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Abstract

Bullying is a prominent issue facing youth, as approximately one-fifth of students report being victimized. The majority of bullying research has been conducted in the academic setting; however, roughly one-third of bullying episodes occur outside of this context, for instance in sport. Sport is one of the most common activities with which youth participate, and initial evidence suggests that bullying occurs in physical-activity settings. Literature investigating bullying in the sport context has mainly focused on examining subsets of athletes within sport, for instance, female athletes, without examining differences across genders and other demographic contrasts. Thus, the present study aimed to identify the frequency of bullying, the demographic differences that exist in sport, and examine the impact that bullying has on an athlete’s development. Questionnaires were used to examine athletes’ frequency of bully-perpetration and –victimization encounters, athletic competence, global self-worth, connection to coach, and connection to teammates. The results from the present study suggest that bullying occurred more frequently in male athletes, and for team sport athletes. In addition, victimization predicts a reduction in global self-worth, connection to coach, and connection to teammates. These results provide a foundation to further explore demographic differences in sport, and presents initial findings regarding the impact of the bullying experience on adolescent athlete development.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Amanda is a 12-year-old soccer player. She has played competitive soccer for two years, with the same team and the same coach. She generally enjoys playing on the team, as she has a passion for soccer, but she finds it a bit lonely. Amanda has trouble maintaining friendships with the other girls on her team. At times she has made friendships with some of the girls, but these friendships are transient. They start off well, and she and her teammates share stories about school and sport experiences. However, after a while, the popular goalie, Katie, starts spreading rumours about her. At first, her friends just laugh along at the jokes. After a while, her friends start adding to the rumours, and begin to hang out with her on fewer occasions.

This is a common pattern that Amanda experienced in relationships with teammates. In the past, she looked to her coach for advice and guidance; however, he simply said that it would pass. His main advice was to focus on the task at hand, improving her soccer performance. In the current instance, Amanda imagined that the conversation would proceed as it always did, and she was afraid that if she re-approached her coach, he would think she was complaining too much, or that her teammates would make fun of her further. Instead, she brought along a novel to practices and games, and read it during breaks. The rumours continued to spread, but she was not sure what else she could do or how else she could change so the girls would like her more. Amanda continued to work on her soccer, but found less enjoyment in going to practices, as she did not feel that she had support from her coaches and teammates. Unfortunately, Amanda’s experience is not an uncommon one.

Bullying is a prominent issue facing youth today, as approximately one-fifth of students report being victimized by bullying (PREVNet, 2010). The majority of the literature investigates
bullying in the school context (e.g., Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Cummings, Pepler, Mishna, & Craig, 2006; Pepler & Craig, 1998; Pepler, Craig, & Roberts, 1998; Stop A Bully, 2013). It is a problem that affects all individuals who are involved. In the past, bullying has been ignored, or treated as a rite of passage, similar to Amanda’s case; however, the trend is slowly changing, given the growing body of literature that denotes the substantial impact that bullying has on youth development.

The bullying experience impacts youths’ physical and psychosocial development, as well as their relationships with others (Hamburger, Basile, & Vivolo, 2011; Jankauskiene, Kardelis, Sukys, & Kardeleine, 2008). Bullying is typically displayed through physical, verbal, social, and/or cyber forms (Crothers & Levinson, 2004; Marsh et al., 2011; Orue & Calvete, 2011), and with the type of bullying differing depending on the gender of the youth (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). For instance, in Amanda’s case, she suffered from social bullying, which is a common form that affects female relationships (DeSouza & Ribeiro, 2005; Orue & Calvete, 2011). Males, on the other hand, are more likely to engage and experience physical and verbal forms of bullying (Orue & Calvete, 2011). Individual differences, such as gender, are critical to investigate, as those investigations improve the ability to provide tailored interventions to reduce bullying.

Bullying has been thoroughly investigated in the school context, and in the cyber realm. Conversely, examinations into youth’s extracurricular environments, including sport, are still in their infancy (Fekkes et al., 2005; Volk & Lagzdins, 2009). However, from the foundation that exists, it appears that bullying does occur and that it has an impact on youths’ sport experience. There is a large body of literature that suggests that sport is capable of providing a fruitful environment to develop positive developmental outcomes, such as confidence or connection with teammates (e.g., Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005; Holt & Neely, 2011). Many factors that are
expected to hinder this positive development have been examined, such as aggression and hazing (Bredemeier, 1983; Crow & Macintosh, 2009). However, bullying is a behaviour that appears in both the sport and school context, and within the school context, is shown to be quite detrimental to youths’ developmental outcomes. Thus it is only natural to posit that sport may be a fertile environment with which to study bullying.

Of the literature that exists in the sport context, bullying has been examined under a singular lens. For instance, researchers have explored bullying within female teams, male teams, and within one sport (e.g., Steinfeldt, Vaughan, LaFollette, & Steinfeldt, 2012; Volk & Lagzdins, 2009), however, researchers have not yet investigated these factors together. Consequently, the literature is lacking a comprehensive investigation into the frequency of bullying that occurs in sport, across gender, and throughout different types of sport. Additionally, there is a lack of understanding of the impact that bullying has on an athlete’s psychosocial development. In order to gain a nuanced explanation of bullying in the sport setting, it is important to have a foundational understanding of who is bullying and who is experiencing bullying, how often it occurs, and how it is impacting athlete development. Through examining bullying as it occurred in male and female athletes of a variety of sports, this present study aimed to provide preliminary answers to these questions.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Bullying is a peer relationship problem, which many youth encounter at some point throughout their childhood (Pepler, 2011). In a longitudinal study, conducted from 2002 to 2010, researchers found that bullying rates in Canada increased substantially for both males and females (Pepler, 2011). Recent Canadian statistics reveal that bullying has reached staggering levels, with 12% of youth who reported engaged in bullying others, and 22% of youth who reported being the victim of bullying (PREVNet, 2010). Notably, the prevalence statistics for bullying rates differs depending on the method that is used to measure bullying (Roberts et al., 2009). Bullying reaches its peak around Grades 7 to 9, and begins to slowly decline thereafter. It not only threatens the development of close peer relationships, but it also has detrimental effects on youths’ physical and psychological health (Hamburger et al., 2011; Jankauskiene et al., 2008). For instance, victims of bullying commonly experience anxiety and lower self-confidence, whereas bullies tend to experience depression and increased antisocial tendencies (Delfabbro et al., 2006; Fekkes, Pijpers, Fredriks, Vogels, & Verloove-Vanhorick, 2006; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). Although bullying research most often explores classroom and playground contexts (Fekkes, Pijpers, & Verloove-Vanhorick, 2006), recent research suggests that one-third of bullying occurs outside of these contexts, such as online and in sport (Fekkes et al., 2006; Volk & Lagzdins, 2009). It is of paramount importance that researchers develop a cohesive understanding of bullying in these different contexts, in order to minimize the bullying experience and the effects that it has on youth development.
**Definition and Forms of Bullying**

Bullying is defined as exposure to repetitive, negative behaviours that are imposed by a higher-power individual who intends to inflict harm onto his or her lower-power victim (Olweus, 1993). This power differential is an important component of the definition of bullying, as it is a relationship problem; hence, individuals involved in the bullying experience must have some sort of relationship with each other, which is impacted (Cummings et al., 2006). Acts of repeated aggression reinforce the power differential that exists in bullying, whereby the bully tends to gain increased feelings of power over the victim, and the victim experiences increased alienation and loss of power (Cummings et al., 2006). These four defining characteristics (*i.e.*, repetitive, negative acts of aggression, intent to inflict harm, and power differential) are necessary to define a given behaviour as bullying rather than as an isolated aggressive act. The terms bullying and aggression are often used interchangeably, but there is an important distinction to be made. Aggression is defined as harmful, violent acts or dispositions towards an individual(s), and can be direct or indirect in nature (Bredemeier, 1983). Bullying typically involves these aggressive acts, but requires them to be repeated over time, and be conducted by an individual who has a higher power status (*e.g.*, larger physical stature or higher social status) over his or her victim.

In addition to defining bullying, it is important to distinguish among the forms that bullying can take, including: (a) physical, (b) verbal, (c) social, and (d) cyber bullying (Crothers & Levinson, 2004; Marsh et al., 2011; Roué & Calvete, 2011). The definitions below are paraphrased from PREVNet (2010). Physical bullying is defined as an act of physical contact to harm a victim. For instance, someone who engages in physical bullying may punch his or her victim. Verbal bullying occurs when a person uses verbal slander to inflict harm on the victim. An example of verbal bullying is when somebody uses a derogatory term to refer to his or her
victim. Social bullying is when the bully undermines the social relationships of their victim, through social manipulation and exclusion. For example, someone engaging in social bullying may exclude his or her victim from a peer group, or start rumours about the victim. The precise definition of cyber bullying is contested and evolving (Vanderbosch & Van Cleemput, 2009), but generally cyber bullying involves acts of bullying perpetrated using a technological medium (PREVNet, 2010). For instance, bullying through ‘Facebook’ or text messaging would be considered cyber bullying. It is important to examine all forms of bullying, in order to capture bullying as it exists in its different conceptualizations, to gain a cohesive understanding of the impact that bullying has on both the perpetrators and victims.

**Bullying in an Academic Context**

There is a large body of research on bullying in the academic setting (e.g., Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Cummings et al., 2006; Pepler & Craig, 1998; Pepler et al., 1998; Stop A Bully, 2013). This body of literature examines bullying occurring within the school environment, including on busses, in classrooms, at snack time, and on the playground. Although several methods have been used to study bullying in the school context, self-report measures or qualitative observations are the most readily used (Crothers & Levinson, 2004; Hamburger et al., 2011). Self-report measures to assess bullying have evolved into questionnaires that can survey levels of bully-perpetration and bully-victimization, the different forms of bullying, and the bystander experience of bullying (Hamburger et al., 2011). For instance, the *Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children Bullying Scale* has been used in over 40 countries around the world to assess levels of physical, verbal, social and cyber bully-perpetration and -victimization in the school context (Molcho et al., 2012). Other questionnaires have been developed to examine similar aspects of bullying, such as the *Adolescent Peer Relations Instrument* (Parada, 2006), as
well as questionnaires intended to survey solely victims of bullying, such as the *Multidimensional Peer-Victimization Scale* (Mynard & Joseph, 2000). In contrast to self-report measures, researchers also observe peer interactions in classrooms and on the playground, for instance, using distance-video cameras and microphones (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Craig & Pepler, 1997; Pepler et al., 1998).

Through assessing bullying via both self-report and observational means, researchers have been able to compile a large body of statistics on bullying in the academic context. For instance, in Canadian schools, 15 bullying behaviours were identified, with the three most common being: (a) name calling, at approximately 64%; (b) shoving/hitting, at 40%; and (c) bullying involving friends and peers, at approximately 33% (Stop A Bully, 2013). In contrast, some of the least frequent bullying acts that were selected were damaging property, at 9%, disability comments, at 7%, and bullying involving weapons, at 5%. These statistics provide clear evidence that certain forms of bullying are prominent and substantial issues in the lives of youth.

Within the academic bullying literature there is evidence to suggest that bullying trends differ between genders and across age groups (e.g., Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Orue & Calvete, 2011). Although males and females display similar overall levels of bullying in the classroom setting, there are differences in the forms of bullying in which they engage (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). Notably, males are more likely to engage in – and be victims of – physical bullying in comparison to females (Orue & Calvete, 2011). Males are also more likely to perpetrate acts of sexual bullying, whereas females are more likely to engage in verbal and social bullying (DeSouza & Ribeiro, 2005; Orue & Calvete, 2011; Pepler et al., 2006). The gender variations
that exist in the expression of bullying demonstrate the need to assess each of these forms of bullying when assessing males and females together.

In addition to gender differences, bullying differs across age groups. For instance, bullying reaches its peak at the beginning of high school and declines slightly thereafter (Brown, Birch & Kancherla, 2005; Peskin, Tortolero, & Markham, 2006). Physical aggression is found more commonly in early- and middle-elementary school aged children, whereas verbal, social, and cyber bullying tend to increase from age 11 to 15 years old (Archer & Côté, 2005; Espelage, Meban, & Swearer, 2004). Finally, it appears that females begin to use social forms of bullying earlier than males (Crick et al., 2001). Thus, it is important to consider age when analyzing the different forms of bullying due to the differences in bullying across age clusters. The academic bullying literature has not only examined the demographic differences in bullying prevalence, it has also accrued a wealth of information on the outcomes related to bullying.

**Outcomes Related to Bullying**

There are numerous physical, psychological, social, and competence-related outcomes related to the bullying experience (Hamburger et al., 2011; Jankauskiene et al., 2008). It appears that the bullying experience can have differential impacts, although sometimes subtle, on both the perpetrators and the victims. Thus, it is important to consider the bullying outcomes related to these social actors as conceptually different. First, bullying has a substantial impact on the physical health of victims (e.g., Fekkes et al., 2004; PREVNet, 2012). Victims are more likely to suffer from headaches, abdominal pains, skin-related problems, poor appetite, sleep disturbances, and bed-wetting, when compared to perpetrators or those who had no role in the bullying experience (Fekkes et al., 2004; PREVNet, 2012). Youth who *perpetrate* bullying mainly cite having more headaches and problems with bed-wetting (Fekkes et al., 2004). As evidenced by
the literature, the theme emerges that the bullying experience differs depending on whether an individual is a bully or a victim.

The second area in which bullying has an impact on victims and bullies is in relation to their psychological health. Victims appear to suffer from heightened levels of anxiety, suicidal thoughts, depression, and engagement in maladaptive or self-destructive behaviours, in comparison to those not involved in the bullying experience (Cleary, 2000; Hamburger et al., 2011; Jankauskiene et al., 2008; Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpela, Marttunen, Rimpela, & Rantanen, 1999). Victims are also likely to have poor emotional adjustment and higher levels of anger (Beran & Li, 2005; Fekkes et al., 2006; Patchin & Hinduja, 2006; Stein, Dukes, & Warren, 2007). Victims are more likely to experience lower self-esteem than those who are not bullied (Delfabbro et al., 2006; Gruber & Fineran, 2007). Researchers have also found that children with lower global self-concepts are at greater risk of being bullied (Neary & Joseph, 1994; Rigby & Cox, 1996, Stanley & Arora, 1998). Alternatively, perpetrators are more likely to experience psychological problems and depression than those who do not bully (Stein et al., 2007; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004, 2007). Many children who bully also tend to exhibit antisocial tendencies from adolescence into adulthood (Hamburger et al., 2011). Children who bully others have been found to self-represent as highly confident (Hymel, Bowker, & Woody, 1993; Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2001). It is ultimately apparent that psychological development is impacted by bullying, both for perpetrators and victims.

Third, both perpetrators and victims experience deficits in social outcomes. Both bullies and victims are more likely to have increased school absenteeism, in comparison to children not involved in the bullying experience (Kshirsagar, Agarwal, & Bavdekar, 2007; Ybarra, Diener-West, & Leaf, 2007). Skues and colleagues (2005) found that the amount of victimization that
children encounter at school moderates how connected they feel with their peers and teachers. Students active in bullying are also more likely to suffer from poor school performance, negative views of school, and poor adjustment to the school environment, in comparison to non-bullies (Hamburger et al., 2011; Nansel et al., 2004; Stein et al., 2007). Bullies and victims appear to have problematic relationships with their teachers (e.g., Hanish, Kochenderfer-Ladd, Fabes, Martin, & Denning, 2004; Skues, Cunningham, & Pokharel, 2005). Children who are involved in perpetrating bullying reported decreased warmth and emotional connection to their teachers (Hanish et al., 2004). This decreased connection with teachers is concerning, as it may perpetuate the bullying experience.

The effect that bullying has on social connection spans not only teacher-student relationships, but also impacts students’ peer relationships (Gommans, 2010; Skues et al, 2005). Victims are more likely than non-victims to experience social isolation from peers, and to report having poor connection to their peers (Delfabbro et al., 2006; Nansel et al., 2004). Interestingly, bullies have generally positive reports of connection with peers – perhaps by socializing with other aggressive children – and therefore experience higher levels of social acceptance than victims (Hanish et al., 2004). For instance, social aggression, which is typically displayed by females, is positively associated with social acceptance, and negatively associated with rejection (Salmivalli, Kaukiainen, & Lagerspetz, 2000). This is an important differentiation because females who engage in social aggression must have power within a good social network, which they can in turn use to influence the group and bully others in a relational manner. If females did not have social influence, they would be ineffective at bullying other individuals through social means. These differences in connection with peers may perpetuate the role of the bully or the victim, and reinforce each of the roles.
Finally, competence-related detriments are problematic for children who bully. Individuals who are viewed as ‘different’ in their physical, mental, and verbal capacities also face differing amounts of bullying (Cummings et al., 2006; Hugh-Jones & Smith, 1999). For instance, Hugh-Jones and Smith (1999) found that children with speech impediments are at risk of being bullied. In addition, Cummings and colleagues (2006) found that children with special needs often suffered from isolation and appeared to be victimized more frequently than children who did not have special needs. On the other hand, being a bully is negatively related to perceived academic competence, which is characterized by low grades (Ma, Phelps, Lerner, & Lerner, 2009; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). It is clear that the bullying experience has serious ramifications for both bullies and victims. In order to reduce the frequency and impact of bullying, it is integral to understand bullying in different contexts (PREVNet, 2012).

**Bullying Research in Different Contexts**

Fekkes, Pijpers, and Verloove-Vanhorick (2005) found that school-time bullying occurs most frequently on the playground and in the classroom. In the playground setting, bullying episodes occurred, on average, 4.5 times per hour, whereas in the classroom setting it occurred 2.4 times per hour (Craig, Pepler, & Atlas, 2000). Yet outside of these contexts less is known about bullying among youth. This is a concern as youth report close to one-third of all bullying episodes as occurring outside of the academic setting (Fekkes et al., 2005). It is integral to consider peer interactions, specifically bullying, in various contexts because they may foster different interpersonal outcomes (Zarbatany, Ghesquiere, & Mohr, 1992). Through exploring contexts outside of the school setting, researchers may gain a nuanced understanding of the different environments in which bullying arises.
In an attempt to expand the knowledge of bullying outside of traditional academic contexts, researchers have recently explored bullying in cyberspace (e.g., Lenhart et al., 2011), and in the physical activity context (e.g., Peguero, 2008; Volk & Lagzdins, 2009). The research in this area suggests that cyber bullying rates are different than classroom and playground rates. Li (2007) found that approximately 14.5 percent of children have engaged in cyber bullying acts, 24.9 percent have been victimized by cyber bullying, and 52.4 percent of children know someone who has been cyber bullied. Interestingly, in comparison to traditional bullying, in which the power imbalance is typically dependent on relative physical stature, those who bully in cyberspace tend to have higher power because they are more technologically savvy (Jordan, 1999). Research into this different context provides evidence that the frequency and forms of bullying can differ depending on the context.

Youth engage in many other activities outside of school and cyberspace, including extracurricular activities. A setting that is of particular interest is the physical activity and sport setting, as sport is one of the most common extracurricular activities in which youth participate (Larson & Verma, 1999). Participation in sport is linked to numerous positive outcomes, such as bettered physical wellbeing, improvements in psychological health, and the development of social outcomes (Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005; Holt & Neely, 2011). First, when organized in such a way that it keeps youth engaged in physical activity, it can have many cardiovascular, muscular, and weight-related benefits (Holt, Kingsley, Tink, & Scherer, 2011; Romani, 2011; Taylor, Sallis, & Needle, 1985). Sport also develops physical competencies that can be beneficial both in and out of sport (Hanson, Larson, & Dworkin, 2003). Physical activity is related to lower rates of diseases, such as cardiovascular disease and some cancers (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011). Second, there appears to be a relationship between sport
and psychological health (e.g., Bano & Tripathi, 2013; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006; Jewett et al., in press). Jewett and colleagues (in press) have found that participation in sport has been correlated to lower levels of stress and reports of lessened depressive symptoms. Sport participation has been also been associated with increased self-confidence, self-esteem, discipline, and to improved academic performance (Broh, 2002; Findlay & Coplan, 2008; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006; Holt et al., 2011). The benefits of participation extend into adulthood, with a relationship to the development of emotional regulation, cooperation, and resilience (Bartko & Eccles, 2003; Findlay & Coplan, 2008; Hanson et al., 2003). Third, social skills, such as the development of teamwork and leadership, can be developed through sport participation (Holt et al., 2011; Wright & Côté, 2003). It also has an impact on the development of closer relationships with parents and coaches (Holt et al., 2011). Sport has an association to the development of social competence, as it is related to career success and community engagement (Larson & Verma, 1999; Wankel & Mummery, 1990).

Although sport has the potential to have a positive impact on a youth’s physical, psychological, and social wellbeing, participation may also be linked to the development of negative outcomes. Sport participants report more frequent physical injuries and increased prevalence of disordered eating (Beals & Manore, 1994; Grimmer, Jones, & Williams, 2000; Reel & Gill, 1996; Steinger, McQuivery, Pavelski, Pitts, & Kraemer, 2000). Second, the demands of some sport experiences are linked to detrimental levels of stress for an athlete (Hanson et al., 2003). Various sport environments have also been linked to decreases in an athlete’s self-esteem, burnout, and poor moral reasoning (Aaron et al., 1995; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Fraser-Thomas & Côté, 2009; Goodger, Gorely, Lavalee, & Harwood, 2007; Gould, Udry, Tuffey, & Loehr, 1996). Furthermore, participation in some sports has been linked to increased
alcohol consumption (Colburn, 1986; Eccles & Barber, 1999). Finally, sport may be associated
with vulnerability around teammates, and increased aggression (Colburn, 1986; Fraser-Thomas
& Côté, 2009; Hanson et al., 2003; Wankel & Mummery, 1990). It is evident that sport has a
noteworthy impact on youth development, and thus, it is important to understand the factors,
especially the negative ones, which could hinder the developmental of positive outcomes related
to sport participation.

A number of factors affect the outcomes of these developmental trajectories and youths’
subsequent participation in sport. For instance, the structure of the sport environment,
specifically how the sport experience is delivered, can have a substantial impact on the
development of both positive and negative outcomes of young athletes (MacDonald, Côté, Eys,
& Deakin, 2011). Coaches also have an impact on this process, through the feedback they
provide (Smoll, Smith, Barnett, & Everett, 1993), the goals they promote (Hill & Hansen, 1988;
Sigenthaler & Gonzalez, 1997), and the type of support provided to athletes (Pelletier, Fortier,
Vallerand, & Brière, 2001; Robinson & Carron, 1982). Parents also share a role in this
development process, through the ways in which they frame their feedback of the overall sport
experience (Brustad & Weigand, 1989; Scanlan & Lewthwaite, 1986). Another important, yet
under-explored, aspect that can impact developmental outcomes is peer influences (Smith, 2003).
Peer relationships are inherently important to social acceptance, which is directly related to
athletic competence, motivation to participate in sport, and sport enjoyment (Evans & Roberts,
1987; Scanlan, Stein, & Ravizza, 1989; Weiss & Duncan, 1992). Thus, social relationships are
pivotal for optimal development, both in and out of sport (Beaumeister & Leary, 1995; Smith,
2003).
Perhaps because of the need to feel accepted by others, peer relationships appear to have a unique contribution amongst varied sport-based relationships (Hirsch, 2005). For example, self-determination theory explicates that individuals have a need for social connection to others (Deci & Ryan, 2011). This social connection is nonetheless important in the sport context, as it is associated with sport enjoyment, motivation to continue, and perceived athletic competence (Smith, Balaguer, & Duda, 2006; Weiss & Duncan, 1992; Weiss & Ferrer-Caja, 2002). In adolescence, the peer influence appears to have heightened importance compared to younger age groups, as peers have a pivotal influence on one’s self-worth, competence, and support (Keegan, Harwood, Spray, & Lavalee, 2009; Smith, 2003; Weiss & Stuntz, 2004). Although it is evident that peer relationships are important contributors to development, this avenue of research is relatively under-explored in the sport psychology literature (Moran & Weiss, 2006; Smith, 2003), especially as it relates to acts of bullying within the sport setting.

**Peers and Antisocial Behaviour in Sport**

Given that peer relationships are paramount to sport experience and continued participation in sport, it is important to understand the ways in which peer relationships can negatively influence the youth sport experience. Sport psychology researchers have generally studied negative peer relationships from either a general perspective by assessing a range of antisocial behaviours, or by considering the more specific negative acts of hazing and bullying - which are both classified as antisocial behaviours. The commonly cited definition of antisocial behaviours includes any behaviour that is enacted to harm another individual (Sage, Kavussanu, & Duda, 2006). Behaviours that fall within the antisocial acts realm can range from inappropriate language directed towards opponents to voluntarily breaking the rules in a game (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009). The antisocial literature has examined harmful acts directed at
opponents, and more recently, towards teammates (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009; Sage & Kavussanu, 2007). Antisocial behaviours are often assessed in conjunction with prosocial behaviours, as evidenced by the *Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviour in Sport Scale* (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009). This scale assesses antisocial behaviour through 13 questions, with five questions reserved to measure antisocial acts targeted at teammates. This scale, although useful in its ability to survey overall prosocial and antisocial behaviours, does not directly assess bullying among teammates. In addition, when assessing antisocial behaviours towards teammates, it focuses almost entirely on verbal or physical forms of harmful behaviour.

Although it is necessary to understand prosocial and antisocial behaviour in the sport context, it is useful to delve deeper into the antisocial behaviours that take place among teammates, particularly those that are enacted in less-observable forms. With investigations into these more covert forms of behaviour, researchers can better understand the underpinnings of negative peer relationships in sport.

There has been a rise in discussion around negative peer relationships within teams, especially in the media (*e.g.*, ESPN, 2014; Eyes, Burke, Carron, & Dennis, 2006; MacGregor, 2013). Hazing may be considered a subset of antisocial behaviour, which is largely defined as behaviour that is intended to inflict harm towards individuals when taking membership into a group (Crow & Macintosh, 2009; Hoover & Pollard, 1999). A comprehensive study assessing hazing in post-secondary students in the United States found that hazing occurred both within varsity sports teams, in that almost 50% of the teams reported having experienced hazing during the duration of their schooling (Allan & Madden, 2008). An interesting finding within the hazing literature is that, although hazing is often construed as a ‘team building’ activity, it actually undermines team cohesion (Van Raalte, Cornelius, Linder, & Brewer, 2007). In
addition, there appear to be three main factors identified to predict involvement in hazing, which include power, acceptance, and exploitation (Crow, 2008).

From a conceptual standpoint, hazing shares numerous characteristics of bullying, which is the third way in which researchers have examined negative peer relationships. Bullying is a construct used to analyze negative behaviours among peers, often within social groups and teams. As outlined earlier, bullying is comprised of direct or indirect aggressive acts, and typically requires that the nature of the aggression be repetitive, intentionally harmful to an individual, and conducted by an individual with higher power status than the victim (Olweus, 1993). In the same vein, hazing is often referred to as an act of bullying. Despite similarities to bullying, hazing behaviours are not considered bullying under the current definition, as hazing requires a group membership component and appear to occur over a defined period of time (i.e., when the roles of rookie and veteran are in play), to be deemed as such. Not only is it important to examine the different forms of aggression within teammates, it is also important to use the term ‘bullying’, as opposed to aggressive or antisocial behaviour. The definition of bullying is well understood within the Canadian school system, and may be considered conceptually distinct to both antisocial and aggressive behaviours.

**Bullying in the Sport Context**

A study conducted by Peguero (2008) introduced the notion that bullying may occur in the physical activity domain, particularly amongst high school students. For this study, researchers surveyed students regarding the types of extracurricular activities in which they participated, and the level of victimization that they experienced. Extracurricular activities were classified into three categories: school clubs, intramural sports, and interscholastic sports. The results demonstrated that students who participated in three or more classroom-related activities
and those who participated in three of more intramural sports reported more bullying than those
who did not. Students who participated in interscholastic sports reported less victimization than
those who engaged in intramural sports. Although this study provides preliminary evidence to
suggest that bullying may occur in physical activity settings, it lacks in-depth exploration into the
forms of bullying that occur in this context.

In 2009, Volk and Lagzdins further contributed to the bullying in sport literature by
asking female adolescent athletes from a variety of sports to report involvement in both bully-
perpetration and bully-victimization roles in the school and the sport contexts. Approximately
30-40% of participants reported experiencing ‘low frequency’ (occurred at least once in a
semester) bully-perpetration and/or bully-victimization in the sport context. With regards to
‘high frequency’ bullying (occurred at least once per week) in the sport context, 15% of
participants reported perpetrated bullying acts, whereas approximately 20-25% reported being
victimized. Furthermore, significantly higher levels of ‘low frequency’ school-time bullying
were reported compared to the sport context, with victimization reported slightly more
frequently. Volk and Lagzdins (2009) also compared the participant responses to a previously
generated Canadian population sample, and found that the rates of ‘low frequency’ bullying did
not significantly differ between the sport context and the overall reported level of the Canadian
average. For the participants who reported ‘high frequency’ bullying, it was reported that
perpetration was significantly more likely to occur in the school context than the sport context,
and that participants in both contexts had significantly higher levels of bullying in comparison to
the Canadian average. In terms of victimization, there was significantly more victimization that
occurred in the school context, in comparison to the sport context and the Canadian average.
This study provides a foundation for understanding frequency of bullying in the female
adolescent context of sport, a base that inspires questions around the demographic differences of bullying (e.g., age-related differences, gender comparisons).

In addition to affecting female athletes, bullying appears to affect male athletes, as demonstrated by Steinfeldt and colleagues (2012). Across the four types of bullying (i.e., physical bullying, relational cyber bullying, verbal bullying, and social bullying), they found that social bullying was the most common form of bullying: 17% of participants reported that they sometimes experienced this type of bullying, 6% experienced it often, and 5% experienced it always. The least common form of bullying was physical bullying, where 69% of participants reported never experiencing it. In addition, the researchers found that the greatest predictors of perpetrating bullying for the participants were: (a) the approval of bullying, (b) the moral atmosphere, and (c) the desire to meet role norms. This study lacks investigation into the demographic differences of bullying, mainly the impact of gender, as well as the impact that bullying has on the social actors involved in the bullying experience.

Most recently, Tamminen, Holt, and Neely (2013) conducted a qualitative study to examine adversity in elite female athletes between the ages of 18-23 years of age. The researchers found that bullying was linked to athletes’ feelings of social isolation, which led to a decline in psychological health. This study provides preliminary findings that resonate with the findings in the academic bullying literature, which suggests that bullying can have detrimental effects on health, and is related to forming connections with peers. The outcomes demonstrate the need for further investigation into these findings with larger samples and a survey of outcome measures, to understand the impact that bullying has in the sport setting.

Ultimately, these initial steps in defining bullying as an important and negative event in youth sport establish understanding of the prevalence and predictors of bullying in sport under a
very specific lens (e.g. female athletes, football players). Past sport research does not, however, examine bullying across genders, who participate in different types of sports. Nor does the research consistently reveal how the bullying experience shapes youth developmental outcomes in sport. As a result, the present study had two aims. First, we sought to answer the question: How often does bullying occur in the sport context, compared to school-time bullying and across demographic categories? In order to answer this question, a variety of forms of bullying were analyzed to glean an overall understanding of the frequency of bullying in sport. Extensions of this question included examining demographic differences that may impact the bullying experience, specifically gender differences, age differences, and individual versus team-sport differences.

The second aim of the study was to gain a foundational understanding of the predictive impact that bullying has on athlete development: If a young athlete is bullied by teammates, or bullies other teammates, how might this experience relate to his or her more general experience in sport? The literature reviewed in school contexts above demonstrates that bullying has an influence on both victims’ and peers’ social relationships and perceptions of self – both within the bullying context and more generally (Hamburger et al., 2011; Jankauskiene et al., 2008). As a result of exploring similar constructs in sport, the degree that bullying victims and perpetrators felt connected to others in the sport context (i.e., teammates, coaches) as well as their feelings of personal competence in sport and perceptions of worth more generally were examined. Taken together, this two-part study provided an in-depth exploration into the experience of bullying in the youth sport context.
Chapter 3

Methods

Participants

When recruiting for the current study, participants had to be between the ages of 13 to 17 years old at time of study completion, and had to be part of a sports team – either in a team sport or in an individual sport, training as a team. Participants from the adolescent age group were selected, as the influence of peer relationships in sport is paramount in the adolescent stage of development (Smith, 2003). It is also a time when bullying reaches its peak, in the academic context (Brown et al., 2005; Peskin et al., 2006; Stop a Bully, 2013). The latter criterion was particularly important, as bullying is inherently a relationship problem, and was expected to occur in group contexts (Pepler & Craig, 2000). Participants were recruited through convenience sampling, which is a method commonly employed in exploratory studies (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006).

There were ultimately 128 male and 228 female participants who completed the study (three participants did not report gender) with an average age of 14.47 years (SD = 1.34). The majority of participants were from Canada (n = 353), with a few from the United States of America (n = 3), and three participants did not provide their country of origin. The most common sports in which participants engaged were cheerleading (n = 105), ice hockey (n = 101), and volleyball (n = 78; Appendix A). There were 190 participants who were coached by male coaches, and 164 participants coached by female coaches.

Measures

The bullying in sport questionnaire. The Bullying in Sport Questionnaire (BSQ; Appendix B) was used to measure the frequency of bullying in sport. This questionnaire
contained 12 demographic questions, and 36 questions that examined the bullying experience in the sport and school contexts. The 36 items (i.e., four global bullying questions and 32 itemized bullying questions) were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, anchored by 1 (I have not been bullied/bullied another teammate in this way in the past couple of months) to 5 (Several times a week).

**Development of the bullying in sport questionnaire.** The Bullying in Sport Questionnaire (BSQ) was adapted from the Canadian version of the Health Behaviours in School-aged Children (HBSC) survey and the Adolescent Peer Relations Instrument (APRI; see Appendix C for composition and scoring of these questionnaires). These two questionnaires were used to develop the BSQ as the first scale selected for use (HBSC) measured eight bullying constructs; however, it contained unequal subscales. To circumvent this issue, additional items taken from the APRI scale were used to equalize subscale sizes – with four items per subscale. Specifically, the HBSC had a few subscales that were measured using one or two items; thus two social bully-victimization/bully-perpetration items, and three bully-victimization/bully-perpetration items were selected for use from the APRI to supplement the HBSC. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the questions used from both the HBSC and the APRI. Ultimately, the current study adapted 22 items from the HBSC, along with 10 items from the APRI.
Table 1. Origin of BSQ question items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Number of Items from HBSC</th>
<th>Number of Items from APRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical bully-victimization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bully-victimization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social bully-victimization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber bully-victimization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical bully-perpetration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bully-perpetration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social bully-perpetration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber bully-perpetration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through adapting the above two measures, the *Bullying in Sport Questionnaire* was created, and served as the measure to examine bullying frequencies in the present study. The first section of the *BSQ* surveyed the demographic details of participants using 12 items. The second section provided a definition of bullying that was meant to differentiate bullying behaviours from aggressive behaviours. The third section (i.e., two items) measured the frequency of overall bullying at school and in the sport context respectively, with one item relating to bully-victimization in each context. As an example, the global-scale *bully-victimization* question asked participants to report, “How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months?” In the fourth section (i.e., 34 items) participants reported experiences with specific bullying encounters of bully-victimization, specifically identifying physical, verbal, social, and cyber victimization (4 items for each construct). *Physical bully-victimization* was measured with four items (e.g., “A teammate(s) hit, kicked, pushed, or shoved...”
me around outside of the team rules and norms”). *Verbal bully-victimization* was measured with four items (*e.g.*, “A teammate(s) called me mean names, made fun of, or teased me in a hurtful way”). *Social bully-victimization* was assessed with four items (*e.g.*, “A teammate(s) left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from the team, or completely ignored me”). *Cyber bully-victimization* was assessed with four items (*e.g.*, “My username and password was stolen and used by another teammate(s) to send mean messages using my name”).

The remaining sections are a mirror of the first sections, which examined bully-perpetration rather than bully-victimization. Thus, the fifth section measured the frequency of *overall bullying* at school and in the sport contexts respectively, with one item relating to bully-perpetration in each context. An example of the global-scale *bully-perpetration* question asked participants to report, “How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months?” In the fourth section, participants reported their experiences with specific bullying encounters of *bully-perpetration*, specifically identifying *physical, verbal, social, and cyber perpetration* (4 items for each construct). *Physical bully-perpetration* was assessed with four items (*e.g.*, “I hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around a teammate(s) outside of the team rules and norms”). *Verbal bully-perpetration* was calculated using four items (*e.g.*, “I made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to another teammate(s)”). *Social bully-perpetration* was evaluated with four items (*e.g.*, “I kept another teammate(s) out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from our team, or completely ignored him or her”). Finally, *cyber bully-perpetration* was measured with four items (*e.g.*, “I took pictures of a teammate(s) without permission and posted them online”).

To adapt the two questionnaires to the sport setting, small question-wording changes were made (*e.g.*, school was changed to team). Items that referred to bullying acts that may
occur frequently and be acceptable in the sport performance/competition context (e.g., I pushed or shoved a teammate) were clarified to ensure that responses did not refer to aggressive acts that would be expected by playing sport. For questions that fit into this category, the tag “…that was outside of the context of the sport/game” was added to the end of each item. The response scales of all questions were converted to that of the HBSC, to maintain consistency. The Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score for the BSQ was 5.0, which demonstrated that it was age-appropriate. In addition, a global bullying measure was added for both the bully-victimization section and the bully-perpetration section, to assess overall bullying perceptions within both the sport and school contexts. Five research team members completed the questionnaire within approximately seven to 12 minutes. Following this review, two researchers who specialized in youth research approved the questionnaire. The BSQ was then piloted with five students between the ages of 13-17 years old, recruited through a local sports organization. The students completed the questionnaire in an average of 14 minutes (range = 12-18 minutes).

**Athletic competence and global self-worth.** Ten items, across two subscales from the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents (SPPA; Harter, 2012), were used to assess competence and self-worth in the current study. Although the original SPPA scale assesses a range of constructs including scholastic competence, romantic appeal, and behavioural conduct, only the athletic competence and global self-worth subscales were of interest for the current study. This is in line with the intended use of the questionnaire, as Harter (2012) noted that the SPPA remains valid and reliable even if multiple subscales are dropped. Each construct was comprised of five items, for a total of 10 questions.

Each question was presented in the form of a two-part question. First, the participants read two opposing statements and identified which one accurately represented their disposition.
An example of one of the questions was, “Some teenagers find it hard to make friends BUT other teenagers find it pretty easy to make friends.” After selecting one of these two options, participants indicated the extent that the statement applied to them, by indicating whether it was “really true for me” or “sort of true for me.” For the current study, the word ‘teenager’ from the original scale was changed to ‘athlete’ to align with the sport context (see Appendix D for adapted version). The SPPA measure has been validated for use with males and females between the ages of 13-18 years of age, and good to excellent internal consistency is reported for each subscale (Harter, 2012). Specifically, the athletic competence subscale has estimates ranging from $\alpha = .86$ to .92, and the global self-worth subscale has estimates ranging from $\alpha = .80$ to .89 (Harter, 2012). This scale has previously been used in the sport setting with adolescent athletes (e.g., Moran & Weiss, 2006; Hanrahan, 2005).

**Connection to coach.** The Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (CART-Q) is a 22-item measure, developed to assess the nature of the coach-athlete relationship as reported by both coaches and athletes (Jowett & Ntoumanis, 2004). The CART-Q consists of three subscales, including (a) commitment, (b) closeness, and (c) complementarity. For the purposes of this study, only the athlete-perspective measure was included (11 items). As a result, participants reported the extent to which their experiences were reflected in three items in regard to commitment (e.g., “I feel close to my coach.”), four items in regards to closeness (e.g., “I like my coach.”), and four items in regards to complementarity (“When I am coached by my coach, I feel at ease.”). Each of the items was measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). The CART-Q has good internal consistency, with the higher-order Coach-Athlete Relationship scale Cronbach’s $\alpha$ coefficient of $\alpha = 0.93$ (Jowett & Ntoumanis, 2004).
Connection to teammates. The *In-group Ties Scale* is a subscale from the Three-Factor Model of Social Identity (Cameron, 2004). *In-group Ties Scale* was the only factor that was selected for use, as it served as an appropriate operational definition (*i.e.*, a participant’s perception of emotional closeness and sense of belonging to a team) for assessing connection of teammates within a team. Ultimately, four items were used, with a sample question being, “I have a lot in common with other members on this team.” Each of the items was measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale, anchored by 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). The scale was adapted for the sport context by Bruner, Boardley and Côté (2014), and has good internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.78$).

**Data Collection and Procedure**

Clearance was obtained from the University Research Ethics Board (Appendix E). Following ethics clearance, the questionnaire package was pilot tested with five athletes between the ages of 13 to 17 years of age to ensure that it was adequate for the selected population. Following the pilot test, and to maximize participation, the study was available to complete both online and in person. As a result, completion procedures are described separately in regard to online and in-person recruitment. Regardless of the format, participants required approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire package. To minimize order effects, the questionnaires were counterbalanced.

**Online data recruitment.** Participants who completed the questionnaire online were recruited through Facebook, Twitter, and word-of-mouth advertising (who accessed the questionnaire through a link to the study through Fluid Surveys). In order to participate in the study, participants were required to read the study information letter, and then check a box stating that they were between the ages of 13-17 years old and wished to participate in the study.
The participants then completed the questionnaire package. Following completion of the questionnaires, the participants were presented with a screen that detailed the debriefing form (Appendix F). This form provided information regarding the study and contact information for Kids Help Phone and other individuals who could assist the participants if they encountered harm from the study. Once participants had checked a box stating that they read the debriefing form, they were brought to a screen where they could enter their email address for a chance to win one of two $50 gift certificates to a sport apparel store. Finally, participants were brought to a screen that stated they had completed the study, and thanked them for completing the study. Ultimately, although 188 site visits were made to the online study website, only 48 complete questionnaires were provided by participants and were included with the study sample.

**In-person data recruitment.** To recruit participants in person, the lead researchers traveled to the participants’ local sports organizations, and to tournaments to recruit the individual athletes. The data collection procedure occurred after tournaments, games, or team practices. Once the data collection process, questionnaires, consent, and process to terminate the study were outlined, questionnaire packages were distributed to interested participants. Each of the participants completed the questionnaire package in private, using small, cardboard privacy barriers. Participants were provided with the debriefing form, which they were encouraged to take home. If the participants wanted to be entered in the sporting apparel gift certificate draw, they were given a cue card to record their email address. Following this procedure, participants were thanked for their participation in the study. Ultimately, 311 participants were recruited in-person – the majority of the sample for the current study.

**Bullying in sport questionnaire preparation.** Although the items within the BSQ were completed along an ordinal scale and are traditionally considered using subscale means across
varying subscales (e.g., Hamburger et al., 2011), the prevalence of bullying in the current sample made this approach untenable. Specifically, responses to bullying items were extremely positively skewed (see Appendix G and H for a tabular representation of participant responses) – with most participants indicating ‘not at all’ across bullying items. Transformations were not able to correct the extreme skew, and therefore, the data was deemed nonparametric. To provide the greatest potential to compare participants according to their perceptions of bullying in sports, participant responses were dichotomized for both bully perpetration and bully victimization. The non-perpetration group (n = 270) rated all bully items as “not at all”. On the other hand, the perpetration group (n = 84) rated at least one or more bully items as “once or twice in the past month” (Mdn = 2.00; SD = 2.15), with participants classified within this group endorsing an average of 2.23 perpetration items to some extent. Related to bully-victimization, the non-victimization group (n = 223) rated all bully items as “not at all”. On the other hand, the victimization group (n = 130) rated at least one or more bully items as “once or twice in the past month”, (Mdn = 2.00; SD = 2.61), with participants classified within this group endorsing an average of 2.93 victimization items to some extent. Preacher, Rucker, MacCallum, and Nicewander (2005) explicate that, although artificially creating dichotomized variables from scale scores is often discouraged, this approach is appropriate when the data is extremely skewed.

Data Analysis

Preliminary analyses. All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS 22. Prior to conducting these analyses, Missing Value Analysis was completed to calculate the frequency of missing responses. For any questionnaires that were missing less than 5% of responses, the missing responses were replaced with a value calculated using the mean reported for the
remaining construct items. For cases that were missing more than 5% of responses, the participant’s responses were removed using listwise deletion. Data was also analyzed to identify extreme outliers, and any extreme outliers were Winsorized (Salkind, 2010).

**Main Analyses.** Following data preparation and completion of preliminary analyses, our next steps focused on addressing comparisons of bullying between school and sport contexts, comparing bullying-perpetration and -victimization groupings according to demographic variables, and examining whether athlete developmental outcomes were influenced by bullying prevalence.

**Descriptive bullying statistics.** To compare the bullying in sport and school contexts, frequencies for overall victimization and perpetration were tallied for both the sport and school contexts, and for the cumulative totals of the bullying subscales. In order to test differences between the frequencies of the contexts, Wilcoxon rank-sum analyses were conducted. To glean further insight into the role of bully-perpetration and -victimization in the two settings, Spearman correlation analyses were conducted on the four roles in both contexts.

**Demographic contrasts.** In order to identify if the bully-perpetration and bully-victimization groups differed based on demographic variables, a series of tests were conducted to contrast these continuous and categorical variables. Specifically, independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess differences between the continuous demographic variables for bully-perpetrators and non-bully perpetrators, and the bully-victims and non-bully victims. Chi-square tests were used to assess differences among categorical demographic variables between the bully-perpetrators and non-bully perpetrators, and the bully-victims and non-bully victims. In addition to being explored in their own right, these analyses also served an important purpose of identifying significant demographic variables to be controlled for in the ensuing analyses.
**Predictors of developmental outcomes.** In order to examine relationships between bullying and the athlete developmental experience, eight Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) tests were conducted to assess the differences between bully-perpetrators and non-bully perpetrators – as well as bully-victims and non-bully victims – on ratings of athletic competence, global self-worth, connection to coach, and connection to teammates. To correct for using multiple comparisons, Bonferroni corrections were used (Bland & Altman, 1995).
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Results

Missing Data and Assumptions of Data

Athletic competence and global self-worth scales were identified as the only scales that had problematic missing data. The Missing Values Analysis revealed that the athletic competence and global self-worth missing values were missing at random, such that it was not associated with any participant demographic differences. As such, the constructs were included in all subsequent analyses. Furthermore, six univariate outliers were identified in regard to the connection to coach variable, and were adjusted using a Winsorized approach (Salkind, 2010).

Descriptive Bullying Statistics

Bully-victimization frequency statistics were first contrasted across both the school and the sport contexts. It is first important to note that the majority of the participants did not experience bully-victimization in the past few months across either context (86% did not experience bully-victimization in sport; 70% did not experience bully-victimization in school). Nonetheless, participants experienced significantly more bully-victimization in the school context ($M = 1.47$, $SD = .89$) in comparison to the sport context ($M = 1.23$, $SD = .68$, $Z = -5.10$, $p < .001$). Figure 1 illustrates the frequency of bully-victimization in these two contexts.
Figure 1. *Frequency of bully-victimization in the school and sport contexts*

This figure illustrates the percentage of bully-victimization that was reported for each response option in the *BSQ*.

Overall bully-perpetration frequency statistics were calculated for both the school and the sport context and are illustrated in Figure 2. The majority of participants did not report perpetrating bullying behaviours in the past few months (92% did not report bullying in sport; 83% did not report bullying in school). Wilcoxon rank-sum test results demonstrate that the participants engaged in bullying behaviours significantly more in the school context (*M* = 1.18, *SD* = .51), in comparison to the sport context (*M* = 1.09, *SD* = .41, *Z* = -3.62, *p* < .001. In the sport context, 6% of participants reported perpetrating acts of bullying once or twice in the past couple of months.
Figure 2. *Frequency of bully-perpetration in the school and sport contexts*

This figure depicts the percentage of bully-perpetration that was reported for each response option in the *BSQ*.

To identify if there was a relationship between bully-victimization and bully-perpetration in the two settings, bivariate correlations were conducted. Spearmen correlation coefficients were selected, in light of the extreme skewness of the data (Field, 2009). The Spearman correlations demonstrated significant relationships between all of the variables (see Table 2 for a description of the results). This means that there was a tendency for those being victimized and perpetrating bullying in one context to experience the same in another context, albeit certain correlations were relatively low (*e.g.*, perpetration in sport had a small correlation with victimization in both contexts).
Table 2. Spearman correlations for bully-victimization and bully-perpetration in the school and sport contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Victimization in School</th>
<th>Victimization in Sport</th>
<th>Perpetration in School</th>
<th>Perpetration in Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Victimization</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Victimization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Perpetration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Perpetration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = correlation is significant at the 0.01 level  
* = correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

**Demographic Contrasts**

Independent samples t-tests were conducted to identify group differences within continuous demographic variables (i.e., age, length of time in sport, length of time with coach, and amount of time with team). Based on these analyses, no significant differences emerged between the bully perpetration group and the no bully perpetration group (i.e., all \( p \)'s > .17).

Similarly, additional t-tests demonstrated that there were no significant differences between the bully victimization group and the no bully victimization group (i.e., all \( p \)'s > .60).

Chi-square tests were conducted to compare groups according to categorical demographic variables (i.e., participant gender, sport type, and coach gender). Based on these analyses, there was a significant difference between the bully-victimization and no bully-victimization groups for the coach gender variable, \( \chi^2 (1) = 33.72, p < .001, V = .31 \). Specifically, 51% of participants with a male coach reported victimization, in comparison to 21% of participants with a female coach reporting victimization. In contrast, the amount of bully victimization reported did not differ between team and individual sport participants, \( \chi^2 (1) = 2.72, p = .10, V = .09 \), nor were there differences between male and female athletes, \( \chi^2 (1) = 2.30, p = .13, V = .08 \).
Based on the analyses assessing categorical demographic differences for the bully perpetration groups, the groups differed on all three variables. There was a difference between those individuals who were coached by male coaches, with 35% reported perpetrating bullying, in comparison to only 11% of those coached by females perpetrating bullying, $\chi^2(1) = 27.77, p < .001, V = .28$. Similarly, 30% of males reported perpetrating bullying behaviours – a percentage that was greater than the 20% of females who perpetrated bullying, $\chi^2(1) = 4.46, p = .04, V = .11$. The amount of bully perpetration reported differed according to sport type, whereby 26% of team sport participants perpetrated bullying in comparison to only 11% of individual sport participants, $\chi^2(1) = 4.92, p = .03, V = .12$.

**Predictors of Developmental Outcomes**

In light of the demographic group differences between the bullying groupings in the current sample (i.e., coach gender, athlete gender, and sport type), it was important to control for these differences when comparing developmental outcomes for each grouping. Notably, although all three variables were not significantly different according to bully-victimization groups, they were trending in a pattern consistent with that of coach gender and nonetheless controlled for. As a result, ANCOVA analyses were conducted to compare participants’ developmental outcomes between those who experienced bully-victimization and those who did not experience victimization (Table 3), as well as between those who reported bully-perpetration with those who did not report bully-perpetration.

The bully-victimization group reported lower developmental outcomes for three of the four developmental outcomes assessed in the current study. First, participants who experienced bully-victimization reported significantly lower levels of global self-worth to that of participants who did not experience bullying, $F(1,254) = 7.97, p = .005, \eta^2 = .03$. Second, the bully victim
group also reported lower connection to coach ratings, $F(1,341) = 6.09$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Third, the bully victims group also reported lower connection to their teammates, $F(1,341) = 10.78$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .03$. In contrast to these differences, participants who reported bully victimization did not differ from those not reporting victimization regarding perceptions of athletic competence, $F(1,253) = .001$, $p = .98$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

With regards to differences between bully-perpetrators and non-perpetrators, the two groups only differed according to one of the developmental outcomes assessed. Specifically, participants who reported perpetrating bullying reported a weaker “connection to coach” score than those who did not perpetrate bullying behaviours, $F(1,341) = 8.48$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Bully perpetrators and non-perpetrators did not significantly vary on their reported levels of athletic competence, global self-worth, and connection to teammates (i.e., all $p$’s > .12).
Table 3. ANCOVA Results for the four developmental outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Outcome</th>
<th>Bully Perpetration</th>
<th>Bully Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Perpetrators</td>
<td>Perpetrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Competence</td>
<td>2.94 (.59)</td>
<td>2.93 (.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Worth</td>
<td>3.09 (.63)</td>
<td>2.96 (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Coach</td>
<td>6.24 (.84)</td>
<td>5.87 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Teammates</td>
<td>5.77 (1.38)</td>
<td>5.60 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

Discussion

Bullying is a process that negatively impacts the health, peer relationships, and the developmental outcomes of youth. Research to support this statement is extensive regarding the outcomes of school-time bullying; however, less is known about bullying in sport. This is a concern because sport is one of the most common extracurricular activities in which youth engage and, hence, has great potential to influence psychosocial development (Larson & Verma, 1999). Preliminary research suggests that bullying occurs in the physical activity and sport settings (Peguero, 2008; Volk & Lagzdins, 2009), but an in-depth investigation of bullying prevalence and developmental outcomes has yet to be conducted in sport. The present study built on existing research, and examined the frequency of bullying within sport teams, and the impact that it had on an athlete’s developmental outcomes.

Based on the findings from the current study, bully-perpetration and -victimization occurs less frequently in the sport context, in comparison to the school environment. Participants who acted as either a perpetrator or victim within their sport team were likely to share the same role at school. In sport, bullying was impacted by the participant’s gender, coach’s gender, and the type of sport (i.e., individual or team), in which they participated. The bullying experience, particularly victimization, predicted a reduction in an athlete’s global self-worth, connection to the coach, and connection teammates. When considering the aggregation of these results, it is clear that – even within a sport team context where bullying behaviours occur at a relatively limited rate – bullying among teammates may harm positive developmental outcomes for young athletes.
**Bullying in the Sport and School Settings**

Based on responses on the global bully experience questions, bullying occurred more frequently in the school setting in comparison to the sport setting. In the current study, approximately 8% of athletes reported perpetrating bullying, and approximately 14% of athletes reported victimization. In comparison to the generally reported average Canadian sample, which states that approximately 12% of youth perpetrate bullying, and 22% of youth are victimized, it is evident that bullying in the sport context occurs less frequently than in the school setting (PREVNet, 2010). This finding is consistent with research conducted by Volk and Lagzdins (2009), who found that bullying rates for both the victimization and perpetration roles were significantly higher in the school setting in comparison to the sport setting. A possible explanation for this finding is that the sport setting may serve as a protective environment against bullying. On one hand, simply being a member of a team might establish shared social identities that increase the likelihood that team members will treat each other in a prosocial manner (Bruner et al., 2014). Similarly, members of a wide variety of teams share interdependence in terms of shared tasks or collective outcomes (Evans, Eys, & Bruner, 2012). Even a setting such as cheerleading involves interdependence, as members must work together (e.g., completing a pyramid) and share in group success or failure. Striving towards these common goals facilitates interdependence among teammates, and may therefore facilitate greater team cohesion and less animosity or bullying within the team.

Another possible explanation of the differences between sport- and school-time bullying may include the contrast between the overall amounts of time spent in the school context as opposed to the sport context. Youth typically spend 35 hours per week in school, which was considerably higher than the average amount of time that athletes spent with their team (\(M = \))
6.88 hours, $SD = 5.13$). Therefore, it is plausible that there is simply more time for these behaviours to occur in the school context, in comparison to the sport setting. Lower reported levels of bullying could also be explained through dropout. Students are generally not permitted to drop out of school, even if they are experiencing victimization; however, it is possible for athletes to drop out of sports if they are experiencing bullying. As this study was cross-sectional in nature, it is limited in its ability to identify bullying in athletes who have chosen to dropout of sport due to victimization. Regardless of the mechanism, the present study aligns with research that suggests that it is important to study bullying in a variety of settings, as the frequency of bullying can differ between contexts (Jordan, 1999; Zarbatany et al., 1992). Particularly, it may be of interest to consider bullying in sport contexts where shared team interdependence and identity may not be as strong – such as in sport camps or large sport clubs.

In comparison to the general prevalence of bullying, a novel consideration relates to the role of the victim and perpetrator across school and sport settings. For example, does victimization occur across contexts? Findings from the present study demonstrate that there was a significant relationship between participating in the same role, as either a perpetrator or victim, across both contexts. This finding is not surprising, given that research suggests that there are individual predictors that may impact whether or not an individual will become a bully or fall victim to bullying. For instance, Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, and Sadek (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of predictive factors of victimization and bullying, and found that victims of bullying are more likely to have negative cognitions about themselves, in comparison to bullies and individuals who are not engaged in bullying. It also appears that victims have unique difficulties establishing positive and enduring relationships, which may predict and perpetuate their role as a victim of bullying in numerous contexts (Cook et al., 2010). In other words, bully-
victimization may affect an athlete's ability to develop relationships with teammates, and to be excluded or ostracized. On the other hand, it appears that academic incompetence acts as a predictor for perpetrating bullying acts (Cook et al., 2010). Thus, perhaps the findings from the current study demonstrate that bullies and victims in school share similar roles in sport, even though overall rates of bullying and victimization were lower in the sport setting.

**Demographic Contrasts**

A striking feature of the current findings involved the tendency for the reporting of bullying behaviours to vary according to the gender of both the coach and athletes, as well as according to sport type. Sport environment characteristics appeared to have negligible impact on bullying, such that bullying did not differ based on the length of time that athletes had been in their sport or with their coach, nor by the amount of time they spent each week with their team. Furthermore, although age had an influence on bullying prevalence in past research (e.g., Brown et al., 2005; Peskin et al., 2006), it was not surprising that bullying was not related to age in the current study because the age category (13-17 years old) represents a fairly small range of developmental age-groupings.

Gender of both the coach and athlete appeared to have an impact on how bullying was experienced. Athletes who had male coaches reported significantly higher rates of perpetrating and experiencing bullying compared to athletes who had female coaches. This was an unexpected finding; however, it is consistent with findings from the academic bullying literature. Hirdes, Bauman, and Yoon (2010) found that female teachers were more likely to aid victims in comparison to male teachers. In response to these findings, Hirdes and colleagues (2010) posited that the action taken towards tending to victims may result from the socialization process to which females are exposed, which leads to increased empathy and care towards victims.
Additionally, female teachers tended to consider bullying situations as problematic more often than male teachers (Green, Shriberg, & Farber, 2008). Thus, it is not a stretch to expect that coach gender differences followed a similar pattern of teacher gender differences in the ability to detect and react to acts of bullying.

Similarly, male participants also reported higher levels of bully-perpetration compared with female participants, whereas there were no participant gender differences for victimization levels. Consistent with academic bullying literature, it appears that the differences in overall victimization levels did not differ between the genders (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). Provided that past research has more frequently revealed gender differences in specific domains (e.g., physical vs. social; Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Orue & Calvete, 2011), future research should examine gender differences between the different forms of bullying, in order to tease out potential gender differences. Furthermore, research could examine the relationship between coach and athlete genders (e.g., male athletes with male coaches, or male athletes with female coaches), to ultimately identify if the coach and athlete gender could potentially interact with each other.

In addition, for the influence of gender on bullying behaviours, a greater relative frequency of team sport athletes reported being a bullying perpetrator compared to individual sports. It is well documented that social norms differ across sports, and that certain sports and specific group contexts condone forms of behaviour that other sports penalize (Carron & Eys, 2011). For instance, physical aggression in the form of fistfights or body checking (and, often, verbal taunting) may appear relatively more acceptable in the sport of ice hockey compared to cheerleading. Thus, it is possible some acts of aggression are more acceptable in certain contexts – ultimately forming an environment where bullying is normative.
Similarly, within team sports, there is typically a hierarchy that is present. For example, status differences are often evident according to status or position on the team, such as, within the role of a ‘rookie’. The hazing literature has documented that these lower status individuals may experience mocking, humiliation, or other aggressive acts, often during the early season as part of integration into a team (Crow & Macintosh, 2009). As a result, the hazing that takes place among team members may form an environment where negative aggressive actions become chronic and take place over a longer period of time – ultimately fitting the operational definition of bullying.

**Bullying as a Predictor of Developmental Outcomes**

In the academic setting, students who experience bullying, as well as those who bully others, experience physical complaints, unstable peer and teacher relationships, and reductions in their self-concept (Hamburger et al., 2011; Jankauskiene et al., 2008). Even despite being reported to a lesser frequency than in school contexts, positive outcomes were limited for athletes who reported even a single bully-victimization or -perpetration instance on their team. To preface this section, the majority of the discussion surrounds victimization as a predictor of the developmental outcomes, as bully-perpetration had an impact on only connection to coach. Although it is possible that being a bully-perpetrator does not predict deficits or improvements to one’s self-worth, connection to teammates, or athletic competence, it is also possible that the sample size that reported engaging in bully-perpetration was too small to produce significant differences.

A primary finding was that bully-victimization was related to lower levels of connection to the participant’s coach. This trend was consistent with the academic context, where victims often report having problematic relationships with their teachers (Skues et al., 2005). Sullivan
(2000) found that student-teacher relationships could have been compromised due to the lack of empathy towards the bully victim. It is also possible that the lack of relationship stemmed from the teacher modeling incongruent bully behaviours in the classroom environment, perhaps reinforcing the victim’s role (Sullivan, 2000). Similarly, in the present study, bully-perpetrators also had a significantly lower connection with their coach. This finding aligns with academic research on bully-perpetrators, as perpetrators have been found to show less warmth and emotional connection to their teachers (Hanish et al., 2004).

Although these results situate well within the academic literature, they are alarming because bullying appears to have a significant impact on an athlete’s connection to his or her coach, which is an important component of an athlete’s experience (Jowett & Cockerill, 2002). Coaches provide technical and tactical knowledge, and aid in the development of many physical, psychological, and social outcomes, such as reduction of competition anxiety (Jowett & Cockerill, 2002; Kenow & Williams, 1999). As identified in the current study, even among the one-quarter to one-third of athletes who reported bullying, bullying has the potential to significantly impact their sport experience.

In addition to deficits in connection to their coaches, participants who experienced victimization reported a lower connection with their teammates. This finding was expected, as bullying is inherently a peer relationship problem, which is marked by the lack of stability of close friendships (Pepler, 2011). Victims of bullying in the academic context report higher isolation from friends, and lower social acceptance (Delfabbro et al., 2006; Gommans, 2010; Skues et al., 2005). This lower social acceptance can reinforce the bullying cycle, as it can impact self-esteem, which predicts further victimization from peers. Findings from the current study are disconcerting, given that positive peer relationships promote satisfaction in sport
contexts and, ultimately, long-term participation in sport (Smith, 1999; Weiss, 1993; Weiss, Smith, & Theeboom, 1996). Correspondingly, athletes who lack social connections with their teammates are more likely to drop out of sport, which in turn, may reduce the likelihood that children will be physical active (Smith, 1999; Weiss, 1993; Weiss et al., 1996). Thus, the trend continues to demonstrate that bullying, even via one or two incidents in the past month, can have a substantial impact on athlete outcomes.

The victimization experience also had an impact on athletes’ views of their self-concept, which reveals an impact on participants’ self-concept outside of sport. In the academic bullying literature, victims of bullying report lower self-esteem and lower global self-concepts (Delfabbro et al., 2006; Gruber & Fineran, 2007; Neary & Joseph, 1994). Low self-esteem can reinforce bully victimization, such that individuals who have low self-esteem are more susceptible to bullying, which in turn negatively impacts their self-esteem, and creates a downward spiral (O’Moore & Kirkham, 2001). Given that sport is often considered to be positive for the development of global self-concept (Strong et al., 2005), it is troubling that athletes who experience bullying may show a reduction in the development of this construct.

Finally, athletic competence was examined as the fourth developmental outcome. Participants who were victimized in the present study did not report a significant difference in their athletic competence, in comparison to those who did not experience bullying. This finding may seem contrary to expectations at first glance; however, research in the academic setting helps to situate this result. Bully-perpetrators are likely to have reduced academic performance, whereas victims are less likely to show cognitive academic deficits, but are likely to suffer from school absenteeism (Hamburger et al., 2011; Nansel et al., 2004; Stein et al., 2007). It is plausible that bullying can independently impact peer relationships, without impacting one’s
perceived ability at completing a task, such as homework or shooting a basketball. However, it is also possible that the amount of bullying, along with the content of the bullying may have had an impact on the current findings. It is plausible that the current questionnaire did not contain bullying acts that affect a victim’s athletic competence, such as verbal bullying that targets an athlete’s physical skills. Thus, future research could investigate whether alterations to the BSQ change the impact of bullying on one’s athletic competence.

Limitations and Future Directions

Perhaps given the novelty of exploring bullying in a sport context, the limitations to the current exploration primarily consisted of limitations in measurement. First of all, the validity of the tool is somewhat evident because it predicted numerous outcomes. However, the severe skewness of the responses limited the ability to fit participants’ bullying responses within existing conceptual frameworks. In order to form a parametrically sound tool, it is necessary to establish a conceptual understanding of bullying in sport, thus future efforts should likely consider: a) a broader range of acts, and/or b) the use a different rating scheme (e.g., more scaled Likert-type scale or including a broader time range). Additionally, in order to understand how impactful bullying behaviours can be on an athlete, future research could measure not only the frequency of a particular bullying act, but also have participants rate the level of harm that they attach to the specific bullying act.

To elaborate on the former point, Monks and Coyne (2011) have suggested that bullying behaviours may be context-specific, in that the behaviours that exist in the academic bullying context may be different than those exhibited in the sport setting. Monks and Coyne (2011) cited that there appear to be context-specific differences in bullying behaviours between cyber bullying, bullying in the workplace, and bullying in dating relationships. It is quite possible that
specific bullying behaviours occur in the sport context, which was not captured in the tool adapted from the school setting. For instance, an athlete who is repeatedly selected last for a scrimmage by a group of individuals could be potentially viewed as bullying in the sport setting, however would not be captured by the questionnaire in the present study. The differences of bullying may signal that the bullying behaviours included in the initial questionnaire and adapted to sport may not be consistent with the bullying behaviours engaged in among teammates. Instead of relying on purely quantitative data to discover these possible context-specific behaviours, research could focus on conducting qualitative research, perhaps in the form of focus groups or interviews, to identify the behaviours that athletes view as bullying. Once these behaviours have been identified, researchers can use observational methods to view the frequency of the behaviours, and develop a questionnaire that captures these sport-specific bullying behaviours. Future considerations should be made to identify bullying behaviours that may be unique to the sport setting in order to increase the sensitivity of the instrument and thus, may lead to a more normalized distribution of responses.

The second major limitation of the present study was the scale chosen to assess athletic competence and global self-worth. The five questions for each subscale were from the SPPA, which had a more complicated response format, in comparison to the other questionnaires in the present study. The two scales were missing approximately 28% of the responses. It is important to note that participants responded to these questions; however, they selected multiple responses that rendered the data unable to be interpreted. This suggests that there was a difficulty in answering the questions rather than a decision to not answer the questions. Nonetheless, the results regarding how bullying predicts athletic competence and global self-worth must be considered with this limitation in mind. A methodological note of interest, that may provide a
solution to this problem in future research, is that the online option emerged as a better method to present the questionnaire. The online format broke the question into a three-step process, which only allowed participants to select one response at a time. Therefore, it simplified the response procedure and ensured that participants completed the questions properly.

Future research could also examine the different forms of bullying that exist in sport. Mainly, it is important to understand how the four main forms of bullying (i.e., physical, verbal, social, and cyber) are represented in the sport setting. Although the current study was unable to answer this issue, as the reported frequencies within each form bullying were insufficient to conduct statistical analyses, the forms of bullying may impact the intervention strategy in sport. For instance, physical bullying is an overt style of bullying that is more easily identified, and dealt with by bystanders, in comparison to social bullying, which is a covert form of bullying, and thus much more difficult to detect as an observer. In addition to identifying the forms of bullying that are prevalent in sport, it is also important to extend our understanding of how bullying impacts the sport experience. From the current study, there is an understanding that bullying has an impact on athletes’ self-concept and their connections with their coach and teammates. However, it is important to understand how bullying impacts the motivation to continue in sport. There is a general understanding that social relationships are an important indicator to continue participation in sport, it is plausible that bullying undermines these relationships and could in turn, reduce the motivation to continue participation in sport.

Finally, it is important that future research utilizes intervention-based research to reduce aggression and bullying on sports teams. The current study pointed to key predictors that predicted bullying, including global self-confidence, and connection to teammates and coaches. Future research could investigate how to use these predictors to target and reduce the occurrence
of bullying. In addition, intervention-based research could focus on the question: How can we ensure that youth entering sport are less likely to fall victim to, or to perpetrate, bullying within their sport team? Using theoretical literature on the frequency, forms, and predictors of bullying to develop interventions would allow researchers to maximize their ability to reduce bullying in the sport setting.
Chapter 6

Implications and Concluding Thoughts

The present study provides a foundational understanding of the prevalence of bullying in sport, and how it predicts athletes’ positive developmental outcomes. When considered in the context of antisocial and hazing sport literature, these findings have an important theoretical implication. Bullying, at least in the traditional sense outlined in the academic bullying literature, is defined as a behaviour that is conceptually different to an aggressive act. Although antisocial and hazing literature in sport may measure acts that resemble bullying, they lack providing a definition of bullying that is consistent with traditional literature. Moreover, youth are inundated with the definition of bullying and education regarding bullying in the academic setting, and consequently have an understanding of what constitutes bullying. To ensure that the sport literature is measuring ‘bullying’ rather than a conceptually different aggressive act, it is important to use the acceptable bullying terminology in order to maintain consistency with what students are familiar.

Additionally, the present study has found differences in the frequency of bullying, depending on the gender of the athletes, gender of their coach, and the type of sport in which they participate. These findings may have implications regarding the way sport environments are structured, as well as sport teams where bullying may be of greatest concern. Although it is too early to place any practical merits on the results ascertained in the present study, it is important for future research to attempt to replicate and expose mechanisms for these demographic differences.

The practical implication for youth sport that is derived from the results of this study is that bullying does occur in sport, and has the potential to decrease the developmental assets that
are often promoted as benefits of sport participation (Fraser-Thomas et al., 2009; Holt & Neely, 2011). As demonstrated by the findings, bullying instances, even at low frequency, can have a substantial impact on the developmental outcomes that result in the sport experience. In order to continue to allow all youth to benefit from the positive outcomes that sport is able to provide, all participants must be able to train and compete in an atmosphere that is without bullying. Therefore, it is integral that sport organizations treat each instance of bullying seriously, in order to reduce the frequency and impact that it can have on a youth’s sport experience.
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### Appendix A

**Frequency of Sports Identified by Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Skating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquet Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missing Values</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 argue or fight. It is also not bullying when the teasing is done in a friendly and playful way.

1. How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months?
   - I have not been bullied at school 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. How often have you been bullied on your sports team in the past couple of months?
   - I have not been bullied 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

3. 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I have not been bullied in this way in the past couple of months</th>
<th>Only once or twice</th>
<th>2 or 3 times a month</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a A teammate(s) called me mean names, made fun of me, or teased me in a hurtful way.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Other teammates left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from the team, or completely ignored me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>A teammate(s) hit, kicked, pushed, or shoved me around outside of the team rules and norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Other teammates told lies or spread false rumours about me and tried to make other teammates dislike me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>A teammate(s) bullied me with mean names and comments about my race or colour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>A teammate(s) bullied me with mean names and comments about my religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Other teammates made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>A teammate(s) got their friends to turn against me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>A teammate(s) sent mean instant messages, wall postings, emails and text messages, or created a Web site that made fun of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Teammate(s) crashed into me on purpose as they walked by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>A teammate(s) took unflattering or inappropriate pictures of me without permission and posted them online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>I was threatened to be physically hurt or harmed by a teammate(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>My username and password was stolen and used by my teammate(s) to send mean messages using my name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Something was thrown at me to hit me by my teammate(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>A teammate(s) tricked me into sharing personal information in an email or text message and forwarded that information to other teammates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>I wasn’t invited to a teammate’s place because other teammates didn’t like me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months?

- [ ] I have not bullied another student(s) at school 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

5. 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 teammate(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

6. 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have not bullied another teammate in this way in the past couple of months</th>
<th>Only once or twice</th>
<th>2 or 3 times a month</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a I called another teammate(s) mean names, and made fun of, or teased him or her in a hurtful way.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b I kept another teammate(s) out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from our team, or completely ignored him or her.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c I hit, kicked, pushed, or shoved around a teammate(s) outside of the team rules and norms.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d I spread false rumours about another teammate(s) and tried to make other teammates dislike him or her.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I bullied another teammate(s) with mean names and comments about his or her race or colour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>I bullied another teammate(s) with mean names and comments about his or her religion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>I made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to another teammate(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Got my friends to turn against a teammate(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>I sent mean instant messages, wall postings, emails or text messages, or created a Web site that made fun of a teammate(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Crashed into a teammate(s) on purpose as they walked by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>I took pictures of a teammate(s) without permission and posted them online.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Threatened to physically hurt or harm a teammate(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>I used a teammate's username and password to send mean messages using his or her name.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Threw something at a teammate(s) to hit them outside the rules of the sport/game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I tricked a teammate(s) into sharing personal information in an email or text and then forwarded that information to other teammates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Kept a teammate(s) away from me by giving them mean looks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Composition and Scoring of the HBSC and APRI Questionnaires
(i.e., two questionnaires used to create BSQ items)

Canadian Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children (HBSC). Twenty-four bullying-related items were adapted from the Canadian HBSC (Molcho et al., 2012), which measures a wide range of different health and wellness outcomes in the educational setting (Molcho et al., 2012). The first section of the HBSC provides a definition of bullying that is meant to differentiate bullying behaviours from aggressive behaviours. The second section measures the frequency of overall bullying at school, with one item relating to bully-victimization, and another relating to bully-perpetration. In the third and fourth sections, participants report on their experiences with specific bullying encounters for both bully-victimization (11-items) and bully-perpetration (11-items). The fifth section is comprised of two global bullying questions, whereby participants report their overall frequency of bullying experience in the past couple of months. The global-scale bully-victimization question asked participants to report, “How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months.” The global-scale bully-perpetration question asked participants to report, “How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months.” The sixth section consisted of 22 items that assessed the participants’ reported frequency of bully-victimization (11 items), and bully-perpetration (11 items). Within these two constructs, there were four bullying subscales: a) physical bully-victimization/bully-perpetration, b) verbal bully-victimization/bully-perpetration, c) social bully-victimization/bully-perpetration, and d) cyber bully-victimization/bully-perpetration. Physical bully-victimization was measured with one item: “I was hit, kicked, pushed, or shoved around, or locked indoors”. Physical bully-perpetration was assessed with one item: “I hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked another student(s) indoors”. Verbal bully-victimization was measured
with four items (e.g., “I was called mean names, made fun of, or teams in a hurtful way”).

Verbal bully-perpetration was calculated using four items (e.g., “I made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to another student(s)”). Social bully-victimization was assessed with two items (e.g., “A student(s) left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from the team, or completely ignored me”). Social bully-perpetration was evaluated with two items (e.g., “I kept another student(s) out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from our team, or completely ignored him or her”). Cyber bully-victimization was assessed with four items (e.g., “My username and password was stolen and used by another student(s) to send mean messages using my name”). Finally, cyber bully-perpetration was measured with four items (e.g., “I took pictures of a student(s) without permission and posted them online”). The 24 items (i.e., 2 global bullying questions and 22 itemized bullying questions) were all measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, anchored by 1 (I have not been bullied/bullied another student in this way in the past couple of months) to 5 (Several times a week).

Adolescent Peer Relations Instrument (APRI). The APRI questionnaire is a self-report measure that assesses the participant’s experience of bully-victimization and bully-perpetration (Parada, 2006; Hamburger et al., 2011). This 36-item questionnaire has six subscales, each which are measured with six items. The six subscales within this questionnaire include: a) physical bully-victimization b) verbal bully-victimization, c) social bully-victimization, d) physical bully-perpetration, e) verbal bully-perpetration, and f) social bully-perpetration. A sample social bully-victimization question was, “I wasn’t invited to a student’s place because other student(s) didn’t like me.” An example of a social bully-perpetration question was, “I got my friends to turn against a student(s).” A sample physical bully-victimization question includes, “I was threatened to be physically hurt or harmed by a student(s).” Finally, an example of a
physical bully-perpetration question was, “I crashed into a student(s) on purpose as they walked by”. The 36 items are assessed using a 6-point Likert-type scale, with responses ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (everyday).
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Adapted Version of the SPPA Athletic Competence and Global Self-Worth Scales

For each of the following questions, first decide whether you are more like the teammates described on the first half of the statement (on the left) or the second half of the statement (on the right). Second, for just that half of that statement that is most like you, decide on whether the statement is “Really True for Me” or just “Sort of True for Me”.

*Please answer the following questions based on your interactions with the athletes on your team in the past few months.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates like to go to the movies in their spare time</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates would rather go to sports events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates do very well at all kinds of sports</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates don’t feel that they are very good when it comes to sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates are often disappointed with themselves</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates are pretty pleased with themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates think they could do well at just about any new athletic activity</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates are afraid they might not do well at a new athletic activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates don’t like the way they are leading their life</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates do like the way they are leading their life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates feel that they are better than others their age at sports</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates don’t feel they can play as well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates are happy with themselves most of the time</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates are often not happy with themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates don’t do well at new outdoor games</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates are good at new games right away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates like the kind of person they are</td>
<td>BUT Other teammates often wish they were someone else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates do not feel that they are very athletic</td>
<td><strong>BUT</strong></td>
<td>Other teammates feel that they are very athletic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some teammates are very happy being the way they are</td>
<td><strong>BUT</strong></td>
<td>Other teammates often wish they were different</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REB Approval Letter

October 08, 2013

Miss Ashley Adler
Master’s Student
School of Kinesiology and Health Studies
Queen’s University
28 Division Street
Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6

GREB Ref #: GPHE-157-13; Romeo # 6010847
Title: "GPHE-157-13 An Examination of Bullying in the Youth Sport Context."

Dear Miss Adler:

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled "GPHE-157-13 An Examination of Bullying in the Youth Sport Context." for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCPS) and Queen’s ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (article D.1.6) and Senate Terms of Reference (article G), your project has been cleared for one year. At the end of each year, the GREB will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB, with a copy to your unit REB, of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period (access this form at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Adverse Event Report). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To make an amendment, access the application at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Amendment to Approved Study Form. These changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services or irvingg@queensu.ca for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair
General Research Ethics Board

c: Dr. Jean Côté, Faculty Supervisor
Dr. Mary Louise Adams, Chair, Unit REB
Josie Birchall, Dept. Admin.
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. The purpose of this research study is to gain an understanding of how often bullying occurs, what forms of bullying occur in youth sport, and how bullying relates to personal development.

We invited male and female athletes, between the ages of 13-17 years old to participate in this study. In order to be eligible to participate in this study, participants had to be on an athletic team or train as a team. In this study, you were asked about your involvement in bullying, and asked to respond to questions about your athletic competence (ability to participate in sports), social competence (ability to make friends), self-worth, and connection to your coach (relationship to your coach). The results of this study will provide researchers with a better understanding of how often bullying occurs, and how it relates to one’s athletic competence, social competence, self-worth, and connection to one’s coach.

If you have been bullied yourself, or if you have participated in bullying directed at your teammates or others, it may be helpful for you to talk about your experiences with someone you trust, like your coach, your parent/guardian, or a teacher at your school. If you would rather talk to someone anonymously, you can call the Kids Help Phone (1-800-668-6868), which provides free telephone and online counseling 24/7. If you feel like you would like to talk with a crisis counselor, you can find the name of someone near you at this website: http://www.suicideprevention.ca/in-crisis-now/find-a-crisis-centre-now/. In addition, you may contact Ashley Adler at 613-533-6000, ext. 78207 or 5aa27@queensu.ca to receive further information about other resources that might be helpful to you.

Thank you for your participation in this study. If you have further questions about the study, please contact Ashley Adler at 613-533-6000, ext. 78207 or 5aa27@queensu.ca. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at 613-533-6000, ext. 74025 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.
### Appendix G

#### Participant Responses for Each Item of the Victimization Scale of the BSQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Questionnaire</th>
<th>Victimization Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Participant Responses for Each Item of the Perpetration Scale of the BSQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Questionnaire</th>
<th>Perpetration Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSC</td>
<td>Cyber</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRI</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 indicates “I have not been bullied/victimized by another teammate in this way in the past couple of months”

2 indicates “Only once or twice”
3 indicates “2 or 3 times per month”

4 indicates “About once a week”

5 indicates “Several time a week”
Appendix I
Entire Study Protocol

PARTICIPANT LETTER OF INFORMATION

Title of the study: Examining Bullying in Youth Sport

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled ‘Examining Bullying in Youth Sport’. This study has been granted ethics approval based on the guidelines recommended by Queen’s University and Canadian ethics guidelines. Please read this form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have.

Purpose and Procedures
The purpose of this research study is to examine bullying and understand how it relates to personal development in the youth sport setting. If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a series of questionnaires. These questionnaires will ask you about your involvement in bullying, and your overall development. The questionnaires should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Questionnaires can be completed in person at your sport organization (a privacy barrier will be provided), or through an online website (the researcher will provide you with a link if you choose this option).

Potential Risks
There are minimal risks to participating in this study. The questionnaires will ask you about your involvement in bullying, and answering questions about this topic may make you feel uncomfortable. At the end or the study (even if you withdraw from the study), the researcher will provide you with a list of people that you can contact in case you feel uncomfortable.

Potential Benefits
As a participant, you may be helping researchers to gain knowledge about bullying in sport. You can also provide your email address at the end of the study, in order to qualify to win 1 of 2 $50 Sport Chek gift certificates. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any direct benefits from the study.

Storage of Data
The information that you write on your questionnaires will stay confidential. No one will see this information except for the researchers assigned to this study. This information and your consent forms will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the PLAYS Lab at Queen’s University for
a maximum of seven years as per University requirements. Access to this cabinet is limited to
the researchers assigned to this research project.

Confidentiality
The data from this study will be published and presented at conferences; however, your identity
will remain confidential. Your email address will be kept confidential, and will only be used to
contact you, if you are randomly selected to win one of the two $50 Sport Chek gift certificates.
You can choose to not provide your email address, however, in that case, you will not be entered
to win the draw.

Right to Withdraw
You may withdraw from the study for any reason, at any time, without penalty of any sort by
returning your incomplete questionnaire package to the researcher, and stating that you would
like to withdraw from the study. You may also withdraw from the study by contacting the
principal investigator, Ashley Adler (613-533-6000 ext. 78207 or 5aa27@queensu.ca). Partially
completed responses will not be analyzed. Your participation in this study is completely
voluntary. If there are some questions you would rather not answer, you can just skip them. If
you decide at some point that you would like to withdraw from the study, you simply have to tell
the researchers, and any information collected up to the time you withdraw from the study will
be destroyed.

Questions
Any questions about study participation may be directed to Ashley Adler at 613-533-6000, ext.
78207 or 5aa27@queensu.ca. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair
of the General Research Ethics Board at 613-533-6000, ext. 74025 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.

Ashley Adler
Primary Investigator
MSc Candidate
School of Kinesiology and Health Studies
Queen’s University
Kingston, ON
(613) 533-6000, ext. 78207
5aa27@queensu.ca

Jean Côté, PhD
Research Project Supervisor
Director of School of Kinesiology and Health Studies
Queen’s University
Kingston, ON
(613) 533-6601
jc46@queensu.ca

Joan Stevenson, PhD
Chair
General Ethics Review Board
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BULLYING IN SPORT QUESTIONNAIRE PACKAGE

Age: _____ Gender: _____ Birthdate (MM/DD/YYYY): _____ _____
Country: ______________________
Sport: ________________________
Coach’s Gender: _____

Length of time that you have participated in your specific sport (Years/Months): _________
Length of time that you have been with your current coach (Year/Months): _________
How many hours/week do you spend with your entire team (including practices, games/competitions, team outings, etc.): _________

First month of season: __________
Last month of season: __________
Current Date: __________
**Bullying in Sport Questionnaire**

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 argue or fight. It is also not bullying when the teasing is done in a friendly and playful way.

7. **How often have you been bullied at school** in the past couple of months?
   - [ ] I have not been bullied at school 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

8. **How often have you been bullied on your sports team** in the past couple of months?
   - [ ] I have not been bullied 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

9. **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.**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>A teammate(s) hit, kicked, pushed, or shoved me around outside of the team rules and norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Other teammates told lies or spread false rumours about me and tried to make other teammates dislike me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>A teammate(s) bullied me with mean names and comments about my race or colour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>A teammate(s) bullied me with mean names and comments about my religion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Other teammates made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>A teammate(s) got their friends to turn against me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>A teammate(s) sent mean instant messages, wall postings, emails and text messages, or created a Web site that made fun of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Teammate(s) crashed into me on purpose as they walked by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>A teammate(s) took unflattering or inappropriate pictures of me without permission and posted them online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>I was threatened to be physically hurt or harmed by a teammate(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>My username and password was stolen and used by my teammate(s) to send mean messages using my name.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Something was thrown at me to hit me by my teammate(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>A teammate(s) tricked me into sharing personal information in an email or text message and forwarded that information to other teammates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>I wasn’t invited to a teammate’s place because other teammates didn’t like me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) **at school** in the past couple of months?
☐ I have not bullied another student(s) at school 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

11. 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

12. 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not bullied</th>
<th>Only once or twice</th>
<th>2 or 3 times a month</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a I called another teammate(s) mean names, and made fun of, or teased him or her in a hurtful way.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b I kept another teammate(s) out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from our team, or completely ignored him or her.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c I hit, kicked, pushed, or shoved around a teammate(s) outside of the team rules and norms.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d I spread false rumours about another teammate(s) and tried to make other teammates dislike him or her.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e I bullied another teammate(s) with mean names and comments about his or her race or colour.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>I bullied another teammate(s) with mean names and comments about his or her religion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>I made sexual jokes, comments, or gestures to another teammate(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Got my friends to turn against a teammate(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>I sent mean instant messages, wall postings, emails or text messages, or created a Web site that made fun of a teammate(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Crashed into a teammate(s) on purpose as they walked by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>I took pictures of a teammate(s) without permission and posted them online.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Threatened to physically hurt or harm a teammate(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>I used a teammate's username and password to send mean messages using his or her name.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Threw something at a teammate(s) to hit them outside the rules of the sport/game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I tricked a teammate(s) into sharing personal information in an email or text and then forwarded that information to other teammates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Kept a teammate(s) away from me by giving them mean looks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.C & G.S.W. Questionnaire

For each of the following questions, first decide whether you are more like the teammates described on the first half of the statement (on the left) or the second half of the statement (on the right). Second, for just that half of that statement that is most like you, decide on whether the statement is “Really True for Me” or just “Sort of True for Me”.

Please answer the following questions based on your interactions with the athletes on your team in the past few months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
<th>Really True for Me</th>
<th>Sort of True for Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Sentence</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Some teammates like to go to the movies in their spare time</td>
<td>BUT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. | | Some teammates do very well at all kinds of sports | BUT | Other teammates don’t feel that they are very good when it comes to sports |
| 2. | | Some teammates are often disappointed with themselves | BUT | Other teammates are pretty pleased with themselves |
| 3. | | Some teammates think they could do well at just about any new athletic activity | BUT | Other teammates are afraid they might not do well at a new athletic activity |
| 4. | | Some teammates don’t like the way they are leading their life | BUT | Other teammates do like the way they are leading their life |
| 5. | | Some teammates feel that they are better than others their age at sports | BUT | Other teammates don’t feel they can play as well |
| 6. | | Some teammates are happy with themselves most of the time | BUT | Other teammates are often not happy with themselves |
| 7. | | Some teammates don’t do well at new outdoor games | BUT | Other teammates are good at new games right away |
| 8. | | Some teammates like the kind of person they are | BUT | Other teammates often wish they were someone else |
| 9. | | Some teammates do not feel that they are very athletic | BUT | Other teammates feel that they are very athletic |
| 10. | | Some teammates are very happy being the way they are | BUT | Other teammates often wish they were different |
Connection to Teammates Questionnaire

*Please read carefully the statements below and circle the answer that indicates whether you agree or disagree. There are no right or wrong answers. Please respond to the statements as honest as possible and relevant to how you personally feel with your current teammates in the past few months.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a lot in common with other members on this team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel strong ties to other members of this team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I find it easy to form a bond with other members on this team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel a sense of being &quot;connected&quot; with other members on this team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connection to Coach Questionnaire

This questionnaire aims to measure the quality and content of the coach-athlete relationship. Please read carefully the statements below and circle the answer that indicates whether you agree or disagree. There are no right or wrong answers. Please respond to the statements as honest as possible and relevant to how you personally feel with your current coach in the past few months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am close with my coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am committed to my coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I like my coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>When I am coached by my coach, I am at ease.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I trust my coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I think that my sport career is promising with my coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When I am coached by my coach, I am responsive to his/her efforts.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I respect my coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I appreciated my coach’s sacrifices in order to improve performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When I am coached by my coach, I am ready to do my best.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>When I am coached by my coach, I adopt a friendly stance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTICIPANT DEBRIEFING FORM

Title of the study: Examining Bullying in Youth Sport

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. The purpose of this research study is to gain an understanding of how often bullying occurs, what forms of bullying occur in youth sport, and how bullying relates to personal development.

We invited male and female athletes, between the ages of 13-17 years old to participate in this study. In order to be eligible to participate in this study, participants had to be on an athletic team or train as a team. In this study, you were asked about your involvement in bullying, and asked to respond to questions about your athletic competence (ability to participate in sports), social competence (ability to make friends), self-worth, and connection to your coach (relationship to your coach). The results of this study will provide researchers with a better understanding of how often bullying occurs, and how it relates to one’s athletic competence, social competence, self-worth, and connection to one’s coach.

If you have been bullied yourself, or if you have participated in bullying directed at your teammates or others, it may be helpful for you to talk about your experiences with someone you trust, like your coach, your parent/guardian, or a teacher at your school. If you would rather talk to someone anonymously, you can call the Kids Help Phone (1-800-668-6868), which provides free telephone and online counseling 24/7. If you feel like you would like to talk with a crisis counselor, you can find the name of someone near you at this website: http://www.suicideprevention.ca/in-crisis-now/find-a-crisis-centre-now/. In addition, you may contact Ashley Adler at 613-533-6000, ext. 78207 or 5aa27@queensu.ca to receive further information about other resources that might be helpful to you.

Thank you for your participation in this study. If you have further questions about the study, please contact Ashley Adler at 613-533-6000, ext. 78207 or 5aa27@queensu.ca. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at 613-533-6000, ext. 74025 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.
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