



Journal of Social Sciences of Mus Alparslan University

**anemon**

Derginin ana sayfası: <http://dergipark.gov.tr/anemon>



**Araştırma Makalesi • Research Article**

**Examining the Relationship Between Fanatic Levels of Football Fans and Verbal, Physical and Cyberbullying Behaviors**

***Futbol Taraftarlarının Fanatik Düzeyleri ile Sözel, Fiziksel ve Siber Zorbalık Davranışları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi***

Hande Baba Kaya\*

**Öz:** Bu araştırma; Futbol taraftarlarının fanatizm düzeylerine göre sözel, fiziksel ve siber zorbalık davranışlarını incelemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Araştırmada ilişkisel tarama modellerinden genel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu 2020-2021 futbol sezonunda Türkiye Futbol Federasyonu süper liginde yer alan 4 büyük takımın taraftarları için tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemiyle belirlenen 388 futbol taraftarı oluşturmaktadır. Düzce Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etik Kurulu 2021/132 sayılı kararı ile çalışmanın etik kurul izni alınmıştır. Araştırma verisi; Futbol taraftarlarının fanatizm düzeylerini belirlemek için Taşmektepligil ve ark. (2015) geliştirmiş olduğu futbol fanatizm ölçeği ve spor izleyicilerinin sözel zorbalık, fiziksel zorbalık ve siber zorbalık davranışlarını ölçmek için Karaca (2019) tarafından geliştirilen spor izleyicilerinin sözel fiziksel ve siber zorbalık davranışları ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Analizler incelendiğinde; Futbol taraftarlarının şiddete yönelik düşünme ve hareket etme eğilimleri ile sözlü, fiziksel ve siber zorbalık davranışları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu görülmektedir. Sonuç olarak futbol taraftarlarının şiddete yönelik düşünme ve hareket etme eğilimleri arttıkça sözel, fiziksel ve siber zorbalık davranışlarının arttığı söylenebilir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Futbol, Fanatizm, Sözel Zorbalık, Fiziksel Zorbalık, Siber Zorbalık.

**Abstract:** This research; It was conducted to examine the verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors of football fans according to their level of fanaticism. General survey model, one of the relational screening model, was used in the research. The study group of the study consists of 388 football fans determined by random sampling method for the supporters of the 4 big teams in the Turkish Football Federation super league in the 2020-2021 football season. Ethics committee permission for the study was obtained with the decision numbered 2021/132 of Düzce University Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee. Research data; To determine the level of fanaticism of football fans, Taşmektepligil et al. (2015) developed the football fanaticism scale, and the verbal physical and cyberbullying behaviors of sports spectators scale developed by Karaca (2019) were used to measure the verbal bullying, physical bullying and cyberbullying behaviors of sports spectators. When the analyzes are examined, It is seen that there is a significant relationship between football fans' tendency to think and act towards violence and their verbal, physical, and cyberbullying behaviors. As a result, it can be said that the verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors of football fans increase as the tendency to think and act towards violence increases.

**Keywords:** Football, Fanaticism, Verbal Bullying, Physical Bullying, Cyberbullying.

\* Doç. Dr. Düzce Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Bölümü

ORCID: 0000-0002-9281-2588 E-posta adresi: handebabakaya@duzce.edu.tr

**Cite as/ Atıf:** Kaya, H.B. (2024). Examining the relationship between fanatic levels of football fans and verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(1),1-11

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18506/anemon.969436>

**Received/Geliş:** 11July/ Temmuz 2021

**Accepted/Kabul:** 31January/Ocak 2023

**Published/Yayın:** 30April/Nisan 2024

## **Introduction**

Football is the sport in which the fanaticism is seen the most among the audience in the world. Football is not only a sport branch that is watched, but also a phenomenon that causes an effect on the psychological and social structure of its audience (Karaca, 2019). So much so that it has become a lifestyle that has become stronger with the audience and supporters that drag the masses after it and occupies a large part of most people's lives. There are some differences between the concepts of being a football spectator and being a football fan. Although football spectators enjoy watching their teams' matches, they sometimes do not watch the matches, but fans are more consistent than spectators in supporting their teams and not missing their matches. It is possible to say that the fans identify with their teams more than the spectators and have more psychological and social loyalty to their teams (Aytaç, 2009). A supporter is a person who adopts an opinion, an opinion or is on the side of someone, who is on its side (Pulur, 2001). In addition to loving a team in tolerance, the fans are nervous, egotistical, who want their team to be victorious, who sees all kinds of bullying as legitimate for this; It is defined as a mass (Kola, 1995). It is possible to name the upper dimension of the fanaticism as fanaticism. Fanaticism, beyond belonging to a group or supporting a team, is the extreme advocacy situation experienced by people who show their loyalty to their team by overreacting (Erdoğan, 2008). Fanaticism is the fact that the individual who hides his / her personality in normal life, reveals his real personality in the stadium environments and shows that he does not need to play the role required by his social status (Canetti, 2003).

Fanatic is a person who is devoted to his team with a divine belief. It cannot bear to lose, and sees victory just like winning a victory. Fanatics give a different meaning to the club they support, the stadium where the matches of the club are played, their jerseys, the colors and symbols of the team. The fanatic is usually a violent supporter. The direction of the violence may be opponent fans or footballers, or even their own team player or manager in case the match is lost. He may even have a friend who watched the match together in the same stands and supported his team shoulder to shoulder (Koruç et al., 2004). If the supporters of football teams are supporters of the same team, if they can think the same things, they back up and support each other. Different thinking can go as far as fighting or even injuring and killing. This is an indicator of being fanatic. Fanatics are often honored and loved by the community they belong to, ranging from fear to admiration. This situation occurs especially when they fight and show courage for the community they live in (Boralıoğlu, 2001). The main behaviors that fanatics can exhibit on sports fields are listed as follows: They see every way to win as legitimate. Their hearts beat only for the color and name of their team. They don't mind the game; they look at victory, the result. When the arrested team takes the lead, they begin to shout and carry out the excitement they are trying to contain. When their team is defeated, they become the opposite of the mood above (Acet, 2006). The main problem in fanaticism is not that the individual is fanatic, but the actions of fanatics coming together. The actions taken are often not limited to football fields, they continue outside the field. Fanatics sometimes attack vehicles carrying rival supporters and start a fight if they meet rival groups of fans on the train, subway or gas stations. They disturb other people with these actions (Riches, 1989).

Football, especially for young fan groups, can often cease to be a football match and turn into areas where a psychological, political and political showdown is seen. While sometimes it gives a drunkenness of self-confidence and power over the victories, it sometimes causes defeats and defeats and causes a sense of collapse and introversion. In the case of chronic failures, football turns into a learned feeling of helplessness reflected in other areas of life. Considering the structure of the groups that cause problems in football, they are abnormal, guilty, uneducated, etc. It is observed that it consists of people with psychological and sociological problems. Considering the personality structure of these people, it is seen that they are inclined to exhibit undesirable behaviors such as aggression and bullying (Beşkat, 2016). It is observed that these people enjoy verbal and verbal behaviors such as shouting, swearing, mocking, throwing something at the opponent's player or supporter in and outside the stands (Hacıyev, 2011). The counterpart of these behaviors in the literature is bullying. If we look at the definition of bullying; It is defined as trying to gain power through aggression and behaviors that aim to

weaken the individual who is repeatedly subjected to physical, emotional and social aggression (Vanderbilt & Augustyn, 2010). Bullying is divided into two as direct or indirect bullying according to the way they turn towards the other party. Direct bullying incidents involve negative actions and often involve physical contact. Direct bullying includes pushing, hitting, kicking, strangling, wounding, damaging or stealing someone else's property. In indirect bullying, on the other hand, there is usually no physical contact, rather there are actions such as repeating name calls, ridicule, swearing, threats, and humiliation to psychologically harm the control mechanism of the person. In addition, behaviors that aim to harm the person psychologically such as gossip, rumor, disturbing writing and notes, social exclusion are also included in the concept of indirect bullying (Buch, 2012). In addition to the actions listed above, behaviors such as frightening glances, frowning, sighing and sneezing should be considered as an important component of bullying in behaviors that put a person in a psychologically difficult situation (Liepe-Levinson & Levinson, 2005). While physical bullying that causes hurting and hurting the victim's body is included in the scope of direct bullying, incidents that do not involve direct physical assault but aim to hurt the victim in a moral sense and harm the victim from a distance are included in the scope of indirect bullying (Türkan, 2013).

According to another classification, bullying is handled in four categories: verbal, physical, social and cyber (Marsh et al., 2011). Another classification regarding bullying is made as follows. Physical Bullying: It includes behaviors such as slapping, hitting, squeezing, poking, punching, kicking, pushing, pulling, pulling hair, spitting, locking in the room and similar physical attacks or damaging things (Coloroso, 2003). Verbal Bullying: Disturbing phone calls, forcibly seizing money or belongings, threatening intimidation, nicknames, racist rhetoric, sexually explicit statements, humiliating statements, swearing, and making lies and hurtful rumors about a person (Coloroso, 2003) The development of technology has caused societies to undergo great change and transformation. This process experienced by societies has led to the emergence of concepts such as violence, war, terrorism, and bullying, as well as cyberviolence, cyberwar, cyberterror and cyberbullying. Cyberbullying, which is a type of aggression displayed on the internet among young people, has become one of the most important problems of the world, especially with the increase in the frequency of using information technologies recently (Tanrikulu, 2015). Cyberbullying refers to behaviors that are carried out using the online environment on the internet by teasing, threatening, insulting, harassing or intimidating (Kowalski et al., 2012). Cyberbullying, which emerged as a result of the changes in technology, has become more important day by day. Cyberbullying, which has become more widespread with the introduction of the Internet into human life, has become harmful to the private or legal personality of the individual or group with the use of information and communication technologies. From this point of view, cyberbullying is caused by an individual or a group in order to harm it, via e-mail, mobile phone, short message services, advertising content messages, websites; It is possible to define deliberate, repetitive behaviors (Tanrikulu et al., 2012).

According to another definition, cyberbullying has been described as deliberate, hostile and repetitive behaviors by individuals or groups through e-mail, mobile phones, text messages or websites (Kocatürk, 2014). It is now possible to encounter these bullying behaviors, which are quite common in football environments, in online environments. In this context, the aim of the study is to determine the effect of the fanaticism level of football fans on verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors.

## **Method**

### **Research Model**

Relational screening model from general screening model, was used in the study, which was conducted to examine the relationship between football fans' fanaticism levels and verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors. Relational screening model is a screening approach that aims to determine the existence of co-variation between two or more variables. In the relational screening model, whether the variables change together; If there is a change, it is tried to determine how it happened (Karasar, 2011).

## Research Sample

The study group of the research consists of football fans determined by random sampling method from the fans of the 4 big teams in the Turkish Football Federation super league in the 2020-2021 football season. The data were collected from the participants on a voluntary basis through questionnaire forms created by the researchers. When the collected data were coded into the computer environment, a total of 388 participants, including 326 male and 62 female participants, were included in the study. Other demographic variables of the participants are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Personal Information Distribution of the Fans

FACTOR	VARIABLE	f	%
Gender	Male	326	84
	Female	62	16
Age	13-25	227	58.5
	26-35	95	24.5
	36-45	34	8.8
	46-55	26	6.7
	56 and over	6	1.5
Profession	Worker	89	22.8
	Officer	50	12.8
	Self-employment	57	14.6
	Retired	12	3.0
	Not working	180	46.4
Education status	Primary education	12	3.0
	Secondary education	96	24.6
	High education	280	72.2
Marital status	The married	278	71.6
	Single	110	28.3
Which Team Are You a Fan?	Fenerbahçe	211	50.5
	Galatasaray	97	23.2
	Beşiktaş	61	14.6
	Trabzonspor	19	4.5
	Total	388	100

The distribution of personal information of the fans participating in the research is given in Table 1. According to the data, 84 % of the participants (n = 326) were "Male", 58.5 % (n = 227) were in the 13-25 age range, 21.5% were in the worker profession, 72.2 % were higher education graduates. (n = 280), 71.6 % (n = 278) of them were married, 50.5% (n = 211) of them were supporters of the Fenerbahçe team.

## Data Collection Tools

### Personal Information Form

This form was created by the researchers to determine the demographic variables of the participants. The personal information form includes questions such as gender, age, profession group, education level, marital status and the team that they support.

### Football Fan Fanaticity Scale

In order to determine the fanaticism level of the participants; The "Football Fan Fanaticity Scale" developed by Taşmektepligil, Çankaya and Tunç (2015) was used. The scale reveals the attitudes of Turkish football audiences towards fans. The football fans fanaticity scale, which is a Likert-type scale, includes four-choice answers: "a) Strongly Agree", "b) Agree", "c) Disagree" and "d) Never Agree".

While coding the data, starting from the option "a", 1, 2, 3, 4 points were given in order. The first 8-item part (first factor) of this 13-item scale includes supporters' "thoughts and actions towards violence"; The last 5 items (second factor) express their attitudes towards the sense of "institutional belonging". Same time; According to the fanaticism scale criteria, if the total score of the audience surveyed over 13 questions is between 13-21, they are called "fanatic", 22-30 "team supporter", and 31-52 "football fan". The reliability coefficient was found to be 0.875 as a result of the reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) conducted in order to reveal the internal consistency of the answers given by the audience to the questionnaire questions (Taşmektepligil, Çankaya and Tunç, 2015). Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to determine the construct validity of the football fans fanaticism scale and to reveal the factor structure. For this, principal components and direct oblique rotation method are used. The reason for this is that the principal components method is the most frequently and easily used method in practice, and the direct oblique rotation method is used when it is considered that there is a relationship between the factors (Büyüköztürk, 2011). First of all, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test sample adequacy value was found to be 0.930, showing that the sample size was sufficient for EFA. This value (Field, 2009) is considered sufficient when it is above 0.50 and is classified in the "excellent" category when it is between 0.80-0.90. In addition, the Bartlett test result was found to be  $p < 0.05$ , which showed that the correlation between the items was large enough. As a result of EFA, it was determined that the 13-item scale consisted of a 2-factor structure and explained 69.10% of the total variance of the two factors. Accordingly, it was concluded that the scale showed a valid feature. In addition, it is seen that the first of the sub-dimensions explains 55.92% of the variance and the second explains 69.10%. As a result of the reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha), which was conducted in order to reveal the internal consistency of the answers given by the participants to the survey questions within the scope of this study, the reliability coefficient was found to be 0.866.

### **Verbal Physical Bullying Behaviors Scale of Sports Spectators**

In this study, "Sports Spectators' Verbal and Physical Bullying Behavior Scale" developed by Karaca (2019) was used to examine the verbal and physical bullying attitudes of football fans. The scale was developed to measure the attitudes of sports spectators towards verbal and physical bullying behaviors. As a result of the analysis, it was stated that the items in the measurement tool were grouped under two sub-factors, 8 items in the first factor show verbal bullying behaviors of football spectators, and 8 items in the second factor show physical bullying behaviors. It was stated that the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was .95 for the overall scale, .94 for the verbal bullying factor and .92 for the physical bullying factor.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to determine the construct validity of the verbal physical bullying behavior scale of sports spectators and to reveal the factor structure. For this, principal components and direct oblique rotation method are used. The reason for this is that the principal components method is the most frequently and easily used method in practice, and the direct oblique rotation method is used when it is considered that there is a relationship between the factors (Büyüköztürk, 2011). First of all, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test sample adequacy value was found to be 0.873, showing that the sample size was sufficient for EFA. This value (Field, 2009) is considered sufficient when it is above 0.50 and is classified in the "excellent" category when it is between 0.80-0.90. In addition, the Bartlett test result was found to be  $p < 0.05$ , which showed that the correlation between the items was large enough. As a result of EFA, it was determined that the scale consisted of a 2-factor structure and explained 73.31% of the total variance of the two factors. Accordingly, it was concluded that the scale showed a valid feature. In addition, it is seen that the first of the sub-dimensions explains 47.52% of the variance and the second explains 35.23%. As a result of the reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha), which was conducted to reveal the internal consistency of the answers given by the participants to the survey questions within the scope of this study, the reliability coefficient was found to be 0.938.

### Cyber Bullying Behaviors Scale of Sports Audiences

In this study, "Sports Audience Cyber Bullying Behavior Scale" developed by Karaca (2019) was used to examine the cyberbullying attitudes of football fans. The scale was developed to measure the attitudes of sports spectators towards cyberbullying behaviors. The scale consists of 7 items in a single factor. Increasing scores indicate an increase in cyber behavior among sports spectators. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale. It has been reported to be 93. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to determine the construct validity of the cyberbullying behavior scale of sports spectators and to reveal the factor structure. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test sample adequacy value was found to be 0.954, showing that the sample size was sufficient for EFA. This value is considered sufficient by (Field, 2009) when it is above 0.50. As a result of the reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha), which was conducted to reveal the internal consistency of the answers given by the participants to the survey questions within the scope of this study, the reliability coefficient was found to be 0.928.

### Data Analysis

Descriptive statistical processes (arithmetic mean, percentage, frequency and standard deviation) were applied by encoding the obtained data into the SPSS 20.0 program. One-Way ANOVA test was used to examine whether there was a difference between the football fanaticism levels of the participants and their verbal physical and cyberbullying behaviors. In addition, the correlation analysis was used to reveal whether there is a relationship between the level of fanaticism and verbal physical and cyberbullying behaviors and their level of fanaticism. 0.05 was used as the level of significance in all analyzes. Since it was seen that the skewness and kurtosis values of the scales and subscales were between the values of +1.0 and -1.0, which are accepted for the field of social sciences, parametric tests were applied (Büyüköztürk; 2014).

### Results

The findings obtained as a result of statistical analysis from the data collected from the participants are examined in this section.

**Table 2.** Anova Results of Football Fans' Verbal Bullying Behaviors Scale Scores According to Fanaticity Level

Source of Variance	Sum of squares	sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Meaningful difference
Between group	4529,488	2	2264,744	39,097	,000	1-2, 1-3
Within Groups	23981,481	386	57,926			2-3
Total	28510,969	388				

1=Fanatic 2=Team Supporter 3=Football lover

When the analysis results given in Table 2 are examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference in terms of the level of fanaticism of the verbal bullying behaviors of football team fans  $F(2,144) = 39.09$ ,  $p < .01$ . In other words, verbal bullying behaviors of the fans vary significantly according to their fanaticism level. According to the results of the Scheffe test conducted to find out which groups the difference between fanaticism levels is; Participants who were fanatical ( $X = 27.83$ ) showed more verbal bullying behavior than team fans ( $X = 21.42$ ) and football-loving participants ( $X = 13.89$ ), it is seen that they show more verbal bullying behavior.

**Table 3.** Anova Results of Football Fans' Physical Bullying Behaviors Scale Scores According to Fanaticity Levels

Source of Variance	Sum of squares	sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Meaningful difference
Between group	6011,808	2	3005,904	93,755	,000	1-2, 1-3
Within Groups	13273,333	386	32,061			2-3
Total	19285,141	388				

1=Fanatic 2=Team Supporter 3=Football lover

When the analysis results given in Table 3 are examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference in terms of the level of fanaticism of the physical bullying behaviors of the football team supporters  $F(2,144) = 93.75, p < .01$ . In other words, the physical bullying behaviors of the fans vary significantly according to their fanaticism level.

**Table 4.** Anova Results of Football Fans' Cyberbullying Behavior Scale Scores According to Fanaticity Levels

Source of Variance	Sum of squares	sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Meaningful difference
Between group	5784,227	2	2892,113	91,705	,000	1-2, 1-3
Within Groups	13056,354	386	31,537			2-3
Total	18840,581	388				

1=Fanatic 2=Team Supporter 3=Football lover

When the analysis results given in Table 4 are examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference in terms of the level of fanaticism of the cyberbullying behaviors of football team fans  $F(2,144) = 91.70, p < .01$ . In other words, the cyberbullying behaviors of the fans vary significantly according to their fanaticism level. According to the results of the Scheffe test conducted in order to find out which groups the difference between fanaticism levels is; Participants who are fanatical ( $X = 27.08$ ) show cyberbullying behavior more than team fans ( $X = 17.59$ ) and football-loving participants ( $X = 9.85$ ), and participants who are also team fans ( $X = 17.59$ ) have football-loving participants ( $X = 9.85$ ), it is seen that they show more cyberbullying behavior.

**Table 5.** The Correlation Analysis of Football Fans' Thought and Action Tendency towards Violence and Verbal, Physical and Cyberbullying Behaviors

	1.	2.	3.
1. Verbal bullying			
2. Physical bullying	,607**		
3. Cyber bullying	,701**	,730**	
4. Thought and Action Tendency towards Violence	,487**	,486**	,470**

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that football fans' thoughts and actions towards violence and verbal ( $r = 0.487, p < .01$ ), physical ( $r = 0.486, p < .01$ ), and cyber ( $r = 0.470, p < .01$ ), bullying It is seen that there is a moderately positive significant relationship between their behaviors. Accordingly, it can be said that the verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors of football fans increase as the tendency to think and act towards violence increase.

**Table 6.** The Correlation Analysis of the Sub-Dimensions of Football Fans' Fanaticity Scale, Institutional Belonging and Verbal, Physical and Cyberbullying Behaviors

	1.	2.	3.
1. Verbal bullying			
2. Physical bullying	,607**		
3. Cyber bullying	,701**	,730**	
4. Institutional Belonging	,406**	,593**	,489**

When Table 6 is examined, it is found that football fans' level of institutional belonging is moderate between verbal ( $r = 0.406, p < .01$ ), physical ( $r = 0.593, p < .01$ ), and cyber ( $r = 0.489, p < .01$ ), bullying behaviors. It is seen that there is a positive significant relationship at the level. Accordingly, it can be said that as the level of corporate belonging increases, the verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors of football fans increase.

## Discussion

The purpose of this research; The aim of this course is to examine the effect of football fans' level of fanaticism on verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors. In other words, this study was conducted to examine the verbal, physical and cyberbullying levels of individuals with fanatic levels such as

football lovers, fans and fanatics. When we examine the findings of the study, it is seen that the participants who are fanatic show more verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors than the participants who are at the level of team supporters and football lovers. In other words, as the level of fanaticism increases, it is seen that verbal, physical and cyber bullying behaviors also increase.

Within the scope of the study, it was examined whether there is a relationship between the sub-dimensions of the fanaticism scale, the thoughts and actions towards violence and the dimensions of institutional belonging, and verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors. According to the findings of the research; It is observed that there is a moderately positive significant relationship between football fans' tendency towards violence and their level of institutional affiliation and their verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors. Accordingly, it was observed that verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors of football fans increased as their scores of thought and action tendency towards violence and their institutional belonging scores increased.

Football has recently become a growing entertainment industry in every region of the world (Koçer, 2012). When we observe football environments, we see that violence and aggression are common. For this reason, studies have begun to be conducted on football fanaticism and the behavior of football fans, and the reasons for the aggressive and bullying behaviors of football fans have been investigated (Theodorakis et al., 2010). What draws attention in these studies is that team fanaticism can lead to aggression and bullying. There are levels of being a fan of a team. The spectators to the people who follow the sports activities of the team, the people who are loyal to the team, who follow the team and the players, who have feelings towards the team and the players, who support and satisfy their motives about football (Arslanoğlu, 2005), to those who are attached to the team they support with an extreme passion. is called fanatic (Koruç et al., 2004). Within the scope of this study, it is seen that people who are passionate about their team in the dimension of fanaticism show higher rates of verbal, physical and cyberbullying behaviors compared to others. The reason for this is that fanatic people are individuals who see every way legitimate in order to win, focus only on the outcome, do not care about the beauty of sports, attach importance to the colors, anthem and symbols of their team (Arıkan, 2007). It is thought to show bullying behavior. The concept called fanaticism is defined as being attached to something with an excessive passion, blind allegiance, in other words, a devotion that disables reason reasoning (Püsküllüoğlu, 2001) and verbal, physical and cyberbullying of people who are passionate about football teams in this dimension. It seems likely that the level of showing their behavior is higher than that of other supporters.

When the studies parallel to the subject of this research are examined; Yu and Wang (2014) and Kerr, Wilson, Nakamura, and Sudo (2005) reported that when teams lost their imprisoned team supporters scored higher in terms of irritability, anger, pessimism, humiliation and anger than those with low fanaticism. It was stated that relaxation and relaxation scores in nervousness were significantly lower than those with low fanaticism. Theodorakis, Wann, Al-Emadi, Lianopoulos, and Foudouki (2017) and Dimmock and Grove (2005) reported that fans identified with the team at the fanatic level have less control over bullying behaviors than fans with medium or low identification. In this context; Hirt et al. (1992) and Hoogland et al. (2015) argue that fanatic team supporters react by perceiving the team's success as a personal success and the team's failure as a personal failure. Pereira (2002) and Belli, Gürbüz, and Biricik (2016) stated that since the most common reasons for being a football fan are membership to the group, aesthetics, entertainment and anger, their unwanted behavior may be related to behavioral motivations to reduce stress, beyond experiencing stress. According to McKaughan (2018), football fans show less activation in brain regions related to pain perception and empathy. It supports the findings of Russel and Goldstein (1995), who reported that football fans scored higher on an overall psychopathy measure. Fanti et al. (2019) emphasizes that emotionless, impulsive and irresponsible behaviors are prominent in individuals who show football fanaticism. Additionally, Carriedo, Cecchini, and González (2020) showed that the frequency of watching football matches is positively associated with low moral behavior and high levels of aggression. The results of the studies in the literature seem to support and explain the findings of this study.



Bullying behaviors among football fans have been encountered frequently in recent years and there is a need for studies in this field. This bullying behavior seen in football has spread all over the world like an epidemic. It is a very important problem that people of all professions and statuses show bullying behaviors with the effect of football environments. According to Ward Jr's social problem theory (2002) and King (2017), from a clinical point of view, scientists rethink the behaviors created by being a group and belonging to a group in order to define values related to paranoid thoughts and hostility of football fans with dysfunctional behavior. It should try to explain the bullying behavior of fanatic people by considering the aspect that is strengthened by group behavior. Studies in this area are very few and there are many versatile studies to be done. It is thought that it will shed light on explaining the bullying behaviors of fanatic individuals. Within the scope of this study, as the level of fanaticism of football fans increases; It has been tried to reveal what the prevalence of bullying behaviors is. It is thought that it will guide the studies in this field.

### References

- Acet M. (2006). *Aggression and Violence in Sports*. Istanbul, Morpa Cultural Publications, 1-173.
- Arıkan Y. (2007). Violence and police in football. *Journal of Police Science*. 9: 1-4.
- Arslanoğlu K. (2005). *Psychiatry of football*. Ithaki Publications. Istanbul.
- Aytaç, K.Y. (2009). Investigation of Fans' Purchasing Attitudes Regarding Licensed Product Marketing Activities in Sports Clubs. Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports. PhD Thesis, Ankara: Gazi University.
- Belli, E .Gurbuz, A., Unique, Y.S. (2016), An Analysis of Motivation of Students at Sports Science Faculty as Football Sports Fans. *Univers. J. Manag.* 4, 397--404.
- Beşkat M. (2016). Investigation of the Relationship Between Empathic Tendencies of Football Audiences and Aggression and Violence Levels in Sports (Şanlıurfa Province Example) Institute of Health Sciences, Physical Education and Sports Department. Master Thesis, Kütahya: Dumlupınar University
- Boralıoğlu G. (2001). *Position of deprivation in the field without football*. Flat Run. Der: T. Bora, 2nd Edition Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 45-50.
- Buch R.D. (2012). Teachers' Perspectives on Bullying: Understanding Educational Intervention, Mankato, Minnesota State University, 6-7.
- Canetti E., Gülşat A. (2003). *Mass and Power Trans. Details Publications*. Istanbul, 18- 308.
- Carriedo, A., Cecchini, J. A., & González, C. (2021). Soccer spectators' moral functioning and aggressive tendencies in life and when watching soccer matches. *Ethics & Behavior*, 31(2), 136-150..
- Coloroso B. (2003). *The Bully, The Bullied, and The Bystander*. USA, New York, NY: Harper Collins, : 1-232.
- Dimmock, J.A., Grove, J.R. (2005). Relationship of Fan Identification to Determinants of Aggression. *J. Appl. Sport Psychol.* 17, 37-47
- Erdoğan İ. (2008). On the Study of Football and Football, *Communication Theory and Research Journal*, 26 (1): 58- 42
- Fanti, K. A., Phylactou, E., & Georgiou, G. (2021). Who is the hooligan? The role of psychopathic traits. *Deviant Behavior*, 42(4), 492-502.

- Hacıyev İ. (2011). Football Fanaticism and the Relationship of Football Programs in Turkish Television, Social Sciences Institute, Radio and Television Department. Master Thesis, Istanbul: Istanbul University
- Hirt, E.R., Zillmann, D. Erickson, G., Kennedy, C. (1992). Costs and benefits of allegiance: Changes in fans' self-Ascribed competencies after team victory versus defeat. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 63, 724-738.
- Hoogland, C. E., Ryan Schurtz, D., Cooper, C. M., Combs, D. J., Brown, E. G., & Smith, R. H. (2015). The joy of pain and the pain of joy: In-group identification predicts schadenfreude and gluckschmerz following rival groups' fortunes. *Motivation and Emotion*, 39, 260-281.
- Karaca, Y. (2019). Studying the bullying behavior of sports spectators (football fan example). İnönü University Institute of Health Sciences. PhD Thesis
- Karasar, N. (2011). *Scientific Research Methods*, Nobel Publications, Ankara
- Kerr, J. H., Wilson, G. V., Nakamura, I., & Sudo, Y. (2005). Emotional dynamics of soccer fans at winning and losing games. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(8), 1855-1866.
- King, A. (2017). *The European Ritual: Football in the New Europe*; Routledge: London, UK
- Kocatürk M. (2014). Investigation of the Relationship Between Peer Bullying and Cyberbullying in Secondary School Students. Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences. Master Thesis, Istanbul: Istanbul University
- Koçer M. (2012). Determining the violent and hooliganism tendencies of the fans who are members of football associations: Kayseri example. *Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences*. 1 (32): 111-135.
- Kola N. (1995). Young fans, stand up. *Journal of Action*. 23-29 2 (55): 24-9.
- Koruç Z, Bayar P ve Arslan F. (2004). Football fanatics in Turkey: Social identity and violence. Scientific Research Competition on Causes of Terrorism and Prevention Ways in Football Competitions of Turkish Football Association Ankara Branch and General Directorate of Spor Toto. Ankara.
- Kowalski RM, Limber SP and Agaston PW. (2012). Cyberbullying: Bullying in digital age, Second Edition Wiley-Blackwell Publication, Malden MA 02148-5020 USA, 56.
- Liepe-Levinson, K., & Levinson, M. H. (2005). A General Semantics Approach To School-Age Bullying. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 62(1), 4-16.
- Marsh HW, Nagengast B, Morin AJ, Parada RH, Craven RG, Hamilton LR.(2011). Construct validity of the multidimensional structure of bullying and victimization: An application of exploratory structural equation modeling. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103, 701-32.
- Pereira, R. Estudo das motivações do adepto de futebol [Study of football fans' motivations]. Bachelor's Thesis, Faculdade de Ciências do Desporto e de Educação Física da Universidade do Porto, Porto, Portugal,2002.  
Availableonline:[https://sigarra.up.pt/fpceup/pt/pub\\_geral.pub\\_view?pi\\_pub\\_base\\_id=38802](https://sigarra.up.pt/fpceup/pt/pub_geral.pub_view?pi_pub_base_id=38802)  
(accessed on 27 March 2021).
- Pulur A. (2001). Violence and aggression in sports. *Turkish Journal of University Sports*, 1: 75-103.
- Püsküllüoğlu A. (2001). *Dictionary of foreign words in Turkish*. 2nd Edition. Friend Broadcasts. Ankara
- Riches D. (1989). *The Phenomenon of Violence, Violence From An Anthropological Point Of View*. Trans. Hattatoğlu D. 1st Edition, Istanbul: Detay Publishing House, 10-42.
- Russell, G. W., & Goldstein, J. H. (1995). Personality differences between Dutch football fans and nonfans. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 23(2), 199-204.

- Tanrıkulu İ. (2015). Relationships Between Cyber Bullying Motives and Personality Traits: Testing Uses and Satisfaction Theory. Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences. PhD Thesis, Ankara: Middle East Technical University
- Tanrıkulu T, Kinay H, Arıcağ (2012). O. Sensitivity Scale Regarding Cyber Bullying: Validity and Reliability Study. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 3 (1): 38-47.
- Taşmektepligil, M. Y. Çankaya, S., Taner, T. (2015). Football Fans Fanatic Scale. *Journal of Sports and Performance Research*, 6 (1), 41-49.
- Theodorakis ND, Dimmock JA, Wann DL, Barlas, A. (2010). Psychometric Evaluation of the Team Identification Scale Among Greek Sport Fans: A Cross-Validation Approach. *European Sport Management Quarterly*. 10: 289-3052.
- Theodorakis, N.D., Wann, D., Al-Emadi, A., Lianopoulos, Y. and Foudouki, A.(2017). An Examination of Levels of Fandom, Team Identification, Socialization Processes, and Fan Behaviors in Qatar. *J. Sport Behav.* 40, 87.
- Türkan Ş. (2013). The Effects of the Peer Support Program for Coping with Bullying on the 6th and 7th Grade Students' Coping With Bullying Skills. Educational Sciences Institute, Educational Sciences Department. PhD Thesis, Eskişehir Anadolu University
- Vanderbilt D., Augustyn M. (2010). The Effects of Bullying. *Pediatric and Child Health, Symposium Special Needs*, Elsevier Ltd, 20-7.
- Ward Jr, R. E. (2002). Fan violence: Social problem or moral panic?. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7(5), 453-475.
- Yu, Y., & Wang, X. (2015). World Cup 2014 in the Twitter World: A big data analysis of sentiments in US sports fans' tweets. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 392-400.