. In the end, a debrief form were distributed to all participants.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

3.1 Data Analysis

The current study applied IBM SPSS Statistics 21 to analyses the existing data. First, group comparison analysis was used to measure whether gender, form of bullying perpetration/victimization, and the current pandemic of COVID-19, could affect the outcome. Then, a Pearson Correlation was applied to assess the relationship among all variables. Besides, the hierarchical regression analysis was used to see whether the independent variables predicted the bullying perpetration and victimization among sports people.

3.2 Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistic of gender, nationality, sport discipline responses aregiven in the tables below. The first frequency table demonstrated the gender of all participants (please see Table 1). The output from the current work confirmed that the percentage of local players was 85 %, and the rate of international ones were 14.9 %. The participants from Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (66. 3%) , Turkey (10.9%) and those who has dual nationality (e.g. TRNC/TC or British nationality and TRNC – 7.8%) were categorised as local players whereas international players were from Bosnia and Hercegovina (1%), Bulgaria (1%), Cameroon (0.5%), Code d'Ivoire (0.5%), Ghana (0.5), Iran (1.6%), Nigeria (5.2%), Palestine (0.5%), Serbia (0.5%), Trinidad and Tobago (0.5%), Tunisia (1.6%), Ukraine (0.5%), USA (0.5%) and Uzbekistan (0.5%) (Please see Table.2) .

Table 1. Gender of all participants

	N (%)
Female	91 (47.2)
Male	101 (52.3)
Missing	1 (0.5)
Total	193 (100.0)

% Percent

Table 2. Nationality of all participants

	N (%)
Bosnia and Hercegovina	2 (1.0)
British & TRNC	1 (0.5)
Bulgaria	2 (1.0)
Cameroon	1 (0.5)
Côte d'Ivoire	1 (0.5)
Ghana	1 (0.5)
Iran	3 (1.6)
TRNC	128 (66.3)
TRNC&TC	14 (7.3)
Nigeria	10 (5.2)
Palestine	1 (0.5)
Serbia	1 (0.5)
Turkey	21 (10.9)
Trinidad and Tobago	1 (0.5)
Tunisia	3 (1.6)
Ukraine	1 (0.5)
United States	1 (0.5)

	N (%)
Uzbekistan	1 (0.5)
Total	193 (100.0)

% Percent

Table 3 represents the frequency of sports discipline among all sports players. Besides, subjects participated in a variety of sport disciplines including: handball (18.1%), football (27.5%), volleyball (28%), and basketball (26.4%).

Table 3. The athletes' competition specialty described in percentage terms

	N (%)
Handball	35 (18.1)
Football	53 (27.5)
Volleyball	54 (28.0)
Basketball	51 (26.4)
Total	193 (100.0)

% Percent

In order to prevent any confounding effect and the negative experience pressure, stress, or depression due to COVID-19, two questions were investigated. According to descriptive statistics, 66 participants (34.2%) were answered the question, "Do you consider yourself to be negatively affected by the current situation due to COVID-19 (financially, emotionally, socially, etc.)" with yes. Moreover, 23 participants (11%) responded yes to the questions: "Do you think that the pandemic of COVID-19 affected your response in the current survey negatively.".

33

3.3 Group Comparison Statistics

A one-way Anova analysis was run to indicated that the type of sports such as handball, football, volleyball, and basketball does not affect separately the ongoing outcomes (perpetration: p = .515; victimization: p = .636). Consequently, different varieties of team sports types have been gathered and used as one variable.

Also, an independent sample T-test was also conducted to point out the impactof gender on bullying dynamics within sports. There was a non-significant differences between women' (M = 1.60, SD = 4.61) and men' (M = 1.36, SD = 1.37) total scores of bullying victimization, t(190) = .39, p = .70. Besides, there was also a non-significant contrasts between women' (M = 1.00, SD = 2.97) and men' athletes (M = 0.54, SD = 2.83) total scores of bullying perpetration, t(190) = 1.09, p = .28. In order for the result to obtain more consistent results, all sixteen victimization and perpetration items were placed separately into the independent sample T-test as well. It should be noted that all test variables were in the expected direction except the second items of perpetration factor "I kept another teammate(s) out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from our team, or completely ignored him or her" t(190) = 3.10, p < .003.

In a way to identify the group differences within COVID-19 variables, an independent t-test with bootstrapping was conducted. Besides, there were two test variables: victimization and perpetration scores. The result did not find any significant differences between those who were stated that are affected negatively by the current situation due to COVID-19 (financially, emotionally, socially, etc.) (M = .79, SD = 1.43) and those who do not mentioned (M = 1.83, SD = 5.11) because the victimization's score difference, BCa 95% CI [.12, 2.08], $t(191) = 1.62, p = .065$. was not significant. On average, the analysis demonstrated that perpetration's score

difference BCa 95% CI [-.10, 1.26], $t(191) = 1.15$, $p = .182$ was also not significant among participant who stated that are influenced (M = .42, SD = 1.08) and those who were not (M = .93, SD = 3.46). Besides, 23 out of 170 participants answered with "yes" the question: do you think that the pandemic of COVID-19 affected your response in the current survey negatively? Nevertheless, according to current result there was a non-significant difference of bullying victimization in the scores of those who answer with ''yes" (M = 2.04, SD = 4.27) and those who reply with "no" (M = 1.39, SD = 4.26), BCa 95% CI [-2.90, .97], $t(191) = -.69$, $p = .519$. Also, the p values for perpetration were found be p = .265, among participant who stated "yes" (M = 2.04, SD = 5.32) and those who replied with "no" (M = .58, SD = 2.35). Therefore, it is assumed that the pandemic of COVID-19 did not affect significantly the dependent variables of the study.

3.4 Correlations among Discrete and Continuous Variables

As shown in Table 4., and Table 5., extraversion, neuroticism, all fourdimensionof group environment questionnaire: individual attractions to the group-social (ATGS), individual attractions to the group-task (ATGT), group integration-social (GIS), and group integration-task (GIT) were significantly negatively correlated with victimization. In comparison, negative personal rapport (CBSS) were positively correlated with victimization.

Table 4. Correlation Among Victimization, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to experience

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Victimization	-					
2. Extraversion	-.300**	-				

3.Agreeableness	-.179	695**	-		
4. Conscientiousness	-.021	-.208*	-.053	-	
5. Neuroticism	-.234*	.730**	. 599**	.013	-
6. Openness to experience	-.046	.142	.122	.495**	.105	-

*p<0.05, **p<0.001

Table 5. Correlation Among Victimization, CBSS, ATGS, ATGT, GIS and GIT

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Victimization	-					
2. CBSS	.535**	-				
3. ATGS	-.294**	-.683**	-			
4. ATGT	-.341**	-723**	.785**	-		
5. GIS	-.351**	-.679**	.786**	.737**	-	
6. GIT	-.413**	-.737**	.782**	.787**	.851**	-

*p<0.05, **p<0.001

Besides, Table 3 and Table 4, demonstrated that personality factor Conscientiousness and all four factors of Group environment questionnaire (ATGS, ATGT, GIS and GIT) were negatively correlated with perpetration. On the other hand, negative personal rapport (CBSS) were again positively correlated with victimization. To sum up, it is important to be noted that all the correlations were in expected direction.

Table 6. Correlation Among Perpetration, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to experience

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Perpetration	-					
2. Extraversion	.148	-				
3.Agreeableness	.136	695**	-			
4. Conscientiousness	-.203*	-.208*	-.053	-		
5. Neuroticism	.091	.730**	. 599**	.013	-	
6. Openness to experience	-.034	.142	.122	.495**	.105	-

*p<0.05, **p<0.001

Table 7. Correlation Among Perpetration, CBSS, ATGS, ATGT, GIS and GIT

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Perpetration	-					
2. CBSS	.261**	-				
3. ATGS	-.176	-.683**	-			
4. ATGT	-.213*	-.723**	.785**	-		
5. GIS	-.225*	-.679**	.786**	.737**	-	
6. GIT	-.201*	-.737**	-.782**	.787**	.851**	-

*p<0.05, **p<0.001

3.5 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

In the present analysis, Hierarchical Regression had been applied to explore the significant function of gender, nationality, personality, the climate of the team, and negative personal rapport on bullying victimization and perpetration. Besides, in total,

three separate blocks were added into that hierarchical regression analysis. In the first block – gender, nationality, and birth year were placed. In the second block – all five personalities total score were added, and in the third block – climate of the team and negative personal rapport were appended. Also, the current study checked at the values of skewness and kurtosis in the SPSS output in a way to ensure that the distribution is normal and checked the linearity, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity of the current data. Besides, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to assure that the current data have no violations of the assumption of normality. However, the assumption of the current study was not met, which is reasonable according to Rutkowski and Rutkowski (2016) since the topic measure such experience as bullying. Additionally, Da Silva Lima et al' (2017) study demonstrated that the data do not meet the assumption for normality but despite that the analysis was performed (n > 200) and there was no any need for using non-parametric tests. Therefore, the ongoing work (n > 193) also performed the necessary statistical investigation.

Using hierarchical regression (See Table 5), first step of that analysis found that nationality, and age explain a significant proportion of the variance in victimization (R^2 = .15, F(3, 188) = 10.80 , p < .001). Especially, nationality (β = .27, t(191) = 3.90, p < .001) age (β = -.24, t(191) = -3.30, p < .005) significantly predicted victimization. The second block analysis where personality dimensions were added explained 21.0% of the variance on victimization (F=5.91, p < .001) with nationality (β = .22, t(191) = 3.15, p < .005) and age (β = -.22, t(191) = -3.02, p < .005). In the third block, climate of the team and negative personal rapport were added to the model. Moreover, third model explain a significant proportion of the variance in victimization (R^2 = .43, F= 10.27, p < .001) with extraversion score (β = -.41, t(191) = -3.87, p <

.001) and negative personal rapport (β = .52, $t(191)$ = 5.41, p < .001). However, it should be noted that close to significance coefficients were the factor ATGS part of the variable associated with climate and cohesion of a team (β = .21, $t(191)$ = 1.86, p = .064).

The second hierarchical regression analysis (See Table 6) was conduct to evaluate the prediction of bullying perpetration. Moreover, the first model (nationality, gender and age) of that analysis was insignificant (R^2 = .03, F(3, 188) = 1.63, p = .183). Into the second model personality dimension were added. However, that model also demonstrated insignificant result (R^2 = .10, F(3, 183) = 2.42, p = .017). Besides, third model which included all climate of the team dimensions and negative personal rapport demonstrated significant result and explain a significant proportion of the variance in victimization (R^2 = .16, F(13, 178) = 2.65, p < .005). Besides, no any of the variables in the third block demonstrated individual significant effect. However, close to significance coefficients were the variable negative personal rapport (β = .22, $t(191)$ = 1.91, p = .058).

Table 8. Hierarchical Multiple Regression analysis for victimization's predictors

	Victimization		
	B	*SEb*	Beta
	Model 1		
Nationality	2.590	.666	.267**
Gender	.261	.603.	.031
Age	-.196	.059	-.237*
	R² = 0.147	ΔR² =0.133	

	Model 2		
Nationality	2.147	.682	.222*
Gender	.345	.604	.041
Age	-.179	.059	-.216*
Extraversion	-.138	.054	-.310
Agreeableness	.039	.037	.098
Conscientiousness	-.045	.040	-.098
Neuroticism	-.004	.047	-.008
Openness to exp.	.016	.064	.021
	$R^2 = 0.205$	$\Delta R^2 = 0.170$	

	Model 3		
Nationality	1.755	.593	.181*
Gender	.723	.544	.085
Age	-.060	.053	-.072
Extraversion	-.183	.047	-.411*
Agreeableness	.071	.033	.181
Conscientiousness	-.029	.035	-.063
Neuroticism	.052	.041	.116
Openness to exp.	.011	.055	.015
CBSS	.282	.052	.517**
ATGS	.077	.041	.206
ATGT	.023	.052	.049
GIS	-.016	.055	-.034
GIT	-.075	.051	-.192

	R² = 0.429		ΔR² =0.387	

*p <0.05, **p<0.001

Table 9. Hierarchical Multiple Regression analysis for perpetration's predictors

	Perpetration		
	B	*SEb*	Beta
Model 1			
Nationality	.357	.483	.054
Gender	-.260	.438	-.045
Age	-.069	.043	-.123
	R² = 0.025	ΔR² =0.010	
Model 2			
Nationality	.414	.494	.063
Gender	-.119	.438	-.021
Age	-.092	.043	-.164
Extraversion	.009	.039	.031
Agreeableness	.023	.027	.086
Conscientiousness	-.072	.029	-.228
Neuroticism	.016	.034	.052
Openness to exp.	.030	.046	.056
	R² = 0.096	ΔR² =0.056	
Model 3			
Nationality	.366	.488	.056
Gender	-.022	.447	-.004
Age	-.053	.044	-.094

Extraversion	-.008	.039	-.025
Agreeableness	.036	.027	.135
Conscientiousness	-.061	.029	-.193
Neuroticism	.040	.034	.132
Openness to exp.	.016	.046	.030
CBSS	.082	.043	.221
ATGS	.021	.034	.084
ATGT	-.041	.042	-.127
GIS	-.044	.046	-.139
GIT	.029	.042	.111
	$R^2 = 0.162$	$\Delta R^2 = 0.101$	

*p <0.05, **p<0.001

3.6 Prevalence rate of Bullying and Victimization in North Cyprus

When "1 standard deviation over the mean score" was applied to the currentdata, the incidence of perpetration and victimization was found to vary between 7.81% and 5.73%, respectively. Besides, for bullying perpetration, the cut of a point was 3.64, whereas, for bullying victimization was 5.72.

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The current research has emphasized the impact of contextual and individual predictors on bullying perpetration/victimization among semi-professional team sport players in North Cyprus. Throughout this study, (i.e., gender, nationality, negative coaching behaviour) were identified as significant predictors that contribute to bullying victimization within the sport context. Therefore, all findings associated with: gender, nationality, negative personal rapport of the coach, psychological climate of the teams, and personality traits will be discussed below.

To start with, all athletes do not matter of their gender reported equal level ofbullying perpetration/victimization in sports contexts, as expected. Hence, the first two hypotheses of the current work were supported and showed that those variables' rates did not differ across male and female athletes. Besides, the outcomes associated with victimization was in line with previous sport linked works (Evans et al., 2016; Adler, 2014) and school-related studies (Ziegler & Pepler, 1993; Craig and Harel, 2004). Nevertheless, inconsistent with other studies that were conduct in the environment differ from sports (Kepenekci & Cinkir, 2006; Orue & Calvete, 2011; Weuve et al., 2014). Based on previous studies (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Craig, 1993), we had proposed that there will be no gender difference in bullying perpetration among athletes. Moreover, no recent sport studies up to date have demonstrated that bullying perpetration within teams is not affected by sex. Also, to the best of our knowledge, no research has proven that gender differences could disappear and, respectively, the

rate of aggression/bullying to become equal in sports. Therefore, the current finding was contradictory to the existing literature that assumed that bullying perpetration frequency differs across gender. Usually, males are typically more likely to initiate bullying (Adler, 2014; Evans et al, 2016; Vveinhardt et al. 2018;). As well as, our research further disputed previous school context studies, which stated that gender plays a major role in bullying perpetration (Orue & Calvete, 2011) and men often are in a position to initiate more bullying incidents compared to women (Kepenekci & Cinkir, 2006; Weuve et al., 2014). A possible cause for those contradictory results could be due to the fact that sports context incorporates highly competitive and masculine- centered-dynamics which can enhance athletes' offensive manners more (Coakley, 2009; Baar, 2012). Besides, same nature and intolerable atmosphere within sports usually encourages athletes to pursue assertive tactics in order to succeed (Parent, &Fortier, 2018). Hence, it may be conclude that masculinity culture within sports is a risk factor which push athletes to mainly focus on winning itself rather than being collective team players. With this in mind, future studies are required to consider that perhaps gender does no matter in sports since each competitor's target/desire is glorious victories. Usually, athletes are split into groups to play a given game at least once a week on training. This division, internal competition, and desire to win between teammates may prompt equal levels of aggression of both sexes. As a result, everyone may do anything in case to be winner even at the cost of using bullying to hurt his/her sports colleagues. According to Verbruggen, Chambers, Lawrence, and Mclaren (2016) variable such as losing future rewards tends to enhance impulsive action. Additionally, Casanova et al. (2016) pointed out that winning/losing tends to cause differences in the amount of stress or physiological/psychological consequences for the athletes. As a result, the team's percentage of losses/winning a given match or

competition may also cause the outcome to vary and, at the same time to trigger internal problems within the team, which on the other hand, to urges equal aggression/bullying between the sexes.

Based on current research results' regarding nationality, international players were more victimized/vulnerable to victimization than the local players. This outcome was consistent with the school analysis of Maynard et al. (2016), who showed that immigrants had suffered more from bullying compared to local people. The current study also demonstrated that nationality has presented as a fundamental element that could produce significant peer' victimization differences between groups (local vs international). Therefore, this finding aligns with the works of Juvonen et al. (2000) and Pepler et al. (1999), who found that nationality is specifically related to the school rate of bullying victimization. However, the current outcome did not confirm the founding of Volk and Lagzdins (2009), who reported that nationality/ethnicity had not been significantly related to bullying victimization within the sport context. Of course, it should take into consideration that Volk and Lagzdins (2009) used a small sample size and tested women's participants independently, which may be the source of this inconsistent finding. Besides, a minimal group paradigm (Tajfel, 1970) could be one explanation of why the current study varies, among others' outcomes. Usually, ingroup members categorized themself as "we" while outgroup members as "they" (Turner et al., 1987). Besides, we–they differentiate, grouping, or categorize people were sufficient to induce ingroup–outgroup discrimination, bias (Tajfel, 1970), or bullying situation directed from one group toward another (Ojala &Nesdale, 2004). Therefore, for instance, international players who enter the team may be viewed from local athletes as an outgroup member for a specified period. That is why being from an ethnic/national minority within a sports organization, as the current thesis has shown,

can increase the risk of victimization within a team. Correspondingly, it would also be advantageous if future studies ought to verify this new assumption/hypothesis later on and also to consider whether the ambition of native players to be in the starting lineup or group local cohesion does not encourages/cause higher usage of bullying towards foreign players.

Although, the current study utilized Paul and Smith's (2000) school founding aligned with negative pedagogy (2000) in order to determine whether negative coaching behaviours would be positively correlated with the team's victimization. It was found that the analysis by Paul and Smith (2000) was compatible with the current one, despite that the context (e.g., sport) and questionnaire tested were somewhat different. This research then provided considerable support for the assumption that coaches' negative way of acting could enhance the victimization within a team. Besides, one explanation of why negative pedagogy could raise negative consequences in sport could be substantiated on Bandura's Social Learning Theory (1977). Actions/manners are learned throughout the process of observational learning in a given context (Bandura, 1977) and, hence, sports players could copy and practice those negative behaviours, simply because their coach is a role model for them. On the other hand, contrary to what we expected, negative coaching behaviours were not positively correlated with the perpetration of the players within the team and, respectively was not in line with the outcome of Paul and Smith (2000). One explanation for that contrary founding can be due to the fact that such actions as abuse, harassment, or bullying may appear covertly in sports, but the knowledge that bullying happens could be present as an open secret within this context. (Brackenridge et al., 2010). Also, athletes might perceive these behaviours as a standard element of relationships

between individuals sharing significant time together (Kerr et al., 2016) and, consequently, not to report it openly.

The findings of the current work supported that a low extraversion score have a significant individual effect on victimization. However, contrary to the current assumption, low agreeableness, high neuroticism scores did not align positively with bullying victimization within team sports. Also, according to the current outcomes, high agreeableness, high extraversion, and low conscientiousness were not significantly correlated with the perpetration level of semi-professional athletes in Northern Cyprus. Therefore, the present findings did not endorse the claim that particular personality traits of one character assessed by virtue of the Big Five-Factor Model of Personality (Goldberg, 1992) can be presented as the sole indicator of bullying perpetration/victimization within the context of sports. Currently, past researches (Tani et al., 2003; Fossati et al., 2012; Duffy et al., 2017) suggested that the particular dimensions of one's individual character were linked to predict bullying perpetration/victimization in classrooms. Also, Kerr et al. (2016) defined specific characteristics of one personality (i.e., dominant vs. silent) as an essential factor that affects those negative behaviours. Additionally, Fossati et al. (2012) have found that low extraversion, low agreeableness, and high neuroticism could be the premise for someone to become victims, whereas high agreeableness, high extraversion, and low conscientiousness were the indicators of bullying perpetration. Nevertheless, the current work was not in line with previous literature and consequently did not find any significant individual level differences among athletes who compete in North Cyprus. The alternative explanation for that contrary outcome could be due to the fact that in a team sport, athletes must collaborate/interact with each other more than a non-team sport in order to be good teammates and be accepted by other players (Hawley, 2003).

Besides, the young adult may encounter/experiment with different interactions and various roles in sports (Coakley, 2009). Hence, this could require some players to modify their character according to the team's norms if they want to be good team members.

Furthermore, the current study assessed the level of team cohesion among semi-professional team players. No significant prediction was identified among the variables related to the psychological climate of the team and bullying perpetration/ victimization. It means that the sample of the current thesis does not demonstrate either that the team's positive psychological climate was negatively correlated with bullying perpetration/ victimization in sports. It should be admitted that one of the factor part of Group Environment Questionnaire called "Individual Attractions to the Group-Social" was close to significance coefficients to demonstrate that the team's positive psychological climate could predict victimization within sport context. However, both results were not consistent with past finding that claimed that a positive environment or inclusive sport climate could be present as a preventive measure against aggression, victimization (Baar, 2012) and bullying (Fisher & Lars Dzikus, 2017). Respondent fatigue (Lavrakas, 2008) may be one of reason why the current data was not compatible with previous sample since the survey incorporate six different questionnaires. Another indication of why the current study has not achieved a desirable result could be due to the fact that titular and reserve players may have a distinct perspective of how each of them perceives the climate within the team.

Lastly, according to the findings, the current study also approaches Bronfenbrenner's (1979) model to interpret and underline the excessive bullying processes. Theoretically, the current study employed Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological framework to examined do the following factors: personal characteristics

(i.g., gender, personality traits, and nationality), microsystem (teammates and coach interaction), mesosystem (coach's/manager involvement in athlete team sports), exosystem (sports-related climate factors) and macrosystem (how cultural factors such as gender, nationality could influence athletes, coach, teammate) affected bullying perpetration/ victimization. Besides, according to outcome, it was significantly displayed that different systems such as individual characteristics (gender, nationality), microsystem, mesosystem, and macrosystem can impact the frequency of bullying perpetration/victimization incidents among semi- professional athletes in North Cyprus. Besides, the thesis' result was in line with previous sports studies, which also adopted the same model to be applying to bullying in sports (Shannon, 2013; Espelage, 2014; Stirling & Kerr, 2014). Therefore, current work confirmed that the Social-Ecological Framework (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) could be used as an adequate/properly theoretical tool for understanding bullying dynamics.

4.1 Limitations

However, the current work involves a few limitations, which might restrict some of the outcomes in a contradictory direction. For instance, online data survey method may be presented as a significant cause for the current study not to achieve the desirable effects since there is an absence of control over the study settings (Kraut et al., 2004). Also, the convenience sampling approach could be presented as another factor that limits the lack of representativeness of the current data (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister, & Zechmeister, 2012). For example, we cannot be assured that every athlete in the sports circle in North Cyprus had an equal/fair opportunity to be selected in the sample. Social desirability may also alter the outcome (Shaughnessy et al., 2012). The participants were aware that their answers were being tracked/monitored,

and thus the respondents may change their reply in a way to demonstrate socially accepted manners.

Self-report bias could also affect the reliability of participants' answers. Hence, the current study relies only on a self-report measurement of bullying perpetration/ victimization. Lastly, the current study cannot be able to evaluate whether the gender of the coach could be considered as a factor that may trigger bullying dynamics because, in North Cyprus, almost all coaches of the First League (e.g., football, handball, volleyball, and basketball) are men. Therefore, this could be presented as another limitation.

4.2 Implications

The current prominent study's result can further help in designing a new bullying prevention system/policy for all sports organizations, federations, affairs offices, local amateur, and semi-professional teams. Study outcome underlines the value of raising awareness about bullying dynamics in sports. More concretely, the outcome could be used to develop campaigns against perpetration/victimization, where negative coaching behaviour within teams should also be stressed. Furthermore, the current outcome has emphasized the importance of involving actively coaches in those organisation since they need to be educated about the consequences of their negative actions. By doing so, coaches will understand how critical their pedagogy in sports is, and then consider twice before screaming or shouting at any of their athletes next time. Taken together, charitable sports tournaments could be applied in order to raise the biggest awareness towards all individuals involved in sports such as directors, managers, coaches, family members, fans, and players.

Besides, the current data indicates nationality as a significant predictor of victimization in the sports context. Therefore, we recommend that the focus of all team

communities, such as football, volleyball, handball, or basketball, should also be centralized on minimizing that negative bullying experience within teams. Local players should apprehend that international athletes bring positive multicultural and coloured light into the existing sports arena. Besides, most of the foreigners who come to compete in North Cyprus were professional national players who definitely have what to prove in a given sports field, and hence, everyone else in the team or from the spectators would benefit to learn and acquire new sports techniques from those newcomers. Consequently, instead of being bullied or rejected, international players should be accepted, welcomed, and encouraged to continue their careers in such a country as North Cyprus. Importantly, any beyond borders practical actions will have implications on the sports world in North Cyprus only after significant future replication of this founding, such as the ones previously stated.

4.3 Future Directions

Further studies may attempt to modify all problematic components that have been listed in the limitation section above in order to achieve significant results. In addition, investigators could take into consideration to conduct studies with only homogeneous variables (i.e, personality traits or group cohesion factors) in order to comprehend the valid and accurate correlation between those items and bullying perpetration/victimization in sports context and eliminated respondent fatigue. This research shows that international players were more vulnerable to victimization compared to local ones. However, the current study was unable to examine whether the knowledge of the foreign language of the international athlete matters or if it is not a crucial factor. In our case, does knowing the Turkish language could serve as a protective factor for those foreign players who could comprehend and speak it? Consequently, adding that question into the demographic questionnaire could extend

our further knowledge in the context of bullying and sports. Although, it would be beneficial if future studies expand our understanding of what are the other protective variables that might help international players to adapt easily in the new team's environment and in the same time to avoid any unpleasant bullying episodes. Furthermore, it would be advantageous if further research explores whether the years of international players being in the team have a negative or positive correlation with bullying victimization in order to help local clubs and sport organisation to raise awareness and prevention action against this bullying issues. Meanwhile, the focus of the existing work has neglected to consider age as predictor that might affect victimization. However, Hierarchical Multiple Regression analysis of the current study, indicated that age could significantly could predict bullying victimization in sports context even in adulthood. Also, according to Kerr, Jewett, MacPherson, and Stirling (2016), age has been described by eight team captains as a part that could either function as a preventive factor or as a risk one depending on the athlete's seniority. For instance, for younger players, age could be a risk factor, whereas for senior members age could be displayed as a protective determinant in a given sport context (Kerr et al. 2016). Besides, Kerr et al. (2016) concluded that not enough studies on modern bullying analysis have been investigating in out-of-school fields such as sport. Therefore, there is still a necessity for variable such as age to be examined in the context of bullying in sports. Lastly, Pellegrini (2001) ascertained that a multi-method using a range of questionnaires, interviews, peer nomination, and observations is the most reliable way to assess the dynamics of bullying. Consequently, future studies should also consider Pellegrini's work (2001), in order to ensure more accurate and efficient result later on.

52

4.4 Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the contextual and individual predictors of bullying perpetration/ victimization within the sports context. The result demonstrated that the rate of bullying perpetration and victimization among men/women becomes equivalent in sports. Consequently this means that "traditional gender stereotypes" could disappear in such backgrounds and revealed a masculine culture in sports as the risk factor for such contradictory findings. With this in mind, outcome of the study displayed also that nationality and coach's negative pedagogy are significant predictors of bullying victimization episodes among semi-professional team sports players. Besides, the current thesis is intended to be vital and beneficial for all sports societies/athletes worldwide. In sum, we genuinely considered that the ongoing work underlined the critical demand for more emphasis and analysis of these problems later on.

REFERENCES

Adair, D., & Vamplew, W. (1997). *Sport in Australian history*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Adler, A. (2014). *An examination into bullying in the adolescent sport context*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Queen's University.

Annematt, L., D'Escury, C., & Dudink, C. M. (2010). Bullying beyond school: Examining the role of sports. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in school: An international perspective* (pp. 235–248). New York, NY: Routledge.

Atlas, R. S., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. *The Journal of Educational Research, 92,* 86-99. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220679809597580

Baar, P. L. M. (2012). *Peer aggression and victimization in Dutch elementary schools and sports clubs: Prevalence, stability, and approach across different contexts* (Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University).

Baldry, A. C. (2003). Bullying in schools and exposure to domestic violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 27,* 713–732. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(03)00114-5

Balogh, L. (2015). *Sport - Culture - Sports Culture*. 10.13140/RG.2.1.3637.5120.

54

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication, 28*, 12–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1978.tb01621.x

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social* Psychology, 63, 575–583. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0045925

Bayraktar, F. (2012). Bullying Among Adolescents in North Cyprus and Turkey: Testing a Multifactor Model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27*(6), 1040–1065.

Biggs, B. K., Vernberg, E. M., Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., & Dill, E. J. (2008). Teacher Adherence and Its Relation to Teacher Attitudes and Student Outcomes in an Elementary School-Based Violence Prevention Program. *School Psychology Review*, *37*, 533-549.

Brackenridge, C., Fasting, K., Kirby, S., Leahy, T. (2010), „*Protecting children from violence in sports: review with a focus on industrialized countries*", The UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre**,** United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), ABC Tipografia srl, Florence, Italy.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human developments: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1996). Understanding the complexity of human aggression: Affective, cognitive, and social dimensions of individual differences in propensity toward aggression. *European Journal of Personality*, *10*, 133–155.

Carron, A. V., Widmeyer, W. N., & Brawley, L. R. (1985). The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sport teams: The Group Environment Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 7*(3), 244–266.

Casanova, N., Palmeira-de-Oliveira, A., Pereira, A., Crisóstomo, L., Travassos, B., & Costa, A.M. (2016). Cortisol, testosterone and mood state variation during an official female football competition. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*, *56*(6), 775-781.

Coakley, J. J. (2009). *Sports in society: Issues & controversies*. Boston: McGraw Hill (tenth edition).

Collot d'Escury, A., & Dudink, A. (2010). Bullying Beyond School: Examining the Role of Sport. In: S. Jumerson, S. Swearer and D. Espelage, ed., *Handbook of Bullying in School*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, pp.223-234.

Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., Kim, T. W., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence. A meta-analytic investigation. *Child Psychology Quarterly, 25*, 65-83.

Côté, J., & Yardley, J. & Hay, J. & Sedgwick, W. & Baker, J. (1999). An exploratory examination of the Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport. *Avante*. *5,* 3, 82-92.

Craig, W. (1993). *Naturalistic observations of bullies and victims on the playground*. Unpublished dissertations. York University.

Craig, W. M., & Harel, Y. (2004). Bullying, physical fighting and victimization. In C. Currie, C. Roberys, A. Morgan, R. Smith, W. Settertobulte, O. Samdal, et al. (Eds.), *Young people's health in context: International report from the HBSC 2001/02 survey*. WHO *policy series: Health policy for children and adolescents* (Issue 4, pp.133-144). Denmark, Copenhagen:WHO Regional Office for Europe.

Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. (2003). Identifying and Targeting Risk for Involvement in Bullying and Victimization. *Canadian journal of psychiatry*, 48. 577-82. 10.1177/070674370304800903.

Cummings, J. G., Pepler, D. J., Mishna, F., & Craig, W. M. (2006). Bullying and victimization among students with exceptionalities. *Exceptionality Education Canada, 16,* 193-222.

Da Silva Lima, M., Veloso Gouveia, R., Silva Soares, A.K., Rodrigues Araújo, R., Costa Ribeiro, M.G., de Sampaio Brito, T.R. & Veloso Gouveia, V. (2017). Attitudes towards potential targets of bullying scale: Elaboration and evidence of validity and reliability. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología, 20*(1), 242-253. DOI: 10.14718/ACP.2017.20.1.12

Dubin, R. (1978). Theory building. New York: Social Sciences Press.

Duffy, A. L., Penn, S., Nesdale, D., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2017). Popularity: Does it magnify associations between popularity prioritization and the bullying and defending behavior of early adolescent boys and girls? *Social Development*, *26*, 263–277.

Eisenberg, M. E., Neumark-Sztainer, D., Perry, C.L. (2003). Peer harassment, school connectedness, and academic achievement. *Journal of School Health*, *73*(8):311-316. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2003.tb06588.x

Espelage, D. (2014). Ecological Theory: Preventing Youth Bullying, Aggression, and Victimization. *Theory Into Practice*. 53. 257-264. http://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.947216.

Evans, C. B. R., & Smokowski, P. R. (2016). Theoretical explanations for bullying in school: How ecological processes propagate perpetration and victimization. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, *33*(4), 365–375. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-015-0432-2

Evans, M. B., Adler, A., Macdonald, D., & Côté, J. (2016). Bullying Victimization and Perpetration Among Adolescent Sport Teammates. *Pediatric exercise science*. 10.1123/pes.2015-0088.

Fasting, K., Brackenridge, C., Knorre, N. (2010). Performance level and sexual harassment prevalence among female athletes in the Czech Republic. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal*. *19*, 26-32.

Felix, E. D., & Green, J. G. (2010). Popular Girls and Brawny Boys. In S. Jimerson, S. Swearer, & D. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in school: An international perspective* (pp. 235–248). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fisher, L. A., & Dzikus, L. (2017). Bullying in sport and performance psychology. In E. Acevedo (Ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Psychology* (pp. 1-24). New York: Oxford University Press. DOI:10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.013.169

Fossati, A., Borroni, S.,& Maffei, C. (2012). Bullying as a style of personal relating: Personality characteristics and interpersonal aspects of self-reports of bullying behaviours among Italian adolescent high school students. *Personality and Mental Health*. 6. 10.1002/pmh.1201.

Fry & Gano-Overway, L. A. (2010). Exploring the Contribution of the Caring Climate to the Youth Sport Experience, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 22*(3), 294-304, DOI: 10.1080/10413201003776352

Gleason, K. A., Jensen-Campell, L. A., & Richarson, D. S. (2004). Agreeableness as a predictor of aggression in adolescence. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 43–61.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The Development of Markers for the Big-Five Factor Structure. *Psychol Assess*, 4:26-42.

Hamburger, M. E., Basile, K. C., & Vivolo, A. M. (2011) *Measuring Bullying Victimization, Perpetration, and Bystander Experiences: A Compendium of Assessment Tools*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.

Hernandez, S. M. (2015). A better understanding of bullying and hazing in the military. *Military Law Review*, 223, 415–439.

Hristuilias, J., & Popov, N. (2003). Psychological factors for improvement during preparation and completion of elite European sports shooters. *Personality, motivation, sports, 9,* 191-196. Nsa Press, Sofia.

Jara, N. & Casas, J. A. & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2017). Proactive and reactive aggressive behavior in bullying: The role of values. *International Journal of Educational Psychology. 6.* 1-24. 10.17583/IJEP.2017.2515.

Jeckell, A. S., Copenhaver, E. A., & Diamond, A. B. (2020). Hazing and Bullying in Athletic Culture. In *Mental Health in the Athlete* (pp. 165-179). Springer, Cham.

Jewett, R., Kerr, G., MacPherson, E. & Stirling, A. (2019): Experiences of bullying victimisation in female interuniversity athletes, *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, DOI: 10.1080/1612197X.2019.1611902

Jimerson, S., Swearer, S. & Espelage, D. (2010). Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective. New York, Routledge.

Juvonen, J., Nishina, A., & Graham, S. (2000). Peer harassment, psychological adjustment, and school functioning in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(2), 349–359. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.2.349

Kepenekci, Y., & Çınkır, Ş. (2006). Bullying among Turkish high school students. *Child abuse & neglect*. 30. 193-204. 10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.10.005.

Kerr, G., Jewett, R., MacPherson, E., & Stirling, A. (2016). Student–athletes' experiences of bullying on intercollegiate teams. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, *10*(2), 132-149.

Klein, J. & Cornell, D. & Konold, T. (2012). Relationships Between Bullying, School Climate, and Student Risk Behaviors. *School psychology quarterly: the official journal of the Division of School Psychology*, American Psychological Association. 27. 154-69. 10.1037/a0029350.

Kraut, R., Olson, J., Banaji, M. R., Bruckman, A., Cohen, J., & Couper, M. (2004). Psychological research online: Report of Board of Scientific Affairs' Advisory Group on the conduct of research on the Internet. *American Psychologist, 59,* 105-117.

Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (Vols. 1-0). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412963947

Lee, C.H. (2011). An Ecological Systems Approach to Bullying Behaviors Among Middle School Students in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*, 1664-1693.

Lewin, K. (1936). *Problems of topological psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Long, J. D. & Pellegrini, A. D. (2003). Studying change in dominance and bullying with linear mixed models. School Psychology Review, 32(3), 401–417. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline. org/publications/spr/index.aspx?vol=42&issue=4

Lorenz, E. N. (1963) Deterministic nonperiodic flow. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 20: 130–141

Martens, R. (2012). *Successful coaching* (4th ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Maynard, B. & Vaughn, M. & Salas-Wright, C., & Vaughn, S. (2016). Bullying Victimization Among School-Aged Immigrant Youth in the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 58. 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.11.013.

Menesini, E., Camodeca, M., & Nocentini, A. (2010). Bullying among siblings: The role of personality and relational variables. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 28 (4), 921-939.doi:10.1348/026151009x479402

Mouttapa, M., Valente, T., Gallaher, P., Rohrbach, L. A., & Unger, J. B. (2004). Social network predictors of bullying and victimization. *Adolescence, 39*, 315–335. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm. nih.gov/pubmed/15563041.

Nery, M., Neto, C., Rosado A. & Smith, P. K. (2019) Bullying in youth sport training: A nationwide exploratory and descriptive research in Portugal, *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 16:4, 447-463, DOI: 10.1080/17405629.2018.1447459

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school children: some basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In Pepler D, Rubin K. (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression*. (p. 411–88). Hillsdale (NJ): Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (2010). *Creating a positive school climate and developing social competence*. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (p. 49–59). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Orue, I., & Calvete, E., (2011). Reciprocal relationships between sociometric indices of social status and aggressive behaviour in children: Gender differences. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28, 963-982*.

Parent, S., & Fortier, K. (2018). Comprehensive overview of the problem of violence against athletes in sport. *J. Sport Soc. Issues*, *42*, 227–246.

Patton, D. U., Hong, J. S., Patel, S., & Kral, M. J. (2017). A Systematic Review of Research Strategies Used in Qualitative Studies on School Bullying and Victimization. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *18*(1), 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838015588502

Paul, J.L. & Smith, T.J. (Eds.) (2000). *Stories Out of School: Memories and Reflections on Care and Cruelty in the Classroom*, Ablex Publishing, Stamford, CT.

Pečjak, Sonja & Pirc, Tina. (2017). Bullying and Perceived School Climate: Victims' and Bullies' Perspective. *Studia Psychologica*. *59*. 22-33. 10.21909/sp.2017.01.728.

Pellegrini, A. D. (2001) The Roles of Dominance and Bullying in the Development of Early Heterosexual Relationships, *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2:2-3, 63-73, DOI: 10.1300/J135v02n02_05

Peltola, M. & Kivijärvi, A. (2017). Sports and structured leisure as sites of victimization for children and young people in Finland: Looking at the significance of gender and ethnicity. *Int. Rev. Sociol. Sport*, *52*, 955–971.

Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (1995). A peek behind the fence: Naturalistic observations of aggressive children with remote audiovisual

recording. *Developmental Psychology, 31*(4), 548–553. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.31.4.548

Pepler, D., Connolly, J., & Craig, W. (1999). Bullying and harassment: Experiences of immigrant and minority youth. (GERIS Report). Retrieved January 11, 2007, from http://ceris.metropolis.net/Virtual%20Library/REPReport/Pepler1997.pdf

Raakman, E., Dorsch, K.D., Rhind, D.J.A. (2010a). The development of a typology of abusive coaching behaviours within youth sport, *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, *5*, 4, 503- 515.

Roland, E., & Idsoe, T. (2001). Aggression and bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, *27*(6), 446–462.

Rutkowski, L. & Rutkowski, D. (2016). The Relation Between Students' Perceptions of Instructional Quality and Bullying Victimization. 10.1007/978-3-319-41252-8_6.

Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15, 112–120. doi:10.1016/j. avb.2009.08.007.

Shannon, C. S. (2013). Bullying in recreation and sport settings: Exploring risk factors, prevention efforts, and intervention strategies. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, *31*(1).

Sharpe, J. P., & Desai, S. (2001). The Revised Neo Personal- ity Inventory and the MMPI-2 Psychopathology Five in the prediction of aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *31*(4), 505–518.

Shaughnessey, J., Zechmeister, E. ,& Zechmeister, J. (2012). *Research Methods in Psychology*, New York: McGraw Hill (ninth edition).

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cam- bridge University Press.

Smith, P. K., & Slonje, R. (2010). The nature and Extend of a New Kind of Bullying, In and Out of School. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (p. 1–12). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Steffgen, G., Recchia, S., & Viechtbauer, W. (2013). The link between school climate and violence in school: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*(2), 300–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.12.001

Steinfeldt, J., Vaughan, E., LaFollette, J. & Steinfeldt, M. (2012). Bullying Among Adolescent Football Players: Role of Masculinity and Moral Atmosphere. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. 13. 340-353. 10.1037/a0026645.

Stirling, A. (2009) Definition and constituents of maltreatment in sport: establishing a conceptual framework for research practitioners. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *43*, 1091–1099.

Stirling, A. E., & Kerr, G. A. (2014). Initiating and sustaining emotional abuse in the coach–athlete relationship: An ecological transactional model of vulnerability. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma, 23*(2), 116–135.

Stirling, A. E., Bridges, E. J., Cruz, E. L., & Mountjoy, M. L. (2011). Canadian Academy of Sport and Exercise Medicine position paper: Abuse, harassment, and bullying in sport. *Clinical journal of sport medicine*, *21*(5), 385-391.

Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (2004). Introduction: A Social-Ecological Framework of Bullying Among Youth. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (p. 1–12). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Swigonski, N. L., Enneking, B. A., & Hendrix, K. S. (2014). Bullying Behavior by Athletic Coaches. *Pediatrics, 133(2), e273–e275*.doi:10.1542/peds.2013-3146

Tani, F., Greenman, P., Schneider, B., & Fregoso, M. (2003). Bullying and the Big Five: A Study of Childhood Personality and Participant Roles in Bullying Incidents. *School Psychology International, 24,*131-146. 10.1177/0143034303024002001.

Tatar, A. (2016). Translation of Big-Five Personality Questionnaire into Turkish and comparing it with Five Factor Personality Inventory Short Form. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*. *18*. 1. 10.5455/apd.220580.

Tremblay, P. F., & Ewart, L. A. (2005). The Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire and its relations to values, the Big Five, provoking hypothetical situations, alcohol consumption patterns, and alcohol expectancies. Personality and Individual Differences, 38, 337–346.

Unutmaz, V., & Kiremitci, O. (2014). Investigating the Psychometric Properties of Group Environment Questionnaire. *Journal of CBU Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 6(2), 23-30.

Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying is power: Implications for school-based intervention strategies. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*(2), 157–176. doi:10. 1300/J008v19n02_10.

Verbruggen, F., Chambers, C.& Lawrence, N. & Mclaren, I.P.L.. (2016). Winning and Losing: Effects on Impulsive Action. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance. 43*. 10.1037/xhp0000284.

Vertommen, T., Veldhoven, N., Wouters, K., Kampen, J., Brackenridge, C., Rhind, D., ... Van Den Eede, F. (2016). Interpersonal violence against children in sport in the Netherlands and Belgium. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 51*, 223–236.

Volk, A., & Lagzdins, L. (2009). Bullying and victimization among adolescent girl athletes. *Journal of athletic training*. 11. 13-31.

Vveinhardt, J., Fominiene, V. B., & Andriukaitiene, R. (2019). Encounter with bullying in sport and its consequences for youth: Amateur athletes'

approach. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *16*(23), 4685.

Vveinhardt, J., Fominienė, V., & Jeseviciute-Ufartiene, L. (2018). Bullying and harassment in sport: overview of management instruments. 10.20472/IAC.2018.039.047.

Vveinhardt, J., Komskiene, D., & Romero, Z. (2017). Bullying and harassment prevention in youth basketball teams, *Transformation in Business & Economics*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 232-251.

Weuve, C., Pitney, W. A., Martin, M., & Mazerolle, S. M. (2014). Experiences with workplace bullying among athletic trainers in the collegiate setting. *Journal of Athletic Training*, *49*(5), 696–705. https://doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-49.3.16

Yapar, A., & Ince, M.L. (2015). The Adaptation of Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport (CBS-S) into Turkish: A Validity and Reliability Study. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi.*, 25 (4), 203–212

Zieglei, S., & Pepler, D. J. (1993). Bullying at school: Pervasive and persistent. *Orbit*, 24. 29-3 1.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Demographic Questionnaire

Please, read the questions careful and answer them in the following way.

1) Please state your gender:

☐ Female

☐ Male

☐ Other

☐ I do not want to specify

2) Please, indicate here your birth year _____

3) What is your nationality? _____

4. Please, indicate your current sport discipline where you are competing in?
……………..

5. Type of sport?

☐ Individual sport

☐ Team sport

6. Please, indicate here the name of your team? ………….

Appendix B: Bullying in Sport Questionnaire (BSQ)

> The questions that follow are about bullying. We say a person is **BEING BULLIED** when another person, or a group of people, say or do nasty and unpleasant things to him or her. It is also bullying when a person is teased repeatedly in a way he or she does not like or when he or she is deliberately left out of things. But it is **NOT BULLYING** when two people of about the same strength or power

1. How often have you been bullied **on your sports team** in the past couple of months?

☐ I have not bullied another teammates(s) on my sports team in the past couple of months

☐ It has only happened once or twice

☐ 2 or 3 times a month

☐ About once a week

☐ Several times a week

2. In the past couple of months **on your sports team**, how often have you been bullied by a teammate in the ways listed below (including at games, practices, and/or team functions)?

(Please mark one box for each line)

I have not been bullied in this way in the past couple of months	Only once or twice	2 or 3 times a month	About once a week	Several times a week

a	A teammate(s) called me mean names, made fun of me, or teased me in a hurtful way	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b	Other teammates left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from the team, or completely ignored me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c	A teammate(s) hit, kicked, pushed, or shoved me around outside of the team rules and norms.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d	Other teammates told lies or spread false rumours about me and tried to make other teammates dislike me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e	A teammate(s) bullied me with mean names and comments about my race or colour.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f	A teammate(s) bullied me with mean names and comments about my religion.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g	Other teammates made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h	A teemmate(s) got their friends to turn against me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i	A teammate(s) sent mean instant messages, wall postings, emails and text messages, or created a Web site that made fun of me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j	Teammate(s) crashed into me on purpose as they walked by.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k	A teammate(s) took unflattering or inappropriate pictures of me without permission and posted them online.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l	I was threatened to be physically hurt or harmed by a teammate(s).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

m	My username and password was stolen and used by my teammate(s) to send mean messages using my name.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n	Something was thrown at me to hit me by my teammate(s).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o	A teammate(s) tricked me into sharing personal information in an email or text message and forwarded that information to other teammates.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p	I wasn't invited to a teammate's place because other teammates didn't like me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. How often have you taken part in bullying another teammate(s) **on your sports team** in the past couple of months?

☐   I have not bullied another teammates(s) on my sports team in the past couple of months

☐   It has only happened once or twice

☐   2 or 3 times a month

☐   About once a week

☐   Several times a week

4. In the past couple of months **on your sports team**, how often have you bullied a teammate in the ways listed below (including at games, practices, and/or team functions)?

   (Please mark one box for each line)
  (Please mark one box for each line)

	I have not been bullied in this way in the past couple of months	Only once or twice	2 or 3 times a month	About once a week	Several times a week

a	I called another teammate(s) mean names, and made fun of, or teased him or her in a hurtful way.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b	I kept another teammate(s) out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from our team, or completely ignored him or her	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c	I hit, kicked, pushed, or shoved around a teammate(s) outside of the team rules and norms	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d	I spread false rumours about another teammate(s) and tried to make other teammates dislike him or her	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e	I bullied another teammate(s) with mean names and comments about his or her race or colour.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f	I bullied another teammate(s) with mean names and comments about his or her religion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g	I made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to another teammate(s).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h	Got my friends to turn against a teammate(s).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i	I sent mean instant messages, wall postings, emails or text messages, or created a Web site that made fun of a teammate(s).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j	Crashed into a teammate(s) on purpose as they walked by	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix C: Coaching Behaviour Scale for Sport (CBS-S)

HOW FREQUENTLY DO YOU EXPERIENCE THE FOLLOWING
COACHING
BEHAVIOUR

Some athletes have a single coach and the others work with a coaching team. If you have more than one coach, think of the coach, or coaches, <u>most </u>responsible for the area.

Please use the scale below to answer all the questions.

My head coach…

40. uses fear in his/her coaching

    methods.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

41. yells at me when angry.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

42. disregards my opinion   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

43. shows favouritism toward others.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

44. intimidates me physically.

45. uses power to manipulate me.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

46. makes personal comments to me   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

    that I find upsetting.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

47. spends more time coaching the   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

    best athletes.

Appendix D: Group Environment questionnaire (GEQ)

This questionnaire is designed to assess your perceptions of your team. There are no wrong or right answers, so please give your immediate reaction. Some of the questions may seem repetitive, but please answer ALL questions. Your personal responses will be kept in strictest confidence.

The following statements are designed to assess your feelings about YOUR PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT with this team. Please CIRCLE a number from 1 to 9 to indicate your level of agreement with each of these statements.

1.   I do not enjoy being a part of the social activities of this team.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

2.   I'm not happy with the amount of playing time I get.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

3.   I am not going to miss the members of this team when the season ends.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

4.   I'm unhappy with my team's level of desire to win.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Strongly Disagree								Strongly Agree

77

5. Some of my best friends are on this team.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

6. This team does not give me enough opportunities to improve my personal performance.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

7. I enjoy other parties rather than team parties.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

8. I do not like the style of play on this team.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

9. For me, this team is one of the most important social groups to which I belong.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree

The following statements are designed to assess your perceptions of YOUR TEAM AS A WHOLE. Please CIRCLE a number from 1 to 9 to indicate your level of agreement with each of these statements.

10. Our team is united in trying to reach its goals for performance.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

11. Members of our team would rather go out on their own than get

together as a team.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

12. We all take responsibility for any loss or poor performance by our team.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

13. Our team members rarely party together.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

14. Our team members have conflicting aspirations for the team's performance.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

15. Our team would like to spend time together in the off season.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

16. If members of our team have problems in practice, everyone wants to help them so we can get back together again.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

79

17.   Members of our team do not stick together outside of practice and games.

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
        Strongly   Strongly
        Disagree   Agree

18.   Our team members do not communicate freely about each athlete's responsibilities during competition or practice.

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
        Strongly   Strongly
        Disagree

Appendix E: The Big Five Personality Test

Question	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree
1. Am the life of the party.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Feel little concern for others.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Am always prepared.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Get stressed out easily.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Have a rich vocabulary.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Don't talk a lot.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Am interested in people.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Leave my belongings around.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Am relaxed most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Feel comfortable around people.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Insult people.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Pay attention to details.	1	2	3	4	5

14. Worry about things.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Have a vivid imagination.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Keep in the background.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Sympathize with others' feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Make a mess of things.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Seldom feel blue.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Am not interested in abstract ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Start conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Am not interested in other people's problems.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Get chores done right away.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Am easily disturbed.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Have excellent ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Have little to say.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Have a soft heart.	1	2	3	4	5

28. Often forget to put things back in their proper place.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Get upset easily.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Do not have a good imagination.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Talk to a lot of different people at parties.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Am not really interested in others.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Like order.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Change my mood a lot.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Am quick to understand things.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Don't like to draw attention to myself.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Take time out for others.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Shirk my duties.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Have frequent mood swings.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Use difficult words.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Don't mind being the center of attention.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Feel others' emotions.	1	2	3	4	5

43. Follow a schedule.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Get irritated easily.	1	2	3	4	5
45. Spend time reflecting on things.	1	2	3	4	5
46. Am quiet around strangers.	1	2	3	4	5
47. Make people feel at ease.	1	2	3	4	5
48. Am exacting in my work.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Often feel blue.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Am full of ideas.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F: COVID-19 related questions

1. Do you consider yourself to be negatively affected by the current situation due to COVID-19 (financially, emotionally, socially, etc.)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

2. Do you think that the pandemic of COVID-19 affected your response in the current survey negatively?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Appendix G: Turkish version of Demographic Questionnaire

Demografik Anket

Lütfen soruları dikkatle okuyunuz ve aşağıda belirtilen şekilde cevaplayınız.

4) Lütfen cinsiyetinizi belirtiniz:

☐ Kadın

☐ Erkek

☐ Diğer

☐ Belirtmek istemiyorum

5) Lütfen doğum yılınızı burada belirtiniz. _____

6) Uyruğunuz nedir? _____

4. Lütfen, şu anda yarıştığınız spor dalını belirtiniz. ……………..

5. Spor türü hangisidir?

☐ Bireysel spor

☐ Takım sporu

6. Lütfen takımınızın adını burada belirtiniz. ………….

Appendix H: Turkish version of Bullying in Sport Questionnaire

Sporda Zorbalık Anketi (SZA)

> Aşağıda yer alan sorular zorbalık ile ilgilidir. Bir kişiye başka bir kişi veya bir grup insan edepsiz ve çirkin şeyler söylediğinde veya yaptığında, bu kişinin **ZORBALIĞA UĞRADIĞINI** söyleriz. Ayrıca, bir kişi ile sevmediği bir şekilde tekrar tekrar alay edildiğinde ya da bu kişi kasıtlı olarak bir şeylerin dışında bırakıldığında da zorbalığa uğramış olur. Ancak, aynı kuvvet veya güce sahip iki kişi tartıştığında veya kavga ettiğinde bu durum **ZORBALIK DEĞİLDİR**. Ayrıca, alay arkadaşça ve eğlenceli bir şekilde yapıldığında zorbalık olmamaktadır.

1. Son birkaç ay içinde **spor takımınızda** ne sıklıkla zorbalığa maruz kaldınız?

   Son birkaç aydır spor takımımda zorbalığa maruz kalmadım
   Sadece bir veya iki kez oldu
   Ayda 2 veya 3 kez
   Her hafta bir kez
   Her hafta birkaç kez

2. Son birkaç ay içinde **spor takımınızda**, bir takım arkadaşınız tarafından aşağıda listelenen yollarla (oyunlar, uygulamalar ve / veya takım işlevleri dahil) ne sıklıkta zorbalığa maruz kaldınız? *(Lütfen her satır için bir kutu işaretleyiniz)*

		Son birkaç ay içinde bu tür bir zorbalığa maruz kalmadım	Sadece bir veya iki kez	Ayda 2 veya 3 kez	Haftada bir kez	Haftada birkaç kez
a	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım bana kötü lakaplar taktı, benimle dalga geçti ya da beni incitici bir şekilde alay etti.					
b	Diğer takım arkadaşlarım beni bilerek bir şeylerin dışında bıraktılar, beni takımdan hariç tuttular					

	ya da tamamen görmezden geldiler.	
c	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım beni takım kurallarının ve normlarının dışında vurdu, tekmeledi, itti veya itip kalktı.	
d	Diğer takım arkadaşlarım benim hakkımda yalan söylediler ya da yanlış söylentiler yaydılar ve diğer takım arkadaşlarımın benden hoşlanmamasını sağlamaya çalıştılar.	
e	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım bana ırkım ve rengimle ilgili kötü lakaplar takarak ve yorumlar yaparak zorbalık yaptı.	
f	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım bana dinimle ilgili kötü lakaplar takarak ve yorumlar yaparak zorbalık yaptı.	
g	Diğer takım arkadaşlarım bana cinsel şakalar, yorumlar ya da jestler yaptılar.	
h	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım kendi arkadaşlarının bana karşı tavır almasına neden oldu.	
i	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım çirkin anlık mesajlar, duvar ilanları, e-postalar ve kısa mesajlar gönderdi ya da benimle dalga	

	geçmek için bir web sitesi oluşturdu.	
j	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım yanımdan geçerken bilerek bana çarptı.	
k	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım izinsiz ve rahatsız edici veya uygunsuz resimlerimi çekti ve onları çevrimiçi yayınladı.	
l	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım tarafından fiziksel olarak yaralanmak veya zarar görmek ile tehdit edildim.	
m	Kullanıcı adım ve şifrem çalındı ve takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım tarafından adımı kullanarak çirkin mesajlar göndermek için kullanıldı.	
n	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım bana çarpması için bana bir şey fırlattı.	
o	Takım arkadaşım/arkadaşlarım beni bir e-posta veya kısa mesajla kişisel bilgilerimi paylaşmam için kandırdı ve bu bilgiyi diğer takım arkadaşlarına iletti.	
p	Diğer takım arkadaşlarım beni sevmediği için bir takım arkadaşımın mekanına davet edilmedim.	

3. Son birkaç ay içinde **spor takımında** başka bir takım arkadaşına/arkadaşlarına yapılan zorbalığa ne sıklıkla katıldınız?

Son birkaç aydır spor takımında bir başka takım arkadaşını/arkadaşlarını zorbalığa uğratmadım

Sadece bir veya iki kez oldu

Ayda 2 veya 3 kez

Haftada bir kez

Haftada birkaç kez

4. Son birkaç ay içinde spor takımınızda, aşağıda listelenen şekillerde (oyun, uygulama ve/veya takım işlevleri dahil) takım arkadaşınıza ne sıklıkta zorbalık yaptınız? (Lütfen her satır için bir kutu işaretleyiniz)

		Son birkaç ay içinde diğer bir takım arkadaşıma zorbalık yapmadım	Sadece bir veya iki kez	Ayda 2 veya 3 kez	Haftada bir kez	Haftada birkaç kez
a	Takım arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma kötü lakaplar taktım, dalga geçtim ya da onu incitici bir şekilde alay ettim.					
b	Diğer takım arkadaşımı/arkadaşlarımı bilerek bir şeylerin dışında bıraktım, takımdan hariç tuttum ya da tamamen görmezden geldim.					
c	Takım arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma takım kurallarının ve normlarının dışında vurdum, onu tekmeledim, ittim veya itip kalktım.					
d	Diğer takım arkadaşlarım hakkında yalan söyledim ya da yanlış söylentiler yaydım ve diğer takım arkadaşlarımın ondan hoşlanmamasını sağlamaya çalıştım.					
e	Takım arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma ırkı ve rengi ile ilgili kötü lakaplar takarak ve yorumlar yaparak zorbalık yaptım.					
f	Takım arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma dini ile ilgili kötü lakaplar takarak					

		ve yorumlar yaparak zorbalık yaptım.
g	Diğer takım arkadaşlarıma cinsel şakalar, yorumlar ya da jestler yaptım.	
h	Takım arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma karşı kendi arkadaşlarımın tavır almasına neden oldum.	
i	Takım arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma çirkin anlık mesajlar, duvar ilanları, e-postalar ve kısa mesajlar gönderdim ya da onunla / onlarla dalga geçmek için bir web sitesi oluşturdum.	
j	Takım arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma bilerek yanımdan geçerlerken çarptım.	
k	Takım arkadaşımdan/arkadaşlarımdan izinsiz resimlerini çektim ve onları çevrimiçi yayınladım.	
l	Takım arkadaşımı/arkadaşlarımı fiziksel olarak yaralamak ile veya zarar vermek ile tehdit ettim.	
m	Bir takım arkadaşımın/arkadaşlarımın kullanıcı adını ve şifresini kullanarak, onun / onlar adına çirkin mesajlar gönderdim.	
n	Spor/oyun kuralları dışında, takım arkadaşıma /arkadaşlarıma çarpması için bir şey fırlattım.	
o	Takım arkadaşımı/arkadaşlarımı bir e-posta veya kısa mesajla kişisel bilgilerini paylaşması için kandırdım ve bu bilgiyi diğer takım arkadaşlarıma ilettim.	

p	Takım arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma kötü bakışlar atarak onu/onları kendimden uzakta tuttum.

Appendix I: Turkish version of Group Environment questionnaire

Sporcular için Antrenör Davranışlarını Değerlendirme Ölçeğinin Türkçe Uyarlaması (SADDÖ):

AŞAĞIDAKİ KOÇLUK DAVRANIŞLARINI NE KADAR DENEYEBİLİRSİNİZ

Bazı sporcuların tek bir antrenörü vardır, diğerleri ise bir koçluk ekibiyle çalışır. Birden fazla koçunuz varsa, bölgeden en çok sorumlu koçu veya koçları düşünün.
Tüm soruları cevaplamak için lütfen aşağıdaki ölçeği kullanın.

1 (HiçbirZaman) 2 (Nadiren) 3 (arasıra) 4 (bazen) 5 (sıksık) 6 (çoğunlukla) 7 (Her Zaman)

Baş antrenörüm,

40. Korkuyu bir antrenörlük metodu olarak kullanır.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
41. Kızgın olduğu zaman bana bağırır.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
42. Fikirlerimi göz ardı eder.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
43. Diğer sporculara karşı ayrımcılık yapar.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
44. Beni fiziksel olarak korkutur.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
45. Ayrımcılık yapar, iltimas geçer.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
46. Üzücü bulduğum konularda bana kişisel yorumlar yapar.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
47. İyi sporculara daha çok vakit harcar.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix J: Turkish version of Group Environment questionnaire

Takım Birlikteliği Envanteri'nin psikometrik özelliklerinin

Açıklama: Aşağıda, takım birlikteliğinin tespitine yönelik ifadeler yer almaktadır. Her bir cümlede ifade edilen durum hakkında, 9 (dokuz) önerme arasından, sizin görüşünüzü en iyi yansıtan seçeneği (X) işareti koyarak belirtiniz.	Hiç Katılmıyorum								Tamamen Katılıyorum
1*	Bu takımın sosyal aktivitelerinde yer almaktan hoşlanmıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2*	Maçlarda aldığım süre nedeniyle mutlu değilim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3*	Sezon sona erdiğinde bu takımın oyuncularını özlemeyeceğim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4*	Takımımın maçlardaki kazanma arzusu yönünden mutsuzum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5	En iyi arkadaşlarımdan bazıları bu takımdadır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6*	Bu takım bana bireysel performansımı geliştirmek için yeterli olanakları sağlamıyor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7*	Takım birlikteliklerinden ziyade diğer birlikteliklerden keyif alırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8*	Bu takımın oynadığı oyun tarzını beğenmiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9	Bana göre bu takım, ait olduğum en önemli sosyal gruplardan biridir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	Takımımız performans hedeflerine ulaşma çabalarında birlik içindedir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11*	Takımımızın üyeleri takım olarak beraber bir araya gelmektense, kendi başlarına dolaşmayı tercih ederler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12	Takım kaybettiğinde ya da kötü performans sergilediğinde hepimiz tüm sorumluluğu alırız.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13*	Takım üyelerimiz nadiren beraber eğlenirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14*	Takım üyelerimizin takım performansına yönelik çelişkili hedefleri vardır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	Takım üyelerimiz sezon dışında beraber zaman geçirmeyi sever.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

16	Eğer takım üyelerimiz arasında antrenmanlarda sorun yaşanırsa, tekrar bir araya gelebilmek için hepimiz onlara yardım ederiz.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17*	Takım üyelerimiz maçlar ve antrenmanlar dışında bir araya gelmez.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18*	Takım üyelerimiz antrenman veya maç sırasında her oyuncunun sorumlulukları hakkında açıkça iletişim kurmaz.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Appendix K: Turkish version of The Big Five Personality Test

Büyük Beş Kişilik Testi-50 Türkçe Formu (B5KT-50-Tr)

Kendinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız? Her anlatımın size ne kadar uygun olduğunu anlatımın yanındaki yanıtlardan uygun olanını işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Kendinizi, gelecekte, olmak istediğiniz gibi değil, şu an nasıl görüyorsanız o şekilde tanımlayınız.

: Hiç uygun değil=1, Uygun değil=2, Orta/kararsız=3, Biraz uygun=4, Çok uygun=5

- Hiç uygun değil=5, Uygun değil=4, Orta/kararsız=3, Biraz uygun=2, Çok uygun=1

Sorular	Hiç uygun değil	Uygun değil	Orta/ kararsız	Biraz uygun	Çok uygun
1. Toplantıların gözdesiyimdir.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Başkalarına pek ilgi duymam.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Her zaman hazırlıklıyımdır.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Kolayca kendimi baskı altında hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Kelime hazinem zengindir.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Çok konuşmam.	1	2	3	4	5
7. İnsanlarla ilgilenirim.	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

8. Kişisel eşyalarımı etrafta bırakırım.					
9. Genelde rahatımdır.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Soyut fikirleri kavramakta zorlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
11. İnsanların arasında kendimi rahat hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5
12. İnsanlara hakaret ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Detaylara dikkat ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Her şeye endişelenirim.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Olayları zihnimde canlandırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Arka planda kalmayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Başkalarının duygularını anlayıp paylaşırım.	1	2	3	4	5
18. İşleri karmakarışık yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Nadiren kendimi keyifsiz hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
20. Soyut fikirlerle ilgilenmem.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Konuşmayı genelde ben başlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Başka insanların problemleriyle ilgilenmem.	1	2	3	4	5
23. İşleri hemen hallederim.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Kolayca huzursuz olurum.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Mükemmel fikirlerim vardır.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Söyleyecek çok şeyim yoktur.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Yumuşak kalpliyim.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Genellikle eşyaları yerlerine koymayı unuturum.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Moralim çabuk bozulur.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Hayal gücüm kuvvetli değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

31. Toplantılarda değişik insanlarla konuşabilirim.					
32. Aslında başkalarıyla pek ilgilenmem.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Düzeni severim.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Ruh halim çok sık değişir.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Olayları anlamada hızlıyımdır.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Dikkat kendi üzerime çekmekten hoşlanmam.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Başkalarına zaman ayırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Görevlerimden kaçarım.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Ruhsal dengem sık değişir.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Zor kelimeler kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
41. İlgi odağı olmaktan rahatsızlık duymam.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Başkalarının duygularını hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5

43. Bir plan takip ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Çabuk rahatsız olurum.	1	2	3	4	5
45. Olaylar üzerinde düşünerek vakit geçiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
46. Yabancıların arasında genelde sessizimdir.	1	2	3	4	5
47. İnsanları rahatlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
48. İşimde titizimdir.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Çoğu zaman kendimi keyifsiz hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Fikirlerle doluyumdur.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix L: Turkish version of COVID-19 questions

1. COVID-19 nedeniyle kendinizi negatif yönde etkilenmiş olarak görüyor musunuz?

(finansal, duygusal, sosyal vb.)

☐ Evet

☐ Hayir

2. Bu ankete verdiğiniz cevapların COVID-19 küresel salgını nedeni ile negatif yönde etkilendiğini düşünüyor musunuz?

☐ Evet

☐ Hayir

Appendix M: Ethics Committee Approval

<table>
<tr>
<td>Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi
"Erdem, Bilgi, Gelişim"</td>
<td>Eastern Mediterranean University
"Virtue, Knowledge, Advancement"</td>
<td>99628, Gazimağusa, KUZEY KIBRIS /
Famagusta, North Cyprus,
via Mersin-10 TURKEY
Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995
Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919
E-mail: bayek@emu.edu.tr</td>
</tr>
</table>

Etik Kurulu / *Ethics Committee*

Reference No: ETK00-2020-0125   04.05.2020

Subject: Your application for ethical approval.

Re: Denitsa Koleva Maydon (18500097)
Faculty of Arts & Sciences.

EMU's Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board (BAYEK) has approved the decision of the Ethics Board of Psychology (date: 30.04.2020, issue: 20/09) granting Denitsa Koleva Maydon from the Faculty of Art & Sciences to pursue with his/her MA thesis work titled **"Predictors of Bullying Perpetration and Bullying Victimization among Semi-Professional Team Sport Players in North Cyprus"** supervised by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar and Assist. Prof. Dr. Dilek Çelik.

Prof. Dr. Yücel Vural

Chair, Board of Scientific Research and Publication Ethics - EMU

YV/ns.

www.emu.edu.tr

Appendix N: Informed Consent English version

Department of Psychology
Eastern Mediterranean University
Famagusta, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
Tel: +(90) 392 630 1389   Fax: +(90) 392 630 2475
Web: http://brahms.emu.edu.tr/psychology

Dear participant,

Please take a few minutes to read the following information on this research carefully before you agree to participate. **If at any time you have a question regarding the study, please feel free to ask the researcher who will provide more information.**

This study is being conducted by **Denitsa Koleva** (a master student) under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar and Co – supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Dilek Çelik.

It aims to investigate contextual and individual predictors of bullying and bullying victimization among semi-professional team sport players. The study should take no more than **20 minutes** to complete.

Of course, you are not obliged to participate in this research and you are free to refuse to participate. You may also withdraw from the study at any point without giving any reason. In this case, all of your responses will be destroyed and omitted from the research. If you agree to participate in and complete the study, all responses and questionnaires will be treated **confidentially**. Identifying information will be kept securely and separately from the rest of your questionnaire. Data will be stored for a maximum of six years after the study. Once the data is analysed, a report of the findings may be submitted for publication.

To signify your voluntary participation, please complete the consent form below.
CONSENT FORM
Research Title: Predictors of Bullying and Bullying victimization among Semi-Professional Team Sport Players in North Cyprus

Name of Researchers: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar , Assist. Prof. Dr. Dilek Çelik and Denitsa Maydon

Email address of Researchers: (fatih.bayraktar@emu.edu.tr); (dilek.celik@emu.edu.tr);

(denito13@icloud.com)
Please tick the boxes to confirm that you agree to each statement.

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for this study and have had the opportunity to ask any questions. ☐

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time without explanation. ☐
☐
3. I agree to take part in this study.

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this study, please inform Dr. Şenel Husnu Raman, Chair of the Psychology Research & Ethics Committee at Eastern Mediterranean University, in writing, providing a detailed account of your concern (shenelhusnu.raman@emu.edu.tr).

Appendix O: Informed Consent Turkish version

Psikoloji Departmanı
Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi
Mağusa, Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti
Tel: +(90) 392 630 1389   Faks: +(90) 392 630 2475
Web: http://brahms.emu.edu.tr/psychology

Sayın katılımcı,

Lütfen katılım göstermeyi kabul etmeden önce, bu araştırmayla ilgili aşağıdaki bilgileri dikkatlice okumak için birkaç dakikanızı ayırınız. **Çalışma ile ilgili herhangi bir zamanda bir sorunuz olursa, lütfen size daha fazla bilgi sağlayacak olan araştırmacıya sorunuzu sormaktan çekinmeyiniz.** Bu çalışma **Denitsa Maydon** (yüksek lisans öğrencisi) tarafından, Doç. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar ve Eş Danışman Yrd. Dilek Çelik gözetimi altında yürütülmektedir.

Yarı profesyonel takım sporcuları arasındaki zorbalık ve zorbalığa maruz kalma davranışlarının bağlamsal ve bireysel yordayıcılarını araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın tamamlanmasının **20 dakika**dan fazla sürmesi beklenmemektedir.Bu araştırmaya katılım göstermek zorunda değilsiniz ve katılmayı reddetmekte özgürsünüz. Ayrıca herhangi bir sebep göstermeksizin, herhangi bir noktada çalışmadan çekilebilirsiniz. Bu durumda, verdiğiniz tüm yanıtlar yok edilecektir ve araştırmadan çıkarılacaktır. Eğer çalışmaya katılmayı ve çalışmayı tamamlamayı kabul ederseniz, tüm yanıtlarız ve anketler **gizli** tutulacaktır. Tanımlayıcı bilgiler, anketinizin geri kalanından güvenli ve ayrı bir şekilde saklanacaktır. Veriler çalışmadan sonra en fazla altı yıl saklanacaktır. Veriler analiz edildiğinde, bulguların bir raporu yayınlanmak üzere sunulabilir.

Gönüllü olarak katılımınızı belirtmek için lütfen aşağıdaki onay formunu doldurunuz.
ONAY FORMU

Araştırma Başlığı: _   Kuzey Kıbrıs'taki Yarı Profesyonel Takım Sporları Oyuncuları arasındaki Zorbalık ve Zorbalık mağduriyeti belirleyicileri.

Araştırmacıların İsimleri: Doç. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar, Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dilek Çelik ve Denitsa Maydon

Araştırmacıların E-posta Adresleri: (fatih.bayraktar@emu.edu.tr); (dilek.celik@emu.edu.tr);(denito13@icloud.com)

Lütfen her bir beyanı kabul ettiğinizi onaylamak için kutucukları işaretleyiniz.

1. Bu çalışma için bilgi sayfasını okuduğumu ve anladığımı ve soru sorma fırsatım
   olduğunu teyit ediyorum.   ☐

2. Katılımımın gönüllü olduğunu ve herhangi bir zamanda açıklama yapmadan çalışmadan ayrılabileceğimi anlıyorum.   ☐

                                                                                ☐
3. Bu çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Bu çalışmanın etik davranışıyla ilgili herhangi bir endişeniz varsa, lütfen Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi Psikoloji Araştırma ve Etik Komitesi Başkanı Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman'a, endişelerinizin ayrıntılı bir açıklamasını yazılı olarak bildiriniz (shenelhusnu.raman@emu.edu.tr).

Appendix P: Debrief Form English version

Department of Psychology
Eastern Mediterranean University
Famagusta, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
Tel: +(90) 392 630 1389   Fax: +(90) 392 630 2475
Web: http://brahms.emu.edu.tr/psychology

Participant Debriefing Form

Thank you very much for participating in this study with the title **Predictors of Bullying and Bullying Victimization among Semi-Professional Team Sport Players in North Cyprus.**

Please take a few more minutes to read the following information, which will explain the aims and purpose of the research further. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask the researcher whose contact details are stated below. The purpose of this study was to examined contextual and individual predictors of bullying and bullying victimization among semi-professional team sport players where bullying can be defined as a complicated phenomenon, where person in power (i.e. bully) repetitively cause a harm to a person in vulnerable position "victim" (Craig & Pepler, 2003). Also, it is essential to be defined as well that the converse of bullying can be interpreted as victimization (Simmons, 2002). Moreover, bullying victimization in sport cause a lot of negative psychological/physical consequences for an athlete, and as a result, trauma, withdrawal from the sport or future health problem could be noticed (Fasting, Brackenridge, & Knorre, 2010). Therefore, If you felt distressed or discomfort during or after the study and If you would like to speak to professionals, please contact one of the below state hospitals and ask for clinical psychology services Famagusta State Hospital (+90 394 364 9146) or Barış Mental and Neurological Disorder State Hospital (+ 90 392 228 5441).

You may also contact the researcher Denitsa Maydon (denito13@icloud.com), the research supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar (fatih.bayraktar@emu.edu.tr. or co-supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Dilek Celik (dilek.celik@emu.edu.tr). Once again thank you for your valuable contribution to this research. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Your sincerely,

Denitsa Maydon

Appendix Q: Debrief Form Turkish version

Psikoloji Departmanı
Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi
Mağusa, Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti
Tel: +(90) 392 630 1389   Faks: +(90) 392 630 2475
Web: http://brahms.emu.edu.tr/psychology

Ek. G

<u>**Katılımcı Bilgilendirme Formu**</u>

Kuzey Kıbrıs'taki Yarı Profesyonel Takım Sporları Oyuncuları arasındaki Zorbalık ve Zorbalık mağduriyeti belirleyicileri başlıklı bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için çok teşekkür ederiz.

Lütfen araştırmanın hedefini ve amacını daha fazla açıklayan aşağıdaki bilgileri okumak için birkaç dakikanızı ayırınız. Herhangi bir sorunuz varsa, lütfen iletişim bilgileri aşağıda belirtilen araştırmacıya sormaya çekinmeyiniz.

Bu çalışmanın amacı, zorbalığın karmaşık bir hadise olarak tanımlanabildiği, güç sahibi kişinin (yani zorbanın) tekrar tekrar savunmasız pozisyonda "mağdur" olan bir kişiye zarar verdiği (Craig ve Pepler, 2003), yarı profesyonel takım sporu oyuncuları arasında zorbalık ve zorbalık mağduriyetinin bağlamsal ve bireysel belirleyicilerini incelemektir. Ayrıca, zorbalığın tersinin mağduriyet olarak yorumlanabileceği de tanımlamak gereklidir (Simmons, 2002). Dahası, sporda zorbalık mağduriyeti bir atlet için çok fazla olumsuz psikolojik / fiziksel sonuçlara sebep olur ve sonuç olarak travma, spordan geri çekilme veya gelecekte yaşanacak sağlık problemleri gözlenebilir (Oruç, Brackenridge ve Knorre, 2010).

Çalışma sırasında veya sonrasında sıkıntı veya rahatsızlık hissederseniz ve bir profesyonel ile konuşmak isterseniz, lütfen aşağıdaki devlet hastanelerinden biriyle iletişime geçin ve klinik psikoloji hizmetleri servises başvurabilirsiniz: <u>Gazimağusa</u>

Devlet Hastanesi (+90 394 364 9146), veya Bariş Ruh Ve Sinir Hastaliklari Hastanes (+ 90 392 228 5441). Ayrıca araştırmacı Denitsa Maydon (denito13@icloud.com), araştırma sorumlusu Doç. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar (fatih.bayraktar@emu.edu.tr) veya yardımcı danışman Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dilek Çelik (dilek.celik@emu.edu.tr) ile de iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Bu araştırmaya yaptığınız değerli katkılardan dolayı bir kez daha teşekkür ederiz. Katılımınız çok takdir edilmektedir.

Saygılarımla,
Denitsa Maydon