

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Assessing the Reliability of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport Among Spanish-Speaking Athletes

[Andrea Sáenz-Olmedo](#) , [Aitor Iturricastillo](#) ^{*} , [Jon Brain](#) , Luis Maria Zulaika , [Oidui Usabiaga](#)

Posted Date: 1 August 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202407.2590.v1

Keywords: Sexual violence; experiences; perceptions; coach-athlete relationship; sport



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

Assessing the Reliability of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport among Spanish-Speaking Athletes

Andrea Sáenz-Olmedo ¹, Aitor Iturricastillo ^{1,2,*}, Jon Brain ³, Luis Maria Zulaika ⁴ and Oidui Usabiaga ^{1,2}

¹ Society, Sport and Physical Activity (GIKAFIT) Research Group, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Education and Sport, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), 01007 Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain. andrea.saenzo@ehu.eus; aitor.iturricastillo@ehu.eus; oidui.usabiaga@ehu.eus

² AKTIBOKi: Research group in physical activity, physical exercise and sport. Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Education and Sport, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), 01007 Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain. aitor.iturricastillo@ehu.eus; oidui.usabiaga@ehu.eus

³ Safeguarding Sport and Society, Centre of Expertise Care and Well-being, Thomas More University of Applied Sciences, Antwerp, Belgium. jon.brain@thomasmore.be

⁴ Department of Physical and Sports Education, Faculty of Education and Sport, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Vitoria, Spain. luismzulaika@ehu.eus

* Correspondence: aitor.iturricastillo@ehu.eus

Abstract: The prevalence of sexual harassment and abuse in school sport, specifically from coaches to their athletes remains a concerning and pervasive issue. In an attempt to better understand and prevent specific coach-behaviours associated with such sexual misconduct, researchers have developed the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport. While the reliability of this measurement tool has been tested in anglo-saxon cultural contexts, it is not known whether the questionnaire is applicable to other cultural contexts. A sample of 146 (52 female, 94 male) Bachelor students from a university in the Basque Country participated in this cross cross-sectional study. The questionnaire was administered twice over a two-week period to assess test-retest reliability. The internal consistency of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport was high, with Cronbach's alpha values of 0.891 for perceptions and 0.813 for experiences across all participants. Gender-specific analysis showed similar reliability, with females having slightly lower alpha values for perceptions. Significant differences between test and retest were found (10 from perceptions 2 from experiences). However, Cohen's Kappa analysis showed significant agreement across all items. In conclusion, the study highlights the questionnaire's overall reliability and suggests its effectiveness as a tool for measuring sexual violence in sports within the Spanish context. Nonetheless, the findings of this study underscore the need for further research to enhance the instrument's stability and to better understand gender differences in perceptions and experiences of sexual violence in sports contexts.

Keywords: sexual violence; experiences; perceptions; coach-athlete relationship; sport

1. Introduction

The prevalence of sexual harassment and abuse in sport, has now been extensively documented and reported within academic research [1]. Young athletes in particular are at a great risk of being victims of sexual violence at this age, unacceptable behavior is often accepted as part of the sports culture [2]. In a study involving of 10000 athletes from 6 European countries, it was found that 35% and 20% of athletes had experienced non-contact sexual violence and contact violence respectively before the age of 18 [3]. There are several reasons that make it difficult to identify sexual violence behaviours, including the normalisation of physical contact, the intense relationships between coaching staff and athletes, and the diversity of leadership styles [4]. It is also important to note that

sexual violence in sport can consist of overt sexual behavior, such as rape, or less obvious behavior, such as non-contact verbal sexual harassment [3]. Understanding the relationship between sport participation and sexual violence behaviors could be crucial for prevention, as recent studies confirm the existence of risk and protective factors associated with sexual violence in sport [5,6].

Interpersonal sexual violence in sport can be perpetrated by other athletes or by adults in a position of power in the sports context [3]. Coaches are amongst those who are in authoritative roles and are perceived as predominant figures by young athletes. Due to the complex and complicated relationships they have with their athletes female coaches can indeed be common perpetrators [7–10]. Coaches are in a position of trust and power over young athletes [11,12] and play a key role in the lives of young athletes. Indeed, they can provide young athletes with supportive relationships, based on trust and closeness, as well as. However, close relationships and the creation of strong emotional bonds can be a trigger for sexual violence to occur [13,14]. One aspect or risk factor of the coach-athlete relationship is the potential for role ambiguity where appropriate and inappropriate behaviors are not clearly defined, due to the time spent by both parties in and out of the sporting environment [15,16]. In addition, a coach's role often involves physical contact in ways that can be instructional (e.g., teaching a start from a swimming pool) or non-educational (e.g., sharing space during a training camp or championship) [17,18]. The literature also addresses other characteristics of the coach-athlete relationship that can significantly increase the likelihood of sexual violence to occur between a coach and athlete, including athlete dependency, age differences, and the drive for success [19–21].

Due to the challenges and the grey area in determining what constitutes sexual harassment and abuse in sport, it is suggested that it is important to clearly determine what appropriate and inappropriate coaching behaviours should look like or take place within the coach-athlete relationship [22]. One of the first retrospective questionnaires on sexual violence in sport, called the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport, was designed and developed to identify different types of coach behaviours susceptible to leading to sexual violence towards athletes [21]. Specifically, the questionnaire was first used to measure student athletes' perceptions and experiences of sexual harassment in sport. Although subsequent questionnaires on sexual violence in sport have been developed, the inclusion of a section specifically addressing perceptions of behaviors and the coach-athlete relationship enables us to explore the nuanced areas of violence in sports. Consequently, understanding these different perceptions of sexual harassment and abuse is crucial for identifying gray areas where athletes' perspectives are essential to consider [23].

The cultural factor also plays an important role in how certain athletes perceive and process sexual violence [24]. For example, existent studies confirm these cultural variations, concluding that Israeli students considered more behaviors as inappropriate compared to American students and that Indian athletes classified more actions as sexual violence compared to European and North American students, while the perceptions of the Danish athletes were similar to those of the North American students [20].

The suitability of the questionnaire of sexual violence [21] was also considered after introducing small modifications, translated it into Catalan and Spanish [25]. This was done after analyzing the content in a previous pilot study with participants sharing the same characteristics. However, given the cultural differences identified in other studies and the fact that the questionnaire was initially developed in English and adapted to this cultural context, and considering that no reliability analysis was conducted for the Spanish version, this study aimed to analyze the internal consistency and reliability of the questionnaire on sexual harassment in sports, originally designed and developed in English [21] and later adapted to Spanish/Catalan [25].

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Participants

A total of 146 students from the Bachelor of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences (CAFYD) at the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU) participated in this study [female: $n = 52$ (35.6%); 20.3 ± 1.9 years; male: $n = 94$ (64.4%); 21.2 ± 2.3 years]. A convenience sample was used, driven by the

crucial need of raising awareness of sexual harassment and abuse in sport among these student-athletes, as they are and will continue to be responsible for the sports programs, clubs, and federations of the Autonomous Community. Before administering the questionnaire, all participants were informed of the objectives of the study, as well as the research procedure, and the possible risks. Their participation was voluntary, and they signed an informed consent form. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee for Human Research of the University of the Basque Country (M10/2022/110).

2.2. Procedure

In order to analyze the reliability of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport, a cross-sectional study design was carried out. The questionnaires were administered in person, during the month of April 2022. Responses were collected 2 weeks apart between the first (Test) and second (re-Test) administration. To maintain anonymity while also being able to match the questionnaires from Test with the re-Test ones a coding system was used. Participants were asked to provide the first letter of their name and the town they lived in and four digits of their phone number.

2.2. Instrument

The Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport previously validated and used in other studies [21,25] seeking to gain the study participants' perceptions and experiences of sexual harassment in sport. In this study we used the Spanish translation of the questionnaire [25] although the translation into Basque was also carried out. Similarly to this study, the current study used a sample of students studying a sport related degree to ensure the comprehensibility and appropriateness of the items. The pilot test confirmed the need to reformulate some terms in the Basque language in order to improve comprehension (e.g., "pinches" or "diminutives").

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. In the first section, perceptions of sexual harassment were collected in relation to 24 items about the coach behaviors. The unit of measurement for the perceptions was a scale: 0 = I'm not sure if the behavior is sexual violence, 1 = the behavior doesn't constitute sexual violence at all, 2 = maybe it is, 3 = the behavior is almost certainly constitutes sexual violence, and 4 = the behavior is almost certainly sexual violence. The second section collected respondents' experiences of the same 24 behaviors. Again, a different scale was also used: 0 = I'm not sure, 1 = it has never happened to me, 2 = yes, sometimes, 3 = yes, often and 4 = not to me, but to a colleague, yes. Both perceptions and experiences are grouped into different categories: behaviors related to sports instruction, behaviors not related to sports instruction, but contextually dependent on it, sexist behaviors, and physical contacts and verbal approaches. Finally, the third section was added to collect both independent variables and demographic data such as age, university degree, sport practiced, number of hours of sport per week and level of competition, among others.

2.2. Statistical Analysis

The results are presented as frequencies and percentages. The Cronbach's alpha test was used to analyze internal consistency, while the Wilcoxon statistic was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the test and the re-test in each item of the perceptions/experiences. On the other hand, the Cohen's Kappa analysis was used to analyze the concordance of the responses in each item. In this study, the interpretation of the scores is based on the classification system developed by [26]: scores of 0.09 indicate very *poor agreement*, scores of 0.01 - 0.20 indicate *poor agreement*, scores of 0.21- 0.40 indicate *fair agreement*, values of 0.41 - 0.60 moderate agreement, scores 0.61- 0.80 indicated *substantial agreement*, and scores 0.81 - 1.00 indicate almost *perfect agreement*. The analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Inc., version 26.0, Chicago, IL, USA). Significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

3. Results

3.1. Internal Consistency of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport

The internal consistency of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport was $\alpha = 0.891$ for perceptions and $\alpha = 0.813$ for experiences for all participants (see Table 1). In the case of females, the value of Cronbach's alpha value of perceptions was slightly lower than that of males ($\alpha = 0.872$ vs 0.891 , for females and males, respectively), while the value of experiences was slightly higher ($\alpha = 0.839$ vs 0.791 , for females and males, respectively). It can be noted that the internal consistency of the questionnaire was good in all cases.

Table 1. Cronbach's alpha values according to gender.

Item	Total		Women		Men	
	Test Percep	Re-Test Experi	Test Percep	Re-Test Experi	Test Percep	Re-Test Experi
1	0.892	0.808	0.858	0.832	0.895	0.788
2	0.892	0.808	0.860	0.832	0.896	0.788
3	0.886	0.809	0.867	0.834	0.885	0.791
4	0.896	0.813	0.862	0.842	0.899	0.789
5	0.890	0.812	0.867	0.829	0.892	0.798
6	0.886	0.810	0.864	0.848	0.887	0.779
7	0.882	0.802	0.861	0.831	0.882	0.777
8	0.883	0.799	0.865	0.834	0.881	0.767
9	0.879	0.807	0.863	0.831	0.878	0.789
10	0.891	0.804	0.866	0.837	0.892	0.776
11	0.890	0.803	0.866	0.839	0.890	0.774
12	0.891	0.800	0.866	0.839	0.891	0.769
13	0.890	0.803	0.860	0.837	0.891	0.776
14	0.885	0.807	0.868	0.830	0.884	0.792
15	0.884	0.809	0.860	0.839	0.886	0.787
16	0.886	0.811	0.876	0.837	0.883	0.786
17	0.886	0.803	0.868	0.827	0.885	0.785
18	0.881	0.801	0.867	0.824	0.880	0.784
19	0.883	0.800	0.873	0.825	0.881	0.780
20	0.887	0.797	0.879	0.825	0.884	0.771
21	0.884	0.802	0.869	0.830	0.882	0.779
22	0.885	0.810	0.872	0.836	0.884	0.789
23	0.886	0.805	0.870	0.829	0.885	0.789
24	0.887	0.810	0.874	0.834	0.886	0.789
Total	0.891	0.813	0.872	0.839	0.891	0.791

Percep = perceptions of sexual harassment; Experi = Sexual Harassment Experiences

3.2. Perceptions and Experiences of All Participants

For perceptions, significant differences between test and re-Test were found for 10 of the 24 items (see Table 2). Similarly, in the case of experiences, significant differences between test and re-Test were in 2 of the 24 items (see Table 3). However, the Kappa index shows that agreement was significant for all items in the perceptions (range = 0.16 – 0.57, from *mild to moderate* agreement; $p < 0.05$). In the analysis, all items showed significant agreements with slightly higher values than in the perceptions (range = 0.37 – 0.61, from *fair to substantial* agreement; $p < 0.05$).

Table 2. Perceptions of whole sample in the Test – Re-test.

	Not at all	Possibility	Constitutes	With complete certainty	I'm not sure	Wilcoxon	Kappa
Touches the shoulder while instructing	78 (54.5%)	60 (42.0%)	3 (2.8%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.1%)	0.612	0.57*
	81 (55.9%)	60 (41.4%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)		
Touches shoulder when waving	97 (67.8%)	41 (28.7%)	4 (2.8%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.0%)	0.776	0.56*
	97 (66.9%)	43 (29.7%)	4 (2.8%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)		
Kiss on the cheek	8 (5.6%)	62 (43.7%)	46 (32.4%)	26 (18.3%)	4 (2.8%)	0.286	0.28*
	6 (4.2%)	72 (50.0%)	46 (31.9%)	20 (13.9%)	2 (1.4%)		

Hug when you win	93 (65.5%)	44 (31.0%)	3 (2.1%)	2 (1.4%)	4 (2.8%)	0.018*	0.28*
	78 (53.5%)	55 (38.5%)	6 (4.2%)	4 (2.8%)	3 (2.0%)		
He comes very close when he instructs	26 (18.2%)	98 (68.5%)	16 (11.2%)	3 (2.1%)	3 (2.0%)	0.214	0.43*
	30 (20.5%)	96 (67.6%)	13 (9.2%)	3 (2.1%)	4 (2.7%)		
Invite the athlete to a coffee	46 (32.4%)	79 (55.6%)	15 (10.6%)	2 (1.4%)	4 (2.7%)	0.528	0.30*
	43 (29.9%)	84 (58.3%)	12 (8.3%)	5 (3.5%)	2 (1.4%)		
Invite the athlete to eat	26 (18.4%)	91 (64.5%)	21 (14.9%)	3 (2.1%)	5 (3.4%)	0.001*	0.31*
	22 (15.2%)	86 (58.6%)	26 (17.9%)	12 (8.3%)	1 (0.7%)		
Invite the athlete to dinner	22 (15.5%)	85 (59.9%)	30 (21.1%)	5 (3.5%)	4 (2.7%)	0.001*	0.16*
	13 (9.0%)	83 (57.2%)	32 (22.1%)	17 (11.7%)	1 (0.7%)		
Invite the athlete to your home	9 (6.3%)	65 (45.5%)	49 (34.3%)	20 (14.0%)	3 (2.0%)	0.778	0.41*
	11 (7.5%)	64 (43.8%)	46 (31.5%)	25 (17.1%)	0 (0.0%)		
Ask the athlete about her leisure time	78 (53.5%)	55 (38.5%)	9 (6.3%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.0%)	0.016*	0.40*
	61 (43.0%)	69 (48.6%)	10 (7.0%)	2 (1.4%)	4 (2.7%)		
Ask the athlete about the weekend	86 (60.1%)	49 (34.3%)	8 (5.6%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.0%)	0.039*	0.43*
	74 (51.4%)	61 (42.4%)	6 (4.2%)	3 (2.1%)	2 (1.4%)		
Explain your personal weekend plans	69 (50.0%)	59 (42.8%)	10 (7.2%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (5.5%)	0.006*	0.28*
	60 (41.7%)	63 (43.8%)	19 (13.2%)	2 (1.4%)	2 (1.4%)		
Explain what you like to do in your leisure time	89 (61.8%)	45 (31.3%)	8 (5.6%)	2 (1.4%)	2 (1.4%)	0.003*	0.28*
	68 (47.9%)	57 (40.1%)	13 (9.2%)	4 (2.8%)	4 (2.7%)		
Compliment the athlete's physical appearance	14 (9.9%)	68 (47.9%)	49 (34.5%)	11 (7.7%)	4 (2.7%)	0.552	0.23*
	15 (10.3%)	71 (49.0%)	42 (29.0%)	17 (11.7%)	1 (0.7%)		
Speak with diminutives to the athlete	21 (15.3%)	80 (58.4%)	26 (19.0%)	10 (7.3%)	9 (6.1%)	0.534	0.31*
	20 (13.9%)	79 (54.9%)	33 (22.9%)	12 (8.3%)	2 (1.4%)		
Makes derogatory comments about women	8 (5.7%)	16 (11.3%)	47 (33.3%)	70 (49.6%)	5 (3.4%)	0.041*	0.31*
	8 (5.6%)	23 (16.0%)	60 (41.7%)	53 (36.8%)	2 (1.4%)		
Pinch the athlete	13 (9.4%)	56 (40.3%)	52 (37.4%)	18 (12.9%)	7 (4.8%)	0.341	0.21*
	15 (10.5%)	61 (42.7%)	52 (36.4%)	15 (10.5%)	3 (2.0%)		
Massages your back	16 (11.4%)	59 (42.1%)	43 (30.7%)	22 (15.7%)	6 (4.1%)	0.279	0.32*
	12 (8.4%)	76 (53.1%)	38 (26.6%)	17 (11.9%)	3 (2.0%)		
He asks the athlete questions about her sex life	6 (4.1%)	23 (15.9%)	52 (35.9%)	64 (44.1%)	1 (0.7%)	0.995	0.29*
	8 (5.5%)	19 (13.0%)	57 (39.0%)	62 (42.5%)	1 (0.7%)		
Stare at the athlete's breasts or ass	6 (4.1%)	11 (7.5%)	36 (24.7%)	93 (63.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0.722	0.24*
	7 (4.8%)	7 (4.8%)	42 (29.0%)	89 (61.4%)	1 (0.7%)		
Shows sexual interest in the athlete	5 (3.4%)	8 (5.5%)	22 (15.1%)	111 (76.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0.111	0.28*
	7 (4.8%)	5 (3.4%)	35 (24.0%)	99 (67.8%)	0 (0.0%)		
Kiss on the lips	5 (3.4%)	3 (2.1%)	16 (11.0%)	122 (83.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0.008*	0.46*
	5 (3.4%)	6 (4.1%)	29 (19.9%)	106 (72.6%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sex with nothing in return	5 (3.4%)	6 (4.1%)	16 (11.0%)	119 (81.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0.155	0.35*
	6 (4.1%)	2 (1.4%)	31 (21.2%)	107 (73.3%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sexual relations in exchange for privileges	5 (3.4%)	1 (0.7%)	5 (3.4%)	135 (92.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0.006*	0.31*
	6 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (13.0%)	121 (82.9%)	0 (0.0%)		

*P<0.05 significant differences between the Test and the re-Test; Not at all: The behavior does not constitute sexual harassment at all; Possibility: The behavior may constitute sexual harassment; It constitutes: The behavior constitutes sexual harassment; With complete certainty: You believe with complete certainty that the behavior constitutes sexual harassment

Table 3. Experiences of whole sample in the Test – Re-test.

	It's never happened to me	Ever	Often	Not me, others do	I'm not sure	Wilcoxon	Kappa
Touches the shoulder while instructing	14 (9.6%)	77 (52.7%)	53 (36.3%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0.267	0.40*
	9 (6.2%)	78 (53.4%)	58 (39.7%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)		
Touches shoulder when waving	9 (6.2%)	65 (44.5%)	69 (47.3%)	3 (2.1%)	3 (2.0%)	0.094	0.37*
	5 (3.4%)	84 (57.5%)	56 (38.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)		
Kiss on the cheek	115 (79.3%)	26 (17.9%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	0.209	0.61*

	107 (73.8%)	34 (23.4%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)		
Hug when you win	10 (6.9%)	47 (32.4%)	86 (59.3%)	2 (1.4%)	1 (0.7%)	0.376	0.49*
	11 (7.6%)	51 (35.2%)	82 (56.6%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)		
He comes very close when he instructs	45 (32.4%)	68 (48.9%)	23 (16.5%)	3 (2.2%)	7 (4.8%)	0.558	0.43*
	44 (30.6%)	70 (48.6%)	27 (18.8%)	3 (2.1%)	2 (1.4%)		
Invite the athlete to a coffee	45 (31.3%)	79 (54.9%)	16 (11.1%)	4 (2.8%)	2 (1.4%)	0.630	0.50*
	47 (32.2%)	79 (54.1%)	16 (11.0%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)		
Invite the athlete to eat	93 (64.6%)	38 (26.4%)	9 (6.3%)	4 (2.8%)	2 (1.4%)	0.807	0.52*
	94 (65.3%)	40 (27.8%)	6 (4.2%)	4 (2.8%)	2 (1.4%)		
Invite the athlete to dinner	99 (68.8%)	34 (23.6%)	7 (4.9%)	4 (2.8%)	2 (1.4%)	0.903	0.50*
	101 (70.1%)	32 (22.2%)	6 (4.2%)	5 (3.5%)	2 (1.4%)		
Invite the athlete to your home	122 (84.7%)	16 (11.1%)	3 (2.1%)	3 (2.1%)	2 (1.4%)	0.239	0.48*
	116 (80.0%)	23 (15.9%)	3 (2.1%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)		
Ask the athlete about her leisure time	13 (9.2%)	73 (51.4%)	53 (37.3%)	3 (2.1%)	5 (3.4%)	0.088	0.52*
	20 (13.7%)	73 (50.0%)	51 (34.9%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)		
Ask the athlete about the weekend	12 (8.5%)	70 (49.6%)	57 (40.4%)	2 (1.4%)	6 (4.1%)	0.033*	0.55*
	14 (9.7%)	80 (55.6%)	48 (33.3%)	2 (1.4%)	2 (1.4%)		
Explain your personal weekend plans	47 (33.1%)	71 (50.0%)	24 (16.9%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.7%)	0.055	0.46*
	37 (25.7%)	77 (53.5%)	30 (20.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.4%)		
Explain what you like to do in your leisure time	37 (25.7%)	75 (52.1%)	31 (21.5%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)	0.789	0.36*
	35 (24.3%)	80 (55.6%)	29 (20.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.4%)		
Compliment the athlete's physical appearance	78 (56.1%)	49 (35.3%)	6 (4.3%)	6 (4.3%)	8 (5.4%)	0.653	0.51*
	73 (51.4%)	60 (42.3%)	2 (1.4%)	7 (4.9%)	5 (3.4%)		
Speak with diminutives to the athlete	87 (62.6%)	40 (28.8%)	4 (2.9%)	8 (5.8%)	7 (4.8%)	0.631	0.44*
	93 (65.0%)	37 (25.9%)	6 (4.2%)	7 (4.9%)	4 (2.7%)		
Makes derogatory comments about women	106 (74.1%)	30 (21.0%)	3 (2.1%)	4 (2.8%)	3 (2%)	0.989	0.56*
	104 (74.3%)	28 (20.0%)	3 (2.1%)	5 (3.6%)	6 (4.1%)		
Pinch the athlete	118 (83.1%)	17 (12.0%)	1 (0.7%)	6 (4.2%)	4 (2.7%)	0.708	0.46*
	117 (82.4%)	19 (13.4%)	1 (0.7%)	5 (3.5%)	4 (2.7%)		
Massages your back	98 (68.5%)	37 (25.9%)	1 (0.7%)	7 (4.9%)	3 (2%)	0.512	0.54*
	98 (68.1%)	39 (27.1%)	2 (1.4%)	5 (3.5%)	3 (2.0%)		
He asks the athlete questions about her sex life	114 (78.6%)	21 (14.5%)	4 (2.8%)	6 (4.1%)	1 (0.7%)	0.172	0.51*
	111 (78.2%)	27 (19.0%)	4 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.7%)		
Stare at the athlete's breasts or ass	112 (81.2%)	14 (10.1%)	5 (3.6%)	7 (5.1%)	8 (5.4%)	0.418	0.47*
	118 (83.7%)	12 (8.5%)	5 (3.5%)	6 (4.3%)	5 (3.4%)		
Shows sexual interest in the athlete	132 (91.7%)	4 (2.8%)	2 (1.4%)	6 (4.2%)	2 (1.4%)	0.355	0.38*
	135 (92.5%)	4 (2.7%)	3 (2.1%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)		
Kiss on the lips	141 (96.6%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0.414	0.69*
	140 (96.6%)	2 (1.4%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)	1 (0.7%)		
Proposes sex with nothing in return	140 (95.9%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0.334	0.57*
	140 (95.9%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sexual relations in exchange for privileges	142 (97.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0.194	0.42*
	143 (97.9%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)		

*P<0.05 significant differences between the Test and the re-Test

Sometimes: Yes. ever

Often: Yes. often

3.3. Perceptions and Experiences in Female Athletes

In contrast to the results obtained for the whole sample, in the case of females, significant differences between the Test and re-Test were only found in 4 out of the 24 items in relation to perceptions (see Table 4). In the case of experiences, significant differences between the Test and re-Test were found only in item 11 (see Table 5). For both perceptions and experiences, Cohen's Kappa indicated that agreement was significant for all items, except for item 24. The rest of the agreement values range from *slight to substantial* (range = 0.06 – 0.67; $p < 0.05$) for perceptions and from *fair to substantial* (range = 0.28 – 0.79; $p < 0.05$) for experiences.

Table 4. Female Perceptions in the Test – Re-test.

	Not at all	Possibility	Constitutes	With complete certainty	I'm not sure	Wilcoxon	Kappa
Touches the shoulder while instructing	24 (49.0%)	24 (49.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (5.9%)	0.796	0.41*
	27(52.9%)	22 (43.1%)	1 (2.0%)	1 (2.0%)	1 (1.9%)		
Touches shoulder when waving	32 (65.3%)	16 (32.7%)	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.8%)	0.316	0.61*
	33 (64.7%)	15 (29.4%)	2 (3.9%)	1 (2.0%)	1 (1.9%)		
Kiss on the cheek	2 (4.1%)	23 (46.9%)	17 (34.7%)	7 (14.3%)	3 (5.9%)	0.867	0.30*
	1 (2.0%)	27 (54.0%)	15 (30.0%)	7 (14.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
Hug when you win	36 (72.0%)	13 (26.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (3.8%)	0.060	0.25*
	29 (59.2%)	16 (32.7%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (6.1%)	3 (5.8%)		
He comes very close when he instructs	5 (9.8%)	36 (70.6%)	7 (13.7%)	3 (5.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0.029*	0.51*
	8 (16.3%)	35 (71.4%)	4 (8.2%)	2 (4.1%)	3 (5.8%)		
Invite the athlete to a coffee	13 (26.5%)	30 (61.2%)	5 (10.2%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (5.9%)	0.637	0.46*
	15 (29.4%)	28 (54.9%)	4 (7.8%)	4 (7.8%)	1 (1.9%)		
Invite the athlete to eat	4 (8.3%)	35 (72.9%)	8 (16.7%)	1 (2.1%)	4 (7.7%)	0.058	0.27*
	5 (9.6%)	33 (63.5%)	7 (13.5%)	7 (13.5%)	0 (0.0%)		
Invite the athlete to dinner	4 (8.3%)	31 (64.6%)	11 (22.9%)	2 (4.2%)	4 (7.8%)	0.043*	0.67*
	3 (5.8%)	30 (57.7%)	10 (19.2%)	9 (17.3%)	0 (0.0%)		
Invite the athlete to your home	1 (2.0%)	19 (38.0%)	22 (44.0%)	8 (16.0%)	2 (3.8%)	0.449	0.39*
	1 (1.9%)	20 (38.5%)	20 (38.5%)	11 (21.2%)	0 (0.0%)		
Ask the athlete about her leisure time	27 (54.0%)	19 (38.0%)	3 (6.0%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (3.8%)	1.000	0.40*
	26 (52.0%)	21 (42.0%)	2 (4.0%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
Ask the athlete about the weekend	32 (65.3 %)	15 (30.6%)	2 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.8%)	0.225	0.43*
	30 (58.8%)	19 (37.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.9%)	1 (1.9%)		
Explain your personal weekend plans	25 (53.2%)	19 (40.4%)	3 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (9.6%)	0.071	0.29*
	22 (44.0%)	22 (44.0%)	4 (8.0%)	2 (4.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
Explain what you like to do in your leisure time	34 (66.7%)	14 (27.5%)	2(3.9%)	1 (2.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0.275	0.26*
	30 (60.0%)	17 (34.0%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (4.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
Compliment the athlete's physical appearance	3 (5.9%)	22 (43.1%)	23 (45.1%)	3 (5.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0.053	0.27*
	4 (7.8%)	16 (31.4%)	22 (43.1%)	9 (17.6%)	1 (1.9%)		
Speak with diminutives to the athlete	3 (6.3%)	34 (70.8%)	9 (18.8%)	2 (4.2%)	4 (7.7%)	0.394	0.21*
	4 (7.8%)	31 (60.8%)	10 (19.6%)	6 (11.8%)	1 (1.9%)		
Makes derogatory comments about women	1 (2.0%)	1 (2.0%)	21 (42.9%)	26 (53.1%)	3 (5.8%)	0.536	0.37*
	1 (2.0%)	5 (9.8%)	19 (37.3%)	26 (51.0%)	1 (1.9%)		
Pinch the athlete	2 (4.3%)	20 (42.6%)	19 (40.4%)	6 (12.8%)	5 (9.8%)	0.340	0.22*
	5 (10.0%)	19 (38.0%)	21 (42.0%)	5 (10.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
Massages your back	3 (6.0%)	18 (36.0%)	19 (38.0%)	10 (20.0%)	2 (3.8%)	0.064	0.26*
	4 (8.0%)	29 (58.0%)	7 (14.0%)	10 (20.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
He asks the athlete questions about her sex life	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.8%)	20 (38.5%)	29 (55.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0.463	0.28*
	2 (3.8%)	3 (5.8%)	20 (38.5%)	27 (51.9%)	0 (0.0%)		
Stare at the athlete's breasts or ass	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.8%)	10 (19.2%)	39 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0.825	0.06*
	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.8%)	11 (21.2%)	38 (73.1%)	0 (0.0%)		
Shows sexual interest in the athlete	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	8 (15.4%)	43 (82.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0.506	0.13*
	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.8%)	7 (13.5%)	42 (80.8%)	0 (0.0%)		
Kiss on the lips	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	3 (5.8%)	48 (92.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0.236	0.45*
	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (13.5%)	44 (84.6%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sex with nothing in return	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (15.4%)	44 (84.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1.000	0.31*
	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (11.5%)	45 (86.5%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sexual relations in exchange for privileges	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	52 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	0.020*	0.00
	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (9.6%)	46 (88.5%)	0 (0.0%)		

*P<0.05 significant differences between the Test and the re-Test; Not at all: The behavior does not constitute sexual harassment at all; Possibility: The behavior may constitute sexual harassment; It constitutes: The behavior constitutes sexual harassment; With complete certainty: You believe with complete certainty that the behavior constitutes sexual harassment

Table 5. Female experiences in the Test – Re-test.

	It's never happened to me	Ever	Often	Not me, others do	I'm not sure	Wilcoxon	Kappa
Touches the shoulder while instructing	2 (3.8%)	33 (63.5%)	16 (30.8%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0.637	0.44*
	2 (3.8%)	30 (57.7%)	20 (38.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		
Touches shoulder when waving	1 (1.9%)	27 (51.9%)	23 (44.2%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0.074	0.37*
	1 (1.9%)	34 (65.4%)	17 (32.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		
Kiss on the cheek	32 (61.5%)	19 (36.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0.763	0.68*
	31 (59.6%)	20 (39.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)		
Hug when you win	2 (3.9%)	18 (35.3%)	31 (60.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1.000	0.46*
	2 (3.9%)	18 (35.3%)	31 (60.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)		
He comes very close when he instructs	19 (41.3%)	17 (37.0%)	9 (19.6%)	1 (2.2%)	6 (11.5%)	0.796	0.60*
	19 (38.0%)	20 (40.0%)	11 (22.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
Invite the athlete to a coffee	17 (32.7%)	24 (46.2%)	9 (17.3%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0.671	0.47*
	14 (26.9%)	31 (59.6%)	5 (9.6%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)		
Invite the athlete to eat	34 (65.4%)	13 (25.0%)	4 (7.7%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0.685	0.46*
	35 (68.6%)	13 (25.5%)	2 (3.9%)	1 (2.0%)	1 (1.9%)		
Invite the athlete to dinner	38 (73.1%)	11 (21.2%)	2 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0.717	0.42*
	41 (80.4%)	7 (13.7%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (3.9%)	1 (2.0%)		
Invite the athlete to your home	43 (82.7%)	7 (13.5%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0.496	0.64*
	45 (86.5%)	6 (11.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)		
Ask the athlete about her leisure time	3 (6.1%)	26 (53.1%)	19 (38.8%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (5.8%)	0.248	0.57*
	5 (9.6%)	27 (51.9%)	19 (36.5%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)		
Ask the athlete about the weekend	3 (6.3%)	23 (47.9%)	21 (43.8%)	1 (2.1%)	4 (7.7%)	0.206	0.64*
	4 (7.8%)	27 (52.9%)	20 (39.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)		
Explain your personal weekend plans	13 (26.5%)	26 (53.1%)	10 (20.4%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.8%)	0.035*	0.47*
	9 (18.0%)	24 (48.0%)	17 (34.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.9%)		
Explain what you like to do in your leisure time	12 (24.0%)	23 (46.0%)	14 (28.0%)	1 (2.0%)	2 (3.8%)	0.297	0.36*
	7 (14.0%)	27 (54.0%)	16 (32.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
Compliment the athlete's physical appearance	24 (50.0%)	18 (37.5%)	2 (4.2%)	4 (8.3%)	4 (7.7%)	0.523	0.53*
	24 (49.0%)	21 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.2%)	3 (5.8%)		
Speak with diminutives to the athlete	25 (54.3%)	13 (28.3%)	3 (6.5%)	5 (10.9%)	6 (11.8%)	0.052	0.41*
	34 (69.4%)	10 (20.4%)	2 (4.1%)	3 (6.1%)	3 (5.8%)		
Makes derogatory comments about women	40 (81.6%)	8 (16.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (5.8%)	0.794	0.28*
	41 (85.4%)	4 (8.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.3%)	4 (7.7%)		
Pinch the athlete	40 (80.0%)	6 (12.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.0%)	2 (3.8%)	0.863	0.60*
	38 (77.6%)	8 (16.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.1%)	3 (5.8%)		
Massages your back	28 (54.9%)	18 (35.3%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (7.8%)	1 (1.9%)	0.621	0.47*
	31 (62.0%)	13 (26.0%)	2 (4.0%)	4 (8.0%)	2 (3.8%)		
He asks the athlete questions about her sex life	43 (82.7%)	4 (7.7%)	2 (3.8%)	3 (5.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0.135	0.41*
	43 (87.8%)	4 (8.2%)	2 (4.1%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.8%)		
Stare at the athlete's breasts or ass	40 (85.1%)	4 (8.5%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (2.1%)	5 (9.8%)	0.832	0.55*
	40 (81.6%)	6 (12.2%)	2 (4.1%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (5.8%)		
Shows sexual interest in the athlete	46 (90.2%)	3 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0.458	0.57*
	47 (90.4%)	3 (5.8%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)		
Kiss on the lips	50 (96.2%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0.317	0.79*
	49 (94.2%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sex with nothing in return	49 (94.2%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0.655	0.65*
	49 (94.2%)	2 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sexual relations in exchange for privileges	51 (98.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0.655	-0.01
	51 (98.1%)	1 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		

*P<0.05 significant differences between the Test and the re-Test

Sometimes: Yes. Ever

Often: Yes. often

3.4. Perceptions and Experiences in Male Athletes

For males, significant differences were found in 7 out of 24 items, a higher number than compared to females (see Table 6). However, as with females, there was only one significant difference between the test and the re-Test, but in this case, on item 9 (see Table 7). For both perceptions and experiences, Cohen's Kappa indicated that agreement was significant for all items, although the values of agreement ranged from *slight* to *substantial* (range = 0.18 – 0.65; $p < 0.05$) for perceptions and from *fair* to *substantial* (range = 0.33 – 0.65; $p < 0.05$) for experiences.

Table 6. Male perceptions in the Test – Re-test.

	Not at all	Possibility	Constitutes	With complete certainty	I'm not sure	Wilcoxon	Kappa
Touches the shoulder while instructing	54 (57.4%)	36 (38.3%)	4 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0.655	0.65*
	54 (57.4%)	38 (40.4%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		
Touches shoulder when waving	65 (69.1%)	25 (26.6%)	3 (3.2%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0.809	0.53*
	64 (68.1%)	28 (29.8%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		
Kiss on the cheek	6 (6.5%)	39 (41.9%)	29 (31.2%)	19 (20.4%)	1 (1.1%)	0.211	0.27*
	5 (5.3%)	45 (47.9%)	31 (33.0%)	13 (13.8%)	0 (0.0%)		
Hug when you win	57 (62.0%)	31 (33.7%)	3 (3.3%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.1%)	0.114	0.29*
	49 (52.1%)	39 (41.5%)	5 (5.3%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)		
He comes very close when he instructs	21 (22.8%)	62 (67.4%)	9 (9.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.1%)	0.990	0.38*
	22 (23.7%)	61 (65.6%)	9 (9.7%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)		
Invite the athlete to a coffee	33 (35.5%)	49 (52.7%)	10 (10.8%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	0.657	0.22*
	28 (30.1%)	56 (60.2%)	8 (8.6%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)		
Invite the athlete to eat	22 (23.7%)	56 (60.2%)	13 (14.0%)	2 (2.2%)	1 (1.1%)	0.009*	0.33*
	17 (18.3%)	52 (55.9%)	19 (20.4%)	5 (5.4%)	1 (1.1%)		
Invite the athlete to dinner	18 (19.1%)	54 (57.4%)	19 (20.2%)	3 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0.006*	0.20*
	10 (10.8%)	53 (57.0%)	22 (23.7%)	8 (8.6%)	1 (1.1%)		
Invite the athlete to your home	8 (8.6%)	46 (49.5%)	27 (29.0%)	12 (12.9%)	1 (1.1%)	0.880	0.41*
	10 (10.6%)	44 (46.8%)	26 (27.7%)	14 (14.9%)	0 (0.0%)		
Ask the athlete about her leisure time	51 (54.8%)	36 (38.7%)	6 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	0.003*	0.41*
	35 (38.0%)	48 (52.2%)	8 (8.7%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.1%)		
Ask the athlete about the weekend	54 (57.4%)	34 (36.2%)	6 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0.095	0.43*
	44 (47.3%)	42 (45.2%)	6 (6.5%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)		
Explain your personal weekend plans	44 (48.4%)	40 (44.0%)	7 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.2%)	0.039*	0.27*
	38 (40.4%)	41 (43.6%)	15 (16.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		
Explain what you like to do in your leisure time	55 (59.1%)	31 (33.3%)	6 (6.5%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	0.006*	0.28*
	38 (41.3%)	40 (43.5%)	12 (13.0%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.1%)		
Compliment the athlete's physical appearance	11 (12.1%)	46 (50.5%)	26 (28.6%)	8 (8.8%)	3 (3.2%)	0.425	0.18*
	11 (11.7%)	55 (58.5%)	20 (21.3%)	8 (8.5%)	0 (0.0%)		
Speak with diminutives to the athlete	18 (20.2%)	46 (51.7%)	17 (19.1%)	8 (9.0%)	5 (5.3%)	0.825	0.34*
	16 (17.2%)	48 (51.6%)	23 (24.7%)	6 (6.5%)	1 (1.1%)		
Makes derogatory comments about women	7 (7.6%)	15 (16.3%)	26 (28.3%)	44 (47.8%)	2 (2.1%)	0.044*	0.28*
	7 (7.5%)	18 (19.4%)	41 (44.1%)	27 (29.0%)	1 (1.1%)		
Pinch the athlete	11 (12.0%)	36 (39.1%)	33 (35.9%)	12 (13.0%)	2 (2.1%)	0.614	0.21*
	10 (10.8%)	42 (45.2%)	31 (33.3%)	10 (10.8%)	1 (1.1%)		
Massages your back	13 (14.4%)	41 (45.6%)	24 (26.7%)	12 (13.3%)	4 (4.2%)	0.882	0.36*
	8 (8.6%)	47 (50.5%)	31 (33.3%)	7 (7.5%)	1 (1.1%)		
He asks the athlete questions about her sex life	5 (5.4%)	21 (22.6%)	32 (34.4%)	35 (37.6%)	1 (1.1%)	0.604	0.27*
	6 (6.4%)	16 (17.0%)	37 (39.4%)	35 (37.2%)	1 (1.1%)		
Stare at the athlete's breasts or ass	6 (6.4%)	8 (8.5%)	26 (27.7%)	54 (57.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0.780	0.30*
	6 (6.5%)	5 (5.4%)	31 (33.3%)	51 (54.6%)	1 (1.1%)		
Shows sexual interest in the athlete	5 (5.3%)	7 (7.4%)	14 (14.9%)	68 (72.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0.129	0.31*
	6 (6.4%)	3 (3.2%)	28 (29.8%)	57 (60.6%)	0 (0.0%)		
Kiss on the lips	5 (5.3%)	2 (2.1%)	13 (13.8%)	74 (78.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0.014*	0.45*

	4 (4.3%)	6 (6.4%)	22 (23.4%)	62 (66.0%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sex with nothing in return	5 (5.3%)	6 (6.4%)	8 (8.5%)	75 (79.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0.106	0.36*
Proposes sexual relations in exchange for privileges	5 (5.3%)	1 (1.1%)	5 (5.3%)	83 (88.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0.074	0.37*

*P<0.05 significant differences between the Test and the re-Test; Not at all: The behavior does not constitute sexual harassment at all; Possibility: The behavior may constitute sexual harassment; It constitutes: The behavior constitutes sexual harassment; With complete certainty: You believe with complete certainty that the behavior constitutes sexual harassment

Table 7. Male experiences in the Test – Re-test.

	It's never happened to me	Ever	Often	Not me, others do	I'm not sure	Wilcoxon	Kappa
Touches the shoulder while instructing	12 (12.8%) 7 (7.4%)	44 (46.8%) 48 (51.1%)	37 (39.4%) 38 (40.4%)	1 (1.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%)	0.303	0.39*
Touches shoulder when waving	8 (8.5%) 4 (4.3%)	38 (40.4%) 50 (53.2%)	46 (48.9%) 39 (41.5%)	2 (2.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%)	0.431	0.36*
Kiss on the cheek	83 (89.2%) 76 (80.9%)	7 (7.5%) 14 (14.9%)	1 (1.1%) 1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%) 3 (3.2%)	1 (1.1%) 0 (0.0%)	0.105	0.48*
Hug when you win	8 (8.5%) 9 (9.6%)	29 (30.9%) 33 (35.1%)	55 (58.5%) 51 (54.3%)	2 (2.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%)	0.326	0.50*
He comes very close when he instructs	26 (28.0%) 25 (26.6%)	51 (54.8%) 50 (53.2%)	14 (15.1%) 16 (17.0%)	2 (2.2%) 3 (3.2%)	1 (1.1%) 0 (0.0%)	0.578	0.33*
Invite the athlete to a coffee	28 (30.4%) 33 (35.1%)	55 (59.8%) 48 (51.1%)	7 (7.6%) 11 (11.7%)	2 (2.2%) 2 (2.1%)	2 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%)	0.847	0.53*
Invite the athlete to eat	59 (64.1%) 59 (63.4%)	25 (27.2%) 27 (29.0%)	5 (5.4%) 4 (4.3%)	3 (3.3%) 3 (3.2%)	2 (2.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0.985	0.56*
Invite the athlete to dinner	61 (66.3%) 60 (64.5%)	23 (25.0%) 25 (26.9%)	5 (5.4%) 5 (5.4%)	3 (3.3%) 3 (3.2%)	2 (2.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0.863	0.52*
Invite the athlete to your home	79 (85.9%) 71 (76.3%)	9 (9.8%) 17 (18.3%)	2 (2.2%) 3 (3.2%)	2 (2.2%) 2 (2.2%)	2 (2.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0.043*	0.40*
Ask the athlete about her leisure time	10 (10.8%) 15 (16.0%)	47 (50.5%) 46 (48.9%)	34 (36.6%) 32 (34.0%)	2 (2.2%) 1 (1.1%)	2 (2.1%) 0 (0.0%)	0.187	0.49*
Ask the athlete about the weekend	9 (9.7%) 10 (10.8%)	47 (50.5%) 53 (57.0%)	36 (38.7%) 28 (30.1%)	1 (1.1%) 2 (2.2%)	2 (2.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0.083	0.50*
Explain your personal weekend plans	34 (36.6%) 28 (29.8%)	45 (48.4%) 53 (56.4%)	14 (15.1%) 13 (13.8%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%) 0 (0.0%)	0.419	0.44*
Explain what you like to do in your leisure time	25 (26.6%) 28 (29.8%)	52 (55.3%) 53 (56.4%)	17 (18.1%) 13 (13.8%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%)	0.289	0.34*
Compliment the athlete's physical appearance	54 (59.3%) 49 (52.7%)	31 (34.1%) 39 (41.9%)	4 (4.4%) 2 (2.8%)	2 (2.2%) 3 (3.2%)	4 (4.2%) 2 (2.1%)	0.297	0.50*
Speak with diminutives to the athlete	62 (66.7%) 59 (62.8%)	27 (29.0%) 27 (28.7%)	1 (1.1%) 4 (4.3%)	3 (3.2%) 4 (4.3%)	1 (1.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0.254	0.46*
Makes derogatory comments about women	66 (70.2%) 63 (68.5%)	22 (23.4%) 24 (26.1%)	3 (3.2%) 3 (3.3%)	3 (3.2%) 2 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%) 2 (2.1%)	0.830	0.65*
Pinch the athlete	78 (84.8%) 79 (84.9%)	11 (12.0%) 11 (11.8%)	1 (1.1%) 1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%) 2 (2.2%)	2 (2.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0.695	0.35*
Massages your back	70 (76.1%) 67 (71.3%)	19 (20.7%) 26 (27.7%)	0 (0.0%) 0 (0.0%)	3 (3.3%) 1 (1.1%)	2 (2.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0.806	0.58*
He asks the athlete questions about her sex life	71 (76.3%) 68 (73.1%)	17 (18.3%) 23 (24.7%)	2 (2.2%) 2 (2.2%)	3 (3.2%) 0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%) 1 (1.1%)	0.648	0.54*
Stare at the athlete's breasts or ass	72 (79.1%) 78 (84.8%)	10 (11.0%) 6 (6.5%)	3 (3.3%) 3 (3.3%)	6 (6.6%) 5 (5.4%)	3 (3.2%) 2 (2.1%)	0.231	0.43*
Shows sexual interest in the athlete	86 (92.5%) 88 (93.6%)	1 (1.1%) 1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%) 2 (2.1%)	4 (4.3%) 3 (3.2%)	1 (1.1%) 0 (0.0%)	0.631	0.27*

Kiss on the lips	91 (96.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.2%)	92 (96.8%)	0.180	0.59*
	91 (97.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sex with nothing in return	91 (97.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.2%)	92 (96.8%)	0.414	0.49*
	91 (96.8%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)		
Proposes sexual relations in exchange for privileges	91 (97.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.2%)	93 (97.9%)	0.180	0.59*
	92 (97.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)		

*P<0.05 significant differences between the Test and the re-Test

Sometimes: Yes. ever
Often: Yes often

4. Discussion

This study evaluated the reliability of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport among Spanish-speaking athletes. Assessing the reliability of this questionnaire is essential to ensure its applicability in other cultural contexts, specifically in Spanish context. The reliability of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport was analyzed in previous studies (e.g., 21,27,28) showing internal consistency values above 0.65 and below 0.90. These results are in line with those obtained in the present study, where the internal consistency of the questionnaire in Spanish and Basque was slightly higher in both languages ($\alpha > 0.791$ for *both perceptions* and *experiences* in girls and boys). Regarding the reproducibility of the questionnaire, although some significant differences were observed between the test and the re-Test, (10 items in perceptions and 2 items in experiences) a significant agreement was observed with a slight to moderate agreement in perceptions and slightly higher from a fair to substantial agreement in *experiences*.

Sexual violence in the context of sport can be perpetrated or experienced by both male or female, regardless of the type of sport [3]. Nevertheless, it can be hypothesized that the *perceptions* and *experiences* of men and women are different, which may affect the reliability of the questionnaire. Regarding the internal consistency of the questionnaire, the results were higher than $\alpha > 0.791$ for *both perceptions* and *experiences* in the whole sample, as well as for the female and male gender, indicating good values of internal consistency. Furthermore, the questionnaire can be reliable for both girls and boys, with very small differences between the two genders (Perceptions: $\alpha=0.872$ vs 0.891 ; Experiences: $\alpha = 0.839$ vs 0.791 , for girls and boys respectively). These values were higher than those previously obtained in the first validation study $\alpha > 0.65$ [21] and similar to those obtained in another study [28], which recorded values between $\alpha=0.77$ and 0.89 for the different dimensions of the questionnaire in the *perceptions* section. These values show similarities with the reference literature in our context; however, it is necessary to carry out this analysis when using the instrument in different or new contexts.

Following established guidelines [29], which indicate that the test-re-Test is one of the most rigorous ways of measuring the reliability of the instrument over time, a comparative and concordance analysis was chosen. In the analysis with all the participants, significant differences were observed between the Test and the re-Test were observed for 10 of the 24 items, but for *experiences* on the other hand, the number of items showing significant differences was only two. This trend was also observed for the female gender (differences in 4 items for *perceptions* and 1 item for *experiences*) and for the male gender (differences in 7 items for *perceptions* and 1 item for *experiences*) where more differences were observed for *perceptions* than for *experiences*. The analysis shows that the instrument seems to be less reliable for perceptions. It is difficult to compare the data obtained because no studies were found that carried out a reproducibility analysis. However, in this study, the differences observed, especially in perceptions, may be due to obtaining fewer than five data points in an area, which could affect the results [30]. Additionally, perceptions do not have as much stability over time as experiences can demonstrate. This is because, as indicated different authors, [1,31] perceptions of behaviors related to sexual violence in sport may change over time depending on the different sporting situations and levels of sport and how this change; even athletes may be more accepting of violence in more serious sporting situations, while experiences remain constant over time. However, the instrument has been shown to be reliable for experiments, although further studies are needed to analyse the stability of the instrument over time.

The differences in several items of the reproducibility analysis differ from those observed in the reliability analysis, where the Kappa index showed significant agreement for all items in *perceptions* and *experiences*, although the range of agreement was from slight to substantial agreement. In the case of girls, there is no significant agreement on item 24, either in perceptions or experiences (it proposes sexual relations in exchange for privileges). As explained earlier, the fact that there is very little data in some responses may have affected the results. However, for the rest of the items, the agreement was significant with slight and substantial agreement in *perceptions* and *experiences*. As with the female gender and in the total sample, the reliability of the questionnaire showed significant agreement for all items, with values ranging from *mild to substantial* for both perceptions and experiences. Despite the differences in the comparative analysis of the Tes-re-Test, significant concordance relationships were also observed, albeit with low values in most cases. Further research is therefore needed in this area.

Reliability studies tend to assume that if the samples used have an equal number of boys and girls, the overall result when comparing the instruments could be valid for both genders, so several questionnaires have been validated with an exclusively female sample (e.g., 32), however, this is somewhat questionable, as there are really few studies that have attempted to evaluate the reliability of questionnaires for both genders [34]. In this study, the internal consistency values for men are similar to those for women with $\alpha = 0.891$ for *perceptions* and relatively lower for experiences, with a value of $\alpha = 0.791$. As in the case of women and in the sample, there were again significant differences in 8 items (7 perceptions + 1 experience). With regard to the reliability of the instrument, Kappa shows significant agreement for all items, with values ranging from *mild to substantial* (0.18– 0.65; $p < 0.05$) for perceptions and from *fair to substantial* (0.33 – 0.65; $p < 0.05$) for experiences. These values determine the reliability and temporal stability of the instrument, although they are relatively lower than those obtained with the instrument validated to measure the harassment in team sports [35].

This study is not without its limitations: 1) the number of participants in the study, 2) the distribution of the sample according to gender (92 vs. 54), 3) although the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport was anonymized, it was given in person, so it is possible that some participants gave socially desirable or biased answers, and this they could have influenced the results, especially in terms of *perceptions*.

5. Conclusions

This study assessed the reliability of the Sexual Violence in Sport Questionnaire, showing a solid internal consistency across the sample and in gender segmentations. Gender-segmented analysis provides a deeper understanding of perceptions and experiences of sexual harassment in sport. Although half of the perceptions items do not appear to be stable over time, the experiences are stable over time, both in the sample as a whole and when differentiated according to gender. The Cohen's Kappa analysis suggests concordance between responses at different times, which reinforces the validity of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport as a measurement tool. Despite these limitations, the results support the usefulness and reliability of the Sexual Violence Questionnaire in Sport and highlight the need for further research to analyze the reliability of the instrument on the basis of different population types.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.S., A.I. and O.U. methodology, A.S., A.I. and O.U.; software, A.S. and A.I.; validation, A.S., A.I. and O.U.; formal analysis, A.S. and A.I.; investigation, A.S., LM.Z. and O.U.; resources, A.S, J.B. and O.U.; data curation, A.S. and A.I.; writing—original draft preparation, A.S., A.I. and O.U.; writing—review and editing, LM.Z. and J.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript."

Funding: "This research received no external funding".

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was approved by the Ethics Committee for Human Research of the University of the Basque Country (M10/2022/110).

Informed Consent Statement: "Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study."

Data Availability Statement: If necessary, you can contact the authors to obtain it.

Conflicts of Interest: “The authors declare no conflicts of interest.”

References

1. K. Fortier, S. Parent, and G. Lessard, ‘Child maltreatment in sport: smashing the wall of silence: a narrative review of physical, sexual, psychological abuses and neglect’, *Br. J. Sports Med.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 4–7, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2018-100224.
2. W. Tschan, *Professional sexual misconduct in institutions: Causes and consequences, prevention and intervention*. in *Professional sexual misconduct in institutions: Causes and consequences, prevention and intervention*. Cambridge, MA, US: Hogrefe Publishing, 2014, pp. xvi, 216.
3. M. Hartill *et al.*, ‘CASES: General Report. The prevalence and characteristics of interpersonal violence against children (IVAC) inside and outside sport in six European countries’, Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://figshare.edgehill.ac.uk/articles/report/CASES_General_Report_The_prevalence_and_characteristics_of_interpersonal_violence_against_children_IVAC_inside_and_outside_sport_in_six_European_countries/17086616/1
4. S. Parent and K. Fortier, ‘Comprehensive Overview of the Problem of Violence Against Athletes in Sport’, *J. Sport Soc. Issues*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 227–246, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0193723518759448.
5. M. L. Mountjoy and E. Verhagen, ‘“#BeTheChange”: the responsibility of sports medicine in protecting athletes from harassment and abuse in sport’, *BMJ Open Sport Exerc. Med.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. e001303, 2022, doi: 10.1136/bmjsem-2021-001303.
6. N. Sarwar, ‘Factors influencing sexual harassment behavior in sports environment: Evidence from Pakistan’, *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 13, p. 837078, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.837078.
7. M. Hartill, ‘The Sexual Abuse of Boys in Organized Male Sports’, *Men Masculinities - MEN MASC*, vol. 12, pp. 225–249, 2009, doi: 10.1177/1097184X07313361.
8. S. Johansson, ‘Coach–athlete sexual relationships: if no means no does yes mean yes?’, *Sport Educ. Soc.*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 678–693, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1080/13573322.2013.777662.
9. S. Kim, D. P. Connaughton, and D. P. Hedlund, ‘Youth Sport Coaches’ Perceptions of Sexually Inappropriate Behaviors and Intimate Coach–Athlete Relationships’, *J. Child Sex. Abuse*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 397–417, May 2023, doi: 10.1080/10538712.2023.2193179.
10. S. Kirby, L. Greaves, and O. Hankivsky, *The Dome of Silence: Sexual Harassment and Abuse in Sport*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2000.
11. T. Leahy, ‘Editor’s note: Understanding and preventing sexual harassment and abuse in sport: Implications for the sport psychology profession’, *Int. J. Sport Exerc. Psychol.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 351–353, Jan. 2008, doi: 10.1080/1612197X.2008.9671878.
12. T. Vertommen, ‘Interpersonal violence against children in sport in the Netherlands and Belgium’, *Child Abuse*, 2016.
13. J. Alexandre, C. Castro, M. Gama, and P. Antunes, ‘Perceptions of Sexual Abuse in Sport: A Qualitative Study in the Portuguese Sports Community’, *Front. Sports Act. Living*, vol. 4, p. 838480, 2022, doi: 10.3389/fspor.2022.838480.
14. S. Bermon *et al.*, ‘Lifetime Prevalence of Verbal, Physical, and Sexual Abuses in Young Elite Athletics Athletes’, *Front. Sports Act. Living*, vol. 3, p. 657624, 2021, doi: 10.3389/fspor.2021.657624.
15. M. Burke, ‘Sexual harassment in sport: Impact, issues and challenges’, *J. Philos. Sport*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 97–100, 2003.
16. M. Hartill and M. Lang, ‘Reports of child protection and safeguarding concerns in sport and leisure settings: an analysis of English local authority data between 2010 and 2015’, *Leis. Stud.*, vol. 37, no. 05, pp. 1–21, 2018, doi: 10.1080/02614367.2018.1497076.
17. C. Brackenridge and K. Fasting, ‘The Grooming Process in Sport: Narratives of Sexual Harassment and Abuse’, *Auto/Biography*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 33–52, 2005.
18. A. Stirling and G. Kerr, ‘Sport Psychology Consultants as Agents of Child Protection’, *J. Appl. Sport Psychol.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 305–319, 2010, doi: 10.1080/10413201003795485.
19. K. Fasting, C. H. Brackenridge, and N. Knorre, ‘Performance level and sexual harassment prevalence among female athletes in the Czech Republic’, *Women Sport Phys. Act. J.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 26–32, 2010, doi: 10.1123/wspaj.19.1.26.
20. J. Toftgaard-Nielsen, ‘The Forbidden Zone. Intimacy, Sexual Relations and Misconduct in the Relationship between Coaches and Athletes’, *Int. Rev. Sociol. Sport*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 165–182, 2001.
21. K. A. E. Volkwein, F. I. Schnell, D. Sherwood, and A. Livezey, ‘Sexual Harassment in Sport Perceptions and Experiences of American Female Student–Athletes’, *Int. Rev. Sociol. Sport*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 283–295, 1997.
22. V. Roberts, V. Sojo, and F. Grant, ‘Organisational factors and non-accidental violence in sport: A systematic review’, *Sport Manag. Rev.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 8–27, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.smr.2019.03.001.

23. É. Marsollier, D. Hauw, and F. Crettaz von Roten, 'Understanding the Prevalence Rates of Interpersonal Violence Experienced by Young French-Speaking Swiss Athletes', *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 12, p. 726635, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.726635.
24. Gurvinder Kalra and Dinesh Bhugra, 'Sexual violence against women Understanding cross-cultural intersections', vol. 55, no. 3, 2013, doi: 10.4103/0019-5545.117139.
25. M. Martín Horcajo and A. Juncà Pujol, 'El acoso sexual en el deporte: el caso de las estudiantes-deportistas del grado de Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte de Cataluña', *Apunts Educ. Física Deport.*, no. 114, pp. 72–81, 2014, doi: 10.5672/apunts.2014-0983.es.(2014/1).115.07.
26. J. R. Landis and G. G. Koch, 'The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data', *Biometrics*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 159–174, Mar. 1977.
27. N. Fejgin and R. Hanegby, 'Gender and cultural bias in perceptions of sexual harassment in sport', *Int. Rev. Sociol. Sport*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 459–478, 2001.
28. Y. Vanden Auweele *et al.*, 'Unwanted sexual experiences in sport: Perceptions and reported prevalence among flemish female student-athletes', *Int. J. Sport Exerc. Psychol.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 354–365, 2008.
29. L. N. Robins, 'Epidemiology: reflections on testing the validity of psychiatric interviews', *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry*, vol. 42, no. 9, pp. 918–924, Sep. 1985, doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1985.01790320090013.
30. Matas A, 'Diseño del formato de escalas tipo Likert: estado de la cuestión', *Rev. Electrónica Investig. Educ.*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2018.20.1.1347>.
31. T. Limpo and S. Tadríst, 'Measuring Sports' Perceived Benefits and Aggression-Related Risks: Karate vs. Football', *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 11, p. 625219, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.625219.
32. S. Parent, 'Development and initial factor validation of the Violence Toward Athletes Questionnaire (VTAQ) in a sample of young athletes', *Soc. Leis.*, 2019.
33. Kozee Holly, Tylka Tracy, and Denchik Angela, 'Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale', *Psychol. Women Q.*, vol. 32, no. 2.
34. D. Martínez-Gómez *et al.*, '[Reliability and validity of the PAQ-A questionnaire to assess physical activity in Spanish adolescents]', *Rev. Esp. Salud Pública*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 427–439, 2009, doi: 10.1590/s1135-57272009000300008.
35. Román J and Guillén F, 'Construcción y validación de un cuestionario para medir el bullying entre iguales en los deportes de equipo', Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 2016.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.