



D2.2 / OUTPUT 2

Data Collection Tools and Methodologies Documentation

WP2 • COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH

Team Up for Respect: Promoting Bully-Free Zones
in Grassroots Sports

LEAD BENEFICIARY

Hacettepe University

PROJECT COORDINATOR

Oslo Orcas IF

ERASMUS+ SPORT 2025 | PROJECT No. 101245037



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT BACKGROUND	6
1.1. The B-FREE Project: Rationale and Approach	6
1.2. Project Objectives	6
1.3. The Consortium and Partner Contributions	6
1.4. The Role of WP2 and Links to Other Work Packages	7
2. METHOD	9
2.1. Research Design	9
2.2. Researcher Positionality and Reflexivity	10
2.3. Ethical Process	10
2.4. First Phase: Prevalence Survey	11
2.4.1. Purpose and Data Collection Instrument	11
2.4.2. Implementation and Sample	12
2.5. Second Phase: Qualitative Research	12
2.5.1. Participant Selection and the Link Between Phases	12
2.5.2. Participants	13
2.5.3. Data Collection Process	14
2.6. Data Analysis: Reflexive Thematic Analysis	14
2.7. Adequacy of the Data: Information Power	15
2.8. Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings	16
2.9. Quality and Trustworthiness of the Research	16
2.10. Limitations	17
3. REFERENCES	18
ANNEX A SURVEY	19
Participant information	19
SECTION I: Demographic Profile	19
SECTION II: Prevalence and Experiences: Psychological and Verbal Context	20
SECTION III: Perpetrators and Environmental Dynamics (Spatial and Social Context)	24
SECTION IV: Help-Seeking Behaviour (Optional)	24
ANNEX B. INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP GUIDES	27
A: Athlete Individual Interview Guide	27
Rapport Building and Team Climate	27



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Perception of Bullying and On-Field Experiences	27
Causes and Power Dynamics	28
Reporting, Intervention, and Institutional Support	28
Cyberbullying and Digital Platforms.....	28
B: Coach Individual Interview Guide	30
Rapport Building and Coaching Approach	30
Perception of Bullying and Observation Capacity.....	30
Intervention, Management, and Policy	30
Cyberbullying and Digital Platforms.....	31
C: Coach Focus Group Guide.....	32
D: Parent Individual Interview Guide	33
Rapport Building and Club Climate	33
General Bullying Observations.....	33
Communication and Organizational Trust	34
Cyberbullying and Digital Monitoring	34
E: Manager Individual Interview Guide.....	35
Rapport Building and Organizational Climate	35
Perception of Bullying and Organizational Awareness	35
Policy, Reporting, and Crisis Management	35
Coach Supervision and Parent Relations	35
Cyberbullying and Digital Governance.....	36
Closing remarks and final thoughts.....	36



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

Deliverable D2.2, Output 2 – Data Collection Tools and Methodologies Documentation, provides the methodological account of the field research undertaken within Work Package 2 (WP2) of B-FREE. Its purpose is to make the research design, data-collection approach, ethical procedures and analysis transparent, supporting informed interpretation and future adaptation of the research approach.

The primary readers are the project partnership, researchers, evaluators and organisations planning research or evaluation in youth sport. The document explains how the quantitative and qualitative components were connected, how different stakeholder perspectives were included and which limitations need to be considered when using the evidence.

Hacettepe University leads WP2 and the scientific preparation of D2.2. Oslo Orcas IF, as project coordinator, has prepared this introductory and project-background contribution to connect the methodology with the agreed objectives and delivery structure of B-FREE. The research procedures described here are based on the WP2 report supplied by the research lead.

D2.2 complements D2.1, Comprehensive Research Report on Bullying in Sports, which presents the literature, empirical findings and their interpretation. It also supports the evidence base for D2.3, Best Practices and Guidelines for Mitigating Bullying in Sports. Readers seeking substantive findings should consult D2.1; readers examining how those findings were produced should use the detailed methodological account in D2.2.

The documentation is a resource for methodological understanding and adaptation. Reuse in a different setting requires attention to local language, participant characteristics, ethical review and safeguarding arrangements. The description of a procedure does not, on its own, establish that the instruments are validated for every population or suitable for unmodified use.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

B-FREE's prevention activities require evidence that can be understood in relation to how it was collected and analysed. D2.2 documents this methodological foundation. It explains the design and procedures underlying D2.1 and provides a basis for informed use of the research in awareness activities, coach education, club development and future evaluation.

The study uses an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design: a descriptive quantitative phase is followed by qualitative investigation intended to explain the experiences and mechanisms behind the survey patterns. The qualitative component carries the main interpretive weight. The approach combines a critical realist understanding of harm with attention to the social and cultural contexts through which participants describe and understand their experiences.

The survey addresses twelve concrete behaviours alongside demographic characteristics, incident settings, perpetrators and help-seeking. Data collection in Türkiye, Slovenia, Croatia and Portugal produced 2,039 records; 2,038 were retained for analysis after one record without the required consent was excluded. Item-specific valid response counts are used where answers are missing. The resulting percentages describe the participating samples and should not be treated as national estimates.

The qualitative phase brings together the perspectives of athletes, coaches, parents and club managers. The method account describes connecting athlete selection to survey responses and then seeking perspectives from the athletes' sporting environments. Semi-structured guides, tested through pilot interviews, addressed experiences of harm, hierarchy, reporting, digital environments and safeguarding. Interviews were conducted face-to-face or online, and non-Turkish transcripts were translated into English for analysis.

The reported ethical procedures include review by the Ethics Committee of Istanbul Rumeli University, voluntary participation, parental or guardian consent and child assent for participants under eighteen, the right to withdraw, anonymisation and procedures for responding to distress or continuing risk of harm. These safeguards are particularly important because the research concerns minors and potentially sensitive experiences within relationships of sporting authority.

Qualitative material was examined using reflexive thematic analysis. The account emphasises iterative engagement with the data, researcher reflexivity, discussion of analytic interpretations and preservation of participants' own language. Quantitative and qualitative components were connected through participant selection, instrument development and integrated interpretation of findings. The documentation also explains why the analysis does not use inter-coder agreement as its quality criterion.

Limitations include self-report, unequal narrative depth across country datasets, possible loss of meaning through translation, limited representation of perpetrator perspectives and the contextual constraints of online interviewing. Making these limitations explicit helps partners judge which aspects of the approach can be transferred and which require adaptation. D2.2 thus supports methodological transparency and responsible reuse while D2.1 provides the substantive findings.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

Research on bullying in sport must account for experiences that may be difficult to identify, disclose or compare. Young athletes and adults can interpret the same conduct differently, and participants may avoid the word “bullying” even when describing harmful experiences. B-FREE therefore requires an approach that combines concrete behavioural questions with opportunities to explore meaning, context and relationships in greater depth. D2.2 situates this methodological approach within the wider project.

1.1. The B-FREE Project: Rationale and Approach

B-FREE – Team Up for Respect: Promoting Bully-Free Zones in Grassroots Sports – is a 24-month Erasmus+ Sport cooperation project (Project No. 101245037). Coordinated by Oslo Orcas IF, it brings together sport organisations, coaching expertise, research capacity and community networks to strengthen respectful and inclusive youth-sport environments.

The proposal identifies a connected set of needs: young athletes require support to recognise and respond to harmful conduct; coaches need practical preparation; clubs require clear policies and reporting structures; and sporting communities need to challenge norms that trivialise bullying. The project addresses behaviour in physical sporting spaces as well as in digital communication associated with sport.

The project’s approach links research, educational development and organisational action. It combines the collection and interpretation of evidence with awareness activities, coach and club capacity-building, practical resources and dissemination. Cooperation across countries and sporting disciplines allows partners to examine shared problems while taking account of differences in language, culture and club organisation.

1.2. Project Objectives

Empower young athletes to recognise and respond to bullying. Strengthen their understanding of harmful behaviour, empathy, constructive conflict resolution, help-seeking and support for peers. The proposal places particular emphasis on athletes aged 14–18.

Build the capacity of coaches and sport staff. Develop the knowledge and practical skills needed to recognise early warning signs, intervene appropriately and create respectful training environments.

Equip sports clubs and organisations with policies and support structures. Support clear responsibilities, accessible reporting pathways and consistent responses so that prevention is embedded in everyday club practice.

Promote a culture of respect and integrity through education and advocacy. Challenge the normalisation of humiliation and exclusion and engage sporting communities through educational resources, awareness activities and shared learning.

D2.2 contributes to these objectives by explaining how the evidence was generated and how its strengths and limits should inform subsequent use. Although the proposal prioritises athletes aged 14–18, the reported survey also includes participants aged 10–13; this distinction must be retained when interpreting or adapting the research.

1.3. The Consortium and Partner Contributions

The Grant Agreement identifies eight beneficiary organisations across seven countries: Norway, Malta, Slovenia, Portugal, Croatia, the Netherlands and Türkiye. Oslo Orcas IF serves as coordinator. The partnership combines academic research with coaching, federation, club, community and digital-resource expertise.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Partner	Country	Contribution
Oslo Orcas IF (OOIF)	Norway	Project coordinator and WP1 lead; overall coordination, partner cooperation and coherence across the project.
Hacettepe University (HU)	Türkiye	Leads WP2 and deliverables D2.1 and D2.2; provides the scientific framework and research leadership.
Judo zveza Slovenije (Slovenian Judo Federation)	Slovenia	Federation and club perspectives; contributes access to sporting communities and the Slovenian research context.
Associação de Futebol de Bragança (AFB)	Portugal	Football-sector expertise and club networks; contributes the Portuguese research context and practical adaptation to football.
Riječki sportski savez (Rijeka Sports Association, RSS)	Croatia	Local multisport networks and the Croatian research context; leads WP5 on dissemination and visibility.
Sport Singularity B.V.	Netherlands	Leads WP4 on coach and club empowerment and D2.3 on best practices and guidelines; contributes digital-resource and sport-innovation expertise.
Spor Gönüllüleri Derneği (Sports Volunteers Association, SVA)	Türkiye	Leads WP3 on the awareness campaign; contributes volunteering, community engagement and awareness-raising expertise.
Sport Coaching Europe	Malta	Coach-development expertise and European coaching networks; connects research and educational content with coaching practice.

The consortium's geographical coverage should be distinguished from the empirical coverage of the study. The prevalence survey reported in WP2 was undertaken in Türkiye, Slovenia, Croatia and Portugal. Participation in the partnership does not imply that every country contributed an equivalent survey or qualitative sample.

For D2.2, the partnership context explains why common methodological guidance is needed alongside sensitivity to language and local conditions. The methods account describes shared interview questions, national-language collection and translation arrangements, while also acknowledging differences in the depth of the qualitative material.

1.4. The Role of WP2 and Links to Other Work Packages

WP2, Comprehensive Research, is led by Hacettepe University and supplies the evidence base for B-FREE. Within this work package, D2.1 reports the research findings, D2.2 documents the field-research methodology and D2.3 translates evidence into dedicated best practices and guidelines under the leadership of Sport Singularity B.V. The outputs are complementary and require clear cross-references.

D2.2 makes the chain from research questions to evidence visible. By explaining participant selection, instruments, ethical safeguards, data processing and interpretation, it enables partners to understand the scope



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

of claims made in D2.1. This is particularly important where findings from different countries are read together or used to design activities for populations different from those in the study.

Within WP1, the documentation supports coordination and review of the research contribution. It helps WP3 partners use findings accurately in awareness materials and helps WP4 partners understand the evidence informing educational resources and club support. It also offers methodological learning relevant to future monitoring and evaluation, although the descriptive survey should not automatically be treated as a validated intervention-outcome measure.

WP5 provides routes for communicating and sharing the project's resources. For methodological materials, useful dissemination means explaining the circumstances in which an approach can be adapted and the safeguards required for its use. Clear version identification, contextual information and links between instruments and procedures are therefore important when preparing the completed D2.2 package.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

2. METHOD

Reading note: references in the supplied methodology to the literature's sections 1–7 refer to the conceptual framework of the combined WP2 report, now presented in D2.1. That original reference context is retained. The ten methodology subsections are numbered 2.1–2.10 in this consolidated deliverable. The survey is reproduced in Annex A. The interview and focus-group guides used for qualitative data collection are reproduced in Annex B.

This section sets out in detail the design, participants, data collection instruments, analytic procedures, and ethical framework of the field research carried out within the WP2 component of the B-FREE project. The conceptual framework developed in the preceding sections of the report (1–7) has directly shaped both the content of the data collection instruments and the theoretical lenses used in the analysis; the method has therefore been planned not as a technical appendix independent of the literature, but as the field-level counterpart of that framework.

2.1. Research Design

The research is conducted using an explanatory sequential mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). In this design, quantitative data are collected and analysed first; a qualitative phase is then designed to explain the quantitative findings in depth. The weighting of the study follows a quan → QUAL structure: the quantitative phase is descriptive (frequency-based) and serves a supportive function, while the analytic weight lies in the qualitative phase, which reveals how the phenomenon is experienced and through which mechanisms it is sustained. This choice is considered to be related to the methodological gap identified in Section 7.2 of the report. The literature has produced strong quantitative evidence on the prevalence of interpersonal violence in sport; however, relatively little work has examined the cultural and organizational mechanisms behind these prevalence rates — how the boundary between joking and bullying becomes blurred, why reporting fails to occur, and how hierarchy is established in unsupervised spaces. While the quantitative phase answers the question of 'how much and in what form,' the qualitative phase takes on the question of 'how and why.'

The research adopts a critical realist ontology and a contextualist epistemology. Accordingly, bullying and interpersonal violence are held to possess a reality independent of participants' narratives; however, access to this reality is always mediated through the meaning-worlds of both participants and researchers. This position allows narratives to be read both as statements reporting 'what happened' and as meanings constructed within a particular cultural repertoire. The theoretical lenses considered to have guided the analysis are explicitly stated: the critical masculinities literature (hegemonic masculinity, homosociality), Foucauldian analysis of power (disciplinary power, surveillance and visibility, technologies of the self), the Bourdieusian conceptual set (field, habitus, symbolic violence, male domination), and a rights-based / child-centred safeguarding framework. These lenses are not interpretive layers added after the analysis, but sensitizing concepts that guided the coding process from the outset.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

2.2. Researcher Positionality and Reflexivity

In reflexive thematic analysis, researcher subjectivity is not a source of bias to be controlled for but the very instrument through which the analysis operates (Braun & Clarke, 2019). For this reason, the team's positionality is stated explicitly here. The first researcher, who took responsibility for identifying, planning, and coordinating the fieldwork, is a faculty member working in the field of sport sociology. In his doctoral research he examined group dynamics in team sports through the phenomenon of team cohesion, using the concepts of obedience, conformity, submission, need to belong, and loyalty; theoretically, he examined the phenomenon of hazing in the context of masculinities, liminality, and homosociality. His master's research, in turn, addressed barriers to social upward mobility through football among working-class children. He is also a founding member of a civil society organisation working on rights-based approaches in sport, has taken part in developing child protection policies and codes of ethics for clubs, and is currently enrolled in the IOC's safeguarding officer certification programme. This background has provided particular analytic sensitivity in reading seniority hierarchies, 'tradition' discourse, masculinities, and their intersections with class. The same background, however, also carries a risk: a tendency to 'anticipate' patterns of hazing and masculinity. This tendency was explicitly tested in team discussions, and readings not grounded in the data were eliminated. Another researcher is a psychologist specialising in adolescent communication and team dynamics, masculinities, cyberbullying, and esports; in the analysis he contributed particularly to the psychosocial dimension of peer relationships, the construction of the prevalence item set, and patterns of digital interaction. The advisory researcher, meanwhile, specialises in inclusive pedagogy and curriculum design in physical education and sport, and provided reflective feedback on the process of translating the findings into the educational output (WP3). The fact that all of the researchers have themselves previously been part of the field of sport — as athletes, physical education teachers, and/or coaches — facilitated the establishment of a common language with participants, but also created a risk of treating the field's own assumptions as 'natural.' To reduce this risk in the interviews, participants were persistently asked clarifying questions about practices they had normalised (e.g., carrying equipment, the 'joking' repertoire).

2.3. Ethical Process

The research was reviewed by the Ethics Committee of Istanbul Rumeli University, Republic of Turkey, and was approved as being in accordance with scientific and ethical standards (Meeting Date: 20.05.2026, Meeting No: 2026/05, Official Letter No: E-53938333-050.04-72181).

Participation in both phases of the research was based on voluntary consent. For athletes younger than eighteen, a two-stage consent procedure was applied: parental/guardian consent and the child's own assent. This procedure was applied in both the face-to-face and online data collection processes; in the online form, participant consent and parental consent appeared as separate, mandatory items. Signed consent documents are kept in the project archive. Participants were explicitly informed that they could withdraw from participation



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

at any time and without providing any justification. It was pledged that the data would be used solely for scientific purposes and that responses would not be shared with any club, coach, institution, or individual. In the qualitative phase, all participants were given pseudonyms; role-city-branch-based codes were used for athletes, coaches, managers, and parents. Club names, personal names, and other details that could reveal identity (including specific tournament, event, and venue information) were removed during the analysis stage. In view of the potentially distressing nature of the topic, a distress protocol was followed in the interviews: at moments when the participant appeared emotionally strained, the flow of questions was paused, the decision to continue was left to the participant, and it was stated that referral to support resources would be made when necessary. For situations disclosed in the interviews that carried an ongoing risk of harm, the project's safeguarding chain of responsibility was applied.

2.4. First Phase: Prevalence Survey

2.4.1. Purpose and Data Collection Instrument

The purpose of the first phase is to describe the prevalence, forms, spatial and social context, and help-seeking behaviour associated with peer bullying and unwanted behaviours in youth and grassroots sport. To this end, the project team developed the B-FREE Prevalence Form. The form was derived from the conceptual framework developed in Sections 1–6 of the report and consists of four parts:

Part I — Information and Consent: participant consent and parental consent (mandatory items).

Part II — Demographic information: age, gender, sport branch, years as a licensed athlete.

Part III — Prevalence and experiences: a 12-item list of behaviours. Each item asks the participant to report the frequency with which they experienced that behaviour on a six-category scale (never experienced / within the last 1 week / 1 month / 3 months / 6 months / 1 year). Items are written concretely and behaviorally, with examples.

Part IV — Spatial and social context: for participants who experienced at least one behaviour, who the perpetrator was and where the incident took place (multiple choice).

Part V — Help-seeking behaviour: who was applied to, and, if no report was made, the main reason for this (multiple choice).

The items were designed to correspond exactly to the report's conceptual framework: verbal bullying and name-calling (item 1), social exclusion (item 2), belittling in front of others on the basis of performance (item 3), 'jokes' about the body and physical appearance (item 4), gossip concerning private life (item 5), deliberate physical harm (item 6), damage to belongings (item 7), seniority-based forced chores and hazing practices (item 8), non-consensual touching and boundary violations (item 9), sexual remarks and innuendo (item 10), being targeted



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

through content in digital environments (item 11), and digital exclusion (item 12). In this way, the form combines the physical, emotional, social, sexual, and digital dimensions of violence within a single measurement set. At the same time, respondents were asked to answer the questions with reference to their experiences over the past year. This choice is intended to reduce the memory-bias problem associated with the retrospective, lifetime measures common in the literature, and to obtain current data from young athletes who are currently active in sport (see Section 7.2).

2.4.2. Implementation and Sample

The form was developed by the Turkish team and communicated to the partner-country coordinators. Each country collected its data in its own national language; data sets from countries other than Turkey were translated into English prior to analysis, and the analysis was conducted using these translations. Implementation was carried out largely through federation and club channels, via an online survey form. The number of participants reached per country is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of prevalence survey participant numbers by country.

Country	Number of participants (n)	Data collection language
Turkey	780	Turkish
Slovenia	486	Slovenian
Croatia	401	Croatian
Portugal	372	Portuguese
Total	2,039	—

The data were analysed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, and cross-tabulations). Since the quantitative component of the research was not intended to test a theoretical model but rather to produce a prevalence map that would guide the qualitative phase, inferential statistical tests were kept to a minimum.

2.5. Second Phase: Qualitative Research

2.5.1. Participant Selection and the Link Between Phases

The two phases of the mixed design are linked at the point of sample selection; in the mixed methods literature, this point of linkage is referred to as 'connecting' (Fetters et al., 2013). The athlete participants of the qualitative phase were determined directly from the prevalence survey data; the athletes' coaches, parents, and club managers were then included in the sample by being traced through this core group. This strategy allowed the same sporting environment to be read simultaneously from different subject positions. At the same time, two criteria were applied jointly in selecting athletes: (a) having reported experiencing at least one behaviour on the



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

prevalence form, and (b) maximum variation (branch, gender, age, level of athletic performance, and geographic region). As a result, within the Turkish sample the profile of athletes predominantly in the exposed (victim) position became visible; only one or two participants who clearly recounted the perpetrator position were included in the sample. This is both a limitation and, at the same time, an indicator — reflected in the data — of the victim–perpetrator fluidity discussed in Section 4 of the report: most participants reported experiencing both positions at different moments.

2.5.2. Participants

The qualitative phase generates data from four subject groups with the contribution of five partners: young athletes, coaches, parents, and club managers. The Turkish sample, which yields in-depth, original, and complex narratives intensively, constitutes the core data set on which the study's thematic framework was built; the partner-country data, in turn, make it possible to assess the cross-country appearance of this framework.

Table 2. Distribution of qualitative-phase participants by country and subject group.

Country / Partner	Athlete (individual)	Coach (focus group)	Parent	Manager
Turkey	15	2 groups	5	5
Croatia	32	2 groups	8	8
Slovenia	28	2 groups	7	7
Portugal	2	1 group	—	5
Total	77	7 groups	20	25

Interviews in Turkey were carried out in five metropolitan cities (Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Trabzon, and Hatay) so as to represent the country's four geographic regions. Role-city-branch–based codes were used instead of names in both the athlete interviews and the other groups. In the Croatian sample, athletes came from volleyball, basketball, football, judo, karate, taekwondo, and swimming; in the Slovenian sample, from judo, gymnastics, football, basketball, athletics, swimming, and volleyball. The Turkish and Slovenian athlete samples were balanced in terms of gender. The Portuguese data are concentrated in football. The Sport Coaching Europe contribution consists of coach focus groups together with one parent interview and one manager interview each. Participants were given pseudonyms and coded. In the reporting, all participants are referred to using standard codes containing information on country, role, branch, gender, and age (e.g., TR-Athlete1-Football-M-17; HR-ATHLETE-05; SLO-PARENT-03). Club names, personal names, and other details that could reveal identity were removed during the analysis stage.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

2.5.3. Data Collection Process

Qualitative data collection took place between 8 June and 15 August 2026. The interviews in Turkey were conducted by three researchers from the project team. Depending on participants' access conditions, some interviews were conducted face-to-face (club facilities, meeting-room offices, study rooms) and others via online video connection. In the partner countries, interviews were conducted by researchers from the respective country teams in their own national languages; all interview transcripts from countries other than Turkey were translated into English prior to analysis.

Before the main interviews, three pilot interviews were conducted, all with athletes. The pilot interviews were used to test the appropriateness of the question sequence and language for adolescent participants and to review any expressions that might be distressing; the interview guides were revised in line with the feedback obtained. Separate semi-structured interview guides were prepared for each participant group. The content of the guides was derived directly from the report's conceptual framework; all contexts intersecting with bullying dynamics were included in the question set: seniority hierarchy and hazing (3.3), the boundary between joking and bullying (3.4), the culture of silence and barriers to reporting (3.5), bystander roles and moral courage (4.1–4.2), unsupervised spaces, the digital environment, and cyberbullying (Section 5), psychological safety and coach behaviours (6.3–6.4), and the functioning of protection mechanisms (6.2). The guides relied on open, non-leading questions; space was left for participants to generate their own conceptualisations. All interviews were audio/video recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim. Non-verbal expressions such as pauses, laughter, and silence were preserved in square brackets in the transcripts; these details were treated in the analysis as meaning-bearing data.

Separate semi-structured interview guides were prepared for each participant group, and these guides were shared with all partners as a common question set. The use of a common question set makes it possible to compare responses to the same questions across different countries. At the same time, a clear difference is observed among the data sets in terms of narrative depth. The Turkish and Portuguese interviews contain lengthy narratives that were deepened through follow-up questions and that left room for participants to generate their own conceptualisations. The Croatian and Slovenian data sets, by contrast, consist of relatively short and direct responses to the common question set. This difference is considered to have also determined the function assumed by each data set in the analysis; the relevant limitation is addressed in Section 2.10.

The questions used for qualitative data collection are reproduced in Annex B: athlete, coach, parent and manager individual interview guides, together with the coach focus-group guide.

2.6. Data Analysis: Reflexive Thematic Analysis

The qualitative data were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019, 2021, 2022). This approach does not seek inter-coder agreement coefficients and takes as its basis not the 'emergence' of themes



from the data but their production through the interaction between researcher and data. The rationale for this choice is threefold: (a) its compatibility with the study's critical realist–contextualist position, (b) its allowance for working with explicitly stated theoretical lenses, and (c) its capacity to carry a heterogeneous data set drawn from four different subject groups within a single analytic framework.

The analysis proceeds through six phases: (1) deep familiarization with the data (repeated readings of the transcripts and initial notes), (2) systematic coding, (3) generating initial candidate themes from the codes, (4) reviewing the themes in relation to the data set, (5) defining and naming the themes, (6) writing up. The process operated not linearly but iteratively. During coding, in-vivo coding was used extensively in order to preserve the strong conceptualisations produced by participants themselves (Saldaña, 2021). Metaphors produced by young athletes (e.g., sport being constructed as 'a door,' laughter functioning as a 'shield,' 'the account never being settled') were not translated into researcher language; participant language was preserved by retaining them in theme names, finding headings, and/or directly within the narrative. This choice is not merely stylistic: by making visible who the subject naming the concept is, it ensures that the rights-based and athlete-centred approach is sustained at the analytic level as well.

The analysis was conducted mainly by the first researcher together with the researcher who is an expert psychologist, with critical-friend support obtained from two social scientists with expertise in the field. This support was provided not for the purpose of validation but in order to compare conceptual readings and analytic interpretations and to enable a stronger analytic interpretation. Focus group data were coded at the sentence level, while individual interviews were analysed through line-by-line coding and the writing of analytic memos. Codes and candidate themes were addressed in regular team discussions; the reflective feedback of the advisory researcher, from an education and curriculum perspective, was incorporated into the process. In keeping with the epistemological position of reflexive thematic analysis, no inter-coder reliability coefficient was calculated; instead, differences in interpretation were explored in depth through discussion, and the rationale for analytic decisions was recorded. No qualitative data analysis software was used in the analysis; coding and thematic mapping were carried out by hand. In addition to thematic patterns, an idiographic layer was added to the analysis in order to make visible the depth of individual experience. Certain participant narratives are presented in the form of case portraits embedded within the text of the themes. These portraits do not signify the application of a separate method (e.g., interpretative phenomenological analysis); rather, they constitute a presentation strategy within reflexive thematic analysis that preserves the tension between pattern and singularity.

2.7. Adequacy of the Data: Information Power

In this research, sample size was evaluated using the framework of information power (Malterud et al., 2016) rather than the contested criterion of 'data saturation.' According to this framework, a sample becomes



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

adequate with a smaller number of participants as the information density it carries increases. The five dimensions are considered to be met as follows:

Study aim: The research addresses a relatively focused question that treats peer bullying in the sporting environment in a multi-stakeholder manner; this focus reduces the number of participants required.

Sample specificity: Participants were selected from the prevalence survey data on the criterion of having reported the relevant experience; the sample therefore has high density.

Use of theory: The analysis is supported by established theoretical frameworks (critical masculinities, analysis of power, symbolic violence, the safeguarding approach).

Dialogue quality: Interviews were conducted by experienced interviewers using guides that had been tested through piloting.

Analytic strategy: A thematic strategy was adopted that seeks patterns across the data set as a whole rather than a case-based strategy.

2.8. Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

In mixed-design studies, integration does not mean reporting the two data sets side by side, but relating them to one another so that each explains the other (Fetters et al., 2013). In this research, integration is established at three levels:

At the design level (connecting): Qualitative participants were selected directly from the quantitative data.

At the instrument level (building): The content of the interview guides was derived from the dimensions of the prevalence form and the initial descriptive findings.

At the reporting level (joint display): In the Findings section, joint display tables are used that position the relevant prevalence indicator alongside each main theme.

The most productive line of this integration is the help-seeking section of the form. Whether or not participants made a report, and, if not, their reason for not doing so (concern about one's career, being stigmatized as a 'snitch,' the belief that one would not be believed, fear that the situation would worsen), constitutes the direct quantitative counterpart of the culture-of-silence theme that emerged in the qualitative phase, and provides the strongest point of intersection at which the two data sets explain one another.

2.9. Quality and Trustworthiness of the Research

In qualitative research, quality criteria are evaluated not through the adaptation of quantitative validity–reliability concepts but through criteria specific to the field (Smith & McGannon, 2018; Tracy, 2010). The following practices are adopted in this research: explicit statement of the theoretical lenses and the researchers'



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

positionality; recording of analytic decisions together with their rationale (audit trail); critical discussion within and outside the team (the critical-friend function); preservation of participant language through in-vivo codes; presentation, without suppression, of negative/deviant cases (e.g., protective coach figures, supportive peer relationships) within the findings text; and reading of the phenomenon from multiple positions through data collection from four different subject groups.

2.10. Limitations

The prevalence survey relies on self-report; social desirability and normalisation may cause the reported rates to appear lower than they actually are. The qualitative findings show that participants who do not define their experience as an 'incident' may not become visible in the measurement.

The qualitative sample consists predominantly of athletes in the exposed position; the perspective of the perpetrator position is represented only to a limited extent.

The Turkish sample was conducted in five metropolitan cities; rural and small-scale club contexts fall outside its scope.

The qualitative data obtained from the partner countries, while adequate in terms of number of participants, differ from the Turkish data in terms of narrative depth. The relatively short responses given to the common question set leave limited room for participants to develop their own conceptualisations. For this reason, the thematic framework was built on the Turkish data; the partner-country data are positioned under the relevant themes to serve a pattern-confirmation and comparison function. This difference is considered to limit the cross-country generalizability of the findings.

Data sets from countries other than Turkey were translated from the national languages into English prior to analysis. It should be borne in mind that the translation process may have led to a loss of meaning, particularly in idiomatic expressions and in-vivo conceptualisations.

The fact that some of the interviews were conducted online may restrict access to body language and contextual cues.



3. REFERENCES

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs: Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6pt2), 2134–2156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117>
- Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., & Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(13), 1753–1760. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315617444>
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2018). Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(1), 101–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317357>
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121>



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

ANNEX A SURVEY

Participant information

Dear Participant (or Dear Parent/Guardian),

This survey forms part of the project “Team Up for Respect: Promoting Bully-Free Zones in Grassroots Sports” (Project No: 101245037), carried out under the Erasmus+ Sport 2025 call. It has been designed to understand the prevalence of peer bullying and unwanted behaviours in youth grassroots sport settings.

Our study has been reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of Istanbul Rumeli University, Republic of Türkiye, as meeting scientific and ethical standards. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and your responses will be stored anonymously. The data collected will be analysed statistically solely for scientific research purposes. Your identity or responses will not be shared with any club, coach, institution or individual under any circumstances.

Please answer the questions with reference to your experiences over the past year. If you feel uncomfortable at any stage while completing the survey, you are entirely free to withdraw without providing any explanation.

Thank you for giving your valuable time and contributing to our efforts to make sporting environments safer.

If you have any questions, please contact:
Prof. Dr. Gıyasettin Demirdağ (demirhang@gmail.com)

Participant Consent

Single choice • Required

- ☐ I have read and understood the information provided above, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this survey of my own free will.

Parental/Guardian Consent

Single choice • Required

- ☐ As a parent/legal guardian, I give my consent for the athlete to participate in this research study.

SECTION I: Demographic Profile

1. Your Age Group:

Single choice • Required

- ☐ 10-13 (Early Youth Sport)
- ☐ 14-18 (Advanced Youth Sport)

2. Your Gender:

Single choice • Required

- ☐ Girl
- ☐ Boy
- ☐ Prefer not to say



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

3. Team or Individual Sport:

Single choice • Required

- ☐ Team Sport
- ☐ Individual Sport

4. How many years have you been participating in this sport with a licensed coach?

Short text • Required

Response: _____

SECTION II: Prevalence and Experiences: Psychological and Verbal Context

Please indicate whether you have experienced the situations listed in the table below in a sports environment.

Please indicate the specified situation.

In the sports environment, by someone or a group of people...

1. I was given hurtful nicknames or mocked in an offensive way.

Single choice • Required

- ☐ Never Experienced
- ☐ In the Last 1 Week
- ☐ In the Last 1 Month
- ☐ In the Last 3 Months
- ☐ In the Last 6 Months
- ☐ In the Last 1 Year
- ☐ I Witnessed It

2. I was deliberately excluded from peer groups in the team or treated as if I did not exist (e.g. being left alone or not included in games during match trips, in the changing room, or in activities outside of training).

Single choice • Required

- ☐ Never Experienced
- ☐ In the Last 1 Week
- ☐ In the Last 1 Month
- ☐ In the Last 3 Months
- ☐ In the Last 6 Months
- ☐ In the Last 1 Year
- ☐ I Witnessed It

3. When I played badly or made a mistake, I was humiliated in front of others, shouted at, or verbally abused (e.g. being publicly humiliated through punishment by my coach or teammates).

Single choice • Required

- ☐ Never Experienced



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

- In the Last 1 Week
- In the Last 1 Month
- In the Last 3 Months
- In the Last 6 Months
- In the Last 1 Year
- I Witnessed It

4. I was subjected to uncomfortable, embarrassing comments about my body or appearance under the guise of a "joke" (e.g. being mocked about my weight, height, physical development/deficiencies, or style of dress).

Single choice • Required

- Never Experienced
- In the Last 1 Week
- In the Last 1 Month
- In the Last 3 Months
- In the Last 6 Months
- In the Last 1 Year
- I Witnessed It

5. I was subjected to embarrassing comments or rumours about my private life (e.g. unfounded romantic/relationship gossip being spread about me).

Single choice • Required

- Never Experienced
- In the Last 1 Week
- In the Last 1 Month
- In the Last 3 Months
- In the Last 6 Months
- In the Last 1 Year
- I Witnessed It

6. I was intentionally physically harmed outside the rules of the game or training (e.g. deliberately committing a hard foul, tripping, pushing, or hitting me).

Single choice • Required

- Never Experienced
- In the Last 1 Week
- In the Last 1 Month
- In the Last 3 Months
- In the Last 6 Months



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

- In the Last 1 Year
- I Witnessed It

7. Something was deliberately thrown at me or my personal belongings or equipment was damaged (e.g. having a ball/bottle thrown at my head, my water bottle being hidden, or my kit or shoes being vandalised).

Single choice • Required

- Never Experienced
- In the Last 1 Week
- In the Last 1 Month
- In the Last 3 Months
- In the Last 6 Months
- In the Last 1 Year
- I Witnessed It

8. Because I was new to the team or younger in age, I was forced to carry out degrading tasks or chores (e.g. being made to carry the entire team's training equipment alone, being forced to clean the older players' equipment or carry water for them).

Single choice • Required

- Never Experienced
- In the Last 1 Week
- In the Last 1 Month
- In the Last 3 Months
- In the Last 6 Months
- In the Last 1 Year
- I Witnessed It

9. I was touched in an uncomfortable way against my will or my boundaries were violated (e.g. unwanted physical contact made under the pretence of joking).

Single choice • Required

- Never Experienced
- In the Last 1 Week
- In the Last 1 Month
- In the Last 3 Months
- In the Last 6 Months
- In the Last 1 Year
- I Witnessed It



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

10. I was subjected to unwanted sexually charged jokes, conversations, uncomfortable suggestive looks directed at me, or sexually explicit remarks.

Single choice • Required

- ☐ Never Experienced
- ☐ In the Last 1 Week
- ☐ In the Last 1 Month
- ☐ In the Last 3 Months
- ☐ In the Last 6 Months
- ☐ In the Last 1 Year
- ☐ I Witnessed It

11. Hurtful rumours about me were spread on social media or team messaging groups (WhatsApp, Instagram, etc.), my photos or videos were shared without my permission, or content mocking me (stickers, memes, GIFs) was created.

Single choice • Required

- ☐ Never Experienced
- ☐ In the Last 1 Week
- ☐ In the Last 1 Month
- ☐ In the Last 3 Months
- ☐ In the Last 6 Months
- ☐ In the Last 1 Year
- ☐ I Witnessed It

12. I was deliberately excluded in digital environments (e.g. being intentionally left out of the team's or players' shared WhatsApp group, being removed from the group, or having my messages deliberately ignored).

Single choice • Required

- ☐ Never Experienced
- ☐ In the Last 1 Week
- ☐ In the Last 1 Month
- ☐ In the Last 3 Months
- ☐ In the Last 6 Months
- ☐ In the Last 1 Year
- ☐ I Witnessed It



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

SECTION III: Perpetrators and Environmental Dynamics (Spatial and Social Context)

If you have experienced at least one of the situations in Section II above, please answer the following two questions.

13. By WHOM were these disturbing situations generally carried out? (You may tick more than one option)

Multiple choice • Required

- ☐ A teammate/peer from my own age group
- ☐ My teammates/peers as a group
- ☐ An older/more senior athlete
- ☐ My coach or a member of the technical staff
- ☐ Club manager / Administrator
- ☐ A parent / Family member
- ☐ Spectators / Supporters
- ☐ Other (free response)

14. WHERE did these situations most often occur? (You may tick more than one option)

Multiple choice • Required

- ☐ On the training ground / At the sports facility
- ☐ In the changing room
- ☐ On the away bus or transport vehicle
- ☐ At a tournament or training camp hotel
- ☐ Online (Social media, messaging groups)

SECTION IV: Help-Seeking Behaviour (Optional)

15. When you encountered this type of bullying, who did you generally turn to to resolve the situation?

Single choice • Required

- ☐ I did not tell anyone / I tried to handle it on my own
- ☐ I sought support from my teammates
- ☐ I told my family or guardian
- ☐ I reported it to my coach or club officials
- ☐ Other (free response)

16. If you did not report the situation you experienced to anyone, or if you hesitated to do so, what was the main reason? (You may tick more than one option)

Multiple choice • Optional

- ☐ I did not think the situation was serious enough to report.



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

- ☐ I believed I could handle it on my own.
- ☐ I was afraid that if I told the coach or officials, I would lose my place in the team (be dropped from the squad) or that my sporting career would be harmed.
- ☐ I was afraid of being labeled a "snitch" by my teammates or of being completely excluded from the group.
- ☐ I thought that even if I complained, nothing would change / no one would believe me.
- ☐ I was afraid that if I told someone, the situation would get worse or that I would face retaliation.
- ☐ Other (free response)



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

ANNEX B. INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP GUIDES

This annex reproduces the question sets supplied by Hacettepe University in Interview_Questions.docx and confirmed by the research team as used for qualitative data collection. The guides cover four participant groups: athletes, coaches, parents and managers. Coaches have separate individual-interview and focus-group guides. The source wording, prompts, sequence and question numbering are retained.

A: Athlete Individual Interview Guide

Rapport Building and Team Climate

1. How many years have you been playing sports at a competitive level, and what is the core feeling or motivation that keeps you committed to this sport?
2. If you had to summarize the camaraderie and overall atmosphere within your team, what would it be like?
3. How do you experience or observe the hierarchy between experienced (veteran, senior, strong, high-scoring, popular, etc.) athletes and new (rookie, young, weak, unremarkable, etc.) athletes both on and off the field?
4. (*Probe*) How do you think the pressure to succeed and advance in sports shapes the friendship groups within the team and determines who gets close to whom?

Perception of Bullying and On-Field Experiences

1. What are your observations regarding the culture of teasing among friends on the sports field? Where exactly do you draw the line between an “innocent joke” and a “disturbing action”?
2. How do you interpret situations like pushing, hitting, or damaging equipment during practice that are disguised as “accidents”? What do you look for when distinguishing whether these actions are intentional or not?
3. How would you describe your experiences with attempts to establish physical or psychological dominance in “unmonitored areas/spaces” like locker rooms or showers?
4. What does it mean to you when teammates use nicknames based on a person’s off-field characteristics, such as their appearance, accent, or economic status?
5. When an athlete makes a mistake, how do you interpret the harsh reactions (yelling, getting angry, etc.) from others toward them? What emotions do these moments evoke in you?
6. When you witness (or experience) a player being intentionally left out of the game or deliberately not passed to, how do you determine whether this is a tactical decision or intentional exclusion?
7. How would you describe the feeling of exclusion when certain individuals are intentionally not invited to social events outside of practice?
8. How did you experience the “initiation rituals” (hazing) or “welcome pranks” (rough games, haircuts, etc.) applied to newcomers to the team? What do you think is the purpose of these rituals within team culture?



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

9. Generally speaking, which do you feel leaves a more lasting impact (or wound) on athletes: physical, verbal, or social actions? Why?

Causes and Power Dynamics

1. Why do you think some athletes feel the need to assert authority over or exhibit domineering behavior toward their teammates?
2. Do you think some players on the team are more talented than others?
 - 2.1. How do these players' attitudes toward other athletes manifest? (This can be explained in terms of power dynamics.)
3. How does the "battle for the starting spot" within the team affect your relationships with your teammates?
4. (*Probe*) What are your thoughts on the well-known "tough/uncompromising nature" of sports? How do you experience this?

Reporting, Intervention, and Institutional Support

1. When a situation arises within the team that puts pressure on you or someone else, how do you decide whether to tell someone about it or keep it to yourself?
2. How do fears of being labeled a "snitch" or being ostracized when you share an incident affect your decision to speak up or remain silent?
3. How do you assess your coach's attitude when they notice tensions among athletes, from your own perspective?
4. Has the pressure from your teammates or the environment changed your perspective on your athletic career? If so, can you describe that?

Cyberbullying and Digital Platforms

1. How does it make you feel when content mocking a friend's mistake (screenshots, videos) is shared in team chat groups (WhatsApp, etc.)?
2. What do demoralizing comments directed at an athlete's personal accounts (Instagram, TikTok)—whether from within or outside the team—mean to you?
3. Do you think these digital attacks, which we could call cyberbullying, differ across specific platforms (e.g., is the experience on Instagram different from that on Twitter)? What is the difference between these platforms compared to the field?
4. Have you experienced or witnessed negative reactions or exclusion in digital groups? How does this affect your presence on the field and your sense of belonging to the team, or that of a teammate who has experienced it?



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

5. Do you think clubs and coaches should intervene in athletes' social media and messaging group communication? Why?
6. (*Probe*) Have you observed situations where someone who isn't physically strong on the field can be more dominant or bullying on digital platforms (messaging groups)? How does the digital space alter power dynamics within the team?



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

B: Coach Individual Interview Guide

Rapport Building and Coaching Approach

1. How would you describe your coaching philosophy regarding athletes in your own words?
2. What are the biggest dilemmas you face on the field when balancing “discipline” and “social camaraderie” within your team?
3. How do you interpret your team’s overall social climate and the hierarchical structure among athletes?

Perception of Bullying and Observation Capacity

1. As a coach, what defines the line between a “tough training culture” and “peer bullying” in your world?
2. Physical Signs: When distinguishing whether rough interventions disguised as “accidents” are actually displays of power within the team, what dynamics on the field do you pay attention to?
3. Verbal Dynamics: When do nicknames and teasing among athletes cross the line from “team fun” into emotional abuse?
4. Social Exclusion: How do you recognize those first moments when an athlete feels tactically or socially isolated by their teammates?
5. How would you describe your intuition and intervention practices regarding the dynamics that occur in “unmonitored areas/ spaces” (locker room, service area) where your supervision is limited?
6. How do you assess the role of “initiation rituals” (hazing) applied to young athletes joining the team within the team’s unwritten rules (traditions)?
7. What are your processes for interpreting signs, such as withdrawal or a decline in performance, that indicate an athlete is being bullied?
8. When you sense that the most talented or “star” athletes on the team are using their status as a tool of pressure, how do you approach this situation?
9. (*Probe*) Do you think the perception of “resilience and toughness” associated with sports leads coaches to sometimes view the cruelty children inflict on one another as “normal”?

Intervention, Management, and Policy

1. When you identify a bullying incident within the team, what pedagogical language and methods do you use to manage the process?
2. How would you describe the emotional atmosphere and your communication strategy during your discussions with the parties involved (the bully and the victim)?
3. How do parents’ ways of intervening in team conflicts affect your efforts to ensure fairness within the team?



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

4. Does your club having (or lacking) a written policy on bullying prevention shape the professional confidence you feel during crises?
5. When managing such crises in a sports environment, what kind of educational modules do you genuinely feel you need from projects like B-FREE?

Cyberbullying and Digital Platforms

1. What are your experiences with moments when digital tensions in athletes' messaging groups concretely spill over into the training and match atmosphere (on the field)?
2. As a coach, where do you draw the line on your authority when it comes to monitoring athletes' social media interactions?
3. When comparing the damage cyberbullying on digital platforms inflicts on team unity to that of physical bullying, what picture emerges?
4. If an athlete becomes the subject of ridicule in the digital world, how do you resolve the professional dilemmas you face regarding when to intervene in the process?
5. From a coach's perspective, how do you view the idea of having rules within the club to regulate behavior in digital spaces?



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

C: Coach Focus Group Guide

1. When “healthy competition” gives way to “toxic rivalry” in your team, what kinds of changes do you observe in the team hierarchy (star players, veterans, newcomers)?
2. How would you describe your experiences regarding the erosion of tactical discipline and coaching authority in a team where cliques have increased?
3. How does the “acceptance” (or proving oneself) process of a new athlete joining the team trigger the team’s existing power dynamics?
4. How would you describe, based on your professional experience, the disruptions in an athlete’s technical development and training focus resulting from exposure to peer bullying?
5. In your view, what are the clear warning signs that “high-potential” athletes are nearing the point of quitting the sport due to exclusion or pressure they face?
6. How do you assess the role of the deeply ingrained expectation in sports culture to “produce tough/resilient/masculine athletes” in normalizing toxic behavior in the locker room?
7. When a bullying incident occurs within a team, how would you describe how this situation reflects on overall motivation and the empathy children feel toward one another?
8. How do your teams react in moments of defeat? Do you observe signs of bullying in these reactions? (e.g., “scapegoating” and blaming one another)
9. How do you believe your own coaching style shapes the team’s overall morale and the level of compassion children have toward one another?
10. What are your experiences with using “sporting sanctions” (such as benching) as intervention tools to resolve bullying when you notice the effects?
11. As a group of coaches, what kind of concrete “tools” or “strategic guidelines” do you expect from the B-FREE project to minimize the harm bullying causes to the team?



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

D: Parent Individual Interview Guide

Rapport Building and Club Climate

1. From your perspective on the sidelines, how would you describe the general level of “friendship and cooperation” among the children in this club based on your own observations?
2. Based on your observations from the stands, what are your thoughts on children who seem to form cliques within the team or who you feel are being “left out”?
3. As a parent, how do you recognize moments when competition among children shifts from “healthy rivalry” to “harmful ambition”?

General Bullying Observations

1. When you notice children making rough contact with each other under the guise of an “accident” during practice, how do you interpret this situation?
2. Verbal Observations: When you hear children using hurtful nicknames based on each other’s physical traits or mistakes on the field, how do you perceive the impact of this on the team’s atmosphere?
3. Social Exclusion: When you witness a player being left out of the game or isolated during training breaks, what do you think are the underlying, unspoken reasons for this exclusion?
4. Unmonitored areas/spaces: Do you have any experiences or observations of children being emotionally mistreated in areas with minimal adult supervision, such as the locker room or the sidelines? If so, what were they?

4.1. What is your perspective on this situation?

1. How did other parents react?

5. Star Player Effect: Do you think some players on your child’s team are more talented than others?

5.1. How do these players behave toward other athletes? What do you observe? (This can be explained in terms of power dynamics.)

6. Initiation Rituals (Hazing): How do you view the role of “harsh pranks” that a new child is subjected to for acceptance into the group—as a tradition or a risk?
7. Social Events: When you notice that certain children are intentionally not invited to team gatherings, what is the general attitude of parents regarding this issue?
8. In your opinion, how do the coaches’ on-field behaviors (strictness, yelling at certain children) affect the team and the children?
9. In your opinion, which type of bullying is most normalized (or overlooked) in this sport under the pretext that it is “part of the nature of the sport”?



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

10. (*Probe*) Do you think the “tough and competitive” nature often attributed to sports creates a foundation that legitimizes children being ruthless toward one another?

Communication and Organizational Trust

1. When your child talks to you about injustices their teammates commit against each other, how do you respond to their inner feelings?
2. If you noticed another child being bullied, what action would you take? Can you explain why?
3. How do these types of conflicts among children affect communication between parents? (Are they swept under the rug, or are they discussed openly?)
4. What are your thoughts on the club’s approach to preventing bullying or child protection?
5. When you file a complaint, what do you think the coach’s attitude is like? (Is it biased or impartial? Do they take it seriously or not, etc.)

Cyberbullying and Digital Monitoring

1. How does cyberbullying or mocking communication (all caps, stickers) in WhatsApp and other messaging groups among children affect your child’s emotional state and your home life?
2. How do these instances of exclusion or demoralizing posts on digital platforms affect your child’s motivation toward sports?
3. Should the club play a role in taking steps to prevent cyberbullying actions by athletes on social media and messaging groups (such as establishing ethical guidelines)? Could you explain?



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

E: Manager Individual Interview Guide

Rapport Building and Organizational Climate

1. As a manager, how would you describe your management philosophy when striking that difficult balance between “expectations of athletic success” and the “psychological safety” of children in the youth program?
2. How would you describe your club’s locker room culture and power dynamics (coach-athlete, athlete-athlete)?

Perception of Bullying and Organizational Awareness

1. From a manager’s perspective, how do you institutionally draw the line between “strict sports discipline” and “harmful peer bullying” within the club?
2. What organizational challenges does the club face in managing risks in locker rooms, team buses, or camp facilities where adult supervision is limited?
3. How do you view the role of traditional “initiation rituals” (hazing) or rough jokes in your club culture?
4. Do you believe that some players on the team are more talented athletes than others?
 - 4.1. How do these players’ attitudes toward other athletes manifest? What do you observe? (This can be framed in terms of power dynamics.)
5. In your opinion, which type of bullying is the last to be detected by management or the most difficult to identify from an organizational perspective? Why?
6. (*Probe*) In situations where the club’s need for success conflicts with the child’s best interest (for example, if a key player is a bully), how would you decide as a manager? Could you explain?

Policy, Reporting, and Crisis Management

1. How does the absence or presence of mechanisms allowing athletes or parents to report incidents safely affect your reflexes in preventing crises?
2. When making decisions about removing or expelling a child who is bullying, how do you balance the club's image, the team's success, and the child's pedagogical development?
3. As a manager, what kind of “institutional policy documents” or “tools” do you expect the B-FREE project—which aims to prevent bullying—to provide to clubs?

Coach Supervision and Parent Relations

1. How do you administratively oversee how coaches in your club manage power dynamics within the team and the masculine/pedagogical language they use?



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

2. When you encounter a coach who consistently wins matches for the team but is harsh toward children, discriminatory, or disregards bullying, how do you manage the situation?
3. How does parents' protective reflex to intervene in the team's peer dynamics affect your managerial decisions and operations?

Cyberbullying and Digital Governance

1. How do you manage situations where cyberbullying incidents experienced by athletes in their private messaging groups or on social media reflect as a "crisis" for the club?
2. How do you assess your club's vision (or lack thereof) regarding "Digital Communication Ethics" that encompasses both athletes and coaches?
3. Given the damage cyberbullying incidents inflict on the club's corporate reputation, how do you assess or explain managers' preparedness for these new threats?

Closing remarks and final thoughts



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.