Coaches' Perspectives on the Use and Effectiveness of Exercise as Punishment in Interuniversity Sport

by

Ahad Karamali Bandealy

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science,

Graduate Department of Exercise Sciences
University of Toronto

Coaches' Perspectives on the Use and Effectiveness of Exercise as Punishment in Interuniversity Sport

Ahad Karamali Bandealy

Master of Science

Exercise Sciences
University of Toronto

2015

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the use, frequency, and perceived effectiveness of exercise as punishment (EAP) in interuniversity sport. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight (four male and four female) interuniversity head coaches; half of the participants coached individual sports and the other half team sports. Data were analyzed inductively and thematically. Results revealed that EAP and shame were methods often used to modify athletic behaviours. When examining coaches' perspectives, three broad themes emerged: the nature of punishment, coaches' conceptualization of punishment, and shame and reintegration. Participants perceived EAP to be effective and were unable to suggest alternative, non-punitive strategies to modifying athletes' behaviours. The findings are interpreted using Goffman's (1961) Total Institution, Hughes & Coakley's (1991) Sports Ethic, and Braithwaite's (1989) Shame and reintegration theory. Future recommendations include: further research on EAP in sport, development of educational initiatives and reframing punishment within the relational maltreatment framework.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my appreciation to all of those who supported and encouraged me throughout the process of this thesis.

To begin, I would like to convey gratitude to my mentor and supervisor, Dr. Gretchen Kerr, for her valuable insight, support, and encouragement throughout this entire process. Dr. Kerr was integral in the composition of this thesis. With her meticulous approach and constructive criticisms she challenged me to continuously improve my work and refine my research skills.

I would like to convey my appreciation to those members on my committee, Dr. Michael Atkinson, Dr. Timur Taha and Dr. Kim Dorsch. Thank you for your constructive criticisms, your interest in my research and your guidance.

I also wish to thank my friends and family for your continually support in my academic endeavours. I would like to thank my Shawna Haynes for her words of encouragement and consistent support throughout the process of this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank the coaches who participated in my study, without whom this thesis would not have been possible. Thank you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1   Background of the Sporting Context

Sport can provide a healthy context for positive physical and psychological development. Research has revealed that young people are more motivated and engaged in sports than in many other contexts (Larson & Kleiber, 1993; Weiss, 2008), and sport often produces rich environments for personal and interpersonal development (Larson, 2000). Participating in sport as a child, adolescent or young adult does not automatically produce health benefits however; instead, research has demonstrated that positive outcomes are dependent upon a number of factors (American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance [AAHPERD], 2013). These factors include the dynamics of the coach-athlete relationship and the meaning an athlete attaches to his/her sporting experience (AAHPERD, 2013). The coach plays a significant role in shaping the experience of a young athlete. Literature on the coach-athlete relationship acknowledges that this interaction is one of the most important of an adolescent's life (Burke, 2001). Coaches are entrusted with the care and development of young people and evidence suggests that this doesn't always occur; as one of many examples, coaches are known to employ exercise as punishment as a method of training, behaviour modification and social control (Albrecht, 2009; Burak, Rosenthal, & Richardson, 2013; Richardson, Rosenthal, & Burak, 2012; Seifried, 2008;Seifried 2010). Punishment in sport has received minimal attention within the research literature. To date, there is a substantial body of work examining the effects of punishment in parenting, education, and military training. Within these contexts, punishment has been regarded as an ineffective method of teaching, resulting in the significantly diminished use of punishment in each of these settings (Baxamusa, 2013; Burns, 2003; Bussmann, 2009; De Nies 2012; Dubanoski et al., 1983;

Durrant, 2002; Gershoff, 2002; Hyman, 1996; Farrell, 2013; Lambert, 2012; Nunley, 1998; O'Hanlon, 1982; and Richardson, 2012). I propose that no such evolution has occurred in sport. There continues to be a paucity of empirical research on punishment practices in sport despite the numerous anecdotal examples of its use. For this reason I investigated the use of punishment in sport.

To better understand the roots of and contextual influences on the use of punishment in sport, I will provide a historical overview of the practices of punishment within the domains of the military, education, and parenting. This paper highlights the evolution that has occurred in society in which, for the most part, specific forms of physical punishment have been eradicated within the military, parenting and scholastic settings. However, anecdotal evidence suggests it is still prevalent in sport. The purpose of this study therefore is to gain a better understanding of the use of punishment in sport.

1.2   Personal Reflection

I began my work with punishment in sport for a number of reasons; first, I have been directly affected by it, and second, I have always found it interesting that punishment has been used as a method of social control. I participated in competitive collegiate football in the United States. While competing in high school, inter-collegiate, and inter-university football, the competition levels, practice regimens and responsibilities continuously changed. The one element of competitive participation that did not change was physical punishment in sport. With the intent to keep control of the team, to discipline players for a poor performance, and to enhance mental capacities in sport, coaches continuously prescribed some sort of physical exercise as method of behaviour modification. Many of the teams I was apart of demanded that, as a team, we are to run sprints to a point of vomiting, do push-ups, plyometrics, and weight lifting exercises until

extreme exhaustion, all for the purpose of punishment. We were given these exercises with the hope that we would no longer lose a game, no longer make a mistake, no longer crumble under the pressure of competition. Was it successful? Coaches and teammates perceived that it was. But, for the most part, in my opinion, it was highly inefficient. One thing that could not be denied, however, was that punishment kept us under control and ever obedient to our authoritative coach. These experiences have fueled my interest and the methods in which I aim to investigate exercise as punishment.

1.3   Organization of Thesis

Chapter 2 consists of a review of literature on punishment and its forms, a historical look at the use of punishment in multiple contexts, and a look at shame and its constituents. In Chapter 3, I explain the methodological approach that was used throughout the study. The methods that were used for data collection and analyses are detailed, including specific information on inclusion criteria and the interview guide. Chapter 4 contains the results of the study based upon my analysis of the coded interviews with interuniversity head coaches. Chapter 5 consists of an interpretation of the findings with references to previous literature. Based on the findings, both practical and theoretical implications will be discussed. Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the study and provides suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2
Review of Literature

2.1 Punishment Defined

Punishment refers to any change that occurs after a behaviour that reduces the likelihood of that behaviour occurring again in the future (Skinner, 1974). Punishment is often mistakenly confused with *negative reinforcement* but there is an important distinction: reinforcement is intended to increase the chances that a behaviour will occur and punishment is intended to decrease the chances that a behaviour will occur. Punishment can take many different forms such as: positive, negative, physical, non-physical, contact physical (or corporal punishment), and non-contact physical punishment (Appleton & Stanley, 2011; Gershoff, 2002a), all of which will be defined in the following section.

2.1.1 Positive and Negative Punishment

Punishment can be divided into two categories: positive and negative punishment. Positive punishment involves presenting an aversive stimulus after an undesirable behaviour for the purpose of extinguishing the undesirable behaviour; an example might be, when a student talks out of turn in the middle of class, the teacher might scold the child for interrupting her (Gershoff, 2002). Positive punishment has also been referred to as "punishment by application" (Cherry, 2011). Negative punishment or "punishment by removal," involves taking away a desirable stimulus after an undesirable behaviour has occurred; for instance, when a student talks out of turn, the teacher promptly tells the child that he/she will have to miss recess because of his/her behaviour (Gershoff, 2002).

Within current literature, the terms punishment and discipline are often used interchangeably despite important differences. Discipline, in contrast to punishment, involves teaching or guiding towards positive or appropriate behaviour (Appleton & Stanley 2011; Gershoff 2002; Pawal, 2007). Another discernible quality of discipline is its ability to teach children to learn from their mistakes rather than incurring negative consequences. Furthermore, punishment involves the adult controlling a child's behaviour, whereas discipline maintains control within the child (Pawal, 2007).

2.1.2   Physical and Non-Physical Punishment

Punishment can also be classified into physical and non-physical categories. Physical punishment is a specific form of punishment that has received substantial attention amongst researchers in the fields of parenting, education, and sport. Physical punishment can be defined as an action intended to cause physical discomfort or pain to correct a child's behaviour, to 'teach a lesson,' or deter the child from repeating the behaviour (Durrant & Ensom, 2004, p. 1). Physical punishment can be dichotomized into two forms, contact and non-contact. Contact physical punishment, also referred to as corporal punishment involves: "the use of physical force with the intention of causing a child to experience pain but not injury for the purposes of correction or control of the child's behaviour" (Gershoff, 2002, p.4). Corporal punishment is, quite literally, the infliction of punishment on the body (Benatar, 1998).

Non-physical punishment involves no physical interaction between the punitive parent, teacher, or coach, but involves non-contact tactics such as threats, yelling, restraint, isolation, neglect, and verbal abuse (Larzelere, 2000). The primary difference between the two forms is obviously the physical contact component; but it is important to identify the potential for psychological harm to exist in both. Physical punishment or corporal punishment has been extensively

reviewed within the research literature; the following section will address the historical use of punishment beginning with the parent-child relationship.

2.2 Historical Use of Punishment

The use of punishment has a long history. Before addressing the use of punishment in sport, a historical overview of punishment more generally, is provided.

2.2.1 Origins of Punishment

When we trace back the origins of punishment, we can see that it began in communities with the primitive buyer and seller relationship; creditor and debtor. Communities provide the setting for these interactions to occur regularly. Within these communities, social order was upheld through infrastructures involving laws or established rules and consequences for those who violate the law. Tunick (1992) in his book *Punishment: Theory and Practice* clarifies that Nietzsche contended that punishment did not arise from an preliminary judgment that the criminal (one who violates a set of rules) deserves punishment—this is "in fact an extremely late and subtle form of human judgment and inference,"(p.20). Instead, the origin of punishment is more primitive:

> Throughout the greater part of human history punishment was not imposed because one held the wrongdoer responsible for his deed, thus not on the presupposition that only the guilty one should be punished: rather, as parents still punish their children, from anger at some harm or injury, vented on the one who caused it. Is this an idea of an equivalence between injury and pain? … in the contractual relationship between creditor and debtor, which is as old as the idea of "legal subjects" and in turn points back to the fundamental forms of buying, selling, barter, trade, and traffic, (Nietzsche, 1967, Essay 2, Section 4).

Tunick (1992) stated that punishment developed as a right of the affluent to experience the cathartic sensation of being allowed to despise and mistreat someone as beneath them;

punishment was an opportunity and justification for cruelty. Before early Christian philosophy restructured power to be something evil, and conditioned man to "be ashamed of all his instincts," cruelty was perceived to be an essential part of life (Kaufmann, 1968). In the days when we did not repress our instincts, we reveled in and celebrated cruelty (Nietzche, 1969, essay 2, section 6). Nietzsche emphasizes how cruelty can be an entertaining experience. First, it taught society that there was a harsh consequence for deplorable actions, and second, it taught society the enjoyable nuances of revenge and punishing the guilty.

Nietzsche (1967) conjectured that as punishment evolved through time it no longer would be used in its original sense. The powerful as defined by society now, is personified as having the strength to forgive; to not punish the guilty. "It is not unthinkable that a society might attain such a consciousness of power that it could allow itself the noblest luxury possible to it—letting those who harm it go unpunished." (Nietzsche, 1967, Essay 2, section 9).

The act of punishing has always occurred, but the meaning of that act has changed radically. Nietzsche (1969) illustrated that what is significant to us about punishment is not the act of punishing, but the meaning that we attach to it. Because this meaning is independent of and inessential to the act itself, we could potentially come to understand punishment as meaning pretty much anything (Nietzsche, 1969). Punishment has normative, political, social, psychological, and legal dynamics, and ways of thinking about each of them continue to change (Tonry, 2011). Although the meaning of punishment can evolve, the purpose of its use even many years ago stays consistent to a certain extent; to maintain social order, or engage in behaviour modification.

One intended purpose of punishment has been deterrence and maintenance of order (Geltner, 2012). For instance, if a person witnesses someone else in society being punished or he/she

have incurred the unpleasant experience of being punished, the individual is thought to be more likely to avoid the situation in the future (Austin, 2011). Some have argued that punishment is also useful as an expression of disapproval (e.g., society punishes as a way of illustrating disapproval at a moral level) (Austin, 2011). A third justification offered for punishment, is that it can act as a form of moral education (e.g., the offender is punished and will learn that the action committed was wrong, and may then apply this life lesson in the future) (Austin, 2011). Punishment may also assist in reinforcing the power differential between the one in control and the one he/she is attempting to control. To find uses of punishment, one can look no further than any domain that involves some sort of power differential (e.g., parenting, schools, the military, and sport). Each of these domains will be addressed in turn.

2.2.2   Punishment in the Parent-Child Relationship

Looking at the historical parental use of punishment, corporal punishment seemed to be the method of choice (Baxamusa, 2012). Corporal punishment has most commonly been used with preschoolers (Clément, Bouchard, Jetté, & Laferrière, 2000; Wauchope & Straus, 1992), because their tendencies are to be highly active, to exhibit exploratory behaviour, to strive for independence, and to challenge compliance. Given that these are positive developmental features, it begs the question, do these behaviours deserve punishment? Additional research has reported that children in this cohort may also be punished because they exhibit negativism, impulsivity, and a limited understanding of harm and danger (Durrant, Ensom, & Wingert, 2004).

In a Québec survey, 70% of parents of three- to six-year-olds described using corporal punishment in the year before the study (Clément et al., 2000). A few parents argued that corporal punishment assists the child in learning right from wrong, as well as, scares the child from engaging in that behaviour again in the future (Baxamusa, 2012). In many cultures, parents

have the responsibility of modifying their child's behaviour to be congruent with societal standards, and with this, given the right to spank them when appropriate. However, opinions regarding punishing children changed in many countries in the 1950s and 60s following the publication of the second best-selling book of all time (second only to the Bible) from American pediatrician Benjamin McLane Spock: *Baby and Child Care* in 1946 (American Academy of Pediatrics, 1996). Contrary to conventional wisdom about child-rearing, this book highlighted the need for parents to be more affectionate and flexible while treating their children as individuals (Spock, 1946). This change in attitude was followed by legislation; since 1979, 34 countries around the world have outlawed domestic corporal punishment of children (Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment around the World, 2012). Similar transformations have occurred in the scholastic domain which will be explored in the following section.

2.2.3 Punishment in Scholastic Settings

Corporal punishment for quite some time was regarded as not only legal but a necessary method of maintaining order and discipline in the classroom. Dating back to the Middle Ages, a commonly used form of corporal punishment in schools was birching (beating a person across the backside with birch twigs) (Lambert, 2012). Up until the late 20th century, teachers participated in the corporal punishment of students (Lambert, 2012). In 1866, in North America a major case was brought to trial. A teacher had whipped a child 15 to 20 times; the parent of the child felt this was unnecessarily brutal, and caused extensive physical harm to the child (Baxamusa, 2012). Although the case was closed and the teacher received no reprimand, it encouraged people to speak against corporal punishment.

In 1868, a number of parents in Beverly, Massachusetts sought to abolish corporal punishment from schools; the school committees and administrators came up with many reasons over the years as to why corporal punishment was necessary, specifically to prevent students from

rebelling and becoming boisterous (Baxamusa, 2012). Eleven years later, an unsuccessful attempt to abolish corporal punishment was made by the Cambridge schools; a year later, the Cambridge school board learned that out of nearly 13,000 students attending the all boy's grammar school, approximately 11,000 incidents were recorded (Baxamusa, 2012). Corporal punishment was forbidden from being used on girls and in "coloured" schools, as it was believed that girls' mentality differs from boys and that whipping them would scar their minds for life (Baxamusa, 2012). Caucasian boys were subjected to corporal punishment because it was believed that it would make them manlier and they would continue to pass down the tradition to their children (Baxamusa, 2012).

Historically, it has been reported that young men were struck with rods or birch twigs; in many cases, teachers kept a stick with birch twigs attached to it, right next to them and boys were hit across their bare buttocks (Lambert, 2012). In the 19th century, hitting both boys and girls with bamboo canes become a popular method of corporal punishment; in the 20th century, popularity shifted to caning, used both in primary and secondary schools (Lambert, 2012). Accompanying caning, the ruler and leather strap (the latter used primarily in Scotland and England) became a popular device for administering corporal punishment. However, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, this method of punishment was phased out of most primary schools (Lambert, 2012). Sweden was the first country to eliminate corporal punishment and it was removed from most schools in Europe by the late 1800s (Baxamusa, 2012). In May of 1870, New York's State Board of Education convened for the second time to discuss removal of corporal punishment, and by 1877, it was permanently removed from schools in New York, as many educators believed it had adverse effects on the child (Baxamusa, 2012). Some states did not agree and continued to engage in this practice. It remained a practice in Massachusetts for the next 70 years as school administrators believed it to be an appropriate method of discipline and had the

potential to develop more studious and educated children (Baxamusa, 2012). Formations of anti-corporal punishment groups in the 1970s pushed the Massachusetts government to finally declare corporal punishment as illegal.

A quantitative research study looking at the 2006-2007 school year, found that 223,190 school children in the United States had experienced corporal punishment; this exhibits an 18% drop since the early 1980s (Baxamusa, 2012). Corporal punishment in schools has decreased substantially, but is still used in many areas in the United States; currently, it is still legal in 19 states in the United States (De NIES, 2012).

Thirty different countries (such as Latvia, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Moldova, Poland, Sweden, Austria, Germany, France, and Spain) have all prohibited the use of corporal punishment (Bussmann, 2009). Currently, Canadian law permits corporal punishment of children, yet its social undesirability continues to grow (Durrant, 2002). Section 43 of Canada's Criminal Code allows parents, teachers, and caregivers to use reasonable force to punish a child and correct behaviour. However, what constitutes "reasonable force"? If a parent uses "reasonable force" and "intends" only to correct a mistake or modify a behaviour, yet the punishment results in an injury or bruising to the child, is it justified? Such concepts as "intention" and "reasonable force" are difficult to define or hold to a standard because they are subjective notions. Examining the next domain, corporal punishment is seen as not only prevalent in military settings, but the most extreme.

2.2.4   Punishment in Military Settings

Frederick the Great famously coined the notion that a General's soldiers must fear his commanding officers even more than they fear the enemy (MHN, 2012). While the 18th Century Prussian military strategist and leader was notorious for his harsh corporal punishment tactics,

he was by no means the only military leader who devised savage consequences for his soldiers' transgressions (MHN, 2012). Numerous armies and navies have gone down in history for their cruel and brutal methods of corporal punishments. Dating back to Roman legions, soldiers could be punished for innumerable military transgressions, as well as "unmanly acts"; for example, for theft or desertion, the convicted would be sentenced to *fustuarium* – a punishment that involved the condemned being stoned or beaten to death with clubs before the entire company – (MHN, 2012).

The British Royal Navy, although not nearly as cruel as Roman legions, found its way into the history books for harsh methods of corporal punishment. The Royal Navy's punishments were listed in a documented entitled *The Articles of War*; this was originally created in the 1660s (Farrell, 2013). Although death was the penalty for most crimes, flogging was administered for minor offenses; this involved lashes being delivered to the back of the condemned while the entire ship's company observed; after the punishment was administered, the victim was brought down to the bottom deck and had salt rubbed into the wounds, a painful practice, but assisted in cauterizing the wound (Farrell, 2013). Flogging was a popular method of punishment because it induced fear, and it didn't cause long-term physical damage, thus allowing the victim to continue to serve. Flogging continued until it was completely outlawed in the 1880s (Farrell, 2013).

Continuing on to the Civil War, lashes had been abolished years before the war. Corporal punishment had to then be administered in different ways. For minor offenses, punishment took the form of non-contact physical punishment. One of the many punishments administered was bucking and gagging. This involved the accused sitting for a long period of time, bent forwards, hands tied underneath his legs while the feet were tied together and with a rod or stick held in place between the victims' teeth like a horse's bit (MHN, 2012). This seemed to cause more

humiliation than pain. In other cases, those breaching the law of the company might be forced to "ride the wooden mule"; this involved the accused sitting on a thin railing that was just high enough so that persons' feet could not touch the ground; in more severe offenses, soldiers were branded with a C (for acts of cowardice under fire) (MHN, 2012).

Taking a closer look at the Second World War, punishment was now used as a military strategy. The penal battalions of the Red Army (Soviet Union Infantry) were composed of those who violated the rules and were condemned to carry out suicidal charges against fortified enemy positions, or march across minefields to clear the path for regular troops waiting nearby (MHN, 2012).

Currently, the dynamics of military punishments have changed. Evidence suggests that non-contact punishment is now the primary method of punishment administered.   Under article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, only non-judicial punishment (NJP) can be delivered, which allows the commanders to administratively punish troops without a court-martial (civil proceedings that have the potential for removal from service); (Powers, 2000). Punishments may range from reprimand to reduction in rank, loss of pay, extra duty, and/or restrictions (Powers, 2000).

Although these changes have occurred in military settings, it was not before an impact was made on the sporting realm. When we look at sport from its inception, we see that military practices influenced not only the creation and practices of sport, but even the verbiage used in sporting contexts. This will be elucidated in the following section.

2.2.5   Military Influence on Sport

If we were to track the origins of sport, it would take us back nearly 3,000 years. Sport historically served the purpose of preparing for war (Bellis, 2012) and as a result, there were

sports games that involved the throwing of spears, stakes, and rocks. In fact, from prehistoric times, because survival was related to physical stamina, strength, and to people's ability to find food (hunter/gatherers), physical fitness was an element in sustaining mankind (Bellis, 2012). In certain areas like Central America and South America, sports were played in lieu of war to resolve their disputes (Cosmell, 2011). Historical evidence suggests that gradually, ancient societies in China, Egypt, Greece, and Rome adopted physical education and sport competition as part of military training. A wide range of sports were already established by the time of Ancient Greece; the military culture and the development of sports in Greece influenced one another considerably (Eassom, 1994).

With the First World War looming on the horizon, much of Europe already engulfed in controversy, the contentious question of America's secondary school's role in preparing young men for the country's eventual entrance into the conflict had gained steam (O'Hanlon, 1982). Prominent school and college administrators along with significant physical educators argued tirelessly that physical education programs (with a significant place for sports) offered a way in which to develop preparedness without encouraging militarism. Physical education and sports were claimed to offer lessons in social discipline and cooperation no less valuable for populations in an industrial society than for future soldiers (O'Hanlon, 1982).

Those who criticized the military training of schoolboys attempted to shift the focus onto the positive characteristics of the training that were similar to characteristics of high school programs; for example, educators frequently suggested physical education and sport as an alternative to military drills in school (O'Hanlon, 1982). These educators argued that a sound program of physical education, with a concentration in sport, offered training to students for preparedness and soldierly attributes without developing a potentially distressing militaristic mentality (e.g., desensitization) (O'Hanlon, 1982).

Military training programs were in existence in some American high schools at the onset of World War I; High schools in Boston had apparently required military drills since the Reconstruction (Bliss, 1917). The New York Public Schools Athletic League offered competition in rifle marksmanship for high school boys as part of a huge sports and recreation program (Wingate, 1908). Military training, however, was not a compulsory component of American secondary education. The Welsh Bill prescribed obligatory physical training for all students above the age of eight, beginning with the 1916 school year; the law specified 20 minutes a day as minimum and included private as well as public schools (O'Hanlon, 1982).

In Canada, there existed no national organization for the advancement of sport or physical education until the twentieth century (Maker, 2011). The earliest program for the national initiative of sport and physical education to the provinces was the Strathcona Trust, introduced in 1909, which began systems of physical training and military drill in schools across Canada (Maker, 2011). Among European governments, the culture of sport and physical fitness became pervasive between the world wars, somewhat as a result of the rise of fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, which displayed healthy youthful images as illustrative of national health and vigour (Maker, 2011). While most people in Britain and Canada rejected the politics of these countries, the national government in Britain launched a "National Fitness Campaign" in 1937 that linked individual fitness to national strength. The Canadian government was not sequestered from these developments. Parliament during World War II passed the National Fitness Act in 1943, which emphasized modern ideas of fitness and participation; these objectives stressed the importance of fitness as well as the skills necessary to develop sufficient psycho-motor skills (Graham & Moore, 2000).

Sport and military training have many parallels: both involve physical fitness, discipline, cooperation with others, and training that involves breaking down the body in efforts of

becoming stronger and more physically efficient. O'Hanlon (1982) stated that, "athletics helped to cultivate the physical and, most particularly, the psychological traits essential for both war and peace" (p. 11).

Military influences are also seen within current colloquial sporting practices and language. For example, in football a 'blitz', is a concentration of force at high speed to break the opposition's line; this finds its genesis from the term used in World War II, blitzkrieg (German word for lightning war) (Ammer, 2011). Another example is the offensive strategy used in football known as a 'ground attack,' which involves the running back attempting to gain yardage; where as in battle that is combat on the ground between soldiers (Rushin, 2012). Ammer (2011) draws attention to the word 'trenches' which when used in war signifies an area where hand-to-hand combat and one-on-one battles take place. In football, this term refers to the area around the line of scrimmage where offensive and defensive linemen compete, one-on-one. Lastly, the term 'suicide', in its military usage was applied to any exceptionally hazardous position or mission; during World War II the suicide squad consisted of machine gunners under heavy fire (Ammer, 2011). The term suicide in sport refers to a drill that helps to develop or improve fast endurance, and by its very nature, tends to be physically taxing on the body.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that militaristic training has found its way into sport. Both elite sport and military training require intense physical training, involving the development of mental resilience, self-discipline, and improved physical capabilities. Both domains also require an authority figure that guides the development process and maintains a degree of social order. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this social order is achieved in part, through punishment, as the following section will illustrate.

2.2.6   Punishment in Sport

Venturing back to 4th century B.C., within ancient Greek societies, slaves appeared in equestrian events and as charioteers (Golden, 2004). Winning brought wealth to their owners, and for the slave, resulted in praise, food, and water. Losing or violating the rules of sport brought them corporal punishment by hand of their masters and public whippings (Golden, 2004).

In the 1980s, Uday Hussein – the head of the Iraqi Olympic Committee – initiated harsh forms of physical punishment. Losing games, simple mistakes, or an inadequate performance resulted in extreme cases of corporal punishment. For example, a poor performance involved head shaving at the Stadium of the People, or having Uday`s bodyguards spit on his players (Burns, 2003). In many cases, the athletes were tortured or imprisoned. Torture involved caning the soles of the athletes' feet (inflicting intense pain without visible scaring); Uday instructed players to kick concrete soccer balls around the field in 130-degree heat, and in other cases had players engage in 12-hour sessions of push-ups, sprints, or other fitness drills while wearing heavy military fatigues and boots (Burns, 2003). Something as minor as a series of poor passes were tallied and resulted in standing before Uday while he punched or slapped the athlete in the face the number of times equivalent to the athlete`s mistakes (Burns, 2003). After Iraq`s loss to Japan in the quarter finals of the 2000 AFC Asian Cup in Lebanon, 3 players were blamed for the loss and flogged for three days by Uday`s bodyguards (Shaw, 2004).

North Korea employed a motivational approach with their Olympic athletes. Media outlets reported that athletes could look forward to refrigerators, cars, and televisions when they win and labour camps when they lose (Richardson, 2012). Defectors have described the conditions of the labor camp as cruel and unusual punishment involving torture, execution, and starvation (Richardson, 2012).

In late December of 2012 in Tokyo, a Japanese high school student endured repeated beatings from his basketball coach in efforts to improve his performance. On this particular occasion, the 17-year-old boy was struck 30 to 40 times to incite a more competitive attitude; a day later the boy committed suicide (Armstrong, 2013). Nearly four years prior to that, a former sumo trainer, in the name of practice, instructed three of his wrestlers to beat another one of his athletes, with beer bottles and a baseball bat; the 17-year-old wrestler sustained fatal injuries (Armstrong, 2013).

These incidents have been met with harsh criticisms and swift retribution such as expulsion from sport and imprisonment. However, a method of punishment that has had marginal consequences is the use of non-contact physical punishment. Non-contact physical punishment involves the use of exercise as punishment which is defined as: instructing athletes to engage in exercises (e.g., running, push-ups, and sit-ups) to a point of extreme exhaustion with the intention of improving athletic performance, conformity, and focus (National Association for Sport and Physical Education, 2009). Another form of non-contact physical punishment involves denying an athlete essential resources, such as rest or water. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this method of practice occurs frequently across an array of sports and physical fitness contexts. For example, a fifth grader at Eagle Lake school in Edwardsburg, Michigan collapsed and died after being forced to engage in "the gut run" (involves running across some rough terrain to a tree and back to the school, a distance of about 1,000 feet within two minutes); this run was imposed as punishment for being slow to line up after recess (Fathman, 1991).

The National Athletic Trainers' Association (NATA), in an effort to prevent deaths of college athletes, have sternly advised football programs not to use non-contact physical punishment or exercise as punishment (Egan, 2012). Since 1984, 67 deaths across all sports have been recorded in the North America, some involving exercise as punishment and some involving dehydration

(denying the athlete water as a form of punishment), a total of 21 NCAA football deaths have occurred since 2000, 75% of them were athletes of Division I programs (Egan, 2012). Although empirical data on the use of non-contact physical punishment is minimal, anecdotal reports suggest that it continues to be used as a coaching practice.

Adams (1987) cites examples of dangerous coaching practices. In one instance, coaches denied players water breaks even on extremely hot and humid days to develop mental toughness; furthermore, these coaches conducted a drill called 'suicide' in which 5 to 6 players would tackle an unprotected lineman because he missed a block. Another example of this would be the deaths of Korey Stringer (NFL football player), Eraste Autin (University football player), or Travis Stowers (high school football player); these fatalities occurred due to excessive exercise as punishment while in extreme heat and involved purposeful dehydration (Young, 2012).

These methods of punishment are defined as non-contact because they involve no physical force on behalf of the coach, yet involves a physical component that directly affects the body. Exercise as punishment, residing within the framework of non-contact physical punishment has recently been scrutinized.

To date, there have only been a few theoretical articles (Albrecht, 2009; Seifried, 2008; Seifried 2010) and two empirical articles (Burak et al., 2013; Kerr et al., 2013; Richardson et al., 2012) examining exercise as punishment. One of these authors justified the need for exercise as punishment to maintain social order and improve athletes' levels of discipline (Seifried, 2008). A second article points out the inconsistencies in this argument and suggests it is a detrimental way to create a compliant athlete (Albrecht, 2009). And the third article (Seifried, 2010) involves a paper written as a rebuttal to this argument and attempts to clarify Seifried's original stance on the subject. The first of two empirical research articles investigated exercise as

punishment within the theoretical framework of the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Richardson, 2012). The second article examined the attitudes, beliefs, and intentions regarding the use of exercise as punishment in physical education and sport using the Theory of Reasoned Action (Burak et al., 2013). It is curious that the use of punishment has been studied extensively in the domains of the military, education, and parenting, and yet remains relatively unexplored in sport.

Often cited as a negative effect of punishment is *shame* (Dubanski, 1983; Gershoff, 2002; Gllian, 1997; and Nunley, 1998). Gillian's (1997) comprehensive work with violent inmates, describes punishment and shame as being interrelated. Evidence suggests that shame, an emotion that can occur as a result of punishment, can also occur independently of punishment; and *shaming*, which is the act of eliciting the emotion of shame, may frequently be used as a method of modifying athletic behaviours (Egan 2012; and Kays & Schlabig, 2013). Shaming and punishment share many overlapping features, for example: shaming creates immediate compliance, it is time efficient and it is easy to implement (Brisbane, 2004; and Weigel, 2012). Another similarity that shaming and punishment have within the context of sport is that shame, like punishment is consistently used despite its negative implications, and there is lack of empirical research investigating the use of shaming in sport. Phyllis Koch-Sheras, president of the American Psychological Association's Division of Media Psychology and Technology decreed, "Shame is a very deep emotion that can have an incredibly negative impact." Shame, shaming and its constituents will be discussion in the subsequent section.

2.3   Defining Shame

Before exploring shame within the sport context, an adequate definition must be provided. Shame has been identified as an intense feeling of regret or sadness as a result of having done something wrong (Weigel, 2012). Common physiological reactions of shame include: blushing,

downward casted eyes, slacked posture and lowered head (Tartakovsky, 2011). To truly

understand the nature of shame one must consider the Greek interpretation of the word; shame

referred to as *aiskyne* is defined as "disgrace, dishonor" (Harper, 2014). A paucity of research

exists examining the concept of shame and inconsistent definitions of this concept are plentiful

(Fisher & Tangney, 1995; Lewis, 1971; Lewis 1990). The following section will address the

concepts of shame, guilt, and embarrassment as these terms are used interchangeably or

considered similar to one another.

2.3.1   Shame, Guilt, and Embarrassment

Shame, guilt and embarrassment are emotions that vary in degree, yet share numerous features

in common; studies suggest that these are three markedly different emotional experiences across

a number of substantial psychological dimensions (Barrett & Campos, 1987; Fisher & Tangney,

1995; Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996). As these emotions have similar physical and

psychological characteristics, the differences between shame, guilt, and embarrassment are

inadequately understood and these terms are often used interchangeably (Tangney et al., 1996).

As previously mentioned, shame is an exceptionally deep emotional reaction and can have a

negative impact on the human psyche, therefore differentiating these terms from one another is

paramount.

In attempts to distinguish these terms, particularly shame and guilt, early anthropological

literature claimed that shame is a more public emotion, whereas guilt is more private (Ausubel,

1955; Benedict, 1946). However, this distinction was rendered inadequate after an investigation

of children and adults' autobiographical accounts of shame and guilt experiences (Tangney,

Marschall, Rosenberg, Barlow, & Wagner, 1994). The results from this study indicated that

although shame and guilt were often experienced while others were present, private shame and

guilt experiences also occurred with some consistency and shame was as likely as guilt to be

experienced in isolation (Tangney et al., 1996). Helen Block Lewis (1971) differentiated the experience of shame from guilt in that shame is a focus on the self/identity whereas guilt is a focus on behaviour. For example, within the sporting context, an athlete stating, "that was a bad play" is regarded as guilt, whereas an athlete stating, "I am a bad athlete" is regarded as shame. Based on the literature, this interpretation seems to be more accurate. From the above example, the degree of self-scrutiny involved in shame is evident. With this, comes a sense of shrinking or inferiority accompanied by feelings of helplessness, insignificance, and a feeling of being exposed (Tangney et al., 1996). As guilt doesn't directly affect one's fundamental self-concept, it has been regarded as a less painful, agonizing experience (Tangney et al., 1996).

Both of these emotions also differ in the reactions they elicit. Guilt usually induces reparative actions (apologies, concessions, attempts to rectify the issue at hand) whereas shame prompts concealment and escape from the situation (Tangney et al., 1996). Tangney (1993) examined 65 young adults' experiences of shame and guilt; consistently the experience of shame was rated as substantially more painful and challenging to describe. In addition to feeling inferior to others and having less control over the situation, the shame experiences involved a sense of exposure and a concern with the opinions of others observing the event; these participants reported feelings of wanting to hide or not wanting to confront the situation as compared to feelings associated with the guilt experience (Tangney, 1993).

Shame and embarrassment have been cited as having a stronger association than even shame and guilt (Tangney et al., 1996). Researchers (Izard 1977; Kaufman, 1989; Lewis, 1971) have considered embarrassment as an element of shame, a "shame variant", and even synonymous with shame. However, recent evidence suggests otherwise; similar to guilt, shame has been considered a more intense emotion than embarrassment (Tangney et al., 1996). Some researchers (Borg et al., 1988) have claimed that intensity is the only thing that sets the two

emotions apart, whereas others have asserted the difference lies within the events that elicit these emotional responses. For example, it has been suggested that shame is an outcome of a more serious failure or a moral infringement while embarrassment is a product of a trivial indiscretion (Buss, 1980; Lewis, 1992; Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988). Tangney et al. (1996) cited another distinction as shame pertains to inadequacies of one's core self and embarrassment represents inadequacies of one's "presented" self. Within a similar vein, Buss (1980) asserted shame as a long-term loss of self-esteem and embarrassment as an ephemeral loss of self-esteem.

In Tangney's et al. (1996) study of 182 undergraduate students, participants were to describe personal experiences of embarrassment, guilt, and shame within structural and phenomenological dimensions. Shame was again cited as creating feelings of inferiority, helplessness, isolation, and the belief that others were angry with them; as a result, participants felt a greater need to hide, a lower inclination to admit to what had occurred, and a yearning to have acted differently (Tangney et al., 1996). Additionally, when feeling shamed, participants felt intensely scrutinized by others and had a heightened awareness of others' reactions (Tangney et al., 1996). Comparing guilt and shame, the latter involved closer consideration of others' opinions and judgments (Tangney et al., 1996). The key differences between these two emotions appear to be positioned less in the situations that elicit these reactions and more in each of their phenomenologies and motivations for ensuing action (Lewis, 1971; Lindsay-Hartz, 1984; Tangney et al., 1996).

2.3.2   Summarizing Shame

The literature on shame claims that it is an intense feeling of humiliation or distress triggered by the consciousness of wrong or inappropriate behaviour. Shame shares substantial features in common with guilt and embarrassment and yet maintains fundamental differences from both of

these emotions. Additionally, shame is a focus on oneself/identity whereas guilt is a focus on the behaviour, and embarrassment occurs in more trivial, short-lived circumstances. Shame has been identified as having a more detrimental effect on the psyche than guilt or embarrassment. Furthermore, shame can be experienced in both public and private settings and can create feelings of inferiority, helplessness and a desire for isolation. Finally, shame involves a closer consideration of others' opinions and judgments than either guilt or embarrassment.

2.3.3   How Shame, Punishment, and Sport are Related

 Shame has the ability to function as a result of punishment and shaming can function as a form of punishment (Book, 1999). Predominantly, research on shame, shaming and punishment exists within the criminological literature. Work is needed on examining these concepts within other contexts.

Both shaming and punishment can occur within a relationship characterized by a power differential (parent-child, teacher-student, coach-athlete). Within the coach-athlete relationship, evidence suggests that punishment and aspects of shaming occur frequently (Burak et al., 2013; Egan 2012; Kays & Schlabig, 2013; Richardson et al., 2012; Young, 2012). The scandal that occurred within the Rutgers' basketball program, in which Mike Rice was relieved of his duties as head coach due to yelling, hitting and kicking his players, demonstrates some of the issues facing youth and elite sport (Kays & Schlabig, 2013). As previously mentioned, shaming can occur as a form of punishment. Shaming within the sport context has been identified as a coach showing anger, frustration, and demeaning an athlete on the sole premise that he or she did not live up to the coaches' expectations (Kays & Schlabig, 2013).

Similar to the shame and guilt distinction, punishment focuses on modifying an athlete's behaviour – "the athlete **made** a mistake"; whereas shaming pertains to the identity and core

self-concept of the athlete – "the athlete **is** a mistake." A significant outcome of shaming and punishment is that youth become susceptible to "people pleasing"; youth develop such a strong desire to feel loved that they withstand physically and emotionally unfavorable situations (Kays & Schlabig, 2013). It has been speculated that because of this strong desire for acceptance, youth may not come forward and report physical or emotional indiscretions (Kays & Schlabig, 2013).

Shame functions as a response to significant social threat, particularly, a fundamental personal failure and transgression that affects others and motivates interpersonally relevant behaviours (Keltner & Buswell, in press; Miller & Tangney, 1994; Tangney, 1995). Braithwaite (1989) proposed that producing shame and coupling it with reintegration, may result in social control and behaviour modification, suggesting that shame occurs following indiscretions of an offender producing expressions of lower esteem in the eyes of external referents (parents, teachers, coaches, or the community). The "family model" suggested by Braithwaite (1989) bolsters the shame and reintegration theory, emphasizing that the deterrent effects of shame are greater within a relationship characterized by a strong social bond, affection, and interdependency, because such persons will amass greater interpersonal costs from shame. According to this theory, shaming is integral when the conscience fails, and that punishment is needed when offenders are beyond being shamed; evidence suggests that punishment isn't as effective with individuals who have evolved beyond control techniques used during infancy. Braithwaite (1989) asserts that for adults and adolescents the conscience is a more effective apparatus for controlling misbehaviour than punishment; the conscience counterbalances the absence of formal control.

The author highlights two important conditions for this theory: a communitarian environment and reintegration. A communitarian environment relies on those within this cluster to maintain

interdependency upon one another attached with a personal and mutual obligation, trust, and loyalty to the goals of the group; reintegration involves the recognition of the transgression followed by gestures or expressions of solace, empathy, or forgiveness (Braithwaite, 1989). Within the context of the coach-athlete relationship this would involve the coach recognizing the athlete made a mistake, but would soon follow with an expression of support, an explanation for how to avoid making the same mistake and words of encouragement, ultimately integrating the athlete back into the "community" (his or her circle of teammates) after initially ostracizing the individual.

As we investigate shame, reintegration, and punishment within the sporting context, we need to consider the nature of sport and the coach-athlete relationship. The physical and psychological benefits of sport are numerous. Sport allows participants to learn life-lessons, discipline, and develop strong social bonds; however, it also provides a platform for detrimental interactions (e.g., exercise as punishment, shaming as a method of deterrence, and abusive coach-athlete relationships). Often youth competitors need guidance and exhibit a desire for acceptance, resulting in a vulnerable position for the sport participant. It is the responsibility of the adults in the sport environment, including administrators, researchers, parents, and coaches, to facilitate positive, growth-enhancing sport experiences for young people.

2.4 Purpose

Due to the lack of research examining punishment, and specifically, non-contact physical punishment in sport, I propose to investigate coaches' perspectives on the use and effectiveness of this practice. Exploring the coaches' perspectives will provide valuable insight into the extent to which coaches use exercise as punishment, the reasons they may use this practice, how they implement it, as well as their perceptions of its effectiveness. I will investigate whether coaches

are aware of alternative non-punitive methods of behavioural modification, and whether or not coaches can identify the difference between punishment and discipline.

2.5   Rationale

Despite potentially negative repercussions associated with the use of exercise as punishment it still appears to be used within the sport context (Burak et al., 2013). However, there continues to be a lack of empirical research on this phenomenon. Additionally, several anecdotal media accounts exist of fatal consequences for athletes as a result of exercise as punishment (Armstrong, 2013; Egan, 2012; Fathman, 1991; and Young, 2012). I plan to explore the use of exercise as punishment from the perspective of those who initiate the practice, namely, coaches. To date, there is paucity of empirical research examining coaches' perspectives on this practice.

There are a few additional reasons for examining this particular population. Firstly, evidence from a collaborative quantitative study conducted by Kerr et al., (2013), examined 335 female and male undergraduate Kinesiology and physical education students and revealed that the head coach most often instructed athletes to engage in exercise as punishment (79%) as compared to others (e.g., assistant coach, trainer, team captain, other). A second reason for examining this particular cohort involves the power relationship. Sport provides the coach with nearly unquestioned authority over athletes (Burke, 2001). Furthermore, the coach enjoys several sources of personal power (e.g., traditional, expert, coercive, and social powers) and often coaches view athletes as their possession (Burke, 2001). Finally, Burke (2001) highlighted that the coach-athlete relationship is resistant to outside influences; if change is to occur within sport, primarily exercise as punishment, it is going to involve challenging sporting structures and assisting head coaches in developing alternative and more appropriate methods of behaviour modification.

Chapter 3
Methodology

3.1   Methodological Approach

A qualitative research design was employed to obtain data in this research project. Qualitative research seeks to study concepts in their natural settings as well as investigate and understand the meanings people attach to these concepts (Denzin, 1994). The nature of qualitative inquiry involves two primary distinctions, "On the one hand, it is drawn to broad, interpretive, postexperimental, postmodern, feminist and critical sensibility. On the other hand, it is drawn to more narrowly defined, positivist, postpositivist, humanistic and naturalistic conceptions of human experience and its analysis" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p.7). The type of investigation allows for a comprehensive examination of a particular concept. Qualitative methods of inquiry are ideal for the study of human experiences (Denzin, 1994); therefore, I considered this form of investigation most suitable for my study.

Within qualitative research there are several theoretical approaches that can be used. This particular study, used a both a constructivist and symbolic interactionist method. Constructivist theory suggests that learning is an active process in which learners create new ideas or concepts built upon their current/past knowledge (Bruner, 1990). Based upon this theory, knowledge is not 'about' the world, but instead 'built-in' to the world (Sherman, 1995). Therefore, objective truth does not exist, only estimated realities that are generated and limited by surrounding social constructions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The data produced from this study is not representative of the entire coaching population and is only one form of truth.

Symbolic interactionism suggests, people establish symbolic meaning and rely upon these meanings in the process of social interaction (Anderson & Taylor, 2009). By employing this

theoretical approach to the study, it is clear that coaches are continually negotiating boundaries of their relationship with athletes, and may characterize their coaching strategies as appropriate and optimal for effective behavioural modification. By using the interactionist approach, my study has attempted to address why coaches use exercise as punishment and whether they perceive it to be an effective model for correcting behaviour. Without this theoretical framework, my perspective may have been narrowed and subjective.

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 Pilot Interview

Before beginning this study, a pilot interview was conducted. An interview guide (Appendix B) was developed based on themes from the literature and personal experience. The pilot interview allowed me to evaluate the typical responses, the sensitivity of the topic, and the fluidity of the interview process. This pilot interview also allowed me to hone my interviewing skills and provided a platform to assess any potential ethical concerns. The participant was 42 years old and the head coach of a CIS sport for the last 3 years. Upon the participant's consent, the pilot interview was digitally recorded and later, transcribed verbatim; however, the data from this interview was not used in the research analysis of this study.

The interview lasted about 60 minutes. The interview was quite successful and the participant provided rich data, as he felt comfortable and intrigued with the questions. After completing the pilot interview, the data yield was assessed and the interview guide was altered accordingly.

3.2.2 Participants

For this study, the sample population was 4 male and 4 female head coaches from various teams (Basketball, Football, Hockey, Soccer, Swimming, Track and Field, Tennis, and Figure Skating). I recruited these coaches purposefully to represent both genders, male and female, as

well as individual/team sports. These participants were interuniversity coaches participating in CIS sports at schools other than the University of Toronto. The decision to recruit from other universities was based on the close relationships I maintained with some of the coaches at the University of Toronto; having previously participated as an athlete and assistant coach with multiple sports at the University of Toronto, avoiding recruitment from this university was justified. Recruitment occurred at this elite competitive level because at this stage athletes tend to be exposed to multiple pressures (transitioning schools, peers, location, and potential professional participation) therefore placing importance on their sport participation. Recruiting from multiple sports provided a comprehensive analysis of the use of exercise as punishment within the sport context. Participants' experiences in sport both as an athlete and a coach ranged from 15 years to 35 years. Head coaches play an integral role in shaping the athlete's experience of sport and the coach-athlete relationship has been regarded as one of the most important and influential interactions of a young adult's life (Burke, 2001). Head coaches, in particular, are in a position of authoritative power and are able to prescribe exercises and activities as they deem appropriate (Brackenridge, 1998); thus my reason for investigating head coaches' perspectives.

Inclusion Criteria

Individuals meeting the following criteria were eligible for participation in this study:

1. Is a head coach of an interuniversity sports team

2. Coached at a university in Ontario other than University of Toronto

3. Is over the age of 18 years

4. Has adequate English communication skills

5. Consents to participate and signs the Informed Consent

Exclusion Criteria

Any participant comprising one or more of the following exclusion criteria was not included in the study:

1. Under the age of 18 years

2. Was not a head coach of an interuniversity sports team

3. Coached at the University of Toronto

4. Does not sign Informed Consent

3.2.3   Measures

Employing a qualitative methods approach yielded thick, rich, useful data (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003) that was analyzed, interpreted, and used to draw conclusions as to the use and perceived effectiveness of exercise as punishment. Upon completing the interviews, the data were transcribed verbatim except for names, which were replaced with pseudonyms. With the data, I conducted a thematic analysis as it is a useful and flexible technique for qualitative research (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Themes were created as consistencies in response emerged during the data analysis. I used the NVivo program which assisted me in organizing my themes and meaning units. The questions for the interview were generated specifically for this study based on existing literature.

An interview guide format (Appendix B) was employed, providing a bit of structure but not confining the participants to a general set of questions. This format allowed for rich detailed and flexible responses from the participants (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). However, one ostensible issue with this type of interview technique was the lack of consistency in the way the research questions were posed (Turner, 2010). The questions in the interview guide explored: what sport participants coached, how long participants were involved in their sport, team management strategies used, how they would react in punitive situations, what they perceived athletes' feelings were in reaction to punitive situations, and the coaches' reactions to the athlete's

response. Additionally, coaches' opinions on the importance of the coach-athlete relationship were investigated. The interview was concluded with questions investigating their knowledge, opinions, and definitions of exercise as punishment, shaming and reintegration within the sporting context, and suggestions for some alternative methods of behaviour modification. During the interview, phrases such as exercise as punishment, and shame and reintegration, were avoided intentionally. The reason for this was to assess participants' genuine feelings about exercise as punishment and shame within the sport context. This proved to be successful as there was a dissonance between participants' responses with and without reference to the terms at the conclusion of the interview.

3.2.4   Procedures

I obtained ethics approval from the University's Human Ethics Review Board and respondents were recruited by email, telephone, and word of mouth. I used purposive sampling, which ensured a balance of the group size and specific characteristics appropriate for this study (Black, 1999). I recruited 8 head coaches. After informed consent forms (Appendix A) were signed, I conducted interviews lasting approximately 60 minutes. Five interviews were conducted in person at the coaches' office at a time convenient to them; three interviews were conducted over the phone as meeting in person was not feasible for the participant. Interviews were semi-structured, digitally recorded, and later transcribed verbatim.

Chapter 4
Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the use, frequency, and perceived effectiveness of exercise as punishment, subsequently contributing to the dearth of empirical research existing on this topic.

4.1 Study Participants

In total, 8 (4 female and 4 male) interuniversity coaches participated in this study. Half of the participants coached team sports and the other half coached individual sports. Participants' experiences in their respective sports both as a player and coach, ranged from 15 to 35 years. A summary of demographic characteristics of the participants is provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Participant Demographics

	Pseudonyms	Gender	Years of Exp.	Sport	Gender of Sport
1	Coach Campbell	Female	20 years	Team Sport	Female
2	Coach Collin	Male	35 years	Team Sport	Male
3	Coach Duncan	Male	20 years	Individual Sport	Male
4	Coach Miller	Male	23 years	Individual Sport	Male
5	Coach Smith	Male	19 years	Team Sport	Female
6	Coach Reed	Female	15 years	Team Sport	Female
7	Coach Reynolds	Female	17 years	Individual Sport	Male
8	Coach Woods	Female	27 years	Individual Sport	Female

4.2   Findings from Interview

In-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted that ranged from 45 to 90 minutes and resulted in 126 single spaced pages of interview transcriptions. In accordance with thematic analysis, each interview was coded and analyzed, and meaning units were created; similar meaning units were grouped and categorized into appropriate themes and sub-themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). As the analysis progressed, the themes evolved and using axial and selective coding procedures, relationships were determined between themes and their respective sub-themes and integrated until no new data appeared and concepts were well-developed (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). When examining coaches' perspectives on the use and perceived effectiveness of exercise as punishment, three broad themes emerged: the nature of punishment, coaches' conceptualization of punishment, and shame and reintegration. These emergent themes, along with their respective sub-themes will be explored in turn.

4.2.1   Nature of Punishment

Each interview began with a preamble identifying the importance of team management strategies followed by inquiries about the strategies used by the participants to manage their team. Within this theme, descriptive data on exercise as punishment (EAP) emerged such as: types of punishments, frequency, perceived effectiveness, reasons for use, and perceived responses. All eight participants admitted using EAP and 75% of them frequently use it.

4.2.1.1   Types of Punishment

The types of punishments used included general exercises such as sprints, push-ups, planks, squats, and burpees, as well as, sport specific exercises such as pushing a one-man sled, bag skating, and copious amounts of backhand swings.

Running is always a big one. I'd say they (EAP) mostly involve running. Sometimes, depending on which program I was in and the field equipment they had, we had some pretty devastating ones with pushing a one-man sled…we'd make them push the sled from one end of the field [to the other], basically 120 yards! (Coach Collin)

Additionally, Coach Collin would punish those who violated team policy by having them sit, watch, and facilitate sprints and push-ups of their teammates until exhaustion. Coach Collin explained, "Those kids, those kids that really care would rather be anywhere else than here. Anywhere else than in front of their teammates."

Coach Smith had his players on multiple occasions do, "…burpees, or things like that. I had them do planks until fatigue, one time had them sit in almost like a squat position until fatigue…push-ups may be, it's any easy one for us to give." Coach Reed employed different methods of EAP as described here:

We do different types. One may be more aerobic, one's a more sprint or ability type thing…like a timed skate or a certain amount of laps or patterns, it's usually a long duration of skating, be it a patterned skate or some type of a skate, where it's long and there's not many breaks. It's quick recovery, there's little time for talking or complaining.

4.2.1.2   Frequency of EAP

According to the participants, the frequency with which EAP was prescribed varied. Some coaches described using EAP regularly. "Yeah two, three, four times a week based on whatever exercises we're doing." Coach Collin instead takes all the mistakes (e.g., arriving late, poor performance, showing attitude, etc.) committed in a given week and administers all the punishment within one day. Coach Duncan explains that everyday someone comes in late so

everyday he requires his athletes to give him twenty push-ups. Coach Woods explained, "someone's usually screwing up everyday [laughs], so you often have something going on at a practice."

Coaches Reed and Reynolds described using EAP on seldom occasions. Coach Reynolds, who used EAP regularly during her first two months of coaching now only used EAP a couple times all year. Coach Reed asserted that, "The only time we've had like a punishment skate like that, like I said, was once this whole year."

4.2.1.3   Reasons for Use

Athletes arriving late were the primary reason for initiating EAP. Coach Woods claimed, "Showing up late is one thing I will always dish out some form of athletic punishment." Other reasons for using EAP included, for example: using inappropriate language, showing attitude, not paying attention, missing practice, breaking curfew, not meeting team expectations, and disrespecting others. In addition to the behaviours of athletes, coaches justified using EAP as means of motivation and/or shame, a lack of options, and because they had previously experienced it themselves while competing.

Although Coach Reynolds initially said she only used EAP one or twice a year, she explained that she would normally fine her athletes a nominal fee for using inappropriate language, but with her younger athletes who were "broke" she had them do ten burpees for each inappropriate word. One participant described how EAP could be used to motivate athletes,

> Certainly in drills we have winners and losers, that when people don't win there is often a consequence involved to build our physical fitness into what we are doing. Within the environment that we train everyday how you can provide a consequence and work to

change behaviour? The options are probably limited so it becomes necessary in some scenarios. (Coach Campbell)

Coach Duncan often used punishment when his athletes would arrive late to practice; he attributed this to his experience in sport.

I came from a background where my coach would punish us for coming in late or misbehaving. [Now] we'll say, 'Oh, you're late. Yeah, you owe us twenty push-ups.' And so, my opinion on that now is that, to be honest I think it's okay. (Coach Duncan)

In more extreme cases, punishment was used to create a feeling of shame within athletes for not adhering to team rules.

The kids who were late or absent, we weren't going to punish them. We brought out chairs…we made them sit in chairs in centre field and we punished the rest of the team. They ran forever. They ran forever. We brought out nice chairs for them. We took it a step further. They actually blew the whistle…they were actually in control of punishing the team. (Coach Collin)

4.2.1.4   Perceived Effectiveness

Participant reflections conveyed varying opinions on the perceived effectiveness of EAP. Some coaches saw EAP as a constructive practice, which had value and left a lasting impression on the athlete to continuously modify his or her own behaviour.

 Coach Miller felt that, "When you enforce that type of punishment on them, you are inflicting something that is not necessarily beneficial in a constructive way for performance." Coach Duncan explained that getting your athletes to do push-ups when they make a mistake for some reason "sticks in their head a bit longer" and has a lasting impact and ability to continually

change an undesirable behaviour. Coach Smith said, "I have used fitness as a punishment. I think there are a lot of character traits that can be built with it… I think there's a lot of value in it, without overstepping the mark. So again, it's a delicate balance."

Two participants justified EAP as being less detrimental to the human psyche than words and could in fact help build team cohesion/camaraderie. Coach Duncan explained, "When it comes to physical punishment, I think it has a lot less lasting effect on the person's psyche. Words can be a lot more damaging." With respect to building camaraderie, Coach Smith explained that there is a place for EAP, you can recognize that when players are pushing each other to complete the session and they remember the pain of EAP with fondness, "…it (EAP) builds mental toughness, group solidarity and camaraderie."

Other coaches thought it to be effective and motivational, despite the potential of creating a negative emotional reaction. Coach Campbell explained,

> Sometimes it leads to little more motivation and a desire to work harder… I think it has its moments when it's effective to get a point across because obviously athletes don't typically enjoy that type of consequence. But like I said I think it does create fear or can create fear.

Some assessed the effectiveness of EAP by monitoring attendance at practices, meetings, non-competition team events, and gauging the locker room environment. Coach Collin stated, "If it's a really good locker room…I don't want to say believe, but hope that these strategies are working. [However] I've never ever had a hundred percent success with physical punishment."

However, one coach did not believe this practice was effective. Coach Reynolds asserted that, "I don't think it's effective. You're going to make a distance runner go run 3 laps, when they run 30

miles a week? That's not much of a punishment." She drew this analogy with cars, "We (athletes) are Ferraris, we are Porsches, we're very fine tuned things. If it's not helping, there's a pretty darn good chance it's going to hinder what you're doing."

4.2.1.5   Perceived Responses

After inquiring about methods used to modify behaviour, participants were asked to reflect upon their athletes' responses to EAP. These participants based their reflections on non-verbal communication from the athletes, verbal cues, and recollections of their own experiences of punishment.

Coach Campbell cited fear and negative body language as a regular occurrence when she competed as an athlete; "It happened on such a regular basis that going to practice became more filled with fear and uncertainty than enjoyment. I think it (EAP) does create fear or can create fear if over used… Negative body language for sure." Similar in nature, Coach Collin created a leadership group consisting of multiple athletes on his team who would come together and preside over the punishment of a particular athlete. "The guys that were late, and were going in front of this leadership group, were much more scared they were going in front of their teammates and in front of me. You know, they were scared of going in front of me, but going in front of their peers was really difficult." Coach Collin has even had scenarios in which athletes would break down and cry as a result of punishment.

Participants identified sinking of shoulders, and shameful verbal and physical cues as common reactions to punishment. Coach Smith said,

> Sometimes they feel like they've let me down, or they've let themselves down.
> Sometimes there's an emotional well-up there. Other times it's kind of, it's them arguing

back or arguing a case by trying to point to other players…there may be tears or

apologies.

Coach Reed claimed,

The first thing you notice, is sunken shoulders, they look away. There's some who I

know I perceive that as being embarrassed. There's some I know are mad. I can just tell

by the mannerism, facial expression, even how they exit a room.

The use of "colorful language" and anger were also consistent reactions the athletes had. Coach

Collin said, "Some will have anger, anger towards me, anger towards the program. I don't mind

being angry, as long as they still respect me. I can deal with the anger."

4.2.2   Coaches' Conceptualization of Punishment

The data revealed participants' views regarding the use and perceived effectiveness of exercise

as punishment in four ways: punishment versus discipline, alternatives to EAP, cognitive

dissonance, and the culture of sport. These sub-themes are described below.

4.2.2.1   Punishment versus Discipline

Participant responses revealed they were unable to define punishment and discipline accurately

or to distinguish between the two concepts.

Coach Reed described discipline as involving a learning outcome, "Being disciplined is

executing a game plan and playing within how we want you to play." When asked to define

punishment and identify a distinction between punishment and discipline, she had this to say, "I

think punishment in a sense that maybe…I think the outcome is different. I think it depends on

how you define learning, though, I guess… I think they can both be interchangeable." Likewise,

Coach Miller defined punishment as being "very similar" to discipline involving the ability to effectively modify an individual's behaviour.

Coach Collin had an interesting interpretation of both terms and their difference, "(Discipline is) being self-aware…(punishment) is a path to becoming self-aware, a vehicle…I would think punishment is reactive, and I would hope discipline it not. Discipline is a structure."

One coach described a lack of love or care as the distinguishing feature between punishment and discipline. Coach Reynolds stated, "The important part about discipline, for it to be effective is that there has to be love involved… punishment is jail! There's no love in there."

Furthermore, Coach Reynolds disagreed with using a positive activity such as exercise as a way to modify an athlete's behaviour. Only two out of eight coaches were able to provide a more accurate definition of discipline describing it as teaching or guiding the athlete to an appropriate behaviour. Coaches Smith and Duncan described punishment as possessing a negative connation and this contributed to the difference between the terms.

4.2.2.2   Alternatives to Punishment

Although participants were able to give multiple suggestions for alternatives to EAP, every alternative suggested was still a form of punishment. Some participants believed that in order to effectively modify behaviour it has to be unpleasant and punitive. When asked to identify some alternatives to EAP, Coach Woods was able to provide suggestions for other forms of EAP only, such as push-ups or wall sits. Coach Collin responded with the notion that,

> In my opinion, I find when dealing with a problem or infraction, it has to be punitive. I
>
> like the idea of film (using game tape to modify behaviour). They'd do it. I don't know if

they'd feel they were being punished. It would get them better and it's a great idea. [But] In my opinion, it has to be punitive. (Coach Collin)

Coaches Smith, Reed, and Campbell agreed that benching the player is an effective way of modifying athletic behaviours. "If a player is late we would often bench them, they wouldn't get a chance to play in the game, that is a big reward for an athlete is the competition. So I think by taking that away I think that is a pretty good consequence."

Some of the other alternatives to EAP that were suggested included: cleaning up the coaches' office, the team bus, or the locker room; organizing jerseys; pumping up balls, publicly apologizing to the coaching staff and team; loss of access to team room; fining the athlete with a nominal fee; and, in extreme cases dismissal from the team.

> If you didn't show up, or were late, you ended up having to clean my office or something like that. You would have to spend so much time cleaning the office. You'd have to apologize to your teammates and to the coaches or the coach whoever you- therefore, you would always have to do that. Then you would start losing things, access to the team room; you'd have to start unloading the bus for everybody, which is 60 people, things like that… When my athletes swear, they have to give me money. (Coach Reynolds)

In some cases, coaches would rely on tactics of shame or embarrassment as a method of modifying the athlete's behaviour. Coach Duncan suggested that if an athlete violates team policy you could, "talk it out with the athlete in front of everybody…In the midst of the instruction, if they (athlete) are late, you can yell at them and embarrass them." Similarly Coach Miller described a situation he dealt with:

I had an athlete that played a match and played horrific, and basically after the match I just kind of told the team captain that the performance was substandard and I would not be speaking to them for the rest of the evening. And I just left it at that, and I sent the message to the team captain. The team captain took the person out for dinner. The next day the person came back and competed at a higher level and I did not even say a word to the person.

4.2.2.3   Cognitive Dissonance

All of the participants agreed that EAP is not an ideal method of modifying behaviour but yet, most continued to use it. Coach Collin had gone back and forth on the use of EAP and identified it as "unfortunately necessary." Similarly, Coach Campbell said, "we certainly use it at times, it's not our primary form of applying a consequence." Furthermore, 90% of these participants admitted to using a disciplinary strategy that they later questioned.

These participants understood the negative nature and results of EAP and in fact called it an "old school" technique, yet 75% of them agreed that it has its place, as long as it is administered within reason. Coach Smith reported,

I would say that was an old school model and is still in place with much of the coaching programs today. I think the 'new school' thinking now is…you know do you ask a piano player to run around his piano?

Both Coaches Reed and Woods explained that it has its place, and Coach Woods elaborated, "I definitely think it has its place. I think that, again it depends on, a big thing would be the level that it's done."

Often coaches would rethink their approach to punitive situations. Coach Duncan explained his quandary with the use of EAP,

> Through my coaching years I kind of went back and forth on using punishment… I didn't use it (punishment) in the past, because I felt it might not be a positive thing for athletes to receive a punishment of a physical activity. So you're basically using, you're associating something that's positive like doing push-ups, to something that's negative, a punishment. So in the past I thought it wouldn't be a good thing to use, and I've changed my mind…It's (punishment) almost like a parent having a child and saying, 'Put your hand out,' and giving them a smack, but not a hard one. You know what I mean? So, that's where I am with that right now.

More than half the participants admitted to using EAP based on prior experience, even at times when they disagreed with its effectiveness.

> When I first started coaching, being an athlete that responded to punishment, I assumed that's what all athletes did, I was given punishment as an athlete when I was growing up, and its why I think I was more successful. (Coach Woods)

Likewise, Coach Smith admitted to experiencing EAP and using it but had some second thoughts about it, "It's (EAP) something that, as a player, I certainly had to deal with…It's something I have used… Maybe I've got to find a better way to handle that, but again I don't know if I would do that differently."

Coach Campbell explained her attempt to avoid using EAP due to her unpleasant experiences, however, recognized its tremendous effect and continued to use it intermittently.

Based on my experiences as a player I try not to use that (EAP) as the lone punishment, it created more fear than enjoyment, so that is something I try to avoid. We certainly use it, but it's not our primary form of applying a consequence. (Coach Campbell)

An issue that Coach Collin raised is that many punitive situations involved in sport are viewed as black and white. "I always find what gets coaches in trouble with players is they don't understand the grey, you know. All rules are black and white. They don't understand the grey area."

All but one of the participants admitted to using a disciplinary strategy with which they felt strong remorse or later regretted.

We all make mistakes. I know I've singled out people and yelled at people over time, and maybe I reflect upon it. I've even singled out opposing players in the past and then I look at it afterwards, and I ask myself, 'Like that was just not the professional way to handle it.' And I've apologized to the people after the fact. (Coach Miller)

Similarly, Coach Duncan explained a disciplinary strategy used with an athlete that he still regrets,

I had one athlete that wasn't in…well he was in okay shape, but he was a bit – I said to him – 'soft.' Like he wasn't muscular. So my other athletes weighing in were all pretty muscular, and I turned to this fellow and I said, 'come on, man. Look, you're a little soft. You're teammates are all in shape. They're ripped.' I was trying to get him motivated to work out and lose some weight and get in shape. But, the athlete took it as very offensive. He didn't say anything to me at this point. He went home on the subway. This was my high school coaching, here. The guy was maybe in grade ten. So another athlete,

his teammate, told me when he went home he cried all the way home. Then he told his father what had happened, and his father agreed with me and said, 'Yeah, you're fat,' to the kid. And so, the kid lost a lot of weight and he got in shape, but now I regret saying that because even though he got in shape he's probably psychologically scarred, [from] having two male role models in his life insult him like that.

Coach Collin claimed, "I've done so many things. So many of them wrong…I've used humiliation tactics, which I completely regret." Coach Woods, Smith, Reynolds, and Campbell admitted to using punishment, or shaming as a tactic to change behaviour. Coach Collin described a punishment strategy employed that he later regretted,

> [Players] had to complete the online medical, concussion tests, and everything had to be done prior to coming in. And only the freshmen had it done. The veterans showed up, and we were supposed to practice the next day. So I cancelled practice, I booked the field house, which has the only windows…there's four big windows on the doors. We taped all the windows closed, I brought the therapists in, and I had one of my coaches outside. I said no one's allowed in except for obviously my boss. If she's not my boss, no one else is allowed in this room. All the therapists were in there. We put buckets in the middle of the floor, probably about ten garbage cans. And we ran them for two hours. And we ran them.

> The guys that didn't do their online medical, I wasn't allowed to run them, because they weren't medically cleared yet. So it was about fifteen of them. So those fifteen guys, I had the checklist. It was about this size. It was a paragraph, and then it was about fifteen things that they had to do. So while we ran, I made all fifteen guys read over and over and over the checklist for two hours while the others ran. We had one rule. You know,

this is the gym floor; you are not allowed puking on this floor. You know, the buckets are there. That's what the buckets are for.

4.2.2.4 Culture of Sport

According to the participants, exercise as punishment remains a commonly used practice because of the culture of sport. These coaches had experienced it when they too were athletes and it appears it is not something they thought about, instead, according to the participants, it's just *"naturally assumed."*

> If I think about myself as an athlete and think of myself as a coach, it's (punishment) something you just grow up with. I think it's something you don't even think about. When I started coaching, I never sat down and said, 'Am I someone who wants to, if you're late, uh, make you do what we call "hockey lines", like "suicides" on the ice?' Or if, if you do such and such behaviour, you'll have to do such and such repercussions. I never really even thought about it, because it's something that I did as an athlete. Like that's what I did for years and years and years. (Coach Woods)

Coach Campbell felt as though,

> In my sport it has become a natural assumption that it (punishment) is going to be used…within the environment that we train everyday how you can provide a consequence and work to change behaviour? The options are probably limited so it (EAP) becomes necessary in some scenarios.

Several coaches described the use of EAP as something they had experienced and considered it a ritual or embedded in the sport culture.

(Why punishment is still used) I would say cultural…it probably is ritual why I continue to do it. I think it's the world we live in. I'm more cognizant to dehydration and heat. Like whenever we punish, all our therapists are there. We're giving them time to drink. Like even though we're handing out in the form of punishment, there will be water breaks built in, or we're making sure they drink. (Coach Collin)

Likewise, Coach Smith decreed that EAP "has just become the norm." He continued, "Yeah (EAP is part of culture), I think part of it, again. My thinking is evolving, and as coaching evolves and as methods evolve so does people's interpretations. I see room for both (EAP and Not using EAP), but it's using them at the right times."

Similar to the notions conveyed above, Coach Duncan also described EAP as a part of the sporting culture. It was something he consistently experienced while growing up, he saw it as a minuscule task for an athlete to complete and he believed it to be an effective way to modify behaviour. He explained that, "I am giving them 20 push-ups. Athletes can handle hundreds of push-ups, what's 20 to them?"

4.2.3   Shame and Reintegration

The data revealed that shame was a method often used to modify athletic behaviours; this occurred as a result of EAP and independent of EAP. Evidence suggested that when using shame to modify behaviour, it required the element of reintegration. Reintegration involved recognizing a mistake, shaming and ostracizing the culprit, and then reintegrating him or her back into the team or community of athletes by means of a physical or verbal gesture (Braithwaite, 1989). The categories that emerged included: coaches' conceptualization of shame and reintegration, peer dynamics, the coach-athlete relationship, and coaches' view on the use of "shaming."

4.2.3.1   Coaches' Conceptualization of Shame and Reintegration

All eight participants admitted to using shame to modify behaviour, either regularly or at some point in their career. Typically the method used to evoke feelings of shame within the athletes was the display of disappointment in performance or the outcome of an event, and a lack of adherence to team policy.

> I think that they would more so feel my disappointment through a process rather than the result. Whether we win or lose, if we win but we don't win how I think we should win then they are going to hear about it too. Typically my experience has been that they feel bad about letting me down and want to change their behaviour because they understand the big picture. (Coach Campbell)

Likewise, Coach Woods explained at times she wouldn't even have to say anything, "A lot of the times you see their behaviour change without me having to say anything because I do show everything all over my face."

Coach Duncan echoed this sentiment with his outward displays of disappointment after an unfavorable performance outcome,

> There have been situations where the person will walk off the mat and I won't be able to even speak to them because I'll be so frustrated with the situation. Like, 'Why weren't you listening? How could you lose the match when there's five seconds left and you're winning by two points? How could you make such a silly mistake?' And at the point when they're coming off, I can't speak to them until later. So they'll see that I'm disappointed, absolutely.

Coaches Campbell and Smith acknowledged having used shame when their emotions got the best of them. Coach Campbell stressed that she will "try not to shame them, unless perhaps I get quite frustrated." Coach Smith admitted that, "Sometimes what I might say might be based on emotion rather than really sitting back and evaluating, and letting it settle."

Coach Reynolds described scenarios in which she used shame to change behaviour,

> When people are late, they have to sing a song on the bus ride in front of the whole bus and sing a song. I'm a little teapot or something like that. There's other ways to do things that aren't- it's embarrassing but not really.

Although all participants have engaged or continue to engage in shaming the athlete, they all condemned the act. In some cases, coaches admitted that it would probably continue to happen in the future despite the negative effects. Coach Collin said, "Even though I have used it, and I do use it, I don't believe in it. I wouldn't let any of my coaches do it. And I'm trying not to do it. I'm trying." Relatedly, Coach Smith admitted that, "I'm sure I've done it in the past, and I'm sure that I'll do it in the future inadvertently."

Coaches Reynolds and Duncan conveyed their opinion on the use of shame in sport, adamantly denouncing its use, "I don't think there's any place for shaming athletes." Ironically, both have engaged in shaming, and Coach Duncan even admitted that he has missed cues of shame occurring, "Maybe they do (show shame) and I'm not attentive to that, and it wouldn't be the first time that I missed a cue from an athlete. That's for sure."

Coaches Woods and Smith, when first beginning their coaching career, thought shaming was an effective strategy for managing behaviour; later their opinion changed on this practice. Additionally, both coaches stated that gender played a role and that females are more

susceptible to experiencing shaming. Coach Woods had this to say, "Well I would say, my first year coaching, I would say that's how you do it (shaming). But what I've learned through working with athletes, and it might be different guys to girls… it doesn't necessarily work." Coach Smith explained his opinion on the gender difference,

> I think in females it's extremely easy for them to interpret something as negative or shameful. I think how you talk to females versus how you talk to males differs greatly, or how things are interpreted…to shame a girl is much easier than it is to shame a guy. So you've got to be very careful in that environment.

When asked, these coaches often described shame as being synonymous with embarrassment or regret. Six of the participants defined shame as "being embarrassed…singled out." However, Coach Miller seemed a bit hesitant in that notion and when asked again about shame later in the interview, he had this to say, "I don't know really if they do experience shame so much in high-performance athletics. I think they just…no, I don't really think…they're above that level of shame."

The most cited sign that athletes were experiencing shame by these coaches was body language, primarily sunken shoulders. "It's usually body language. The kids that really care, their shoulders sink. They would just rather be anywhere but here right now." Additionally, coaches cited verbal and other physical cues such as, apologizing, turning red in the face, and crying. "We've had kids breakdown and cry." Coach Woods described how she handles scenarios in which cues of shame are exhibited, "If you're going to cry, then step off the ice, cry, get it done…don't do it in front of other people, but do it. Get it done."

Seven out of eight participants agreed that part of successfully shaming an athlete hinged on following the act with a gesture or explanation as to why it occurred. Coach Smith regularly engaged in methods of reintegration, primarily with the use of dialogue,

> For one single player to be doing a particular thing, they've got to know why they're doing it and why they're being singled out in that way. But as soon as they're back in the team, it's done. They've served the exercise that they were supposed to do and now they're back in the group and they're moving forward with the group.

Coach Collin also advocated for the use of dialogue. He explained that it was necessary for athletes to understand what they did wrong, why they have feelings of shame, and that the coach and athlete have rectified the situation; "team needs to know that this individual has done everything we've asked them to do." At this point the team can finally accept the athlete back into the normal proceedings of practice. Coach Reynolds stressed the importance of first validating the athletes' feelings, empathizing with his or her feelings of shame, disappointment or anger, and conclude the conversation with a positive comment, "If you're angry, you're disappointed, you're frustrated, you should feel all of the above because you are a great athlete and you had a bad day."

Some coaches described a simple gesture at times would suffice. Coach Reed said, "Sometimes that's just like a nod, right. Like just a body gesture, like, 'Hey, that's it.' You know, or just a little reassurance, or a nod, or a wink, or a quick verbal quip kind of thing."

For shame and reintegration to occur, coaches need a communitarian environment; this in turn creates an emphasis on peer dynamics; a notion to be described in the next section.

4.2.3.2   Peer Dynamics

Peer influences can be a very powerful form of modifying behaviour. These coaches cited many examples, both positive and negative, of athletes trying to create change amongst each other. In some positive cases, coaches recalled situations in which athletes would help one another with physically strenuous tasks; they would encourage and motivate one another. Coach Campbell explained how punishing the whole team for one person's mistake could bring them closer, "Sometimes it leads to a little more motivation and a desire to work harder for each other." Likewise, Coach Reed explained the process of how athletes influence each other; "They usually try to police themselves first, either with a comment or gentle encouragement, or something along that kind of nudging, pushing, you know that kind of thing."

However, this positive interaction between athletes can quickly change to a negative experience. Coaches cited examples of athletes feeling fear, anger, and shame. Athletes would also call one another out, and engaging in *"bullying tactics."* Coach Reynolds recalled a situation last year that involved some players not adhering to team policy and because of that, their end of the year party was canceled, "I wasn't here last year but there was a Facebook bullying situation where it was not good." Similarly, Coach Collin described situations in which the whole team was punished with EAP, because of the mistake of one player, "There's usually all lot of calling out. The kids that are really upset are ashamed because they caused this." After this incident Coach Collin briefly mentioned the team engaged in bullying tactics of the player who caused the punishment.

The participants described the creation of a leadership group and the dynamics of peer influences as a method of managing behaviours. Leadership groups incorporated student-athletes in years one through four; this leadership group would have responsibility and stake in running the team. Coach Collin explained,

> We started implementing a leadership group, where we took a certain amount of seniors, a certain amount of juniors, a certain amount of sophomores, a certain amount of freshmen…give them an opportunity to steer the ship. They'd have a vested interest in the running of the team.

Participants described how the leadership group would often assist in enforcing team policy. Coach Smith said, "We'll initially lay out a meeting with the team of what our expectations and our guidelines are…we'll go through our leadership team, and group of captains. And their job is to help enforce that and be the example." If the leadership group felt as though no strides were made, they'd notify their coaching staff and the next step would be a coach intervention.

Coach Duncan described his reasoning for creating a leadership group;

> You can create an atmosphere where you can get your own athletes to manage their behaviours. You can say to them, 'Okay, listen. Some people here are not coming to practice on time. I'm going to leave it on your shoulders to figure out how to deal with it.'

Coaches who employed the leadership group felt like it was an effective way in which to teach athletes about "real world" responsibilities. Coach Reed felt as though the creation of a leadership group was an effective approach to managing a team, "if you can have a group, a leadership group manage those things (enforcing rules)… If you can get your team to do that, then I think you're sitting pretty good." Additionally, Coach Reynolds explained that coaching becomes "a lot easier when they (athletes) are holding each other accountable."

4.2.3.3   Coach-Athlete Relationship

The deterrent effects of shame are greater within a relationship characterized by a strong social bond and interdependency (Braithwaite, 1989). According to these participants, the primary method in which this social bond and interdependency was built with their respective athletes was through open communication. Participant reflections outlined several ways to coach and the important elements to consider when interacting with the athlete. Providing structure, feedback, clearly laid out rules, and motivation were just a few concepts mentioned by these participants.

The participants stressed an "open-door" policy, "two-way" communication, and adaptability as keys to success. Coach Campbell had this to say about an ideal coaching style, "I operate with a pretty open-door policy where athletes can come in and talk to me…I would say honesty, caring, trustworthy, umm, where there is a two-way communication on a constant basis." She explained that if her athletes felt comfortable and close to her, they would be more likely to cooperate during practice. Coach Woods explained that she strives to be structured but at the same time adaptive to each of her athletes, which requires constant communication.

Additionally, coaches emphasized the importance of possessing an active role in paying attention to issues plaguing the athletes both on and off the field; some of these participants explained that it becomes easier to create change in behaviour and develop group conformity if there exists a familiarity and closeness between coach and athlete. Coach Smith said,

> [Coaches should be] somebody they feel that they can come into this office, and they can sit down, and they can be honest, they can pour their heart out to in some regards about their home life, their family, they can feel trusted and secure here…developing the athlete becomes easier when there is a vested interest on both parts.

Likewise, Coach Miller conveyed, "…In many ways I prefer it if they come to see me to talk about other things besides sport, because we'll solve that problem and indirectly you're solving the sport problem."

Many of the participants felt as though at no point should the athlete fear or hesitate divulging issues that may be occurring and it is up to them as coaches to create such an environment. Coach Collin described his ideal coach-athlete interaction,

> It would be the ability for the player not to be afraid to approach you, not be afraid to hold anything back, whether it's personal, school, or sport-related. If something's going wrong in their life, being able to share that with you…those players, those players tend to find themselves in leadership positions.

However, all these participants widely expressed the concern for not being too close to an athlete, as there should be some "boundaries." Coach Reynolds explained that a coach should be,

> Somebody there to help and support them. They're not a peer. You can't be too close. They're (coaches) not your friends. Meaning that friends have a tough time being honest with each other because you're scared you might ruin that friendship. As a coach, as a parent, you should be able to be honest with that person.

Likewise, Coach Duncan suggested that the "relationship should have clear boundaries," and that often the line can become blurred and it is up to the coach to maintain that appropriate distance.

Coaches Collin, Smith, and Woods felt that having several rules, being firm and uncompromising were, at times, the only way to maintain control and ensure your team adheres

to the policies outlined. Coach Woods felt that with some athletes, "yelling" and "getting in their face" is all that works.

> I have to be a certain disciplinarian to make sure that we have an order and a structure to our program, and that some of the lines are not getting crossed, and that they're (athletes) not trying to take advantage. (Coach Smith)

Similarly, Coach Collin explained that, "It's good to be strict. It's good to have rules, but when you're making a rule or setting a policy, you better make sure you're going to adhere to it."

Conversely, one coach felt that the best teams do not have multiple rules but have leadership amongst the athletes. Coach Reed stated, "We're trying to build that (leadership)…I don't think championship teams are created by having a million rules. I don't believe that."

4.2.3.4   Coaches' Views on the Use of "Shaming"

Throughout the interview process, a judicious effort was made to refrain from using terms such as, exercise as punishment, and shame. The data gathered around these concepts emerged organically within the interview. However, at the conclusion of each interview, participants were asked their opinions and definition of these terms.

At the beginning and during the interview, when the terms "exercise as punishment" and "shame" were avoided, every participant admitted to engaging in these practices at some point in their coaching career. At the conclusion of the interviews, when the terms were used, 90% of participants admitted that EAP has *"its place,"* however, many of these same participants adamantly condemned and criticized the use of shame as method to modify behaviour.

Coach Duncan explained that sometimes to modify behaviours, an effective alternative to EAP could be "to yell at them (athlete), or embarrass them. They'll think twice next time." However,

at the end of the interview Coach Duncan had this to say, "I don't think that (shame) is a good way to address somebody's performance, or I don't think there's any place for shaming athletes." Similarly, Coach Reynolds explained that from time to time, when athletes violate team policy, she would instruct them to, "sing a song in front of the team, load the bus with team bags, and pick up trash after their teammates…" or engage in a "slightly embarrassing" act. Yet at the conclusion of the interview she said,

> That's never okay. I'd much rather you have somebody run 1,000 laps than do that (shaming). You're going to forget the running part. The psychological aspect of feeling that kind of shame…that's why when you work with female athletes, that's why they become anorexic, because of that. (Coach Reynolds)

During the interview, Coach Miller spoke of an instance in which he froze out a player because of his performance. He was so disgusted with the performance that he didn't speak, talk, or look at the athlete for twelve hours, until he competed again the next day. Coach Miller explained that because of this, the athlete felt ashamed of his performance and played much better the next day. However, when confronted with questions regarding shame, and using the actual term Coach Miller explained, "I believe coaches do use that (shame) as a form of discipline. I choose not to because I don't believe that that works…it's futile to behave like that."

During the interview, Coach Smith admitted to using shame intermittently. When confronted with the term at the end of the interview, Coach Smith said, "I don't agree with it…I don't like the idea of shaming. I would say I am an introverted kind of guy, I don't want to be picked on by my coach."

4.3   Summary of Findings

In summary, the use of exercise as punishment appeared to be a method often used by coaches.

Additionally, shame and reintegration also seemed to be a commonly used tool for modifying

athletic behaviours. The participants were aware of the harmful effects of EAP but continued to

use it because they were unaware of alternative non-punitive strategies. Interpreting the data

with appropriate theoretical contexts may provide explanations as to why EAP continues to be

used despite potential negative ramifications, why shame and reintegration seemed to be a

popular tool for modifying athletic behaviours, and why coaches are unable to suggest non-

punitive practices.

Chapter 5
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine coaches' perspectives on the use and effectiveness of EAP. This research makes three contributions to the literature: it indicates the frequent use of EAP, coaches' lack of knowledge of non-punitive alternatives to using EAP, and the use of shame as a method to modify behaviour. These findings will be interpreted in relation to the existing literature.

The results from this study confirmed previous research that EAP is a commonly used practice within the realm of sport (Burak et al., 2013; Kerr et al., 2013; Richardson et al., 2012). When examining EAP, three themes emerged including: the nature of punishment, coaches' conceptualization of punishment, and shame and reintegration.

The current study highlights the frequent use of EAP despite the well-documented adverse effects of this practice (Albrecht, 2009; Burak et al., 2013; Kerr et al., 2013; Richardson et al., 2012). Interestingly, in other highly child-populated domains such as scholastic and domestic settings, the use of punishment has received substantial attention and criticism in the recent past (Baxamusa, 2012; Bussmann, 2009; De Nies, 2012; Fletcher, 2012; Durrant & Ensom, 2004; Gelter, 2012; Gershoff, 2002; and Lambert, 2012). Such criticisms have led to attempts to eradicate punishment within both contexts (Baxamusa, 2012; Bussmann, 2009; De Nies, 2012; Gelter, 2012; Gershoff, 2002; and Lambert, 2012), while it appears to be a commonly used practice in sport. It may be the culture of sport that sets it apart from other domains.

5.1 Alternative Universe

The culture of sport, referred in this section as an *alternative universe*, influences the behaviours and decisions of all those involved. Many of these participants in the current study claimed that

sport is different from any other realm, and one in which punishment is an effective approach to diminishing undesirable behaviours. This belief provides support to Erving Goffman's (1961) concept of a *Total Institution.* In his book *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*, Goffman (1961) states:

> A total institution may be defined as a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time together lead an enclosed formally administered round of life. (p. 11)

Atkinson and Young (2008) discussed how sport embodies these features as well as an extensive list of other characteristics including: denied rights and privileges from other spheres, role singularity, programming and identity-trimming, imposition of deference to authority, regimentation, and restrictions on self-determination, autonomy, and freedom of action. Participants from this study admitted that athletes spent a large portion of time with them; creating an environment with maximum conformity, regimentation and restricted independency was cited as an effective way of maintain social control when coaching a team sport.

Gervis and Dunn (2004) examined the prevalence of emotionally abused elite athletes and suggested that adages of "win at all costs" are problematic and place athletes in a vulnerable position. Testimonies of various participants suggest that success in sport is often assessed on how many wins a coach can produce and not on how many well-rounded athletes have been produced. Hughes and Coakley's (1991) 'sports ethic' perspective described how athletes (whether amateur or professional) learn 'interpretive frames', and use these frames to appraise commitment to the group and sport. According to the sports ethic perspective, athletes are taught to strive for distinction, assume risk and injury, play through pain, make sacrifices for their sports, accept no limits, and personify a "win at all costs" mentality (Young, 2012). These

axioms are so pervasive that most athletes have not only encountered them, but have come to

accept and encourage these behaviours (Young, 2012). Throughout many of these interviews

participants asserted that pushing through the pain of EAP and accepting no limits is an

effective way in which to build character and team camaraderie. However, research has argued

that many myths regarding punishment persist, for example, it is not needed to build character;

on the contrary, it in fact, can lead to more problems than it appears to solve (Dubanoski et al.,

1983).

Many of the participants described team policies that delineated athletes behave a particular way

in practice, competition, and in non-sport settings. One participant shamefully admitted that

from a safety standpoint, when using exercise as punishment, it was imperative to have the team

therapists present in order to intervene if he got carried away with the extent to which he

punished the athletes, and to assess whether an athlete could actually continue to participate in

the exercises or whether the athlete was pushing himself or herself to an unhealthy extent.

Hughes and Coakley (1991) proposed that the majority of athletes' behaviours during

competition, training, as well as social settings outside of sport, are in accordance with the

conditions of the sports ethic perspective. These researchers created a continuum placing

positive and negative deviance at either end. Positive deviance, involves compliance with the

sports ethic to an unhealthy extent; for example, this would involve dangerous weight loss

strategies in the pursuit of gaining access to a specific weight category in boxing, or aesthetic

purposes for gymnastics or figure skating; whereas negative deviance, involves rejection of the

sports ethic; this could involve deliberate disobedience of the coach's instructions (e.g., not

working hard or attending training sessions) (Young, 2012). From this study the data revealed

that at times negative deviance occurred. When athletes disregarded the coaches or team rules

(e.g., late for practice, not paying attention, etc.) the athletes were punished. Data collected from

this study suggest further researcher is needed on the extent of positive and negative deviance in sport.

Participants explained that those in influential positions such as the coaching staff and team captains determined the team policy and what was considered "appropriate" behaviours. The majority of the participants claimed that by encouraging the team captains and "playmakers" to endorse the team policies they had established, team cohesion and conformity were assured issue. Sport insiders interpret rule violations as well as inappropriate demands and behaviours according to group-specific categories (Young, 2012). In sport, athletes who have an extensive understanding of that team's specific sport culture or sports ethic (e.g. coaches, captains, "playmakers," etc.) determine attitudes and behaviours that are considered appropriate.

Similarly, the establishment of leadership groups in the current study resulted in higher rates of group conformity. Six out of eight participants in this study created leadership groups and cited peer influence as a "powerful tool" to modify behaviours. These leadership groups were comprised of first through fourth year student-athletes; this group, along with the coaching staff, would deliberate over the fate of the athlete. Often decisions would result in EAP or in more extreme cases, removal from the team. Participants claimed that the leadership group was an effective tool because it put punitive decisions in the hands of the athletes and created group conformity.

According to these participants, leadership groups consisting of team captains and other influential members of the team were put in place to help them justify and enforce what they deem as appropriate sporting practices. The sports ethic allows us to understand how particular behaviours are negotiated, and how athletes are taught to rationalize rule-breaking, or excessive behaviours, as a normal, acceptable part of sports culture (Hughes & Coakley, 1991).

Evidence from this study suggested that in the case of teams where their sports' ethic delineated that EAP is required for athletic development, the occurrence of EAP increased and resistance decreased; this resulted in both parties rationalizing EAP as a normative practice in sport. Participants widely expressed experiencing EAP in their formative years and in turn, eventually used EAP, justifying it as a cultural aspect and norm in sport. This lends support to Bandura's (1963) social learning theory, demonstrating that behaviours are modeled, imitated, and then added to an individual's behavioural repertoire. This suggests, that EAP has potentially become so ingrained in our sporting practices, that initiating new methods may prove to be difficult. When one considers other highly child/adolescent populated domains such as parenting and education, there has been quite an evolution in which the use of punishment, and specifically physical punishment, has become unpopular and often unacceptable. Conversely, sport remains largely unaffected by changes seen in other domains.

All of the participants from this study confirmed the negative consequences associated with EAP. When asked to suggest alternative methods, these coaches were only able to recommend other punishment tactics, suggesting that to modify athletic behaviours, the process has to be unpleasant and punitive. The alternative universe of sport provides a platform that allows this perspective to be supported and encouraged. Conversely, there is value in considering controlling motivational strategies and the element of social control employed by coaches. To gain a better understanding of controlling motivational strategies and social control, we look to the sport and exercise psychology literature, as well as the punishment literature.

All eight of these participants acknowledged multiple scenarios in which they had coerced an athlete to behave in accordance with their own expectations or desires, despite the ramifications. The data could contribute to understanding why coaches have come to normalize the practice of EAP. Coaches can behave consciously in a coercive, pressuring, and demanding way, with the

intention of imposing a specific and predetermined method of thinking or behaviour upon the athlete; consequently, athletes often conform to but do not endorse the requested behaviour (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thogersen-Nthoumani, 2009). It has been suggested that coaching styles that are predominately punitive allow coaches more control over an athlete's behaviours and decreases non-conformity; however, along with this, player autonomy also decreases (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thogersen-Nthoumani, 2010). The external pressure administered by the coach produces a change in the athletes' perception of the cause of their success or failure in sport, from internal to external (Ryan & Deci, 2002). This change can generate a situation in which the athlete may feel compelled to respond in ways that may ignore their own needs, merely to placate their coach's desires and expectations (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003).

Based on the participants' responses, some of these coaches implied that punishment was an easy, time efficient, and effective tool. This is substantiated by Brisbane's (2004) work in which he suggests that punishment is an easier method of behaviour modification because it is time and energy efficient, and it facilitates immediate compliance. It is no wonder that these participants rely so heavily upon punitive measures. Supporters of the use of punishment believe that it guides behaviours and attitudes of children. One cited advantage of using punishment is that it can prevent the occurrence of an undesirable behaviour provided that the punishment is delivered appropriately (Brisbane, 2004). Using the corporal punishment literature as a reference, Benatar (1998) argued that the use of punishment is justified under the following circumstances: if it does not result in injury, if it is non-discriminatory [the literature indicates that minority groups and especially males receive a disproportionate share of corporal punishment] (Shaw & Braden 1990); if it involves due process, specifically that the child understands why he/she is being punished; if it occurs soon enough after the undesirable

behaviour so that the child can correctly internalize it and finally; if it safeguards, that is, the punishment occurs only with the child's best interests in mind, with no clear intention to cause injury. This latter criterion begs the question, what is defined as injury or pain and does this include psychological injury?

Within the team dynamic, coaches found it hard to employ strategies that took time, patience, and individual attention. Individual sport coaches recognized this difference and explained that they were in a better position to have one-on-one conversations and develop autonomy within the athlete. However, 2 out of 4 individual sport coaches in this study continued to employ EAP citing that it was easier, achieved immediate results, and in their opinion, was not as detrimental as the use of words to the human psyche. On the contrary, there is growing evidence that suggests punishment is an ineffective and harmful method of behavioural modification (Nunley, 1998). Benatar (1998) explains that corporal punishment may be psychologically damaging. Hyman and colleagues' (1996) study shows that positive reinforcement and discipline (guiding the child's behaviour) are more effective and cause less psychological damage.

Social control may also account for the continued use of punishment in scholastic, military, and sport contexts (Baxamusa, 2012; Burns, 2003; Bussmann, 2009; De Nies 2012; Durrant, 2002; Farrell 2013; Lambert, 2012; O'Hanlon, 1982; and Richardson et al., 2012). Participants explained that when instructing a large group of athletes, the use of EAP was an efficient behaviour modification tool. When inquiring as to how team sport coaches effectively modify behaviour, EAP independent of and coupled with shame, often was the practice employed. When an individual made a mistake, coaches described assigning push-ups or sprints in the presence of the whole team to not only deter that individual from repeating an undesirable behaviour, but also to deter others from engaging in the same behaviour. Furthermore, 6 out of 8 participants would often punish all athletes for the indiscretions of one individual hoping that

players would react and "police themselves." Participants felt that if an athlete's peers are negatively affected by the offender's actions, all athletes involved will strive to adhere to team policy on a regular basis. Proponents of punishment who suggest punishment can stimulate learning substantiate this method of modifying behaviour; when you use an adverse stimulus, you are presenting a distinction between appropriate and inappropriate behaviour (Brisbane, 2004). For example, when the punitive teacher uses punishment on one child, other children observe and learn as well; for instance, if a child is punished in class for improper behaviour and other children witness this, it may decrease the likelihood for others to replicate the improper behaviour (Brisbane, 2004).

These coaches described scenarios in which an athlete would arrive late to practice because of hanging out with friends; coaches suggested that the athlete weighs the benefits and costs of running sprints or doing push-ups as compared to having a few more minutes of "down time" with peers. This is an example of the deterrence theory (Carlsmith, Darley & Robinson, 2002). Proponents of the deterrence theory argue that people choose to obey or violate rules only after calculating the costs and benefits of their actions (Nagin, 1998). As such, if the negative consequences of the act outweigh potential positive consequences, then avoidance will likely occur (Bentham, 1962; Carlsmith et al., 2002). The avoidant behaviour thought to result from punishment can take various forms: truancy, blaming others, "tuning-out", faking illness, and tardiness (Dubanoski et al., 1983).

Punishment is primarily used with the intention to modify a behaviour, however, mollifying an uncomfortable or unpleasant emotion often takes precedence (Nunley, 1998). Most scenarios involving punishment occur within a state of frustration or anger. Many of the participants in this study revealed that when using EAP or shaming an athlete, it often occurred within a state of frustration. Due to this emotional response, changing the behaviour no longer remains the

objective; instead, establishing dominance becomes the priority. Furthermore, the literature on punishment suggests that the use of punishment and shaming may not facilitate moral internalization because it does not educate the athlete about reasons for behaving appropriately, it does not involve communication of the effects of athlete's behaviour on others, and may encourage avoidant behaviour (Grusec, 1983; Hoffman, 1983; Lewis, 1992; Smetana, 1997). Because of the nature of punishment and shaming, there is potential for an emotional reaction from the athlete to avoid the punishment and the perpetrator.

A key finding that emerged from the data was an inability to properly define and differentiate punishment and discipline. Six of the eight coaches were unable to accurately define punishment and discipline, and continued to use both terms interchangeably. Similarly, a common issue cited in the punishment literature is parents' use of the terms punishment and discipline interchangeably (Bettelheim, 1985). Punishment tends to emphasize suffering and control as opposed to stressing the importance of learning and developing new behaviours; in fact, imposing suffering, shifts the focus from the lesson that needs to be learned to who is in control (Pawal, 2007). Unfortunately, punishment teaches young adults that those who have power can force others to be at their will (Bettelheim, 1985). Instead of considering how one can impose appropriate or desired behaviours, the coach should consider how he/she could instill these behaviours.

As pointed out by two of these participants, discipline involves both patience and gradual progression, initiated by the authority figure. Likewise, the literature delineates that discipline, in contrast to punishment, involves teaching or guiding towards positive or appropriate behaviour (Appleton & Stanley 2011; Gershoff, 2002; Pawal, 2007). Pawal (2007) conveyed that young adults need practice at behaving positively or retaining behavioral practices encouraged by a coach or parent. It is important for a coach to establish what his/her goals are;

if the objective is to create a healthy relationship along with promoting constructive athletic behaviours, discipline as opposed to punishment should be considered. Another discernible quality of discipline is its' ability to teach others to learn from their mistakes rather than incurring negative consequences. Furthermore, punishment involves the adult controlling a child's behaviour, whereas discipline maintains control within the child (Pawal, 2007). Two of the eight participants cited great success with the use of discipline, however, discontinued its use for various reasons including time constraints. Unfortunately, the majority of participants identified their approach to modifying behaviour as discipline, unaware of how far from it they really were.

Punishment, although excessively used, rarely yields the desired long-term responses a coach maybe aiming to achieve. Literature on parenting suggests that sometimes, those who utilize punishment, particularly physical punishment, are parents who do not know how to parent, are unable to define or distinguish discipline from punishment, do not have the financial means to be a good parent, or who are consumed with personal problems that make it difficult to be a good parent (Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 2007). Similarly, in a progressively competitive milieu such as sport, it may be coaches who find themselves in some of these same compromising situations in the sense that they may not know other coaching methods, do not have the financial support needed to develop a successful program, or are consumed with personal problems or threats of job insecurity.

An inadequate understanding of punishment and discipline could be a reason why participants were only able to provide punitive alternatives to EAP. The question then becomes, why is it that coaches find it problematic to define discipline and suggest alternative non-punitive strategies, in turn relying only on punitive measures such as EAP? It may be characteristics of

coaching profession that lends itself to such practices; these characteristics will be explored in the following section.

5.2   Professionalization of Coaching

The only requirement coaches must have in order to pursue a coaching position is past experience as an athlete. Every one of the participants in this study obtained their coaching jobs based primarily on their experience/success in their respective sports as athletes. Only 50% of coaches in the U.K. hold recognized qualifications (Lyle, 2002). In Canada, only 20% of coaches of carded athletes had an undergraduate degree in Physical Education and Kinesiology (Reade, 2009). There exists no threshold of accredited educational qualifications that admits members to coaching (Kerr, 2013). In spite of the well-respected National Coaching Certification Program (NCCP), education is not mandated, monitored, or evaluated (Kerr, 2013). Furthermore, educational initiatives such as *Respect in Sport* that are geared towards the mediation of the maltreatment of athletes are, for the most part, not empirically generated or assessed (Kerr, 2013).

Often, these participants compared coaching to the teaching profession., These coaches explained that in order to be an effective coach, you have to be a good teacher. In 1944, with the proclamation of the Teaching Profession Act, the Government of Ontario decreed that teaching is recognized as a profession. And yet coaching continues to have no such recognition, and the erroneous assumption remains that elite athletes and past experience is all that is needed to be an effective coach (Reade, 2009). Other highly youth oriented professions (e.g., teachers, early childhood educators, and day care employees) have stringent educational and training requirements, recognized scope of practice, ethical protocol, and governing bodies.

Mageau and Vallerand (2003) examined the integral role coaches play in shaping the psychological experiences athletes derive from their sport participation. Coaching practices may have a constructive impact on athletes' well-being and motivation, but maladaptive coaching techniques have become all too common (Bartholomew et al., 2009). The tremendous physical and mental demands placed upon athletes by their coaches can lead to various emotionally distressing reactions and in more severe cases, physical and/or psychological damage (Ryan 1996; Scanlan, Stein, & Ravizza, 1991). Further research is need on exercise as punishment (EAP) and whether it can be classified as a maladaptive coaching technique that may result in physical and emotional distress. Seven of the eight participants from this study stressed the importance of their role in the athletes' life and explained that the majority of a student-athlete's time is spent with them. It is imperative therefore that more initiatives are created to educate coaches on ways to appropriately train, interact, and guide their athletes. Further, it is important to explore the conditions under which the use of EAP may become a form of relational maltreatment.

5.3   Relational Maltreatment & the Coach-Athlete Relationship

Relational maltreatment occurs within the context of a critical relationship role, which involves the influence over an individual's sense of safety, trust, and fulfillment of needs, (Crooke & Wolfe, 2007). "This relationship role is no longer limited to that of the parent-child relationship; rather, extra-familial caregiver-child relationships such as that of the coach-athlete relationship have been included within child-protection legislation" (Kerr & Stirling, 2008, p. 309). Relational maltreatment can be distinguished into four subgroups; physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, and neglect; to date, the vast majority of research on relational maltreatment in sport has focused on sexual abuse (Glaser, 2002). Emotional abuse is

understood to be an under-recognized but extremely common form of child abuse (Glaser, 2002), and, more recently, research has turned to understanding emotional abuse.

Within this study, seven out of eight participants described a regretful disciplinary strategy employed and felt they had crossed a line. Upon further investigation, these participants explained how easy a punitive strategy meant simply to modify an athletic behaviour crossed over into something more. Of these participants, half of them expressed remorse for their behaviours but also continued to employ dubious punitive strategies. Gervis and Dunn (2004) conducted a study on the prevalence of emotional abuse of elite athletes and concluded that the culture of sport and ideologies (e.g., winning at all costs, striving for distinction, accepting no limits, etc.) proposed are challenging and can create athletic vulnerability. Because there is so much emphasis in society based on winning performances in sport, we may ignore the methods in which this is achieved. Gervis and Dunn (2004) stated that shouting, demeaning, intimidating, and humiliating were the most common types of emotional abuse experienced in sport. Anecdotal evidence, along with the testimonies of these participants demonstrated that exercise as punishment is often initiated by methods of shouting, belittling, threats, and humiliation (Book, 1999; Burns, 2003; Egan, 2012; Kays & Schlabig, 2013; and Shaw, 2004). Because of the importance and influence the coach has over the athlete's sense of trust, safety, and fulfillment of needs, it is imperative that coaches recognize and behave responsibly within this relationship. It is paramount that coaches fully understanding how easily one can cross the line into relational maltreatment.

The coach-athlete relationship has been regarded as the most important and influential interactions of an adolescent's life (Burke, 2001). Moreover, the coach-athlete relationship has been shown to be an unbalanced one, with the coach having power over the athlete by virtue of his/her age, expertise, experience, and access to resources and rewards (Tomlinson & Strachan,

1996). With increasing relevance, influence, and time a coach spends with an athlete, the potential for abuse within the relationship increases. Crosset (1986) referred to the coach-athlete relationship as being similar to that of a "master-slave" relationship; Crosset believed that an abusive relationship can result from the lack of independence of the athlete, and the high level of control and dominance the coach has over the athlete in this relationship. When asked to describe important attributes of a coach-athlete relationship, these participants unanimously agreed that being "approachable" was key; however, all but two participants claimed that athletes were afraid to approach the head coach in varying scenarios based on the power of the head coaches' position. This fear could be a product of continuous, inappropriate coach-athlete interactions over the span of an athlete's career.

There exists substantial literature concerning the 'power of authority' as well as the aetiology of athlete abuse in sport. Sport provides the coach with nearly unquestioned authority over the athlete; the coach enjoys several sources of personal power such as: reward, traditional, charismatic, expert, coercive, and social power related to age, sex, and race (Brackenridge, 1994). In addition, the coach often assumes that his/her goals are what the athlete should desire; the coach endorses the viewpoint that his/her goals are primary for both members of the relationship and uses his/her power to produce those goals (Burke, 2001). When an imbalanced relationship occurs for an extended period of time between the coach and athlete, implementation of protection initiatives prove to be difficult. Within the coach-athlete relationship, the athlete is trained to submit without question; quite often these individuals will not question what is appropriate for their sport participation based on their trust in the coaches' judgment (Duquin, 1994). The participants from this study cited experiencing EAP while participating in sport and in turn used EAP as a coaching technique; as sport participants, they never questioned this method of practice and thought it to be effective and acceptable. Likewise,

these coaches reported that athletes never questioned EAP; they find it to be effective, and at times "a bonding experience" developing camaraderie amongst the team.

> We have been taught to trust people like sports coaches, who are placed in positions and traditions by society and sports organizations from which abuse is made relatively easy; we have been taught that being a sports coach is occupying a position of trust: the coach, often unpaid, sacrifices his/her time for the benefit of the players is therefore made worthy of trust by such sacrifice (Burke 2001, p.236).

If this is the case, the coach-athlete relationship may become resistant to outside influence and judgment by the 'us versus them" mentality (Burke, 2001). It's imperative that coaches recognize that they may be in a position of greater influence and significance than many other trusted members of society due to the traditions of sport and the physicality of the relationship with the athlete. Coaches need to exercise caution and behave responsibly within this context. This relationship, in addition to providing a platform for the regular occurrence and acceptable use of exercise as punishment, allows for the use of shame. Similar to punishment, shame has been cited as a method often used by coaches to modifying athletic behaviours. Shame can occur independently of, or as a result of EAP. The literature underscores the deleterious effects of shame (Book, 1999; Brown, 2012; Fischer & Tangney, 1995; Kaufman, 1989; Kays & Schlabig, 2013; Lewis, 1971; Lewis, 1992).

5.4   Shame and Reintegration

Braithwaite (1989) proposed the concept of *shame and reintegration*, as a means for social control and behaviour modification. He explained that shaming occurs following indiscretions of an offender producing expressions of lower esteem in the eyes of external referents (parents, teachers, coaches, or the community). Once shame has occurred, the offender is ostracized from

the community he/she subscribes to (siblings, students, or athletes). Following this separation of social interaction, the offender is then reintegrated back into his/her particular community. A communitarian environment relies on those within this cluster to maintain interdependency upon one another attached with a personal and mutual obligation, trust, and loyalty to the goals of the group (Braithwaite, 1989). Reintegration involves the recognition of the transgression followed by gestures or expressions of solace, empathy, or forgiveness (Braithwaite, 1989).

The "family model" suggested by Braithwaite (1989) bolsters this theory, emphasizing that the deterrent effects of shame are greater within a relationship characterized by a strong social bond, affection and interdependency, because such persons will amass greater interpersonal costs from shame. According to this theory, shaming is integral when the conscience fails, and that punishment is needed when offenders are beyond being shamed. Braithwaite (1989) asserts that for adults and adolescents, the conscience is a more effective apparatus for controlling misbehaviour than punishment; the conscience counterbalances the absence of formal control.

Within the context of the coach-athlete relationship this would involve the coach recognizing the athlete made a mistake, making the athlete feel badly about that mistake, ostracizing the athlete from his/her teammates, and following with an expression of support or empathy, an explanation for how to avoid making the same mistake and words of encouragement, ultimately integrating the athlete back into the "community" (his or her circle of teammates).

Although Braithwaite (1989) suggests that appealing to the conscience of adults or adolescences is a more effective tool for controlling behaviour than punishment, many of these participants continued to use punishment as method of creating shame with the intent to maintain social control. In many cases, participants from this study described using exercise as punishment (EAP) to shame the athlete, suggested that initiating EAP and isolating the athlete not only

would teach the athlete to adhere to team policy but would discourage others from violating team policy as being shamed is so powerful. Coach Collin explained that he would punish with the intent to create shame. Participants in this study also attested to punishing their respective teams as a unit for the transgressions of one player as a method of shaming an athlete as well as deterring the perpetrator and others from violating team rules. All participants agreed that shaming was an effective way of maintaining social control.

Shame, as previously mentioned, can occur independently of punishment. Every participant in this study admitted to having used or continued to use techniques of shame as a coaching method. Shaming within the sport context has been identified as a coach showing anger, frustration, and demeaning an athlete on the sole premise that he or she did not live up to the coach's expectations (Kays & Schlabig, 2013). Interestingly, when posed with the question "During your coaching career, do you or have you ever regretted using a disciplinary strategy," all these coaches described instances in which they shamed an athlete and stressed the importance of an appropriate group dynamic.

According to Braithwaite's (1989) theory, after punishing or shaming and eventually isolating the athlete, creating that longing to again be part of the "community of athletes" is integral in coaches' attempts to modify an athlete's behaviour. The data revealed that participants felt shaming multiple athletes could create comfort and camaraderie as remembering the difficult tasks they all successfully completed would bring athletes closer together. Furthermore, social control within the sport context seems to be achieved primarily through methods of exercise as punishment and shame. One could attribute this to the ease in which a coach can administer punishment or shame.

The data from this study revealed the consistent use of exercise as punishment in sport, along with potential explanations for its' continued use. There are multiple variables researchers must consider when evaluating the reasons for the use of EAP and ways in which to prevent this practice. It has been speculated that because of a strong desire for acceptance in adolescence, youth may not come forward and report physical or emotional indiscretions (Kays & Schlabig, 2013). This, coupled with the power and authority of the coach as described above, can further discourage athletes from reporting inappropriate interactions that may occur within the sport context.

5.5 Limitations

The findings may differ across age, and gender of the coach and athletes, ethnicity, and type of sport. It is essential to acknowledge the possibility that those coaches that used questionable coaching strategies would have avoided volunteering to participate in this study. Of those who did participate, they may have been reluctant to give a completely accurate response to many of the interview questions due to social desirability.

This study is also limited by the reflective nature of the participant interviews. Over time, participants' recollection of their experiences in sport may have been altered or influenced in a positive or negative direction. Our understanding of EAP would be considerably improved by following athletes and coaches through the course of an athlete's career, allowing researchers to evaluate the nature of punishment and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions designed to prevent the occurrence of inappropriate coaching practices.

5.6 Ethical Considerations

Due to the nature and sensitivity of this inquiry, there was the potential for an observer-expectancy effect and/or social desirability. Therefore, each interview began with demographic

questions in order to allow participants to relax, speak freely, and develop a rapport with the researcher. This was followed by a preamble inquiring as to the team management strategies employed by these coaches when addressing team performance and adherence to team policy. Due to the sensitive nature regarding the use of punishment and shame as a method of modifying behaviour, an inadequate understanding of the term punishment and shame and to avoid responses laden with social desirability, both terms were avoided until the end of the interview. This approach to the interview questions revealed a dissonance in these participants' responses and their understanding of both punishment and shame. Through semi-structured interviews, I gained a better understanding as to the purpose and motivation behind the use of exercise as punishment. Conducting the interviews in person allowed for the observation of physiological reactions (e.g. shaking or lowering of the head, anxious tapping of their fingers, etc.) to the interview questions. The length of the interview, along with the use of an interview guide allowed for rich, detailed responses to unfold. This study yielded useful data contributing to the dearth of existing empirical research literature on exercise as punishment.

5.7   Future Directions

Interestingly, the coaches in the current study condoned the use of exercise as form of punishment. When interviewing these coaches, a consensus existed; to achieve team success, minimize mistakes, and develop team cohesion, exercise as punishment was the method most often used. Furthermore, there was a lack of awareness of other, non-punitive strategies.

There is a dearth of empirical research pertaining to the use of exercise as punishment. Additionally, there is minimal research exploring shame as a result of punishment, and shaming as method of modifying behaviours in sport. As described earlier, shame is an intense emotion that can have a strong, unhealthy impact on an athlete's psyche. The literature should further investigate the players', coaches', and sport psychology consultants' (SPCs) perspectives on the

use, purpose, and perceived effectiveness of exercise as punishment, as well as shaming as a

tool for modifying athletic behaviours. Useful data may be contributed to the literature through

the testimonies of athletes and SPCs as to the negative emotional effects of EAP and shame.

Furthermore, investigating the coaches' understanding of discipline and punishment may prove

to be beneficial. Research is needed on understanding and identifying the conditions under

which EAP and shaming constitute a form of maltreatment. Finally, cultivating interest and

research in the athlete-centred approach (Kidman, 2005), in which the athlete exercises

autonomy, and has an equal part in developing his or her own workout regimen, may prove to

be effective in preventing inappropriate coaching practices.

Researchers should consider developing educational strategies, in addition to research, and

policy initiatives. More attention should focus on formalizing the coaching profession. It would

be helpful to provide course work and certification focused on appropriate ways in which to

interact with athletes as well as appropriate methods of behaviour modifications. Sporting

organizations need to reconsider the amount of pressure that is applied to both coaches and

athletes "to win at all costs"; instead, focusing attention on the holistic development of the

athlete is paramount. We need to challenge the culture of sport as well as practices that have

come to be normalized.

Chapter 6
Conclusion

To date, very few studies have specifically investigated the use of exercise as punishment (EAP). The purpose of this study was therefore to investigate coaches' perspectives on the use and effectiveness of exercise as punishment in Interuniversity sport.

The methodological approach used for this study was a qualitative inquiry, utilizing an interview guide in order to allow for rich, useful data to emerge (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Thematic analysis was used to interpret and categorize the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In total, 8 Interuniversity head coaches including 4 male and 4 female coaches were interviewed. Half of the participants coached individual sports and the other half coached team sports. Participants' involvement with their respective sports as a coach and player ranged from 15 to 35 years of experience.

When examining these participants' perspectives on the use and effectiveness of exercise as punishment, three categories emerged: the nature of punishment, coaches' conceptualization of punishment, and shame and reintegration. Findings of this study highlighted the continued and frequent use of EAP. This study revealed that along with the frequent use of EAP, coaches also employed methods of shame regularly as a technique to modify behaviour. Often, participants described their previous experience with EAP as normal and part of the "sport culture," citing this as reason for the continued use of this practice. The lack of certifications needed to be a coach warrants further examination. In order to decrease or prevent against the use of EAP, the need to affect change in the culture of sport is paramount. It has

been suggested that various aspects of the sport culture may contribute to the common practice of EAP including the *Total Institution* of sport, which allows coaches to deny athletes personal rights, to restrict self-determination and to suppress athletic autonomy (Goffman, 1961). Further, the emphasis on a "win at all cost" mentality and pushing past your limits (Hughes & Coakley, 1991), the power of the coach (Burke, 2001), the lack of professionalization in the coaching sector (Lyle, 2002), and attempts to maintain social order and induce conformity through tactics of shame and reintegration (Braithwaite, 1989) may contribute to the use of this practice.

Exercise as punishment merits further investigation into coaches', athletes' and sport psychology consultants' perspectives on its' use and effectiveness. Researchers should evaluate and consider implementing programs to educate coaches on appropriate strategies for modifying athletic behaviours; formalizing the coaching occupation through course work and certifications will help to moderate, and ultimately, diminish inappropriate coaching practices.

To conclude, all of the findings in this study have emphasized the need for reevaluating practices in sport that have now become normalized. Implementing an athlete-centred sport model should be considered. Developing an athlete from a holistic standpoint will not only prevent against potentially harmful coach-athlete interactions, by may assist in producing better athletic performances.

References

Adams, S. (1987). Liability and negligence. In Adams, S., Adrian, M. and Bayless, M. (eds), *Catastrophic Injuries in Sport: Avoidance Strategies.* Indianapolis: Benchmark: 3-7.

Albrecht, R. (2009). Drop and give us 20, Seifried: A practical response to "defending the use of punishment by coaches." *Quest, 61*, 470-475.

American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance., (2013). Maximizing the benefits of youth sport [Position statement]. Reston, VA: Author.

American Sport Education Program. (2007). *Coaching youth lacrosse*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Andero, A., & Stewart, A. (2002). Issue of corporal punishment: Re-examined. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 29*(2), 90-96.

Anderson, L., & Taylor, F. (2009). *Sociology: The Essentials*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Andre, L. (2009). Spare the child, spoil the rod. *ProQuest Education Journals, 154*, 31.

Appleton, J., & Stanley, N. (2011). Physical abuse and corporal punishment. *Child Abuse Review, 20*, 1-5.

Armstrong, J. (2013). Former MLB pitcher Kuwata rejects corporal punishment in sports. *Abuse Neglect Death, World Press*. Retrieved from http://kwbrow2.wordpress.com/2013/01/12/former-mlb-pitcher-kuwata-rejects-corporal-punishment-in-sports/

Atkinson, M., & Young, K. (2008). *Deviance and social control in sport.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Austin, M., (2011). The purpose of punishment. *Ethics for everyone: Moral wisdom for the modern world.* Retrieved from http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/ethics-everyone/201107/the-purpose-punishment

Ausubel, P. (1955). Relationships between shame and guilt in the socializing process. *Psychological Review*, *62*, 378-390.

Azrin, H. & Holz, C. (1966). Punishment. In W. K. Honig (Ed.), *Operant behavior* (380–447). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Bandura, A. (1963). The role of imitation in personality, *The Journal of Nursery Education, 18*(3) 1-9.

Barrett, C., & Campos, J. (1987). Perspectives on emotional development: II. A functionalist approach to emotions. In Osofsky, J., (Eds.), *Handbook of infant development* (2nd ed., 555-578). New York: Wiley.

Bartholomew, K., Ntoumanis, N., and Thogersen-Ntoumani, C. (2010). The controlling interpersonal style in a coaching context: Development and initial validation of a psychometric scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, (32)* 193-216.

Bartholomew, K., Ntoumanis, N., and Thogersen-Ntoumani, C. (2009). A review of controlling motivational strategies from a self-determination theory perspective: Implications for sports coaches. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology Vol. (2)* 215-233.

Baumeister, R., & Leary, M. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*. 497-529.

Baumeister, R, F., & Tice, D. M. (1990). Anxiety and social exclusion. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*, 165-195.

Baxamusa, B. (2012). History of Corporal Punishment. *Buzzle.* Retrieved from http://www.buzzle.com/articles/history-of-corporal-punishment.html

Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R., & Cowan, P. (2002). Ordinary physical punishment: Is it harmful? Comment on Gershoff (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128,* 580-589.

Benatar, D. (1998). Corporal punishment. *Social Theory and Practice, 24*(2), 237-260.

Benedict, R. (1946). *The chrysanthemum and the sword.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Bentham, J. (1962). Principles penal law. In J. Bowring (Eds.), *The Works of Jeremy Bentham* (396). New York: Russell and Russell.

Bettelheim, B. (1985). Punishment versus discipline. *The Atlantic Monthly,* 51-59.

Black, R. (1999). *Doing quantitative research in the social sciences: An integrated approach to research design, measurement, and statistics.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bolton, G. (1988). "Normal" violence in the adult-child relationship: A diathesis-stress approach to child maltreatment within the family. In Hotaling, G., Finkelhor, D., Kirkpatric, J., & Straus M. (Eds.), *Family abuse and its consequences: New directions in research* (61-76). London: Sage.

Borg, I., Staufenbiel, T, & Scherer, R. (1988). On the symbolic basis of shame. In Scherer K. (Eds.), *Facets of emotion: Recent research* (79-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Book, A. (1999). Shame on you: An analysis of modern shame punishment as an alternative to incarceration, *40 Wm. & Mary L. 653 (1999),* retrieved from http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr/vol40/iss2/8

Brackenridge, C. (1998). Health sport for healthy girls? The role of parents in preventing sexual abuse. *Sport, Education and Society, 3*, 59-78.

Brackenridge, C. (1994). "Fair Play or Fair Game? Child Sexual Abuse in Sport Organizations." *International Review for Sociology of Sport, 29*, 287-297.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. England: Cambridge University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology 3* (2),77-101.

Brisbane, H. (2004). Advantages of the use of punishment to shape behaviour. *eHow contributor.* Retrieved from http://www.ehow.com/info_8370656_advantages-use-punishment-shape-behavior.html

Brown, B. (2012). Listening to shame. *TedTalks.* Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/brene_brown_listening_to_shame

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bugental, D., & Goodnow, J. (1998). Socialization processes. In Damon W. (Series Ed.) & Eisenberg N. (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., 389–462). New York: Wiley.

Burak, L., Rosenthal, M., & Richardson, K. (2013). Examining attitudes, beliefs, and intentions regarding the use of exercise as punishment in physical education and sport: An application of the Theory of Reasoned Action. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *43*(7), 1436-1445.

Burke, M. (2001). Obeying until it hurts: Coach-athlete relationships. *Journal of The Philosophy of Sport,* 227-240.

Burns, F. J. (2003, May 6). Soccer players describe torture by Hussein's son. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2003/05/06/international/worldspecial/06TORT.html?pagewanted=all

Buss, A. H. (1980). Self-consciousness and social anxiety. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.

Bussmann, K. (2009). *The Effect of Banning Corporal Punishment in Europe: A Five-Nation Comparison*. Unpublished manuscript.

Canadian Paediatric Society. (1996). *Statement: Effective discipline for children* (1-7). Ottawa, Ontario.

Carlsmith, K., Darley, J., & Robinson, P. (2002). Why do we punish? Deterrence and just deserts as motives for punishment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Vol. 83*(2), 284-299.

Caspersen, C., Powell, E., & Christenson, M. (1985). Physical activity, exercise, and physical fitness: definitions and distinctions for health-related research. *Public Health Representation Mar-Apr; 100*(2): 126–131.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, (1997). Guidelines for school and community programs to promote lifelong physical activity among young people. *Morbidity and Morality Weekly Report, (46)*1-36.

Cherry, K. (2011). What is positive punishment? *About.com (psychology).* Retrieved from http://psychology.about.com/od/operantconditioning/f/positive-punishment.htm

Clément, M., Bouchard, C., Jetté, M., & Laferrière, S. (2000). *La Violence Familiale dans la Vie des Enfants du Québec.* Québec: Institut de la Statistique du Québec.

Correria, M. (1997). Boot camps, exercise and delinquency: An analytical critique of the use of exercise to facilitate decreases in delinquent behavior. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 13*, 94-113.

Cox, R. H. (2007). *Sport psychology: Concepts and applications (6th ed.).* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Crittenden, P., & DiLalla, D. (1988). Compulsive compliance: The development of an inhibitory coping strategy in infancy. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 16*, 585-599.

Crooks, C., & Wolfe, D. (2007). Child abuse and neglect. In Mash E. & Barkley R. (Eds.), *Assessment of Childhood Disorders (4th ed.,*639–684). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Crosset, T. (1986). Male coach-female athlete relationships. Paper presented to the *Norwegian Confederation of Sport Conference on Coaching Female Top-Level Athletes,* Sole, Norway, 15-16 November.

Darwin, C. (1872). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals* London: John Murray.

De Nies, Y. (2012). Should your child be spanked at school? In 19 states, its legal. *ABC News.* Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com/US/spanking-school-19-states-corporal-punishment-legal/story?id=15932135

Denzin, N. (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (1-18). London: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2000). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Denzin N., & Lincoln Y. (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dubanoski, R., Inaba, M., & Gerkewicz, K. (1983). Corporal punishment in schools: Myths, problems and alternatives. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 7*, 271-278.

Duquin, E. (1994). The body snatchers and Dr. Frankenstein revisited: Social construction of bodies and sport. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, (18)*, 268-281.

Durrant, J. (2002). Distinguishing physical punishment from physical abuse: Implications for professionals. *Canada's Children, 9*(1), 17-21.

Durrant, J. (1993). Spare the rod and spoil the child? The physical discipline of children and child abuse. *Institute for Social Research Newsletter, 8*, (1).

Durrant, J., & Ensom, R. (2004).Coalition on Physical punishment of children and youth. *Joint Statement on Physical punishment of children and youth.* Ottawa: Coalition on Physical Punishment of Children and Youth.

Durrant, J., Ensom, R., and Wingert, S. (2003). *Joint statement on the physical punishment of children Youth: Coalition on the physical punishment of children and youth.* Retrieved from http://www.toronto.ca/health/pdf/boh_june16_2003_physical_punishment

Durrant, J. (1996). Public attitudes toward corporal punishment in Canada, in *Family Violence Against Children*, Frehsee, D., Horn, W., & Bussmann, D., (Eds.), 1996, Walter de Gruyter: New York. 19-26.

Durrant, J., Rose-Krasnor, L., & Broberg, A. (2003). Physical punishment and maternal beliefs in Sweden and Canada. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 34(4),* 585-604.

Eamon, M. (2001). Antecedents and socioemotional consequences of physical punishment on children in two-parent families. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 25*(6), 787-802.

Egan, E., (2012, June 27). Athletic trainers: Don't use exercise as punishment. *USA Today.* Retrieved from http://usafootball.com/news/high-school/usa-today-dont-use-exercise-punishment

Fathman, R. (1991). Child abuse in our schools. *Mothering Winter*. Retrieved from http://www.nospank.net/exercz.htm

Farley, A., Kreutter, K., Russell, R., Blackwell, S., Finkelstein, H., and Hyman, I. (1978). The effects of eliminating corporal punishment in the school setting: What are we going to do with some of these kids? *Educational Perspectives, 19*, 20-23.

Farrell C. (2013). Corporal punishment in the British Army. *World Corporal Punishment Research.* Retrieved from http://www.corpun.com/counuka.htm

Fesbach S., & Fesbach, N. (1975). Alternatives to corporal punishment: Implications for training and controls. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology 11*: 46-49.

Fischer, K., & Tangney, J. (1995). Self-conscious emotions and the affect revolution: Framework and overview. In Tangney J. & Fischer K. (Eds*.), Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (3-22). New York: Guilford Press.

Fletcher, J. (2012). Positive parenting, not physical punishment. *Canadian Medical Association Journal. 184*(12), 1339.

Gall, M., Gall, J., & Borg, W. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: A & B Publications.

Gelter, G. (2012). *History of Corporal Punishment.* Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gershoff, E. (2002). Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviors and experiences: A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(4), 539-579.

Gershoff, E. (2002). Corporal punishment, physical abuse, and the burden of proof: Reply to Baumrind, Larzelere, and Cowan (2002), Holden (2002), and Parke (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(4), 602-611.

Gervis, M., & Dunn, N. (2004). The emotional abuse of elite child athletes by their coaches. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 26,* 697-714.

Gillian, J. (1996). *Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic* (1st ed). New York: Vintage.

Glaser, D. (2002). Emotional abuse and neglect (psychological maltreatment): A conceptual framework. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 26,* 697-714.

Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GITEACPOC). Retrieved from http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/pages/progress/prohib_states.html

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Graeme, N. (1983). *Just and painful: A case for corporal punishment of criminals.* New York: Macmillan.

Graham, C., & Moore, N. (2000). History 349. *Malaspina University- College.* Retrieved from http://www.viu.ca/homeroom/content/topics/programs/physed.htm

Graziano, A. (1994). Why we should study subabusive violence against children. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9(3),* 412-419.

Graziano, A., Hamblen, J., & Plante, W. (1996). Subabusive violence in child rearing in middle class American families. *Pediatrics, 98(4*), 845-848.

Gregov, C., Jukic, I., Markovic, G., Milanovic, D., Milanovic, L., & Simek S. (2007). Scientific and practical Approach to physical conditioning of athletes. *Serbian Journal Of Sports Science Vol.*(4) 116-121.

Grolnick, W., Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1997). Internalization within the family: The self-determination theory perspective. In Grusec J. & Kuczynski L. (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (135–161). New York: Wiley.

Grusec, J. (1983). The internalization of altruistic dispositions: A cognitive analysis. In E. T. Higgins, D. N. Ruble, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Social cognition and social development* (pp. 275–293). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grusec, J., & Goodnow, J. (1994). Impact of parental discipline methods on the child's internalization of values: A reconceptualization of current points of view. *Developmental Psychology, 30,* 4–19.

Harper, D. *Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved from
http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=shame

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hoffman, M. (1983). Affective and cognitive processes in moral internalization. In Higgins, E. Ruble D., & Hartup W.(Eds.), *Social cognition and social development* (236–274). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Holden, G., Coleman, S., & Schmidt, K. (1995). Why 3-year-old children get spanked: Parent and child determinants as reported by college-educated mothers. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 41*, 431– 452.

Hughes, R., & Coakley, J. (1991). Positive deviance among athletes: The implications of overconformity to the sport ethic. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 8, (4),* 307-325.

Hyman, I. (1996). Using research to change public policy: Reflections on 20 years of effort to eliminate corporal punishment in schools. *Pediatrics, 98*(4), 815-818.

Hyman, I., & Wise, J. (1979). *Corporal Punishment in American Education: Readings in History, Practice and Alternatives.* Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Iwaniec D. (1995). *The emotionally abused and neglected child.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Izard, C. E. (1977). *Human emotions*. New York: Plenum.

Johnson P. J. (2007). Discipline verses punishment. *Parent's Toolshop consulting Ltd.* Retrieved from*: http://www.parentstoolshop.com/HTML/tips6.htm*

Kaufman, G. (1989). *The psychology of shame: Theory and treatment of shame-based syndromes.* New York: Springer.

Kaufmann, W. (1968). Nietzsche. New York: Random House.

Kays, T., & Schlabig, J. (2013). Stop the shame in youth sports. *Athletic mind institute.* Retrieved from http://www.athleticmindinstitute.com/blog/stop-the-shame-in-youth-sports/

Keltner, D., & Buswell, B. (1996). Evidence for the distinctness of embarrassment, shame, and guilt: A study of recalled antecedents and facial expressions of emotion. *Cognition and Emotion, 10,* 155-171.

Kerr, G. (2008). Forced physical exertion. Unpublished Manuscript.

Kerr, G., & Stirling, A. (2008). Child protection in sport: Implications of an athlete-centered philosophy. *Quest, Vol. 60 (2),* 307 – 323.

Kerr, G. (2013, February). Safeguarding Youth in Sport: Lessons from the Education Sector. *Professional Seminar.* Lectured conducted from University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

Kerr, G., Stirling, A., Bandealy, A., Banwell, J., Macpherson, E., and Preston, C. (2013). A quantitative study examining exercise as a form of punishment in sport. Unpublished Manuscript.

Kidman, L. (2005). *Athlete-centred coaching: Developing inspired and inspiring people.* Christchurch, New Zealand: Innovative Communications.

Kirby, S., Greaves, L., & Hankivsky, O. (2002). Women under the dome of silence: Sexual harassment and abuse of female athletes. *Canadian Woman Studies, 21*(3), 132-138.

Kochanska, G., & Thompson, R. (1997). The emergence and development of conscience in toddlerhood and early childhood. In Grusec J. & Kuczynski L. (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (53–77). New York: Wiley.

Koch-Sheras, P. (2012). Changing our name and clarifying our mission. *American Psychological Association Division 46*: *Society for Media Psychology and Technology.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/divisions/div46/Amplifier_Summer2012.pdf

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive– developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (347–480). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kuczynski, L., & Hildebrandt, N. (1997). Models of conformity and resistance in socialization theory. In Grusec, J., & Kuczynski, L.(Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory,* 227–256. New York: Wiley.

Lambert, T. (2012). *A brief history of corporal punishment*. Retrieved from http://www.localhistories.org/corporal.html

Larson, R. W. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist, 55*, 170-183.

Larson, R., & Kleiber, D. (1993). Daily experience of adolescents. In Tolan P. & Cohler B. (Eds.), *Handbook of clinical research and practice with adolescents* (125-145). New York, NY: Wiley.

Larzelere, R. (1996). A review of the outcomes of parental use of nonabusive or customary physical punishment. *Pediatrics, 98*(4), 824-828.

Larzelere, R. E. (2000). *Child outcomes of non-abusive and customary physical punishment by parents: An updated literature review.* Unpublished manuscript,

Larzelere, R. E., & Merenda, J. A. (1994). The effectiveness of parental discipline for toddler misbehavior at different levels of child distress. *Family Relations, 43*, 480-488.

Lepper, M. (1983). Social control processes and the internalization of social values: An attributional perspective. In Higgins, T., Ruble, D., &. Hartup, W. (Eds.), *Social cognition and social development*, 294–330. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.

Lewis, M. (1990). Thinking and feeling the elephant's tail. In Maher, C., Schwebel, M., & Fagley N. (Eds.), *Thinking and problem-solving in the developmental process: International perspectives (the WORK)* (89-110). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lewis, M. (1992). *Shame: The exposed self.* New York: The Free Press.

Lindsay-Hartz, J. (1984). Contrasting experiences of shame and guilt. *American Behavioral Scientist, 27*, 689-704.

Lutze, F., & Brody, D. (1999). Mental abuse as cruel and unusual punishment: Do boot camp prisons violate the eighth amendment? *Crime and Delinquency, 45*(2), 242-255.

Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports coaching concepts: A framework for coaches' behaviour.* London, Routledge.

Maccoby, E. (1980). *Social development: Psychological growth and the parent-child relationship.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent–child interaction. In Mussen, P. (Series Ed.) & Hetherington, E. (Vol. Ed.), *Socialization, personality, and social development, handbook of child psychology, Vol. 4.* New York: Wiley.

Mageau, G., & Vallerand, R. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 21*, 883-904.

Martens, R. (2004). *Successful Coaching.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Mashe, E., Barkely, R., Crooks, C., & Wolfe, D. (2007). Child abuse and neglect. In: Mashe, E., Barkley, R. (Eds.), *Assessment of childhood disorders (4th Ed.).* New York: Guilford Press.

McCord, J. (1996). Unintended consequences of punishment. *Pediatrics, 98(4),* 832-834.

McCord, J. (1991). Questioning the value of punishment. *Social Problems, 38*, 167-79.

Merriam-Webster. *An Encyclopedia Britannica Company.* Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/shame

Miller, R., & Leary, M. (1992). Social sources and interactive functions of emotion: The case of embarrassment. In Clark, M. (Eds.), *Review of personality and social psychology Vol. 14.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miller, R., & Tangney, J. (1994). Differentiating embarrassment and shame. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 13,* 273-287.

Miller-Perrin, C., & Perrin, R. (2007). *History and Definitions of child Maltreatment. Child maltreatment: An introduction, (2nd Ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Military History Now, MHN. Editor, (2012). This is Gonna Hurt: Military Punishment Throughout the Ages. *Odds Facts. World Press.* Retrieved from http://thisiswarblog.wordpress.com/2012/06/29/this-is-gonna-hurt-military-punishment-throughout-the-ages/

Nagin, D. (1998). Deterrence and incapacitation. In Tonry, M. (Ed.), *The handbook of crime and punishment* (345-368). New York: Oxford University Press.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2004). *Appropriate practices.* Retrieved from http://www.aahperd.org/naspe/template.cfm?template=peappropriatepractice/index.html.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2006). *Quality coaches, quality sports: National standards for sport coaches (2nd ed.).* Reston, VA: Author.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2009). *Physical activity used as punishment and/or behavior management [Position statement].* Reston, VA: Author.

Nietzsche, F. (1967). *The Birth of Tragedy.* Trans. Kaufmann, W. New York: Vintage.

Nietzsche, F. (1969). *On the Genealogy of Morals* and *Ecce Homo.* Trans. Kaufmann W., & Hollingdale, R. New York: Vintage.

Nunley, K. (1998). Why punishment – Based systems don't work: yet we're stuck with them. *Layered Curriculum.* Retrieved from *http://help4teachers.com/punishment.htm*

O'Hanlon, T. (1982). School sports as social training: The case of athletes and the crisis of World War I. *Journal of Sport History, 9* (1), 5-29.

Ortony, A., Clore, G., & Collins, A. (1988). *The cognitive structure of emotions.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Paolucci, E., & Violato, C. (2004). A meta-analysis of the published research on the affective, cognitive, and behavioral effects of corporal punishment. *The Journal of Psychology, 138(3),* p. 197-221.

Parke, R. (2002). Punishment revisited – Science, values and the right question: Comment on Gershoff (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(4), 596-601.

Parke, R. (1977). Some effects of punishment on children's behavior revisited. In Hetherington E., & Parke, R. (Eds.), *Contemporary readings in child psychology.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parke, R. (1969). Effectiveness of punishment as an interaction of intensity, timing, agent nurturance, and cognitive structuring. *Child Development, 40*, 213-235.

Pawal, J. (2007). Discipline verses punishment. *Parent's Toolshop consulting, Ltd.* Retrieved from *http://www.parentstoolshop.com/HTML/tips6.htm*

Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child.* Gabain, M. Trans. New York: Free Press.

Polite, K. (1996). Response: The medium/the message: Corporal punishment, an empirical critique. *Pediatrics, 98(4),* 849-851.

Powers, R. (2000). Nonjudicial punishment (article 15). *Commander's Tool for Discipline.* Retrieved from http://usmilitary.about.com/od/justicelawlegislation/a/article15.htm

Reade, I. (2009). *A Report on the Status of Coaches in Canada: A Summary of the Findings*. Canadian Heritage, Sport Canada.

Reinboth, M., & Duda, J. (2006). Perceived motivational climate, need satisfaction and indices of well-being in team-sports: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 7*, 269-286.

Richardson, K., Rosenthal, M., & Burak, L. (2012). Exercise as Punishment: An application of the Theory of Planned Behavior. *American Journal of Health Education*, *43(6),* 356-365.

Rudd, A. (2005). Which 'character' should sport develop? *Physical Educator, 64(4),* 205-211.

Rosenthal, M., Pagnano-Richardson, K., & Burak, L. (2010). Alternatives to using exercise as punishment. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance 81(5),* 44-48.

Ryan, J. (1996). *Little girls in pretty boxes: The making and breaking of elite gymnasts and figure skaters.* London: The Women's Press.

Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research.* Rochester NY: University of Rochester Press.

Saarni, C., Mumme, D., & Campos, J. (1998). Emotional development: Action, communication, and understanding. In Damon,W. (Series Ed.), & Eisenberg, N. (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development (5th Ed.).* New York: Wiley.

Scanlan, T., Stein, G., & Ravizza, K. (1991). An in-depth study of former elite figure skaters: III. Sources of stress. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 13,* 103-120.

Seifried, C. (2010). The misconception of corporal punishment: A rejoin to Albrecht's "Drop and give us 20, Seifried: A practical response to defending the use of punishment by coaches." *Quest, 62 (2),* 218-223.

Seifried, C. (2008). Examining punishment and discipline: Defending the use of punishment by coaches. *Quest, 60*, 370-386.

Shaw, K. (2004). *Power Mad! A Book Of Deranged Dictators*. London: O'Mara Books.

Shaw, B., & Braden, J. (1990). Race and gender bias in the administration of corporal punishment. *School of Psychology Review 19,* 378-383.

Sherman, L. (1995). A postmodern, constructivist and cooperative pedagogy for teaching educational psychology, assisted by computer mediated communications. In Schnase, J., & Cunnius, E. (Eds.), *Proceedings of CSCL '95: The first international conference on computer support for collaborative learning.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Skinner, B. (1974). *About Behaviorism*. New York: Knopf.

Smetana, J. (1997). Parenting and the development of social knowledge reconceptualized: A social domain analysis. In Grusec, J., & Kuczynski, L. (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory.* New York: Wiley.

Smith, R. (2006). Positive reinforcement, performance feedback, and performance enhancement. In Williams, J. (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology personal growth the peak performance*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Spock, B. (1946). *The Common sense book of baby and child care*. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce.

Stirling, A. (2008). Definition and constituents of maltreatment in sport: establishing a conceptual framework for research practitioners. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 43*, 1091-1099.

Stirling, A., & Kerr, G. (2008). Defining and categorizing emotional abuse in sport. *European Journal of Sport Science 8*(4), 173-181.

Straus, M., & Kantor, G. (1994). Corporal punishment of adolescents by parents: A risk factor in the epidemiology of depression, suicide, alcohol abuse, and wife beating. *Adolescence, 29,* 543–561.

Straus, M., & Stewart, J. (1999). Corporal punishment by American parents: National data on prevalence, chronicity, severity, and duration, in relation to child and family characteristics. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 2,* 55–70.

Straus, M., Sugarman, D., & Giles-Sims, J. (1997). Spanking by parents and subsequent antisocial behavior of children. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine, 151,* 761–767.

Straus, M., & Paschall, M. (1998). *Corporal punishment by mothers and child's cognitive development: A longitudinal study.* Paper presented at the 14th world conference of sociology, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Durham, NH: Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.

Straus, M. (2001). *Beating the devil out of them: Corporal punishment in American families and its effects on children (2nd ed.).* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sykes, G., & Matza, D. (1957). Techinques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 22,* 664-670.

Tangney, J., Miller, R., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D., (1996). Are shame, guilt, and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Personal Social Psychology 70* (6), 1256–1269.

Tangney, J. (1995). Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships. In. Tangney, J., & Fischer, K. (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride*. New York: Guilford Press.

Tangney, J., Marschall, D., Rosenberg, K., Barlow, D., & Wagner, P. (1994). *Children's and adults' autobiographical accounts of shame, guilt, and pride experiences: An analysis of situational determinants and interpersonal concerns*. Unpublished manuscript.

Tangney, J. (1993). Shame and guilt. In Costello, C. (Ed.), *Symptoms of depression*. New York: Wiley.

Tartakovsky, M. (2011). Building Your Resilience to Shame. *Psych Central*. Retrieved on from http://psychcentral.com/blog/archives/2011/12/22/building-your-resilience-to-shame/

Tomlinson, P., & Strachan, D. (1996). *Power and ethics in coaching*. National Coaching Certificate Program. Ottawa: Coaching Association of Canada.

Tonry, M. (2011). *Why Punish? How Much? A reader on punishment.* Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.

Tunick, M. (1992). *Punishment: Theory and Practice.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Turner, D. III. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(3), 754-760**.**

Van Houten, R. (1983). Punishment: From the animal laboratory to the applied setting. In Axelrod, S., & Apsche, J. (Eds.), *The effects of punishment on human behavior*. New York: Academic.

Wauchope, B., & Straus, M. (1992). Physical punishment and physical abuse of American children: Incidence rates by age, gender, and occupational class. In Straus, M., & Gelles, R.

(Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Weigel, J. (2012). Shame may be an effective punishment but what are the long-term effects on the person being shamed*? Lessons for Life, Chicago Tribune.* Retrieved from http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-12-04/features/ct-tribu-weigel-shame-20121204_1_shame-bad-person-behavior

Weinberg, R., & Gould, D. (2007). *Foundations of sport and exercise psychology (4th Ed.).* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Weiss, M. (2008). "Field of dreams": Sport as a context for youth development. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 79*, 434-449.

Women's Sports Foundation. (2007). Addressing the issue of verbal, physical and psychological abuse of athletes. Retrieved from http://www.womenssportsfoundation.org/Content/Articles/lssues/Coaching/A/Addressing-the-lssue-of-Verbal-Physical-and-Psycholog-ical-Abuse-of-Athletes-The-Foundation-Position.aspx.

Wooden, J., & Jamison, S. (1997). *Wooden: A lifetime of observations and reflections on and off the court.* Lincolnwood, III: Contemporary Books.

Young, K. (2012). *Sport, Violence and Society.* New York: Routledge

Zolotor A., Theodore A., Runyan D., Chang J., & Laskey A. (2011). Corporal punishment and physical abuse population-based trends for three-to-11-year-old children in the United States. *Child Abuse Review 20*, 57–66.

Figure 1: Thematic Analysis of Coaches' Perspectives

Themes	Sub-themes	Sample Meaning Units	Participants
The Nature of Punishment	Types	Running is always a big one.I'd say they (EAP) mostly involve running	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8
		Push-ups...it's an easy one to give.	2,3,5
	Frequency	Two, three, four times a week based on whatever exercise.	1,2,3,5,8
		I rarely use EAP.	4,6,7
	Perceived Effectivness	I think there's a lot of character traits that can be built with it.	1,2,3,5,8
		Sometimes it leads to more motivation and a desire to work.	1,2,3,5
	Reasons for Use	Showing up late is one thing I will always dish out EAP.	1,2,3,5,8
		(Alternative) options ar probably limited so EAP becomes necessary in some scenarios.	1,2,3,5,8
	Perceived Responses	I think EAP does create fear or can create fear if overused.	1,4,5,6,7
		The first thing is sunken shoulders, they look away.	1,2,5,6,7,8
Coaches' Conceptualization of Punishment	Punishment Versus Discipline	I think they can be both interchangeable.	1,2,4,6,7,8
		Discipline involves guiding the athletes' behaviour.	3,5
	Alternatives to Punishment	When dealing with an infraction, it has to be punitive.	1,2,3,5,7,8
		If a player is late we would often bench them.	1,5,6
	Cognitive Dissonance	Through my coaching years I went back and forth on using punishment	2,3,5,7
		Being an athlete that responded to punishment, I assumed all athletes did.	2,3,4,5,8
	Culture of Sport	It became a natural assumption that EAP is going to be used.	1,2,3
		It (EAP) probably is ritual why I continue to do it.	2,3,5,8
Components of Shame & Reintegration	Coaches' Conceptualization of Shame & Reintegration	Shame is being embarrassed...singled out.	1,3,4,5,7,8
		I'll try not to shame them, unless perhaps I get quite frustrated.	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8
	Peer Dynamics	They'd have a vested interest in the running of the team.	1,2,4,5,6
		There's usually a lot of calling out. The kids that are really upset are ashamed because they cause it (EAP).	1,2,5
	The Coach-Athlete Relationship	I operate with a pretty open-door policy where athletes can come in and talk to me.	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8
		Somebody there to help and support them (athletes). You can't be too close.	2,3,5,6,7
	Gaps in Coaching Behaviours Versus Perception	You can embarrass them (athletes). I don't think there is any place for shaming athletes.	2,3,4,5,7
		I have an will inevitably use it (shame)...I don't like the idea of shaming.	2,3,5,7

Appendix A: Information Letter and Consent Form

<u>Title of Research Project:</u> Examining coaches' perspectives on the use and effectiveness of exercise as punishment in intercollegiate sport.

We are requesting your participation in a research study. Your participation in this study is voluntary. Please read the information below, and feel free to ask questions about anything you do not understand before deciding to participate and before signing the document.

1. Study Objective:

The purpose of this study is to better understand exercise as punishment in sport.

2. What is involved?:

If you decide to participate in the study you will be asked to meet with the researcher to discuss your experiences with the use of exercise as punishment. More specifically, interviews will investigate the team management strategies you employ and their perceived effectiveness for performance development. The interview will be held at a time and place that is mutually convenient and will take between 30 and 60 minutes.

3. Statement of Confidentiality and Disclosure of Information:

With your permission the interview will be digitally-recorded so as to not miss any information. Please be assured that the information you provide will be kept confidential at all times. Consistent with the conduct of human research studies, the data will not be available or revealed to anyone outside of the research team. The interview data will be destroyed twelve months after the conclusion of the research project. Following the interview the researchers may use quotations from the interview in the write up of the study but be assured that your identity will remain anonymous through the use of a pseudonym and the elimination of any identifiable information. No personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

4. Potential Risks of Participation:

Recollecting negative experiences when employing particular team management strategies maybe emotionally distressing. It is possible that when asked to recall previous negative experiences you may experience frustration or regret as a result of your decision or behaviour. Should this occur, you would be given the opportunity to take a break from the interview, to reschedule the interview, or withdraw from the interview and the study. Additionally sharing your stories you may encounter fear that your responses negatively impact your reputation or status within the coaching/sport community. If this occurs you will be given the chance to take a break from the interview, reschedule the interview, or withdraw from the interview.

5. Potential Benefits of Participation:

Through participation in this study you may gain a greater awareness of the use of team management strategies that benefit athletic development. Additionally, the findings of this study could be used to inform standards of best practice in coaching.

6. Compensation:

$20.00 Starbucks gift card.

7. Voluntary Participation and Early Withdrawal:

Your participation in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw from this study at any time by notifying the researchers. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions during your participation in the study.

8. Right to ask Questions:

As well, please feel free to contact the researchers below at any time if you have questions regarding your participation in this study. You may decline to answer specific questions at any time.

Researcher:
Ahad Bandealy
Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education
University of Toronto
Email: Ahad.Bandealy@mail.utoronto.ca
Phone: 416-978-6096

Faculty Supervisor:
Gretchen Kerr, Ph.D.
Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education
University of Toronto
Email: gretchen.kerr@utoronto.ca
Phone: 416-978-6190

Office of Research Ethics:
ethics.review@utoronto.ca
416-946-3273

Volunteer's Informed Statement of Consent:
This is to certify that I consent to and give permission for my participation in this program of investigation. I have read this form and understand the content of this consent form. I have been able to discuss the complete protocol with the researcher, and all my questions have been answered fully to my satisfaction. I understand there are no perceived risks or benefits of participation. I understand quotations may be used in the research write-up but my identity will remain anonymous through the use of a pseudonym and the elimination of any identifiable

information. I am also aware that should I, at any time during my participation in this study, have any further questions I can contact the researchers listed below. I voluntarily consent to participate in this study.

☐ I consent to participating in this study

Research Volunteer:

_____Date: _____

(signature)

_____

(print name)

Appendix B: Interview Guide

Preliminary Questions

1. What is the sport you coach?

2. How long have you been involved with this sport?

3. Describe your experience while involved in this sport (whether as a player or coach).

4. Walk me through a typical day of coaching.

Team Management Questions

Coaching a team involves strategies for performance development but also involves strategies to manage a team of athletes. As some examples, coaches must ensure that athletes adhere to and respect certain team rules or procedures such as arriving at practice on-time, dress codes, curfews, paying attention during practices, etc. I'm interested in hearing how you manage these, how you get the athletes on your team to adhere to these. (Let them begin to address this question).

Team management probes:

- How often do you need to use these strategies?

- How effective do you think these strategies are? Why do you use these particular strategies?

- What are the typical effects or outcomes of using these strategies? How do athletes typically respond?

- How do you feel using these strategies?

Exercise as punishment probes:

- Anecdotal evidence suggests instructing an athlete to engage in physically strenuous tasks as a result of committing a mistake, or violating team policies is a method often used in inter-university sport, what are your thoughts on this?

- Have you ever experienced this? If so, in what capacity?

- What is your opinion on the effectiveness of this method of practice?

- Describe other possible strategies coaches could use.

- During your coach career, do you or have ever regretted using a disciplinary strategy? If so, please describe.

Coaching style probes:

- Describe an ideal coaching style/method.

- Explain your coaching style/method.

- How do you teach pro-social behaviours?

- How do you negotiate/deal with a punitive situation?

- **Shame and Reintegration probes:**

- How do you think the athletes feel when they have to be disciplined?

- Describe some of the physical, emotional and/or verbal cues athletes exhibit when disciplined?

- Do athletes ever display physical, emotional or verbal cues of embarrassment, disgrace, or reproach after a punitive situation has occurred? If so, please describe.

- Once this occurs how do you assist the athlete in understanding the reasons for these feelings?

- How do you assist the athlete in averting a punitive situation in the future?

- As a coach, heading into a game, you have predetermined goals and expectations, when obstacles occur whether be it poor performance, lack of team cohesion or lack of execution in team strategy that prevent you from achieving these expectations, do you make disappointment apparent?

- What are the athletes reaction to this?

Coach-athlete/team relationship probes:

- Describe an ideal coach-athlete/coach-team relationship?

- Describe your relationship with your athletes?

- Describe why or why not a close social bond between a coach and athlete is important.

- Describe the importance of cohesion between athletes.

- Describe the dynamics between you and your team.

- What kind of relationship works for you and why?

Summary

- We are now reaching the end of our interview, so to summarize I am wondering if you could define the word discipline? Now the word punishment?

- What is your opinion on the use of exercise as punishment?

- How would you describe the word shame?

- Why do you think people experience shame?

- Reintegration is a term identified as, first, recognizing the mistake the athlete has made, followed by verbal expression of acceptance and integration back into the community of athletes after initially being ostracized. Can you speak to this term? Explain your understanding and experiences, if any, with this concept.

- Anecdotal evidence suggests that shaming is when coaches show anger, frustration and demean an athlete because he or she did not live up to their expectations. Coaches use it to as a method of discipline? What are your opinions on this method of practice?

- What are some alternative methods of behaviour modification?

- Thank you for your time, do you have any questions?

Appendix C: Compensation Form

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY:
EXAMINING COACHES' PERSPECTIVES ON THE USE OF EXERCISE AS
PUNISHMENT IN INTERUNIVERSITY SPORT

I _____, have received the compensation of a $20.00 Starbucks card for participating in this study.

_____   _____
Signature   Date