Do Fair Play Behaviors Reduce Aggression and Anger in Sport?

Yasemin YALÇIN[1*] ⓘ, Özge KAHRAMAN[1] ⓘ
[1]Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Alanya.

Abstract

The sample group of the study, which examined the relationship between the fair play behaviors of student athletes and their levels of aggression and anger in sports, consisted of a total of 333 student athletes, 140 female and 193 male, studying at Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University Faculty of Sports Sciences in the 2021-2022 academic year. The aim of the study, in which both screening (descriptive) and correlational models were used, was to examine the relationship between student athletes' fair play behaviors and their levels of aggression and anger in sports. The Multidimensional Scale of Sportsmanship Orientation (MSOS-25) and the Scale of Aggression and Anger in Sport (CAAS) were used to collect data. The data were collected from the participants through face-to-face forms in April 2022. In the analysis of the data obtained in the study, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated to examine the internal consistency of the measurement tools. According to the various demographic characteristics of the participants, t-test and ANOVA tests were applied to evaluate the levels of the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientation Scale and the Aggression and Anger in Sport Scale. In addition, the level of relationship between the scales was evaluated by Pearson correlation analysis. Whether the data met the prerequisites of parametric tests was decided by examining the Skewness and Kurtosis (normal distribution of data) values and Levene (equality of variance) test results. As a result of the research, it was seen that there was a significant negative relationship between the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientation levels of student athletes and the levels of Aggression and Anger in Sports. Accordingly, it can be said that as the fair play behaviors of student athletes increase, their levels of aggression and anger in sports decrease.

Keywords: Fair play, Sport, Sportsmanship, Anger, Aggression

Fair Play'e Yönelik Davranışlar Sporda Saldırganlık ve Öfkeyi Azaltır mı?

Öz

Sporcu öğrencilerin fair play'e yönelik davranışları ile sporda saldırganlık ve öfke düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelendiği çalışmanın örneklem grubunu 2021-2022 Eğitim-Öğretim yılında Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi'nde öğrenim gören 140'ı kadın, 193'ü erkek toplam 333 sporcu öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Hem tarama (betimsel) hem de ilişkisel modelin kullanıldığı çalışmanın amacı, sporcu öğrencilerinin fair playe yönelik davranışları ile sporda saldırganlık ve öfke düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Veri toplamak için Çok Boyutlu Sportmenlik Yönelimi Ölçeği (MSOS–25) ile Sporda Saldırganlık ve Öfke Ölçeği (SSÖÖ) kullanılmıştır. Veriler katılımcılardan 2022 yılı Nisan ayında yüzyüze formlar aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Araştırmada elde edilen verilerin analizinde ölçüm araçlarının iç-tutarlılıklarının incelemesi için Cronbach Alpha güvenirlik katsayısı hesaplanmıştır. Katılımcıların çeşitli demografik özelliklerine göre Çok Boyutlu Sportmenlik Yönelimi Ölçeği ile Sporda Saldırganlık ve Öfke Ölçeği düzeylerini değerlendirmek için t-testi ve ANOVA testleri uygulanmıştır. Ayrıca ölçekler arasındaki ilişki seviyesi pearson korelasyon analizi ile değerlendirilmiştir. Verilerin parametrik testlerin ön şartlarını sağlayıp sağlamadığına ise Skewness ve Kurtosis (verilerin normal dağılım durumu) değerleri ve Levene (varyans eşitliği) testi sonuçları incelenerek karar verilmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda sporcu öğrencilerin Çok Boyutlu Sportmenlik Yönelimi düzeyleri ile Sporda Saldırganlık ve Öfke düzeyleri arasında negatif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu görülmüştür. Buna göre sporcu öğrencilerin fair playe yönelik davranışları arttıkça sporda saldırganlık ve öfke düzeylerinin düştüğü söylenebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Fair play, Spor, Sportmenlik, Öfke, Saldırganlık

---

* **Corresponding Author:** Yasemin Yalçın, **E-mail:** yasemin.yalcin@alanya.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

The origin of the word sport, which is defined in the dictionary as all of the movements performed individually or collectively with certain rules that aim to develop the body or mind and are based on these rules, is Latin (Turkish Language Association). It was formed from the word "Disportere" which means to separate from each other in Latin. The word, which has changed over time, has become the word "sport" that we use today (Atasoy & Öztürk-Kuter, 2005). Sport is a discipline that adds movement to people's daily lives, maximizes the gains they have while adding movement to their daily lives, is carried out under certain rules, alone or as a team, contributes to being social, brings the society together, enables individuals to reach a better level in terms of motor skills, includes competition, and includes cultural elements with a spirit of solidarity (Kılcıgil, 1998).

In a general definition, sport is seen as the process of becoming a society with willpower and socialization. The reason for the term "will" is that sport is a tool that leaves a mark on people's character. It provides a measure of endurance and enables all motor skills to work. It is the desire and satisfaction of empowerment, being virtuous towards the winning or losing opponent, the desire of people to act as a team, being humble instead of thinking only of oneself, and virtuously carrying the dosimology elements that a fast run or passing a jumping bar creates (Tiryaki, 1981).

The idea that sport is an ethical pursuit is compatible with the attitudes and behaviors exhibited. The harmony between this thought and attitude does not include acts such as violence, cheating, anger, cynicism, profit-seeking, corruption, and bullying. When such inappropriate elements occur, the true spirit of competition is lost. Fair play, with its social and moral principles, represents the spirit of fair, genuine competition. The concept of fair play, which advocates both obeying the rules and behaving in the spirit of sport, is a virtue that commits to competing in a fair spirit (Keating, 1964). The basis of sport is competition. Its goal is to be victorious. It is only necessary to be in a virtuous, honest game and to carry the spirit of fair play in order to be victorious in this game (Eitzen, 2006). Rules and regulations in sport are necessary not only to evaluate performance and emphasize fair play, but also to ensure that all stakeholders enjoy sport (Loland & McNamee, 2000). Fair play, which represents a fair and ethical way of behavior, means following the rules in any case, seeing the opponent not as an enemy but as an essential part of the game, avoiding unfair gain, respecting equality of opportunity, and most importantly, respecting the game, the opponent and all stakeholders (Yıldıran, 2004).

The personal qualities of student athletes and their attitudes towards sportsmanship have started to be evaluated under different headings over time. Sportsmanship, which is also evaluated as virtuous behavior or ethics, shows people's ideas rather than fixed value judgments or theoretical thoughts (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2006). The inherent purpose of sportsmanship is to lower the tension in the game, not to raise it. Sportsman can be defined as "a person who can accept losing and see it as a part of the game, who avoids hiding behind various excuses to gain unfair gain when defeated, who has internalized that it is not appropriate to win with illegal behaviors and who treats his opponent with respect, kindness, generosity and courtesy". Sportsmanship shows exhibiting emotions and behaviors such as patience, sincere intentions, courage, self-

confidence, respect for other individuals' rights and opinions, kindness, goodness, honor, cooperation, nobility and generosity (Sakallı, 2001). Fair play represents an honorable, moral understanding of competition. It is not possible to realize this understanding only by adhering to the rules. Because all behaviors exhibited within the scope of the rules may not be evaluated in a morally positive way. In this context, fair play needs to be examined both in terms of rules (formal fair play) and ethical attitudes beyond the rules (informal fair play). Unfortunately, during the 20th century, the increase in commercial and political demands on sports has pushed sports ethics to the background. This has led to the decline of the amateur spirit in the face of the professional spirit. In this period of time, the understanding of Fair Play represents human values such as providing equal conditions and eliminating inequality of opportunity, seeing the opponent as equal to oneself, valuing him as a necessary factor for the realization of the game, respecting both the physical and mental integrity of the opponent, and staying away from unfair gains, The tendency of student athletes, especially in the professional field, to exhibit behaviors that are not in accordance with Fair Play occurs due to the anxiety created by both individual and social expectations of success. The anxiety and negative impact of other stakeholders such as public figures, fans, press and media, financial supporters, political circles, sports clubs, coaches, etc. on athletes cause student athletes to be only success-oriented and thus push them into unethical, unethical, purely utilitarian pursuit of success and competition that is contrary to Fair Play. In this context, Fair Play is not only an ethical understanding that only those who participate and perform in the competition should have. All stakeholders of sports as well as athletes should adopt Fair Play and exhibit behaviors in accordance with the spirit of fair play (Kotan, 2004).

Nowadays, the fact that the financial criteria determined in return for the performance and struggle expected from athletes are expressed in high sums can cause them to exhibit anger and violent behavior in case of defeat. It is seen that hundreds of fans who support athletes in the stands are also aware of these high sums and if they cannot see the success and performance they expect from the athletes they support, their angry and aggressive behavior turns into violence. In addition, within the framework of the phrase "every path to victory is mubah", which is quite common and adopted among the public, all stakeholders of sports can turn to unethical methods and solutions that are contrary to fair play in order to turn the results of the competition in their favor and thus gain unfair gains (Yücel et al., 2015).

The occurrence of anger can be influenced by many internal or external events (threatening rhetoric used by the opponent, a past defeat that has created a traumatizing effect). Although anger is a very human emotion, the inability to manage this emotion can lead to aggression. In this context, it can be said that there is a significant relationship between anger and aggression (Mowlaie et al., 2011).

In order for initiatives to prevent aggression in sports to be effective, first of all, the root causes of aggression should be known, in this context, athlete students, teachers and coaches who train them, sports clubs and managers should take the necessary responsibility to have fair play ethics; avoid broadcasts that may cause aggression and anger in the media; viewers, fans and therefore the society should be self-sacrificing in ensuring the cooperation of all necessary conditions to support all stakeholders of sports to exhibit behaviors in accordance

with fair play ethics (Dervent, 2007). There have been various differences in the way aggression incidents in sports are reflected to the society and the way these incidents are evaluated day by day. Thus, there have been many changes in the studies and social consciousness. In previous periods, hooliganism and the behavior and attitudes of hooligans were considered by the media of the period as behaviors that negatively affected the social structure. As time passes, it is seen that this idea has not remained the same and that the current media has started to look at the incidents from a more rational perspective compared to the media of the past. For example, in some sports branches (boxing), aggressive behaviors are evaluated by the media of our period as an element based on performance or required by the performance displayed in the competition (Pehlivan & Konukman, 2004). The aim of sports competitions, beyond competing and winning in a gentlemanly manner, should be to establish and strengthen sincere bonds that bring all stakeholders of sports and even societies closer to each other (Yetim, 2005). The licenses of coaches who push their athletes to aggressive behaviors or appreciate them for such attitudes and behaviors should be revoked (Tiryaki, 2000). Coaches and club managers should not make statements that will create anger and aggressive behaviors before the start of the competition, and they should make their statements in the spirit of fair-play (Doğan, 2007).

The whole society should be taught that sports is not a war, but a competition that includes sincere feelings such as peace, friendship and brotherhood (Acet, 2005). It would be useful to use these environments, especially in physical education classes given in schools and in inter-school competitions, to create a social consciousness within the framework of ethical values through sports and to make the necessary changes in this regard, to gain ethical behaviors towards Fair Play and to implement these behaviors. Because it is understood that the understanding of Fair Play can be gained not only by campaigns or by explaining simple moral theories, but rather by doing and living in a sustainable learning process (Yıldıran, 2005). The spirit of fair play, which constitutes the main structure of physical education and sports ethics, also constitutes the main structure of physical education lessons (Yıldıran, 2005). Physical education lessons conducted in the spirit of fair play not only contribute to the development of students' psychomotor skills, but also develop their social and moral aspects in a good way. For this reason, teachers should prepare for fair play practices before the lessons they will conduct (Skaalvik, 2010). It is one of the main responsibilities of a physical education and sports teacher to conduct lessons with the spirit of fair play. The confidence in the spirit of fair play and the teacher's competence also affect the lesson activities. The main conditions for conducting lessons in accordance with this spirit and using fair play practices in lessons are how much knowledge physical education teachers have about fair play, how much they keep the spirit of fair play alive in lessons and how much they have moral awareness of fair play (Yıldıran, 2005).

The power of sport is measured by its ability to connect people to each other, to provide socialization, unification and cohesion. Sport has a miraculous power to bring people and societies together. Sports have a great share in the formation and survival of our very important social values. All these values include diligence, self-sacrifice, sacrifice and sense of responsibility (Topan, 2011). Sports is an important tool for societies to adopt the beautiful and the right, to internalize winning and not winning as a part of life and to strengthen social

harmony among people (Şahin, 1997). In this context, the study aims to examine whether there is a significant relationship between the behaviors of student athletes towards fair play and their levels of aggression and anger in sports, and whether there are significant differences in the behaviors of student athletes towards fair play and their levels of aggression and anger in sports according to their personal information. The lack of a similar study in the relevant literature increases the importance of the study. This study is expected to contribute to the studies in the literature. Our study will show the importance of fair play to athletes, coaches who train athletes, teachers and sports people in terms of minimizing anger and aggressive behaviors in sports. Therefore, it will lead to an increase in fair play behaviors and thus lead to studies on the reduction of anger and aggression in sports.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Model

In this study, both screening (descriptive) and relational models were used to examine the fair play behaviors of student athletes and their levels of aggression and anger in sports. The survey model is a research approach that aims to describe a past or present situation as it exists. In the survey model, in a universe consisting of a large number of elements, a survey is conducted on the whole universe or a group of samples or samples to be taken from it in order to make a general judgment about the universe (Karasar, 2008). Descriptive researches are researches that aim to determine a situation and aim to obtain a description and description of the subjects or activities of interest (Şavran, 2009). Within the scope of the study, since the fair play behaviors of student athletes and the levels of aggression and anger in sports are tried to be determined, the current research is a descriptive research, but it is also an explanatory relational research since the relationship between both variables is discussed (Cresswell, 2005; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). In the first step of the study, the literature on the subject was reviewed and the results of the previous studies were examined and a detailed theoretical framework was prepared. In the second step, with the data obtained by using the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientation Scale and the Aggression and Anger in Sport Scale, the fair play behaviors of student athletes and the levels of aggression and anger in sport were determined. In addition, the differences between fair play behaviors and levels of aggression and anger in sports were examined in terms of personal variables by determining the demographic information of the student athletes with the personal information form.

Research Group

The study group of the research consists of student athletes studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences of Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, determined by convenience sampling method (Bishop, 2017), which is one of the non-probability based sampling methods. In the literature, when determining the sample size, it is recommended that the number of participants should be 5 to 10 times the number of items in the scale (Bryman & Cramer, 2001; Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). Since there were 32 statements in total in the 2 scales used in the study, it

was aimed to conduct the study with a total of 320 student athletes, and as a result, 333 student athletes were reached.

Data Collection Tools

In the first part of the current study, questions including personal information of the participants were included. In the other parts, two types of data collection tools were used.

Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientation Scale: The Multidimensional Scale of Sportsmanship Orientation (MSOS-25) developed by Vallerand et al. (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Balçıkanlı (2009) is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 25 items and 5 sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions of the original MSOS are; Conformity to Social Norms (e.g.: I congratulate my opponent even if I lose the match), Respect for Rules and Administration (e.g.: I obey the referee's decisions), Commitment to Responsibilities in Sports (e.g.: I do not stop fighting even if I make many mistakes in the match), Respect for the Opponent (e.g.: I extend my hand to my opponent who falls to the ground to get up) and finally Negative Approaches (e.g.: I compete for trophies, medals and honor in sports). As a result of the first factor analysis of the 25 items and 5 sub-dimensions in the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientation Scale, it was observed that 5 items (Items 5, 10, 15, 20, 25) in the "Negative Approaches" dimension did not work. In the second factor analysis, this sub-dimension was not added to the study. The Turkish version of the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientation Scale has 4 sub-factors and 20 items.

Aggression and Anger Scale in Sport: The "Sport Aggression and Anger Scale" (CAAS) used in the study was developed by Maxwell and Moores, (2007). The original form of the scale adapted into Turkish by Gürbüz et al. (2019) has a structure consisting of a total of 12 items with "anger" (6 items) and "aggression" (6 items) sub-dimensions. Participants marked each statement on a Likert-type 5-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). In order to conduct the adaptation study of the CAAS to Turkish culture, the cross-cultural scale adaptation stages frequently used in the literature and suggested by Hambleton and Patsula (1999) were taken into consideration.

Research Publication Ethics

"Ethics Committee Report" dated 27/04/2022 and decision number 2022/11 was obtained from Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University Social and Humanities Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee for the realization of the research.

Data Collection

After ethics committee approval was obtained, the volunteer students in the research group were contacted and the purpose and content of the study were explained. Data were collected from the participants through face-to-face forms in April 2022. The average time to answer the relevant scale was approximately 10 minutes. Student athletes who volunteered to participate in the study completed the relevant scales under the supervision of the researchers.

Data Analysis

The data obtained in the study were analyzed with the help of IBM SPSS 25.0 statistical package program. In the analysis of the data obtained in the study, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated to examine the internal consistency of the measurement tools. T-test and ANOVA tests were applied to evaluate the levels of the participants according to various demographic characteristics of the participants. In addition, the level of relationship between the scales was evaluated by Pearson correlation analysis. Whether the data met the prerequisites of parametric tests was decided by examining the Skewness and Kurtosis (normal distribution status of the data) values and Levene (equality of variance) test results.

Answers to the following questions were sought within the framework of the aims of the research:

- Is there a significant relationship between the behaviors of student athletes towards fair play and their levels of aggression and anger in sports?
- Is there a significant difference between athlete students' behaviors towards fair play and their levels of aggression and anger in sports according to their personal information?

FINDINGS

In this section, firstly, the table showing the frequency distribution of the research group according to their demographic characteristics is given. Afterwards, the table showing the distribution of the scores of the scales, the table showing the relationship between fair play behaviors and aggression and anger levels in sports, and the result tables showing the difference between the averages of the scales (sub-dimensions) and demographic variables (gender, age, department, class, branch, duration of interest in the branch, and fair play training status) are given respectively.

Table 1. Frequency distributions according to demographic characteristics of the research group

Variables	Subgroup	N	%	Total
Gender	Female	140	42.0	333
	Male	193	58.0	
Age	18-20 years old	164	49.2	333
	21-23 years old	139	41.7	
	24 years or older	30	9.0	
Department of Education	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	36.9	333
	Coaching Education	132	39.6	
	Recreation	78	23.4	
Class	1st class	114	34.2	333
	2nd class	102	30.6	
	3rd class	59	17.7	
	4th class	58	17.4	
Branch	Team Sports	155	46.5	333
	Individual Sports	178	53.5	
Duration of Interest in the Branch	1-3 years	76	22.8	333
	4-6 years	116	34.8	
	7-9 years	84	25.2	
	10 years and older	57	17.1	
Fair Play Training	Yes	113	33.9	333
	No	220	66.1	

It was determined that 58% of the student athletes included in the study were male, 49.2% were in the age group of 18-20 years, 39.6% were students in the department of coaching education, 34.2% were first-year students, 53.5% were interested in individual sports, 34.8% were professionally involved in a sports branch between 4-6 years, and 66.1% did not receive any fair play training/fair play training (Table 1).

Table 2. Distribution of the scores of the MSOS and the CAAS

Scale	Item	Mean	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis	C.Alpha
Compliance with Social Norms	5	4.34	0.677	-1.190	1.442	0.88
Rules and Respect for Management	5	4.10	0.729	-0.712	0.222	0.82
Commitment to Responsibilities	5	4.61	0.474	-1.270	1.218	0.77
Respect for the Opponent	5	3.77	0.923	-0.439	-0.635	0.79
Total score of the MSOS	20	4.21	0.527	-0.570	-0.110	0.88
Anger	6	2.94	0.987	-0.186	-0.699	0.88
Aggression	6	2.15	1.030	0.651	-0.613	0.90
Total Score of the CAAS	12	2.55	0.886	0.226	-0.720	0.91

Table 2 shows that the mean score of the athlete students in the study was 4.21. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.88 for the MSOS. It is

seen that the mean score of the CAAS, which is another scale included in the research, is 2.55. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the CAAS was calculated as 0.91. According to Özdamar (2002), the criterion values for the reliability coefficient are "not reliable" when $0.00<\alpha<0.40$, "low reliability" when $0.41<\alpha<0.60$, "medium reliability" when $0.61<\alpha<0.80$, and "high reliability" when $0.81<\alpha<1.00$. In the light of these reliability coefficient criteria, it can be said that the internal consistency coefficients of the total scores of the scales used in the current study have a high level of reliability. When the skewness and kurtosis values are examined, it is observed that the data fulfill the normality assumption. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), skewness and kurtosis values are within ±1.50, and according to George and Mallery (2010), values within ±2 are acceptable for normality. From this point of view, it was decided to apply parametric statistical techniques for the analysis procedures for the determination of relationship and difference.

Table 3. Pearson's correlation analysis results showing the relationship between the MSOS and the CAAS

Scale		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Compliance with Social Norms	r	1	.585**	.378**	.490**	.823**	-.290**	-.372**	-.378**
	p		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		333	333	333	333	333	333	333	333
2. Rules and Respect for Management	r	.585**	1	.227**	.434**	.775**	-.420**	-.462**	-.503**
	p	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		333	333	333	333	333	333	333	333
3. Commitment to Responsibilities	r	.378**	.227**	1	.235**	.527**	-.088	-.198**	-.165**
	p	.000	.000		.000	.000	.107	.000	.003
		333	333	333	333	333	333	333	333
4. Respect for the Opponent	r	.490**	.434**	.235**	1	.798**	-.287**	-.298**	-.333**
	p	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
		333	333	333	333	333	333	333	333
5. MSOS (Total)	r	.823**	.775**	.527**	.798**	1	-.384**	-.454**	-.478**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
		333	333	333	333	333	333	333	333
6. Anger	r	-.290**	-.420**	-.088	-.287**	-.384**	1	.544**	.873**
	p	.000	.000	.107	.000	.000		.000	.000
		333	333	333	333	333	333	333	333
7. Aggression	r	-.372**	-.462**	-.198**	-.298**	-.454**	.544**	1	.884**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
		333	333	333	333	333	333	333	333
8. CAAS (Total)	r	-.378**	-.503**	-.165**	-.333**	-.478**	.873**	.884**	1
	p	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	
		333	333	333	333	333	333	333	333

*p<0,05, **p<0,01

When the analysis results in Table 3 are examined, it is seen that there is a significant negative correlation between the total score of the MSOS and the total score of the CAAS, and that there is a significant negative correlation between the sub-dimensions of compliance with social norms, respect for rules and management, and respect for opponent of the MSOS and the anger and aggression sub-dimensions of the CAAS. However, it was found that there was no significant relationship between the commitment to responsibilities sub-dimension of the MSOS and the anger sub-dimension of the CAAS.

Table 4. Results of t-test analysis according to gender variable

Scale	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	T	p
Compliance with Social Norms	Female	140	4.42	.654	1.666	.097
	Male	193	4.29	.691		
Rules and Respect for Management	Female	140	4.22	.717	2.509	.013*
	Male	193	4.02	.727		
Commitment to Responsibilities	Female	140	4.63	.491	.464	.643
	Male	193	4.60	.462		
Respect for the Opponent	Female	140	3.86	.947	1.498	.135
	Male	193	3.71	.903		
MSOS (Total)	Female	140	4.28	.523	2.165	.031*
	Male	193	4.16	.525		
Anger	Female	140	2.83	1.008	-1.738	.083
	Male	193	3.02	.966		
Aggression	Female	140	2.04	1.040	-1.755	.080
	Male	193	2.24	1.017		
CAAS (Total)	Female	140	2.43	.903	-1.991	.047*
	Male	193	2.63	.867		

* $p<0.05$

The results of the analysis in Table 4 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the research group in terms of "gender" variable. It was seen that the mean score of the female athlete students was higher than that of the male athletes and the mean score of the CAAS was lower in female athletes. It is seen that the mean score in the sub-dimension of respect for rules and management of the MSOS differs statistically significantly according to the gender variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the mean score of female athlete students was higher than male athlete students.

Table 5. ANOVA analysis results according to age variable

Scale	Age	N	Mean	Sd	F	p
Compliance with Social Norms	18-20 years old	164	4.30	.695	0.905	0.406
	21-23 years old	139	4.40	.633		
	24 years or older	30	4.35	.777		
Rules and Respect for Management	18-20 years old	164	4.15	.669	2.293	0.103
	21-23 years old	139	4.10	.735		
	24 years or older	30	3.85	.955		
Commitment to Responsibilities	18-20 years old	164	4.56	.481	1.802	0.167
	21-23 years old	139	4.66	.435		
	24 years or older	30	4.67	.584		
Respect for the Opponent	18-20 years old	164	3.74	.916	0.570	0.566
	21-23 years old	139	3.78	.924		
	24 years or older	30	3.93	.977		
MSOS (Total)	18-20 years old	164	4.19	.528	0.282	0.754
	21-23 years old	139	4.23	.504		
	24 years or older	30	4.20	.629		
Anger	18-20 years old	164	2.90	.967	1.638	0.196
	21-23 years old	139	2.93	.998		
	24 years or older	30	3.25	1.019		
Aggression	18-20 years old	164	2.29	1.082	5.189	0.006* (1-2)
	21-23 years old	139	1.94	.934		
	24 years or older	30	2.37	1.022		
CAAS (Total)	18-20 years old	164	2.59	.871	2.683	0.070
	21-23 years old	139	2.45	.886		
	24 years or older	30	2.81	.915		

* $p<0.05$

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined, it is seen that the mean score in the aggression sub-dimension of the CAAS differs statistically significantly according to the age variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students between the ages of 18-20 was higher than the athlete students between the ages of 21-23.

Table 6. ANOVA analysis results according to the department variable

Scale	Department of Education	N	Mean	Sd	F	p
Compliance with Social Norms	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	4.30	.617		
	Coaching Education	132	4.30	.719	2.106	0.123
	Recreation	78	4.48	.686		
Rules and Respect for Management	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	3.94	.710		0.003*
	Coaching Education	132	4.14	.735	6.006	(1-3)
	Recreation	78	4.29	.702		
Commitment to Responsibilities	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	4.60	.471		
	Coaching Education	132	4.61	.485	0.133	0.875
	Recreation	78	4.64	.464		
Respect for the Opponent	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	3.72	.920		0.038*
	Coaching Education	132	3.68	.903	3.190	(2-3)
	Recreation	78	4.00	.935		
MSOS (Total)	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	4.14	.470		0.016*
	Coaching Education	132	4.18	.547	4.186	(1-3)
	Recreation	78	4.35	.556		
Anger	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	3.06	.955		
	Coaching Education	132	2.93	.992	1.936	0.146
	Recreation	78	2.78	1.015		
Aggression	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	2.14	1.016		
	Coaching Education	132	2.15	.992	0.038	0.963
	Recreation	78	2.18	1.122		
CAAS (Total)	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	123	2.60	.896		
	Coaching Education	132	2.54	.854	0.451	0.637
	Recreation	78	2.48	.927		

* $p < 0.05$

When the results of the analysis in Table 6 are examined, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the research group in terms of the "department of study" variable. It was seen that the mean score of the athlete students studying in the department of Recreation was higher than the athletes studying in the department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching, and the mean score of the CAAS was higher in the athletes studying in the department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching than the athlete students studying in the department of Recreation. The results of the analysis showed that the mean score in the respect for rules and management sub-dimension of the CAAS differed statistically significantly according to the department of study. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the Recreation department was higher than the athlete students studying in the Physical Education and Sports Teaching department. The results of the analysis showed that the mean score in the respect for opponent sub-dimension of the MSOS differed statistically significantly according to the department of study variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the Recreation department was higher than the athlete students studying in the Coaching Education department.

Table 7. ANOVA analysis results according to class variable

Scale	Class	N	Mean	Sd	F	p
Compliance with Social Norms	1st class	114	4.39	.551	3.004	0.031* (2-3)
	2nd class	102	4.19	.854		
	3rd class	59	4.50	.518		
	4th class	58	4.36	.659		
Rules and Respect for Management	1st class	114	4.19	.667	0.963	0.410
	2nd class	102	4.04	.734		
	3rd class	59	4.08	.748		
	4th class	58	4.06	.814		
Commitment to Responsibilities	1st class	114	4.56	.487	2.509	0.059
	2nd class	102	4.56	.529		
	3rd class	59	4.69	.351		
	4th class	58	4.73	.434		
Respect for the Opponent	1st class	114	3.92	.858	4.483	0.004* (1-3)
	2nd class	102	3.51	.978		
	3rd class	59	3.78	.787		
	4th class	58	3.92	.994		
MSOS (Total)	1st class	114	4.27	.505	3.179	0.024* (1-2)
	2nd class	102	4.08	.584		
	3rd class	59	4.26	.425		
	4th class	58	4.27	.528		
Anger	1st class	114	2.88	1.012	0.236	0.871
	2nd class	102	2.96	.963		
	3rd class	59	3.00	.849		
	4th class	58	2.97	1.120		
Aggression	1st class	114	2.33	1.095	3.174	0.024* (1-3)
	2nd class	102	2.19	1.039		
	3rd class	59	1.84	.870		
	4th class	58	2.05	.972		
CAAS (Total)	1st class	114	2.61	.926	0.620	0.602
	2nd class	102	2.58	.883		
	3rd class	59	2.42	.732		
	4th class	58	2.51	.960		

* $p < 0.05$

When the results of the analysis in Table 7 are examined, it is seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the first class is higher than the athlete students studying in the second class. It is seen that the mean score in the adaptation to social norms sub-dimension of the MSOS differs statistically significantly according to the class variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the 3rd class was higher than the athlete students studying in the 2nd class. It is seen that the mean score in the respect for opponent sub-dimension of the MSOS differs statistically significantly according to the class variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the 1st class was higher than the athlete students studying in the 3rd class. The results of the analysis showed that the mean score in the aggression sub-dimension of the CAAS differed statistically significantly according to the class variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athletic students studying in the 1st class was higher than the athletic students studying in the 3rd class.

Table 8. Results of t-test analysis according to branch variable

Scale	Branch	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Compliance with Social Norms	Team Sports	155	4.30	.723	-1.109	0.268
	Individual Sports	178	4.38	.633		
Rules and Respect for Management	Team Sports	155	3.99	.733	-2.742	0.006*
	Individual Sports	178	4.20	.711		
Commitment to Responsibilities	Team Sports	155	4.60	.478	-0.610	0.542
	Individual Sports	178	4.63	.470		
Respect for the Opponent	Team Sports	155	3.71	.985	-1.063	0.289
	Individual Sports	178	3.82	.865		
MSOS (Total)	Team Sports	155	4.15	.554	-1.905	0.058
	Individual Sports	178	4.26	.498		
Anger	Team Sports	155	2.99	.975	0.851	0.395
	Individual Sports	178	2.90	.997		
Aggression	Team Sports	155	2.17	.998	0.337	0.737
	Individual Sports	178	2.13	1.058		
CAAS (Total)	Team Sports	155	2.58	.865	0.666	0.506
	Individual Sports	178	2.52	.904		

* $p < 0.05$

The results of the analysis in Table 8 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the research group in terms of "sport branch". It was seen that the mean score of the athlete students who were interested in individual sports was higher than the athletes who were interested in team sports and the mean score of the CAAS was higher in the athletes who were interested in team sports than the athlete students who were interested in individual sports. The results of the analysis showed that the mean score in the sub-dimension of respect for rules and management of the CAAS differed statistically significantly according to the sport branch variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students interested in individual sports was higher than the athlete students interested in team sports.

Table 9. Results of t-test analysis according to fair play training variable

Scale	Fair Play Training	N	Mean	Sd	T	p
Compliance with Social Norms	Yes	113	4.38	.623	0.793	0.428
	No	220	4.32	.704		
Rules and Respect for Management	Yes	113	4.13	.775	0.496	0.620
	No	220	4.08	.704		
Commitment to Responsibilities	Yes	113	4.65	.431	1.117	0.265
	No	220	4.59	.493		
Respect for the Opponent	Yes	113	3.77	.930	0.057	0.954
	No	220	3.76	.922		
MSOS (Total)	Yes	113	4.23	.488	0.702	0.483
	No	220	4.19	.546		
Anger	Yes	113	2.93	.988	-0.050	0.960
	No	220	2.94	.988		
Aggression	Yes	113	2.04	1.002	-1.309	0.191
	No	220	2.20	1.041		
CAAS (Total)	Yes	113	2.49	.882	-0.788	0.431
	No	220	2.57	.888		

* $p < 0.05$

The results of the analysis in Table 9 show that there is no statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the research group in terms of the variable of "receiving fair play training".

Table 10. Results of t-test analysis according to the variable of duration of interest in the branch

Scale	Duration of Interest in the Branch	N	Mean	Sd	F	P
Compliance with Social Norms	1-3 years	76	4.28	.714	0.706	0.549
	4-6 years	116	4.40	.582		
	7-9 years	84	4.29	.715		
	10 years and older	57	4.37	.751		
Rules and Respect for Management	1-3 years	76	4.12	.691	0.853	0.466
	4-6 years	116	4.17	.720		
	7-9 years	84	4.05	.768		
	10 years and older	57	4.00	.735		
Commitment to Responsibilities	1-3 years	76	4.59	.493	0.083	0.969
	4-6 years	116	4.62	.478		
	7-9 years	84	4.62	.473		
	10 years and older	57	4.60	.448		
Respect for the Opponent	1-3 years	76	3.80	.955	2.102	0.100
	4-6 years	116	3.88	.835		
	7-9 years	84	3.56	.967		
	10 years and older	57	3.79	.956		
MLSD (Total)	1-3 years	76	4.20	.557	1.65	0.323
	4-6 years	116	4.27	.488		
	7-9 years	84	4.13	.545		
	10 years and older	57	4.19	.532		
Anger	1-3 years	76	3.11	.996	2.414	0.067
	4-6 years	116	2.75	1.011		
	7-9 years	84	2.99	.952		
	10 years and older	57	3.02	.934		
Aggression	1-3 years	76	2.43	1.054	2.843	0.038* (1-4)
	4-6 years	116	2.10	1.080		
	7-9 years	84	2.09	.989		
	10 years and older	57	1.95	.890		
CAAS (Total)	1-3 years	76	2.77	.857	2.459	0.063
	4-6 years	116	2.42	.948		
	7-9 years	84	2.54	.859		
	10 years and older	57	2.49	.791		

* $p < 0.05$

When the analysis results in Table 10 are examined, it is seen that the mean score in the Aggression sub-dimension of the CAAS differs statistically significantly according to the duration of interest in the sport. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students who have been doing sports between 1-3 years is lower than the athlete students who have been doing sports for 10 years and more.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this section, the results based on the findings obtained as a result of the data analysis are discussed. In addition, the results of this study are compared with the results of the related research in the literature and the common and different aspects are emphasized. In addition, suggestions are presented in the light of the results of the study.

In the study, the relationship and the direction of the relationship between the fair play behaviors of student athletes and their levels of aggression and anger in sports were tried to be

revealed. In addition, it was examined whether both the behaviors towards fair play and the levels of aggression and anger in sports differed in terms of various variables.

It was determined that 58% of the student athletes included in the study were male, 49.2% were in the 18-20 age group, 39.6% were coaching education students, 34.2% were first-year students, 53.5% were interested in individual sports, 34.8% were professionally involved in a sports branch between 4-6 years, and 66.1% did not take a course on fair play education / fair play.

When the findings of the study are analyzed, it is seen that there is a significant negative correlation between MSOS and CAAS. According to this, it can be said that as the sportsmanship orientation of the student athletes increases, the levels of aggression and anger in sports decrease. As behaviors towards sportsmanship, fair play and sports ethics are exhibited, aggression and anger-based behaviors will decrease. Empathizing with the opponent, seeing the opponent as a part of the game rather than an enemy, knowing that the rules exist to make the game fairer and more enjoyable, and acting accordingly, unfair behaviors that are not in accordance with sports ethics and unsportsmanlike will be exhibited less. Efek and Yiğiter (2022), in their study on sports, stress and sportsmanship, observed that as the stress levels of the participants increased, their level of respect for the opponent decreased. It can be thought that the increase in the stress levels of athletes is caused by the ambition to win and what it brings with it. When athletes focus on respect and tolerance instead of focusing on winning, fame, popularity, material concerns with the society they are in and their own value judgments; there will be a decrease in violent incidents that occur in sports activities and incidents that are not in accordance with sports ethics (Tanrıverdi, 2012). Nowadays, the fact that the financial criteria determined in return for the performance and struggle expected from athletes can be expressed in high sums can cause them to exhibit anger and violent behavior in case of defeat. It is seen that hundreds of fans who support athletes in the stands are also aware of these high sums and if they cannot see the success and performance they expect from the athletes they support, their angry and aggressive behavior turns into violence. In addition, within the framework of the idiom of "every path to victory is mubah", which is quite common and adopted among the public, all stakeholders of sports can turn to unethical methods and solutions that are contrary to fair play in order to turn the results of the competition in their favor and thus gain unfair gains (Yücel et al., 2015). In this context, as the factors that cause aggression and unethical behaviors in sports are eliminated, athletes will exhibit more sportsmanlike and therefore less aggressive and angry behaviors.

When the data were analyzed according to the gender variable, it was seen that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the MSOS and the CAAS according to the "gender" variable. It was seen that the mean score of female athlete students was higher than male athletes. Teke (2018) examined the effect of personality traits of athletes on fair play behavior and concluded that male students exhibited less fair play behavior than female students. Gürpınar and Kurşun (2013), in their study examining the sportsmanship orientations of basketball players and football players, revealed that when the behaviors towards sportsmanship were examined according to the gender variable, women exhibited more sportsmanlike behaviors in all dimensions compared to men, and parallel results were

found with our current research. In addition, Başaran et al. (2017) examined the fair-play understanding of physical education and sports college students and found a statistically significant difference in the dimension of "respect for rules and management" according to gender variable. This significant difference is in a way to reveal that women behave more sportsmanlike than men in the relevant sub-dimension.

When the mean score of CAAS was analyzed, it was seen that the mean was lower in female athletes. As in this study, Baykan (2018) and Bozkurt (2017) found that anger scores differed significantly according to gender in their studies. Dilek and İmamoğlu (2020), in their study investigating trait anger-anger expression style in sports-educated students, stated that women express their anger less than men and therefore their trait anger is higher than men. However, when the literature is examined, it is possible to come across studies in which no difference was found in the aggression dimension according to gender. This situation shows that instead of saying that aggression differs according to gender, it can be explained by variables such as the individual's personality traits, psychological state, and social conditions. Uluç (2022) evaluated the effect of sport character on aggression and anger in karate athletes in his study and concluded that there was no difference between aggression and anger behaviors according to gender variable. Güvendi and Keskin (2020), in their study in which they examined the aggression and anger behaviors of athletes according to their perception of unethical behavior perceived by their coaches, found no significant difference in the aggression sub-dimension of the aggression and anger scale in sports according to gender, but they also found significant differences in the anger sub-dimension. According to the results, they observed that the anger levels of male athletes were higher than female athletes. Gedik and Güvendi (2023), in their study conducted in Yalova in order to determine the aggression and anger levels of combat athletes, concluded that the mean scores of anger and aggression of female combat athletes were significantly lower than the mean scores of male combat athletes. Şahin (2022) examined the physical activity and emotional states of university students and concluded that gender was effective on positive emotions, but not on negative emotions and total physical activity levels. Again, when analyzed according to the gender variable; it is seen that the mean score in the respect for rules and management sub-dimension of the MSOS differs statistically significantly. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of female athlete students was higher than male athlete students. Looking at the literature, in the study conducted by Ulukan et al. (2021), sportsman behavior and attitude towards sports in athletes were examined and significant differences were found according to the mean scores of the sub-dimensions of respect for management and rules and commitment to responsibilities in sports according to gender variable. It was revealed that female athletes in the study exhibited more sportsman behavior than males. In this context, it can be said that the study is similar to the findings of our research. Çetinöz et al. (2020) examined the sportsmanship levels of university students in their study and concluded that the sportsmanship levels of female students were higher than male participants in all subscales except the adaptation to social norms subscale, as well as in the overall measurement tool. Gül and Bingöl (2022) examined the sportsmanship perception of sports high school students and concluded that the sportsmanship orientation of female students was higher.

When the mean scores of the research group were analyzed according to the "age" variable, it was seen that there was a statistically significant difference. It was observed that

the mean score of the students aged 21-23 years and above on the CAAS was higher than the mean score of the students aged 18-20 years and the mean score of the students aged 24 years and above on the CAAS was lower than the students aged 21-23 years. This situation can be interpreted as athletes exhibit more sportsmanlike behaviors when they reach a certain age and maturity level and can control their aggressive and angry situations in sports. Türkçapar and Yasul (2021) examined the anger levels of individual and team sports students in university school teams according to different variables and observed that there was an increase in anger level as age increased. Uluç (2022) found a significant difference in total and all sub-dimensions of aggression and anger according to age variable in his study and concluded that aggression and anger decreased as age increased.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that there are studies with different results. The sportsmanship orientation of older athletes is lower than that of younger athletes (Tsai & Fung, 2005). Teke (2018) examined the effect of athletes' personality traits on fair play behavior and concluded that as the age increases, athletes' fair play behaviors decrease. When the mean score in the Aggression sub-dimension of the CAAS was analyzed according to the age variable, it was seen that the mean score of this sub-dimension differed statistically significantly. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students between the ages of 18-20 was higher than the athlete students between the ages of 21-23. In this context, it can be said that as the fair play behaviors of student athletes who have reached a certain level of maturity increase, the levels of anger and aggression in sports decrease. It is known that ethical behaviors are acquired and learned behaviors and that each of us has the capacity to have good character from birth and learn it later. Coaches should teach their athletes the difference between good and bad in all kinds of sporting situations and this should be the first responsibility of a coach. Coaches can realize character development in their athletes at any age (Sezen, 2009). Afyon and Metin (2014) examined the aggression levels of football players in the muğla super amateur league and concluded that football players with a higher duration of involvement in the branch were more experienced and in this context, they were better able to distinguish between aggression and claiming their rights and thus learned to protect both their own rights and the rights of their opponents under the rules of the competition. In addition, when we look at the literature, there are also studies in which no significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of the scale of aggression and anger in sport according to age. Gedik (2023) Determination of Aggression and Anger Levels of Fighting Athletes: Yalova Province Sample, they concluded that there was no significant difference in the scale sub-dimensions according to the age variable. Güngör et al. (2022) revealed that there was no significant difference between the sportsmanship orientations of the participants and the gender variable in their study.

It was seen that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the research group in terms of the "department of study" variable. It was seen that the mean score of the athlete students studying in the Department of Recreation was higher than the athletes studying in the Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching, and the mean score of the CAAS was higher in the athletes studying in the Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching than the athlete students studying in the Department of Recreation. This situation can be explained by the fact that recreation students have more developed empathy skills and thus they can be more sensitive to their competitors and management. Koçyiğit and

Özel (2018), with their research on examining the relationship between socialization and empathy tendency in the context of recreational activities, concluded that people contribute to the increase of their empathic tendencies by socializing through recreational activities and easily experience empathy with other people. When the literature is reviewed, Balçıkanlı and Yıldıran (2011) conducted a study on the sportsmanship orientations and empathic tendency levels of professional football players and concluded that as the empathy skills of professional football players improve, their level of exhibiting sportsmanlike behaviors increases in the same way. It is seen that the mean score in the sub-dimension of respect for rules and management of the MSOS differs statistically significantly according to the department of study. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the recreation department was higher than the athlete students studying in the physical education and sports teaching department. It is seen that the mean score in the respect for opponent sub-dimension of the MSOS differed statistically significantly according to the department of study. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the recreation department was higher than the athlete students studying in the coaching education department. If a general evaluation is made according to the department variable; The fact that the level of exhibiting fair play appropriate behaviors of the students of the recreation department is so high can be explained by the fact that the athlete background of the students accepted to the recreation department of Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University Faculty of Sports Sciences, where the study was conducted, is stronger than the students studying in other departments. In addition, based on the education program of the recreation department students, it can be explained by the fact that the communication and organization skills of these students are more developed than the students studying in other departments, and therefore their ability to work in cooperation and their ability to empathize are more developed.

When the research was analyzed according to the class variable, it was seen that the mean score in the adaptation to social norms sub-dimension of the MSOS differed statistically significantly according to the class variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the 3rd class was higher than the athlete students studying in the 2nd class. This may indicate that the tendency of student athletes studying at the faculty of sport sciences to exhibit behaviors appropriate to sport culture has increased over time. It is seen that the mean score in the respect for opponent sub-dimension of the MSOS also differed statistically significantly according to the class variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was observed that the average score of the athlete students studying in the 1st class was higher than the athlete students studying in the 3rd class. When the literature is examined, different studies that are in parallel with our study are also found. Güllü (2018), in his study on the coach-athlete relationship and sportsmanship orientations of athletes, concluded that the sportsmanship tendencies of first-year students were higher than the others. Apart from this, Çetinöz et al. (2020) concluded that there was an increase in the level of sportsmanship as age and class increased in their study examining the sportsmanship levels of university students. It is seen that the mean score in the aggression sub-dimension of the CAAS differs statistically significantly according to the class variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant

difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students studying in the 1st class was higher than the athlete students studying in the 3rd class. This situation can be interpreted as that the level of aggression in sports decreased over time with the courses taken by the students of the faculty of sport sciences who are new to the university and the spirit of sportsmanship created by the faculty.

It was seen that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the research group in terms of "sport branch" variable. It was seen that the mean score of the athlete students interested in individual sports was higher than the athletes interested in team sports and the mean score of the CAAS was higher in the athletes interested in team sports than the athlete students interested in individual sports. When the empathy ability of athletes interested in individual sports is examined in the literature, there are also studies in which there is no statistically significant difference in sportsmanship orientations between individual sports and team sports. Yalçın et al. (2020), in their study on examining the sportsmanship orientations of university students engaged in amateur sports, found no statistically significant difference in sportsmanship orientations between individual sports and team sports, but it was concluded that athletes interested in individual sports had higher averages in other dimensions except for the sub-dimension of respect for opponent than athletes interested in team sports. Tutkun et al. (2010) found a statistically significant difference between the general aggression mean scores of individual and team athletes in their study in which they evaluated the aggression levels of athletes who played team sports and individual sports. They concluded that individual sports athletes had higher levels of aggression than team sports athletes.

It is seen that the mean score in the respect for rules and management sub-dimension of the MSOS differs statistically significantly according to the sport branch variable. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students interested in individual sports was higher than the athlete students interested in team sports. The correct establishment of interpersonal communication in terms of team sports provides positive criticism and continuous interaction within the team. In this direction, one of the most important conditions for establishing positive communication is to have the ability to empathize (Sortullu, 2011). Team unity is the power created by this interaction (Moralı, 1997). If correct communication and empathy skills are developed within the team, the ability to see the opponent not as an enemy but as a part of the game can also be developed. In this context, it can be said that as empathy skills improve, the dynamics of the group will change and the behaviors of student athletes interested in team sports towards fair play will increase and the levels of aggression and anger in sports will decrease. In addition, there are also studies in the literature showing that there is no significant difference between sports branches and sportsmanship orientations. Güngör et al. (2022) found that there was no significant difference between students' sports branches and sportsmanship orientations in their study on athletic students with a focus on self-esteem and sportsmanship orientation.

When the mean scores of the research group on the CAAS were examined, it was seen that there was a statistically significant difference according to the variable "duration of interest in the branch". It is seen that the mean score in the aggression sub-dimension of the CAAS differs statistically significantly according to the duration of interest in the branch. In the sub-dimension where a significant difference was found, it was seen that the average score of the athlete students who have been doing sports between 1-3 years is lower than the athlete students

who have been doing sports for 10 years or more. It was seen that students who just started to do sports had higher levels of sportsmanship orientation than those who had been doing sports for longer years. The reason for this can be thought to be that the athlete students attach importance to obeying the rules of the sports branch they are interested in in line with their ideals in the first time, but in the following years, the pressure they feel on them to achieve success, interest, economic gain and the effect of the ambition to win result in the loss of sportsmanship understanding over time. Güllü (2018), in his study on the coach-athlete relationship and sportsmanship orientations of athletes, concluded that the sportsmanship orientations of the participants with less time of interest in the branch (1-5 years) were higher than the participants with more time of interest in the branch in the sub-dimensions of compliance with social norms, respect for rules and management, and respect for the opponent. In addition, Şahin and Yıldırım (2023) examined the sportsmanship levels of hockey athletes and concluded that there was no significant difference between the sportsmanship level sub-dimensions of the participant athletes according to the sport year variable. Considering the studies of Cin and Yılmaz (2022) and Güvendi and Keskin (2020), it is seen that there are statistical differences in anger and aggression levels considering the sport year variable. The findings obtained from the research are parallel to our current study. However, it is also possible to come across studies in which it is seen that anger and aggression levels in athletes do not differ according to sports age. Şahinler and Ulukan (2020) did not find a statistically significant difference between the levels of aggression and the year of doing sports in their study in which they examined the aggression levels of university students doing sports.

When the mean scores of the research group were examined, there was no statistically significant difference according to the variable of "receiving fair play education". This situation can be explained by the fact that the athlete students who make up the research group are students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences and therefore, they are being educated in a faculty that aims to train highly qualified physical education and sports teachers, coaches, recreation instructors and sports managers who are trained in accordance with sports ethics, have contemporary and universal values, and can reflect the knowledge and skills they have gained into practice. Çetinöz et al. (2020), in their study in which they examined the sportsmanship levels of university students, concluded that the average scores of the students studying at the Faculty of Sports Sciences (SBF) were higher both in the multidimensional sportsmanship orientation scale and in the sub-dimensions of the related scale according to the school variable in which the participants studied.

As a result, it was seen that there was a significant negative relationship between the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientation levels of student athletes and their levels of Aggression and Anger in Sport. Accordingly, it can be said that as the fair play behaviors of student athletes increase, their levels of aggression and anger in sports decrease. In this context, the increase in fair play-oriented behaviors of athletes, all sports people who train athletes, coaches, employees of sports clubs and all stakeholders of sports is important in terms of decreasing the verbal and physical behaviors that we often encounter in the media and in our society, which include anger and aggression.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The research revealed the results showing the effect of fair play behaviors of student athletes studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences on the levels of aggression and anger in sports. In order for this study to serve the purpose, the following suggestions can be made according to the results obtained from the research:

- Fair play trainings for athletes interested in team sports can be increased. The understanding of fair play should be given to all/other stakeholders of sports (athletes, coaches, managers) in all clubs, especially in amateur sports clubs. Thus, the levels of aggression and anger in sports caused by disrespect and lack of understanding in sports can be reduced.

- Efforts can be made to provide fair play education from an early age, and thus, physical education classes can be used to teach this culture, thus providing educational environments that emphasize that the concept of fair play is not only limited to sports but also a way of life.

- It is recommended that the Faculties of Sports Sciences organize sportive activities that will keep the spirit of fair play alive and spread the fair play culture.

- It is recommended that advertisements aimed at improving the moral perspectives of athletes and all stakeholders of sports should take place more frequently in public.

- This study was conducted with student athletes who were studying at the Faculty of Sports Sciences and thus grew up in sports culture. In order to see the effect of the fair play courses and trainings given in the Faculties of Sports Sciences on the fair play behaviors of the students, it is recommended that future studies be conducted as a comparison study between the athlete students studying in the Faculty of Sports Sciences and the athlete students studying in different faculties.

- In the context of this study, the relationship between the behaviors of other stakeholders of sport towards fair play and the levels of aggression and anger in sport can be examined. The relationship between the attitudes of sports people who train athletes and the attitudes of their athletes in this context can be examined.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest in our study.

Declaration of Contribution Rate of Investigators: Research design was carried out by YY, ÖK; Statistical analysis by YY; Preparation of the manuscript by YY, ÖK; Data collection by ÖK.

Information on Ethics Committee Approval:

Board Name: Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University Social and Humanities Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee

Date: 27/04/2022

Number/Decision No: 2022/11

REFERENCES

Acet, M. (2005). *Aggression and violence in sport*. Morpa. [Turkish]

Afyon, Y., & Metin, S. (2015). The examıne of the aggressıveness level of super amateur football players in Mugla. *Journal of Sports and Performance Researches, 6*(1), 5-11. https://doi.org/10.17155/spd.05537. [Turkish]

Atasoy, B., & Öztürk-Kuter, F. (2005). Globalization and sports. *Journal of Uludağ Unıversity Faculty of Education, 18*(1), 11-22. [Turkish]

Balçıkanlı, G. S., & Yıldıran, İ. (2011). Sportspersonship orientation and empathic dispositions of professional soccer players. *Spormetre The Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, *9*(2), 49-56. https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000199. [Turkish]

Baykan, E. (2018). *Determination of continuous anger levels and examination of related factors between y and z generations taekwondo athletes*. Master Thesis, Yozgat Bozok University, Graduate School of Health Sciences,Yozgat. [Turkish]

Bishop, P. (2017). *Measurement and Evaluation in Physical Activity Applications: Exercise Science, Physical Education, Coaching, Athletic Training & Health*. Routledge.

Bozkurt, B. (2017). *Evaluation of the anger controls of the individual and team sportsmen in the young categories.* Yüksek lisans tezi. Haliç University, Graduate School of Health Sciences, İstanbul. [Turkish]

Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2001). *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS release 10 for Windows.* Routledge Press.

Cin, H., Yılmaz, B. H., & Ektirici, A. (2022). The Investigation of anger and aggression perception of athletes in terms of various variables. *CBU Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, *17*(2), 230-243. https://doi.org/10.33459/cbubesbd.1141428. [Turkish]

Cresswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.*, (*2nd Edt.).* Pearson Education.

Çetinöz, F., Yurtcu, E., & Üstgörül, Y. E. (2020). Investigation of the sportsmanship levels of university students. *Inonu University, Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, *7*(3), 1-13. [Turkish]

Dervent, F. (2007). *Determination of aggresiveness level of high school students according to their sport participation level.* Master Thesis, Gazi University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara. [Turkish]

Dilek, A. N., & İmamoğlu, O. (2020). Investigation of continuous anger-anger expression style status in sports education students. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies, 6*(2), 566-575. [Turkish]

Doğan, O. (2007). *Sport psychology*. Nobel. [Turkish]

Efek, E., & Yiğiter, K. (2022). Sport, stress and sportsmanship. *Yalova University Journal of Social Sciences*, *12*(1), 109-130. [Turkish]

Eitzen, D. S. (2006). *Fair and foul: Beyond the myths and paradoxes of sport.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education (7th ed.).* McGraw-Hill.

Gedik, M. R. (2023). The Aggression and anger levels of martial athletes: An Example of Yalova. *Yalova University Journal of Sports Sciences, 2*(2), 29-35. [Turkish]

George. D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A Simple guide and reference. (10. Baskı.)*. Pearson.

Gül, C., & Bingöl, Ş. (2022). Examination of sportsmanship perception of sports high school students. *Hakkari Review, 6*(2), 46-58. https://doi.org/10.31457/hr.1164803. [Turkish]

Güllü, S. (2018). A Reseach on coach-athlete relationship and sportsmanship orientation of the athletes. *Spormetre The Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, *16*(4), 190-204. https://doi.org/10.33689/spormetre.482295. [Turkish]

Güngör, N. B., Kurtipek, S., & Yenel, F. (2022). A Study on athlete students with a focus on self-esteem and sportsmanship orientation. *Journal of Global Sport and Education Research, 5*(2), 118-127. https://doi.org/10.55142/jogser.1189526. [Turkish]

Gürbüz, B., Kural, S., & Özbek, O. (2019). Competitive aggressiveness and anger scale: Validity and reliability study. *Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 6*(2), 206-217. [Turkish]

Gürpınar, G., & Kurşun, S. (2013). Sportspersonship orientations of basketball and soccer players *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, *III* (1), 171-176. http://dx.doi.org/10.13114/MJH/20131660. [Turkish]

Güvendi, B., & Keskin, B. (2020). Examination of competitive aggression and anger behaviors according to the perception of unethical behavior of athletes from their coaches. *Gaziantep University Journal of Sport Science*, *5*(2), 134-145. https://doi.org/10.31680/gaunjss.718565. [Turkish]

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2006). *The new man and people.* Evrim. [Turkish]

Karakuzulu, E. (2018). *Anayzing the aggression level of athletes who do martial arts and defense sports and also the ones who do other personel sport.* Master Thesis, Gaziantep University Graduate School of Health Science. [Turkish]

Karasar, N. (2008). *Scientific research method*. Nobel. [Turkish]

Keating, J. W. (1964). Sportsmanship as a moral category. *Ethics*, *75*(1), 25-35.

Kılcıgil, E. (1998). *Social environment sports relations (Theory and an Application on Elite Athletes)*. Bağırgan. [Turkish]

Koçyiğit, M., & Özel, G. (2018). The Relationship between socialization and empathy tendency in the context of recreational activities: a research on university students. *The Journal of Turkish Sport Science*, *1*(2), 49-57. [Turkish]

Kotan, R. (2004). *Profesyonel futbol takım taraftarlarının fair play anlayışları üzerine bir araştırma (Trabzon İl Örneği).* Master Thesis, Gazi University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara. [Turkish]

Loland, S., & McNamee, M. (2000). Fair play and the ethos of sports: An Eclectic philosophical framework. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, *27*(1), 63-80.

Maxwell, J. P., & Moores, E. (2007). The development of a short scale measuring aggressiveness and anger in competitive athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 8*(2), 179-193.

Mowlaie, M., Besharat, M., Pourbohlool, S., & Azizi, L. (2011). The Mediation effects of self-confidence and sport self-efficacy on the relationship between dimensions of anger and anger control with sport performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 30,* 138 – 142.

Özdamar, K. (2002). *Statistical data analysis with package programs-1.* (4. Edition). Kaan. [Turkish]

Pehlivan, Z., Konukman, F. (2004). Sport in schools for improving the concept; Fair-play. *Spormetre The Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 2*(2), 49-53 https://doi.org/10.1501/Sporm_0000000028. [Turkish]

Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis: the use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research.* Sage.

Sakallı, N. (2001). *Social impacts: Who influences whom and how.* İmge. [Turkish]

Sezen-Balçıkanlı, G. (2010). The Turkish adaptation of multidimensıonal sportspersonship orientation scale-msos: a reliabibiliy and validity study. *Gazi Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences,15*(1),1-10. [Turkish]

Shields, D. L., LaVoi, N. M., Bredemeier, D. L., & Power, F. C. (2007). Predictors of poor sportpersonship in youth sports: Personal attitudes and social influences. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *29,* 747–762.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A Study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(4), 1059-1069. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001.

Şahin, M. (1997). *Sports ethics and problems.* Evrensel. [Turkish]

Şahin, M. (2022). Examination of physical activity and emotional status of university students. *International Journal of Sport Exercise and Training Sciences - IJSETS, 8*(2), 45-55. https://doi.org/10.18826/useeabd.1093887 [Turkish]

Şahin, M. O., & Yıldırım, A. (2023). Investigation of hockey athletes' sportsmaning levels. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 17*(1), 26-35. [Turkish]

Şahinler, Y., & Ulukan, M. (2020). Investigation of aggression levels of university students doing sports. *International Sport Science Student Studies, 2*(1), 16-24. [Turkish]

Şavran, G. T. (Ed). (2009). *Research methods and techniques in sociology.* Anadolu University Publishing. [Turkish]

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics (6th Ed.).* Pearson Education.

Tanrıverdi, H. (2012). Sports ethics and violence. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, *5*(8),1071-1093. [Turkish]

Teke, E. (2018). *An investigtion of the effect of athletes' personality traits on fair-play behaviors.* Master Thesis, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Muğla. [Turkish]

Tiryaki, G. (1981). *Doping. 19 Mayıs Youth and Sports Academy graduation thesis.* [Turkish]

Tiryaki, Ş. (2000). *Sport psychology, concepts, theories and practice.* Eylül. [Turkish]

Topan, A. (2011). *Examination of the relationship between club experience and the understanding of fair play of secondary education students who participate in interscholastic soccer matches.* Master Thesis, Gazi University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara. [Turkish]

Tsai, E., & Fung, L. (2005). Sportspersonship in youth basketball and volleyball players. *Athletic Insight*, *7*(2), 37-46

Tutkun, E., Çobanoğlu-Güner, B., Ağaoğlu, S. A., & Soslu, R. (2010). Evaluation of aggression levels of individuals partıcıpatıng in team and individual sports. *Journal of Sports and Performance Researches, 1*(1), 23-29. https://doi.org/10.17155/spd.30525 [Turkish]

Türk Dil Kurumu. (t.y.). Spor. Current Turkish dictionary. https://sozluk.gov.tr/ Access Date: 22.04.2022.

Türkçapar, Ü., & Yasul, Y. (2021). Analysis of Individual and Team Sports Students in Unıversity School Teams According to Different Variables. *MANAS Journal of Social Studies, 10*(3), 1923-1931. https://doi.org/10.33206/mjss.891966 [Turkish]

Uluç, E. A. (2022). Examination of the effect of sports character on aggression and anger in Karate athletes. *Gümüşhane University Journal of Health Sciences, 11*(4), 1559-1568. https://doi.org/10.37989/gumussagbil.1181544. [Turkish]

Ulukan, H., Ulukan, M., & Esenkaya, A. (2021). Investigation sportsman behaviors and attitudes towards sports of athletes. *Bilge International Journal of Social Research*, *5*(2), 169-180. [Turkish]

Vallerand, R., Briere, N. M., Blanchard, C., & Provencher, P. (1997). Development and validation of the multidimensional sportspersonship orientations scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 19*(2), 197-206.

Yalçın, Y. G., Tek, T., & Çetin, M. Ç. (2020). Examine the sportsmanship orientation of university students who play sports as amateurs. *The Journal of Turkish Sport Science, 3*(1), 29-34. [Turkish]

Yazar, A. M., Süleymanoğulları, M., & Bayraktar, G. (2022). Sportspersonship orientations of karate kumite athletes. *International Sport Science Student Studies*, *4*(2), 51-59. [Turkish]

Yetim A. (2005). *Sociology and sport.* Morpa. [Turkish]

Yıldıran, İ. (2004*).* Fair play: Concept, view in Turkey and improvıng perspectives. *Gazi Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 9*(4), 3-16*.* [Turkish]

Yıldıran, İ. (2005). The role of physıcal education in fair play *Gazi Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences,10*(1), 3-16. [Turkish]

Yücel, S., Atalay, A., & Gürkan, A. (2015). Factors affecting violence and aggression in sports. *International Journal of Psychiatry and Psychological Researches*, *2*(2), 28-90. [Turkish]