

The Relationship Between Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviors and Personality Traits in Team Athletes*

Selman ÇUTUK**

Zülbiye KAÇAY***

Zeynep AKKUŞ ÇUTUK****

Abstract. The aim of this study was to investigate the relationships between personality traits and prosocial and antisocial behaviors displayed in team athletes. In this respect, the data was collected from a total of 445 (61 females and 384 males) participants engaged in team sports. The relational screening model was used in the study. The Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sports Scale, Five Factor Personality Inventory and Personal Information Form prepared by the researcher were used to collect data. Descriptive statistics, and Pearson Correlation Coefficient were used in the analysis. As a result of the analysis it was determined that there was a positive and a significant relationship between prosocial behavior-team (PT), prosocial behavior-opponent (PO) and extroversion, responsibility and openness sub-dimensions. However, significant negative difference was determined between prosocial behavior-team, prosocial behavior-opponent (PO) and neuroticism. Accordingly, as prosocial behaviors of team athletes increase, the neuroticism level of the athletes decreases. A negative significant relationship was determined between the scores obtained from the antisocial behavior-team (AT) and antisocial behavior-opponent (AO) and the sub-dimensions of consistency and responsibility. There was a significant positive correlation between the neuroticism sub-dimension. There was no statistically significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of extraversion and openness.

Keywords: Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior, Responsibility, 5 Factor Personality Traits

* The ethics committee approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Rectorate of Nişantaşı University, dated 23/11/2020 and numbered 2020/21.

** Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7802-2440>, Lecturer, Nişantaşı University, Turkey, selmancutuk@gmail.com

*** Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9794-0888>, Dr., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey, zzkacay@gmail.com

**** Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8364-4431>, Assist. Prof. Dr., Trakya University, Turkey, zeynepdr1001@hotmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Each individual is different in terms of personal characteristics as well as physical. Personality, a concept that forms the basis of this difference, can be expressed as the sum of the social, mental, moral and physical characteristics that separate the individual from others and make it their own (Morris, 2002). On the other hand, it is a miscellaneous concept related to person, which includes the features such as attitude, behavior, thought style, lifestyle, skills, and self-expression style that used to define him (Kızmaz, 2004: 5). It has been tried to be expressed in many ways as it has a wide coverage feature. Sometimes, in daily conversations, phrases such as " have a strong personality ", " a respected personality owner ", " a weak personality " or " a characterless" are used. Sometimes, while defining one, individual features are used; evaluations such as social, asocial, cute, successful, hardworking, honest and reliable are described as personality traits (Erdoğan, 1997). Factors such as education, heredity, environmental factors, tradition and custom are among the factors that contribute to the self-formation of the individual (Eren, 2000: 67). Therefore, in order to talk about personality traits, the relationship of the individual with the environment should be considered (Kızmaz, 2004: 5). In this context, personality can be defined as a set of features that are open to development and change as a result of interaction with the environment, making the individual unique and distinguishing it from everyone.

Also the physical features, intelligence, abilities, temperament, character, social characteristics and the concept of "self" that the individual developed are the factors that contributes to the formation of the personality (Kuru & Baştuğ, 2008).

On the other hand, "Sport has been defined as all forms of physical activity which, through casual or organized participation, aim at expressing or improving physical fitness and mental well-being, forming social relationships or obtaining results in competition at all levels" (The European sport charter, Article 2, 2001). The aim of the sport is forming a young, dynamic and healthy generations (Kaçay, 2019:3). In this context, it has a positive effect on the personality of the individuals and it helps people to understand, express and develop their own personality. Also, by strengthening the will, sport helps to develop self-confidence and mature personality. It is to positively affect individuals' beliefs that the events they experience and the things happening around them are under their control and that they can turn their lives in the direction they want (Özen, Özsoy & Yıldız, 2018). It activates the hidden abilities and creative aspects of the person and enables physical and social development as well as physical development (Selçuk ve Aydos, 1998:32). Sports activity's effects on personality vary according to sports branches. Various scientists, thinkers, sports moralists generalize these effects as below:

1. Sport shapes the character.
2. Team sports teaches cooperation.
3. Individual sports develop personal discipline.
4. Sport teaches manly struggle.

5. Freedom and non-compulsory physical education facilitates the socialization process of the athlete by developing student-instructor relations.
6. Training in extreme sports increase courage.
7. Some sports have a high communication value. This is more evident especially in sports branches where there is bodily contact.
8. Sports teaches to evacuate the aggression motives in a natural way and in accordance with social rules (Başer, 1986; Koruç & Bayar, 1989).

Prosocial behaviors are generally altruistic behaviors that are exhibited to increase the accepted interpersonal harmony in the society such as empathy, cooperation, sharing, helping those in a bad situation, tolerance, respect, sense of responsibility, and kindness (Jackson & Tisak, 2001; Ma, 2005). Aggressive behaviors have entered all areas of life and their incidence has increased considerably, especially among individuals interested in sports. The internal conflicts, fears and worries of individuals who cannot find a place in the society, who cannot realize themselves or who have difficulty in expressing themselves and who cannot do what they want to do lead them to exhibit aggressive behaviors (Nergiz, 2018: 8-9). Kağıtçıbaşı (2006) stated that any behavior that intends to harm consciously can be described as aggressive behavior.

Prosocial and aggressive behaviors are two different side of the individual behaviors. Considering the effects of sport on personality, it is thought that the level of exhibiting prosocial behaviors is more likely in team athletes depending on the characteristics of the sport.

Aggression is a behavior intended to give harm to another person (Krahé, 2013). According to Derwent, (2007) in order to accept the behavior as aggressive, it should be actual, directed to a living being and intended to give harm. So aggression can be defined as a planned ongoing trend with emotional and actual goals, such as consciously harming the social environment, controlling it, and putting pressure on it (Nergiz, 2018).

On the other side, the intention in prosocial behavior is to benefit another person (Eisenberg et al., 2015). Many social behaviors can be accepted as a prosocial such as obeying the rules, donating or volunteering (Baumeister & Bushman, 2007). People generally try to behave pro-socially in a society because it increases the self-image of a person (Ariely et al., 2009). In sports, it can motivate the athletes by providing a target.

According to some researchers, prosocial behaviors are caused by genetic structure (Grusec, 2002; Hastings, Zahn-Waxler & McShane, 2005), while to others are both genetic and personality (Hay, 2009) or learned by imitation (Clarke, 2004, Scott & Seglow, 2007). Also it is claimed that sports affect personality and personality affects both sports type and success in sports (İkizler & Karagözoğlu, 1997: 93-95). In this context, sports can be expressed as an activity that shapes personality, socializes the individual, increases harmony, contributes to the development of talents and abilities, makes it easier for the individual to control himself and his emotions, and gives the habit of following the rules. There are studies showing that these features are effective on individuals, even if it is performed recreatively (Yıldız & Bostancı, 2016). In some

studies, this inference is supported. Kapan (2001); Yılmaz (1989) revealed that individuals who do sports have a more extroverted, harmonious and strong personality. Team athletes were also found to be more extrovert than those who do individual sports (Geron, 1982 transferred by Sönmez, 1995).

One of the most important factors determining the behavior of individuals is personality traits. Determination of personality traits will enable the determination of factors related to positive social and aggressive behaviors shown by team athletes, determination of individual differences of athletes and gaining awareness, so that athletes are better known. This will also enable various measures to be taken in the sports environment. In this context; It is thought that determining whether there is a relationship between positive social and aggressive behaviors shown in team athletes and personality traits, which has not been investigated in our country, will contribute to the literature.

2. METHOD

Study group

This research was carried out with a total of 445 participants, 61 (13.7%) female and 384 (86.3%) male, who were determined by the convenience sampling among individuals engaged in team sports. Participants are between the ages of 18-26 (mean = 21.84, standard deviation = 2.57). It has been determined that the duration of the participants to have a sports license varies between 1-16 years (mean = 11.34, standard deviation = 3.24). 277 (62.2%) of the athletes participating in the research are engaged in football, 72 (16.1) volleyball, 81 (18.2) basketball and 15 (3.3%) other sports. When the education level of the participants was examined, it was determined that 281 (63.1) were high school graduates, 124 (27.9%) were college graduates, 21 (4.7%) were graduate and above, and 19 (4.3%) were primary education graduates.

Research Model

In this study, the relational screening model was used to determine whether there was a change among variables or the degree of this change. In the aforementioned model, the variables to be examined are given separate symbols, as in the singular hatch. However, this symbolization (valuing, measuring) process must be done in a way that allows a relational analysis (Karasar, 1995: 81).

Data Collection Tools

In the study, the Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sports Scale, Five Factor Personality Inventory and Personal Information Form prepared by the researcher were used.

Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale - (PABSS)

The scale was developed by Kavussanu and Boardley (2009) to determine the level of prosocial and antisocial behaviors in sports. It was adapted to Turkish by Balçıklanlı

(2013). The scale is 5-point Likert type and consists of 20 items. The scale has 4 sub-dimensions: prosocial behavior-team (PT) and prosocial behavior-competitor (PR), antisocial behavior-team (AT) and antisocial behavior-opponent (AR). The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 20, and the highest score is 100. The internal consistency coefficients of the scale items are between .74 and .86 for all dimensions of the original scale and between .70 and .75 in the scale adapted to Turkish. In this study, it was determined that the Cronbach alpha number for each sub-dimension of the scale was between .70 and .84.

Five Factor Personality Inventory

The scale was developed by Benet-Martinez and John (1998) in order to measure personality traits. The scale is a self-report style, 5-point Likert type (1-Never agree, 5-Strongly agree), 44-items measurement tool. The scale consists of five sub-dimensions: extraversion, neuroticism, compatibility, responsibility, and openness to experience. The Turkish version of the scale, in a study on personality traits of participants of 56 countries (Schmitt, Blush, McCrae et al., 2007) made by Sümer and Sümer (2005) and reliability coefficients was determined between .64 and .77 related to the subscales. In various studies where the scale was used, the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions ranged from .67 to .83 (Ülke, 2006), .60 to .73 (Basım, Çetin & Tabak, 2009), and .77 to .81 (Ulu & Tezer, 2010). In the analyzes conducted within the scope of this research, it was determined that the Cronbach Alpha value of the sub-dimensions of the scale was between .66 and .79.

Personal Information Form

The form prepared by the researcher consists of questions about the athletes' gender, age, which team sport they are engaged in, how many years they have had an athlete license and their educational status.

Data Collection and Analysis

The ethics committee approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Rectorate of Nişantaşı University, dated 23/11/2020 and numbered 2020/21. The data was collected by the researchers via face to face and online survey technique. In the application process, the forms that were filled incompletely and carelessly were determined and these forms were removed from the study after the application. The data obtained in the research were analyzed by using SPSS 22.00 for Windows package program. Whether the variables show normal distribution or not was determined according to their kurtosis and skewness values, and the results obtained are presented in Table 1. It was determined that these values were within the required value range for normal distribution. Then, T-Test, One Way Analysis of Variance (One Way Anova) and Pearson Correlation Coefficient were used. $\alpha=0.05$ was chosen for the level of significance.

3. FINDINGS

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics Relating to Variables

	Descriptive Statistics				
	Mean (SD)	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Prosocial behavior-team (PT)	16.54(2.11)	11	20	-.19	-.48
Prosocial behavior-opponent (PO)	10.70(2.87)	3	15	-.67	.01
Antisocial behavior-team (AT)	10.21(2.38)	5	21	.84	.72
Antisocial behavior-opponent (AO)	14.57(4.36)	8	28	.75	.05
Extroversion	28.09(4.58)	17	40	.06	-.36
Compatibility	20.23(2.69)	12	25	-.34	-.31
Responsibility	35.13(4.57)	23	45	-.16	-.09
Neuroticism	16.09(3.90)	6	28	.20	-.31
Openness	34.52(4.93)	21	45	-.04	-.48

According to Table 1, whether the variables show a normal distribution or not was examined using the skewness and kurtosis values. The values obtained showed that there was no significant problem in the normal distribution of the data obtained from the scales (George & Mallery, 2010; Finney & DiStefano, 2006; Huck, 2012; Kim, 2013).

Table 2

The Relationship Between Scores Obtained from Prosocial Behavior-Team (PT) Sub-Scale and Five-Factor Personality Inventory

	Extraversion	Compatibility	Responsibility	Neuroticism	Openness
Prosocial Behavior-Team (PT)	r .269**	.072	.185**	-.149**	.242**
	p .000	.130	.000	.002	.000
	N 445	445	445	445	445

**p<0.01

When Table 2 was examined, it was determined that there was a positive and a significant relationship between prosocial behavior-team (PT) and extraversion ($r = .269, p < 0.01$), responsibility ($r = .185, p < 0.01$), and openness sub-dimensions ($r = .242, p < 0.01$). However, it was found that there was a significant and negative correlation with the neuroticism sub-dimension ($r = -.149, p < 0.01$). No significant relationship was determined between prosocial behavior-team (PT) and compatibility sub-dimension ($p > 0.01$).

Table 3

The Relationship Between Scores Obtained from Prosocial Behavior–Opponent (PO) Sub-Scale and Five-Factor Personality Inventory

		Extraversion	Compatibility	Responsibility	Neuroticism	Openness
Prosocial Behavior-Opponent (PT)	r	.170**	.194**	.254**	-.188**	.207**
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	445	445	445	445	445

* $p < 0.01$

When Table 3 was examined, it can be stated that there was a positive, significant correlations between prosocial behavior-opponent (PO) and extraversion ($r = .170, p < 0.01$), compatibility ($r = .194, p < 0.01$), responsibility ($r = .254, p < 0.01$), and openness ($r = .207, p < 0.01$), while there were significant negative correlations between the sub-dimensions of neuroticism ($r = -.188, p < 0.01$).

Table 4

The Relationship Between Scores Obtained from Antisocial Behavior-Team (AT) Sub-Scale and Five-Factor Personality Inventory

		Extraversion	Compatibility	Responsibility	Neuroticism	Openness
Antisocial Behavior-Team (AT)	r	-.078	-.404**	-.335**	.230**	-.088
	p	.103	.000	.000	.000	.066
	N	445	445	445	445	445

** $p < 0.01$

When Table 4 was examined, it can be said that there were negative significant relationships between the scores obtained from the antisocial behavior-team (AT)

subscale and the sub-dimensions of compatibility ($r = -.404$, $p < 0.01$) and responsibility ($r = -.335$, $p < 0.01$). There was a significant positive correlation between the neuroticism sub-dimension ($r = .230$, $p < 0.01$). There was no statistically significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of extraversion and openness ($p > 0.01$).

Table 5

The Relationship Between Scores Obtained from Antisocial Behavior-Opponent (AR) Sub-Scale and Five-Factor Personality Inventory

		Extraversion	Compatibility	Responsibility	Neuroticism	Openness
Antisocial	r	-.040	-.349**	-.197**	.181**	-.081
Behavior-Opponent (AO)	p	.410	.000	.000	.000	.060
	N	445	445	445	445	445

* $p < 0.01$

According to Table 5, there were negative significant relationships between the scores from the antisocial behavior-opponent (AO) subscale and the compatibility ($r = -.349$, $p < 0.01$) and responsibility ($r = -.197$, $p < 0.01$) sub-dimensions. There was a significant positive correlation between the neuroticism sub-dimension ($r = .181$, $p < 0.01$). There was no statistically significant relationship between the subscales of extraversion and openness ($p > 0.01$).

4. RESULTS, DISCUSSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This study was carried out to determine whether there was a relationship between personality traits and prosocial and aggressive behaviors displayed in team athletes. In this respect the data was collected from a total of 481 (64 females and 417 males) participants engaged in team sports.

According to the descriptive statistics the variables showed a normal distribution. The results showed that there was a positive and a significant relationship between prosocial behavior-team (PT), prosocial behavior-opponent (PO) and extroversion, responsibility and openness sub-dimensions. However, significant negative difference was determined between prosocial behavior-team, prosocial behavior-opponent (PO) and neuroticism. Accordingly, as prosocial behaviors of team athletes increase, the neuroticism level of the athletes decreases. A negative significant difference was determined between the scores obtained from the antisocial behavior-team (AT) and antisocial behavior-opponent (AO) and the sub-dimensions of consistency and responsibility. There was a significant positive correlation between the neuroticism sub-dimension. There was no

statistically significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of extraversion and openness.

According to the literature, it was stated that individuals who were accepted by their peers or who had close relationships had higher levels of prosocial behavior (Kumru et al., 2004; Wentzell & McNamara, 1999). In addition, the relationship between positive social behaviors and aggression is thought to be negative (Carlo et al., 2003). Nergiz, (2018), found that there was a positive significant difference between prosocial behaviors of high school students who do sports and those who do not and attitudes towards school, a negative relationship between the levels of aggression. In the study of Türkay, (2019). It has been determined that professional and amateur football players' prosocial behaviors increase and antisocial behavior levels decrease as their social identity levels increase in sports.

In the literature (Aktaş & Güvenç, 2006; Demirel & Buğdaycı, 2019; Gözün-Kahraman & Kurt, 2013; Türkay, 2019), the relationship of prosocial and aggressive behaviors with various variables has generally been examined according to demographic characteristics. Different from the literature, the relationship between prosocial and aggressive behaviors and personality traits was investigated in this study.

As a result, it is possible to say that as the extroversion, responsibility and openness levels of team athletes increase, their level of displaying prosocial behavior also increases. For this reason, doing sports that reinforce personality traits can be stated to positively contribute to the display of prosocial behaviors and can reduce aggressive behaviors.

There is that limitation of the study is that the data from the participants were acquired by self-reporting data collection tools. For this reason, the difficulties of self-reporting measures should not be overlooked in the interpretation of the findings.

References

- Aktaş, V., & Güvenç, G. B. (2006). Kız ve erkek ergenlerde saldırgan ve olumlu sosyal davranışlar ile yaş, ilişkisel bağlam ve kişiler arası duyarlılık arasındaki ilişkiler [Relationships between aggressive and positive social behaviors and age, relational context, and interpersonal sensitivity in male and female adolescents]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(2), 233-264.
- Ariely, D., Bracha, A., & Meier, S. (2009). Doing good or doing well? Image motivation and monetary incentives in behaving prosocially. *The American Economic Review*, 99(1), 544-555.
- Balcıkanlı, G.S. (2013). The Turkish Adaptation of the Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS). *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(18), 271-276.
- Basım, H.N, Çetin, F., & Tabak, A. (2009). Beş faktör kişilik özelliklerinin kişilerarası çatışma çözme yaklaşımlarıyla ilişkisi [The relationship between five factor personality traits and interpersonal conflict resolution approaches]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 24(63), 20-34.

- Başer, E. (1986). *Uygulamalı spor psikolojisi [Applied sports psychology]*. Ankara: B.T.G.M. Yayınları.
- Baumeister, R.F., & Bushman, B.J. (2007). *Social psychology and human nature*. Cengage Learning. p. 254. ISBN 9780495116332.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). Los cinco grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait multimethod analyses of the big five in Spanish and English. *American Psychological Association*, 75(3), 729-750.
- Carlo, G., Hausmann, A., Christiansen, S., & Randall, B. A. (2003). Sociocognitive and behavioral correlates of a measure of prosocial tendencies for adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 23(1), 107-134.
- Clarke, J. (2004). The sociology of childhood. In D. Wyse (Ed.), *Childhood studies and introduction*. Chapter 12. USA: Blackwell Publishing LTD Council of Europe.
- Demirel, H., & Buğdaycı, S. (2019). Spor yapan ve yapmayan üniversite öğrencilerinin olumlu sosyal davranış eğilimlerinin incelenmesi [Examining the positive social behavior tendencies of university students who do sports and those who do not]. *Türk Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(1), 55-59.
- Dervent, F. (2007). *Lise öğrencilerinin saldırganlık düzeyleri ve sportif aktivitelere katılma ilişkisi [The aggression levels of high school students and their relationship to participating in sports activities]* (Masters' Thesis). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Dorak, F., & Vurgun, N. (2006). Takım sporları açısından empati ve takım birlikteliği ilişkisi. *Sportmetre Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 73-77.
- Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T., & Knafo, A. (2015). Prosocial development. In: Lamb ME, Lerner RM, editors. *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science*, Vol. 3: Social, Emotional and Personality Development (7th edition, pp. XXX) New York: Wiley.
- Erdoğan, İ. (1997). *İşletmelerde davranış [Business behavior]* (2. Baskı). İstanbul: İ.Ü İşletme Fakültesi Yayını.
- Eren, E. (2000). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi [Organizational behavior and management psychology]* (6. Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Finney, S. J., & DiStefano, C. (2006). Non-normal and categorical data in structural equation modeling. In Hancock, G. R., & Mueller R. O. (Eds.), *Structural equation modeling: A second course*, (pp. 269-314). Information Age Publishing, U.S.A.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*, 17.0 update (10a ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- Gözün-Kahraman, Ö., & Kurt, G. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının olumlu sosyal ve saldırgan davranış eğilimlerinin incelenmesi [Examining prospective teachers' tendencies of positive social and aggressive behavior]. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 3(3), 236-243.
- Grusec, J. E. (2002). Children's social and moral reasoning. P. Smith (Edt.), *Childhood social development*. 457-470. USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hastings, P. D., Zahn-Waxler, C., Robinson, J., Usher, B., & Bridges, D. (2000). The development of concern for others in children with behavior problems. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 531-546.
- Hay, D. F. (2009). The roots and branches of human altruism. *British Journal of Psychology*, 100(3), 473-479.

- Huck, S. W. (2012). *Reading statistics and research* (6th ed). Boston: Pearson.
- İkizler, H. C., & Karagözoğlu, C. (1994). *Sporda başarının psikolojisi [Psychology of success in sports]* (3. Baskı). İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Jackson, M., & Tisak, M. S. (2001). Is prosocial behaviour a good thing? Developmental changes in children's evaluations of helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19(3), 349–367.
- Kaçay, Z. (2019). *İşyeri yılmazlığının yordayıcıları: Örgütsel güven, lider-üye etkileşimi ve işyeri maneviyatı (Spor Genel Müdürlüğü örneği) [Predictors of workplace resilience: Organizational trust, leader-member interaction, and workplace spirituality (General Directorate of Sports example)]* (Doctoral Dissertation) Sakarya Uygulamalı Bilimler Üniversitesi, Sakarya.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2006). *Yeni insan ve insanlar [New person and people]* (10. Basım). İstanbul: Evrim Yayınevi.
- Kapan, S. (2001). *Elit artistik cimnastikçilerin kişilik özelliklerinin araştırılması [Investigation of the personality traits of elite artistic gymnasts]* (Masters' Thesis). Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Manisa.
- Karasar, N. (1995). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler [Scientific research method: Concepts, principles, techniques]*. Ankara: Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık Ltd.
- Kavussanu, M., & Boardley, I.D. (2009). The Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 31, 97-117.
- Kızmaz, M. (2004). *Bireysel ve takım sporu yapan sporcuların kişilik özelliklerinin araştırılması [Investigation of personality traits of athletes doing individual and team sports]* (Masters' Thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, 38(1), 52–54.
- Koruç, Z., & Bayar, P. (1989). *Sporun Kişilik Üzerine Etkileri Araştırma Raporu [Research Report on the Effects of Sports on Personality]*. Gençlik ve Spor Genel Müdürlüğü, SESAM, Ankara,
- Krahé, B. (2013). Social psychology: A modular course. *The social psychology of aggression* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
- Kumru, A., Carlo, G., & Edwards, C.P. (2004) Olumlu sosyal davranışların ilişkisel, kültürel, bilişsel ve duyuşsal bazı değişkenlerle ilişkisi [The relationship of positive social behaviors with some relational, cultural, cognitive and affective variables]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 19(54), 109-125.
- Kuru, E., & Baştuğ, G. (2008). Futbolcuların kişilik özellikleri ve bedenlerini algıama düzeylerinin incelenmesi [Examining the personality traits and body perception levels of football players]. *Sportmetre Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 95-101.
- Ma, H. K. (2005). The relation of gender-role classifications to the prosocial and antisocial behavior of Chinese adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 166(2), 189–202.
- Morris, C. G. (2002). *Psikolojiyi anlamak [Understanding psychology]*. (Çev. Nedret Öztan), 1. Baskı s. 456-481. Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.
- Nergiz, S. (2018). *Spor yapan ve yapmayan lise öğrencilerinin olumlu sosyal ve saldırgan davranışları ile okula yönelik tutumlarının incelenmesi [Investigation of positive social and*

- aggressive behaviors and attitudes towards school of high school students who do sports and those who do not*. (Masters' Thesis). Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya.
- Özen, G., Özsoy, A., & Yıldız, N. O. (2018). The impact of artificial wall climbing as a recreational activity on children's locus of control. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 15(4), 2462-2467.
- Schmitt, D. P., Allik, J., McCrae, R. R., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2007). The geographic distribution of big five personality traits: Patterns and profiles of human self description across 56 Nations. *Journal of CrossCultural Psychology*, 38, 173-212.
- Scott, N., & Seglow, J. (2007). *Altruism*. New York: Open University Press
- Selçuk, E., & Aydos, L. (1998). Ankara Polis Akademisi sporcu olan ve sporcu olmayan öğrencilerinin bazı kişilik ve davranış özelliklerinin araştırılması [Investigation of some personality and behavioral characteristics of athletes and non-athletes students of Ankara Police Academy]. *Gazi Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 28-41.
- Sönmez, K. (1995). *Elit atletlerde kişilik özellikleri ve duyu durumlarının araştırılması [Investigation of personality traits and moods in elite athletes]* (Masters' Thesis). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Türkay, H., (2019). *Futbolcularda sosyal kimlik bağlamında prososyal ve antisosyal davranışlar [Prosocial and antisocial behaviors in football players in the context of social identity]* (Doctoral Dissertation). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Wentzel, K. R., & McNamara, C. C. (1999). Interpersonal relationships, emotional distress, and prosocial behavior in middle school. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19(1), 114-125.
- Wispe, L. G. (1972). Positive forms of social behavior: An overview. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28(3), 1-19.
- Yıldız, N. O., & Bostancı, T. G. (2016). Bireylerin iş yaşamlarına ilişkin motivasyon düzeylerine dağcılık sporunun etkisi [The effect of mountaineering sport on the motivation levels of individuals regarding their work life]. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 18(3), 65-77.
- Yılmaz, E. (1989). *Gazi üniversitesi elit voleybolcularının şahsiyet boyutları ile bazı davranış özelliklerinin karşılaştırılması [Comparison of personal dimensions and some behavioral characteristics of Gazi University elite volleyball players]* (Masters' Thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

The ethics committee approval for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Rectorate of Nişantaşı University, dated 23/11/2020 and numbered 2020/21.

Statement of Contribution of Researchers to the Article:

1st author contribution rate: 30%

2nd author contribution rate: 30%

3rd author contribution rate: 40%

Conflict of Interest Statement:

There is no conflict of interest.

Statement of Financial Support or Acknowledgment:

No financial support was received from any institution for this study.