

**COACHES' PERCEIVED IMPACT OF THE RESPECT IN SPORT (RiS) PROGRAM
ON BULLYING, ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND HARASSMENT IN SPORTS**

by

Rashmeen Nirmal
B.S., Nova Southeastern University, 2004

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

The Faculty of Graduate Studies

(School Psychology)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

March 2010

© Rashmeen Nirmal, 2010

ABSTRACT

Interpersonal problems such as harassment, bullying, and sexual abuse by both peers and adults are becoming increasingly recognized as a problem among children and youth in schools, and are also gaining attention in sports. With an increase in awareness comes concerted educational efforts to address interpersonal problems, including prevention programs targeting adults in schools and in the community. Respect in Sport (RiS) is an online, preventative education program for coaches designed to create safe and healthy sport environments for participants by targeting key areas that are paramount to prevention and intervention in bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment in sports. The purpose of the current study was to examine the extent to which coaches perceived the Respect in Sport program to have impacted their knowledge and practice in these areas. Participants included coaches from Alberta Gymnastics, Ontario Gymnastics, and Sport Manitoba who completed the RiS training in the last three years. A total of 1,091 participants, representing 51 different sports, were asked to complete a self-report survey regarding their perceptions of the impact of RiS on their coaching practice. Results from this study revealed that an overwhelming percentage of participants perceived the Respect in Sport program to have enhanced their knowledge and practice in key areas of the program's objectives. Further examination of results across type and level of sports, age and sex of coaches and athletes, and time at which coaches were certified in Respect in Sport revealed few significant differences, and the effect sizes were small. The results of this study have implications for further program development, implementation, and ongoing systematic evaluation. With the heightened demand for implementing and evaluating programs that are evidence-based, the results of this study also have implications for school psychologists working in schools and in the community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	v
Acknowledgments	vi
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction	1
CHAPTER TWO: Review of the Literature	4
Part One: Social and Emotional Development in Youth Sports.....	4
Social and Emotional Learning in Youth Sports	6
Education for Adults: A Prevention Tool?	9
The Role of a Coach	11
Respect in Sport	13
Power	15
Bullying in Sports	16
Abuse in Sports	20
Sexual Abuse	22
Sexual Harassment.....	23
Neglect in Sports.....	26
Summary	30
Part Two: Evaluation of Prevention Programs.....	31
Evidence-Based Practice.....	32
Program Evaluations as a Process.....	33
The Present Study	35
CHAPTER THREE: Research Methodology	38
Evaluation Stakeholders.....	38
Participants and Recruitment	39
Measures	40
Procedures.....	42
CHAPTER FOUR: Results.....	44
Demographic Characteristics	44
Analysis of Research Questions.....	50
Variations in Perceived Impact of the Respect in Sport Program	58
CHAPTER FIVE: Discussion	67
Evaluation Findings	67
Noted Observations of the Respect in Sport Program	75
Limitations of the Research Study	76
Discussion of the Evaluation Process	78

Implications for Future Research, Policy, and Practice	80
Conclusion	82
REFERENCES.....	85
APPENDICES.....	97
Appendix A: Respect in Sport Program Objectives and Corresponding Self-Report Survey Questions	97
Appendix B: Behavioural Research Ethics Board Certificate of Approval.....	99
Appendix C: Letter of Initial Contact	101
Appendix D: Respect in Sport Self-Report Survey	102

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Affiliation of Participants	39
Table 3.2	Respect in Sport Subset of Program Objectives	41
Table 4.1	Sex and Age of Coaches	45
Table 4.2	Sport Coached by Survey Participants.....	46
Table 4.3	Level, Sex, and Age of Athletes Coached	48
Table 4.4	Time of Respect in Sport Training	49
Table 4.5	Participants' Knowledge for Awareness and Identification of Bullying, Abuse, Harassment and Neglect	51
Table 4.6	Competence in Recognizing and Dealing with Bullying, and Reporting Observations/Disclosures of Harassment, Abuse, or Neglect	52
Table 4.7	Identifying and Responding to Bullying, Abuse, Harassment, and Neglect	53
Table 4.8	Awareness of a Coach's Role in Teaching Respect in the Sport Environment.....	54
Table 4.9	Using Positive Strategies to teach Respecting Others	55
Table 4.10	Increasing the use of Positive Power	56
Table 4.11	A Model of Emotional Control and Regulation.....	56
Table 4.12	Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Type and Level of Sport Coached.....	60
Table 4.13	Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Age and Sex of Coaches	62
Table 4.14	Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Age and Sex of Athletes Coached.....	63
Table 4.15	Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Sex of Coaches and Athletes.....	64
Table 4.16	Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Time of Respect in Sport Certification	65

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to Dr. Bill McKee. There are not enough words to describe the knowledge, expertise, strength and support Bill has provided me, not only through this project, but through my own personal and professional development during my graduate career. Bill's knowledge and experience continues to impress me daily, and I feel privileged to work closely with not only a great scholar, but a wonderful mentor and friend- a friend who displays the epitome of humility. His honesty and commitment to my progress has challenged me not only to become a better student, but a better person.

I would also like to thank Dr. Shelley Hymel for her continued support throughout this project. The level of respect and admiration I have for Shelley is indescribable. Her wealth of knowledge, expertise, and experience in the area of social and emotional development is exemplary, and I feel honoured to have worked closely with a world-renowned scholar. Shelley pushed me to a point that, at the time, I believed was beyond my capability. She challenged me, yet supported me, to be the best scholar I could be. For this, I am truly grateful. Through her teaching and support, she has instilled a sense of success and competency in me that will carry me through my doctoral studies and beyond.

The expression, "it's a small world" held true to this project. I had the opportunity to work with Dr. Robert Sparks, Director of the Human Kinetics program at UBC, who also is the spouse of one of my former internship supervisors. Dr. Sparks provided a unique and valuable contribution to this project given his area of expertise in sport psychology. I deeply appreciated his kind nature and his encouragement to "think outside the box."

I would also like to thank Wayne McNeil and Garth Stonier from Respect in Sport for a wonderful and supportive collaborative process. I could not have asked to work with anyone other than Wayne and Garth for my masters thesis- a project that can often be stressful and anxiety-provoking for any graduate

student! I would like to especially thank Sheldon Kennedy for disclosing his story and developing the Respect in Sport program. Finally, I would like to thank Drs. Debra Pepler and Joanne Cummings, and Jennifer Ma from PREVNet for their contribution to this project, as well as the coaches from Sport Manitoba, Alberta Gymnastics, and Ontario Gymnastics for participating in this project.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents, Bruce and Dolly Nirmal, and my sisters, Jasreen, Parveen, and Shauna, for their continued support. They are truly my “rock” and provide me with the strength and encouragement I need to remain positive through challenging times. Knowing how supportive my family is provides me with the passion to deliver the best that I can on a daily basis, both personally and professionally.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Sheldon Kennedy, a former National Hockey League (NHL) player for the Calgary Flames, Boston Bruins, and Detroit Red Wings, was a junior hockey athlete playing under a highly respected and reputable coach, Graham James. Kennedy was sexually abused by his coach, James, over 350 times, twice weekly between 1984 and 1990 when Kennedy was between the ages of 14 and 19. Kennedy was silent about the abuse for thirteen years while feeling isolated, withdrawn, defenseless, and suicidal, meanwhile turning to substance use to cope with the trauma. In 1997, Kennedy disclosed the sexual abuse he experienced by James to the Calgary police. As a result, James was sentenced to approximately three and a half years in prison for sexually abusing Kennedy and another hockey player. After James' sentencing, Kennedy went public with his story and began his campaign to bring awareness of sexual abuse in sport environments to the community through the Sheldon Kennedy Foundation (Silent Edge, 2009). As part of his campaign, Kennedy skated across Canada and published an autobiographical book in 2006 titled, *Why I Didn't Say Anything – The Sheldon Kennedy Story*. In 1999, a television movie based on his life and his campaign against abuse was aired on the Canadian Television Network (CTV). Kennedy is currently working with the Canadian Red Cross and Respect-Ed on developing and implementing prevention programs to address, not only sexual abuse, but also neglect, harassment and abuse by both adults and peers, including bullying. One of the programs Kennedy developed is Respect in Sport (RiS), the subject of this study.

Respect in Sport is a preventative e-learning program that is designed to promote safe and healthy sport environments for coaches and athletes with an emphasis on eliminating bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect by both adults and peers in the sport community. The program

focuses on teaching coaches how to monitor their own behaviour while coaching, how to identify manifestations of bullying such as the misuse of power, and how to recognize, intervene in, and report incidents of bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect. This program is widely implemented across Canada, and the aims of the program are endorsed by national organizations such as the Canadian Red Cross and PREVNet (Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence Network), and by provincial and national sport and activity programs. A further description of the Respect in Sport program is included in Chapter 2.

Epidemiological evidence on the prevalence of child and youth-based problem behaviours (e.g., bullying, internalizing and externalizing disorders) is guiding the allocation of funding for prevention programs (Biglan, Mrazek, Carnine, & Flay, 2003). However, there is a history of prevention programs being implemented without evidentiary support to verify their purpose, validity, and outcomes (e.g., Slavin, 2008; Twemlow et al., 2001). Examination of a program's design, development, and implementation is needed to better understand successful intervention development and implementation (Card, Isaacs, & Hodges, 2007). Conducting program evaluations can help us to better understand which objectives of particular programs are instrumental in preventing problem behaviours, thus informing further refinement and development of programs, and evaluation research.

At this time, there has been no systematic evaluation of the Respect in Sport program, on its design, implementation, or outcomes. It is important to evaluate the RiS program in light of the increasing emphasis on implementing prevention programs that are empirically validated (e.g., Biglan et al., 2003; Slavin, 2008). The current study provided an initial step toward evaluation of the Respect in Sport program through the eyes of coaches who have completed the program in the last three years. The study examined the extent to which coaches perceived the

program to have enhanced their knowledge and practice of various elements of the program. This was recognized as a critical initial step of a more systematic evaluation for the Respect in Sport program.

In the chapter which follows, I provide a review of the literature related to social and emotional development in youth sports and program evaluations. Part I of the literature review is largely focused on providing the reader with an understanding of literature and empirical support for the critical themes underlying the RiS program. These themes include adult training in preventative education, the role of coaches, and power, bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect in sports. Part II introduces program evaluation as a process and presents a model for examining evidence in a hierarchical array of program evaluation procedures.

CHAPTER TWO

Part One: Social and Emotional Development in Youth Sports

The current and historical focus of education in North America has been on child and youth academic development, with an emphasis “reading, ‘riting, and ‘rithmetic,” (also known as the “three R’s”) (Hymel, Schonert-Reichl, & Miller, 2006, p. 149). However, with an increase in awareness of mental health issues, substance use, high-risk behaviour, and violence experienced by children and youth (e.g., Merrell, 2008), a growing body of evidence has suggested that an emphasis be placed on youth social-emotional learning (SEL) in schools and communities (e.g., Jaffe, Wolfe, Crooks, Hughes, & Baker, 2004; Metlife, 2002), what Hymel and colleagues refer to as the fourth “R”, namely, relationships (p. 149).

This greater awareness is also acknowledged in preventative youth-based programs that are being implemented in school environments (Greenberg et al., 2003; Le Menestrel & Perkins, 2007) and widely promoted at many levels. For example, the British Columbia Ministry of Education has identified social responsibility as a major foundational skill for schools, in addition to the more traditional curricular goals of Reading, Writing, Numeracy, and Information and Communications Technology Integration (BC Ministry of Education, http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/perf_stands). In the United States, the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL; www.CASEL.org) focuses on increasing evidence-based practice in the area of social-emotional learning, with a mandate of establishing social-emotional learning in schools across the United States. Importantly, there is a growing body of evidence demonstrating that prevention-based social-emotional learning programs for children and youth yield positive outcomes and long-term benefits (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, in press; Weissberg, Kumpfer, & Seligman, 2003).

Systems-level intervention and prevention efforts are needed to target typical and at-risk populations to reduce the likelihood of developing serious maladaptive behaviour (e.g., bullying) and mental health difficulties (e.g., internalizing and externalizing disorders) (Brown-Chidsey & Steege, 2005; Hymel et al., 2006). Targeting children and youth as early as possible in their developmental course will allow for selecting the most appropriate individualized interventions for students who may require intensive and long term support. This also requires increased attention to providing teachers, leaders, coaches and students with the skills and training necessary to facilitate adaptive social development, as teachers and school leaders often feel ill-equipped to deal with social, emotional, and behavioural problems in their environments (e.g., Byrne, 1994; Card et al., 2007).

Respect in Sport is a preventative program designed to target both typical and at-risk populations by providing adults with the knowledge and skills to promote safe environments for their participants. However, with the implementation of new prevention programs, there is also an increasing demand for program evaluations, to ensure that the programs being implemented indeed have positive effects in areas they were purported to target and ameliorate (Slavin, 2008). The purpose of the present study was to provide an initial evaluation of Respect in Sport.

To this end, this thesis begins by considering how social and emotional behaviour and development manifests in the sport environment, focusing on advantages and disadvantages of participating in youth sports. Next, as Respect in Sport is an educational program intended to increase adults' understanding of interpersonal problems, evidence on the value of prevention education training for adults is addressed. From here, research literature relating to the key foci of the Respect in Sport program is addressed, including the role of coaches, and how bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect presents itself in sports.

Social and Emotional Learning in Youth Sports

Within the school environment, there is a considerable amount of engagement in sports, whether it is at recess or lunch, or through school sports teams, or extra-curricular activities. Children and youth also participate in after-school sports, community league teams, and clubs (e.g., Girl Guides of Canada, Scouts Canada). At later ages, participation at elite sports levels such as college and professional leagues also encompasses a large portion of the sport community. The sport environment itself provides coaches, parents, teachers, leaders, and participants with opportunities for social and emotional learning.

Engagement in youth sports has been associated with a number of benefits including increased social competence and positive adjustment, greater academic achievement, and recognition of the importance of fitness and living an active and healthy lifestyle (e.g., Bartco & Eccles, 2003; Eccles & Templeton, 2002; Le Menestrel & Perkins, 2007). It is an environment that teaches technical skills, in addition to team work, sportsmanship, patience, and respect. Sociological research has shown that participation in adolescent extracurricular activities (including sports) is linked with greater educational attainment, employment, and income in adults (e.g., Landers & Landers, 1978; Otto & Alwin, 1997). In a controlled longitudinal study examining the potential risks and benefits of participation in structured leisure activities (i.e., church and volunteer activities, school team sports, student council, performing arts, and academic clubs), Eccles and Barber (1999) found that participation in prosocial activities and in sports teams predicted positive educational trajectories. Further, Baumert, Henderson, and Thompson (1998) found that sport participation was associated with better academic achievement and cognitive benefits, such as increased levels of attention and working memory.

Sport participation also has several physical health advantages such as increasing cardio-respiratory strength, building healthy bones and muscles, reducing the risk of mortality and diseases such as heart disease, cancer, hypertension, obesity, and establishing healthy dietary patterns (Colcombe & Kramer, 2003; Le Menestrel & Perkins, 2007; Myers et al., 2004; see Warburton, Nicol, & Bredin, 2006 for a review). In a recent longitudinal study of 842 adult males (M age = 59), Myers et al. found that exercise capacity and energy expenditure from recreational physical activity was inversely associated with mortality, with a 72% reduction in mortality between the most-fit and least-fit participants. In fact, no deaths were documented in participants who were classified as both “fit and active” during the course of the study. In contrast, low exercise capacity and low physical activity (i.e., low energy expenditure) were strongly associated with mortality, even more than well-known risk factors, including smoking, hypertension, diabetes, previous myocardial infarction, or a history of heart failure. Thus, physical activity and fitness clearly have long-term positive health benefits. Relatedly, engagement in sports is associated with decreased cigarette and marijuana use (see Baumert et al., 1998; Colcombe & Kramer, 2003; Eccles & Barber, 1999).

Sports participation has also been found to yield a number of social and emotional benefits to participants, including reduced feelings of anxiety and depression (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1996). For example, in a study of adolescents, Bartko and Eccles (2003) found that participation in structured activities, including sports, school and community clubs, and paid work as opposed to less structured activities (e.g., watching television, hanging out with friends) was associated with lower rates of problem behaviours, and fewer internalizing and externalizing problems. Further, Hansen, Larson, and Dworkin (2003) found that youth who participated in sport and club activities reported more experiences of

personal development, such as learning how to take initiative, problem-solve, set goals, and manage time as compared with youth who spent most of their time in academic classes and socializing with friends. As well, participants in youth activities reported more experiences of identity exploration and reflection, and emotional learning, including how to manage anger, anxiety, and stress when compared with comparison activities. In a three-year longitudinal study examining weekly physical activity and mental health in 15- to 16-year-olds in schools in Norway, physical activity at age 15-16 was negatively associated with emotional symptoms and peer problems at age 18-19 for males, but not females (Sagatun, Sogaard, Bjertness, Selmer, & Heyerdahl, 2006). Participation in physical activity has also been linked to high self-esteem both concurrently and longitudinally (Bowker, 2006; Findlay & Bowker, 2009; Gadbois & Bowker, 2007).

In terms of long-term SEL benefits, Zaff, Moore, Papillo, and Williams (2003) found that ongoing participation in one extra-curricular activity during high school was associated with attending post-secondary education, volunteering, and becoming an active member of the community (e.g., involved in voting). Additionally, youth who participated in sports were more likely to continue physical activity as adults (Perkins, Jacobs, Barber, & Eccles, 2004).

Although there is a large body of evidence supporting the positive contributions of sport and physical activity to mental health and both social-emotional and academic functioning, there is also evidence of negative outcomes associated with sport participation, such as problem and health risk behaviours (Le Menestrel & Perkins, 2007). For example, Bartko and Eccles (2003) found higher rates of reported lying and substance use among students involved in youth sports compared to those involved in youth clubs. Although engagement in youth sports has been associated with decreased cigarette and marijuana use (Baumert et al., 1998), Eccles and Barber

(1999) found that youth sports participation was associated with greater alcohol use and problematic gambling. Additionally, Weiss (1999) found that athletes had higher maladaptive behaviours (i.e., alcoholism, drug abuse, exhibitionism, and problem gambling) than non-athletes, especially men.

In summary, there are many physical, academic, and social-emotional benefits of sport participation (e.g., Eccles & Templeton, 2002; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Myers et al., 2006; Sagatun et al., 2007; Schmalz, Deane, Birch, & Davison, 2007; Warburton et al., 2006; Zaff et al., 2003). However, negative outcomes have also been documented (e.g., Eccles & Barber, 1999; Weiss, 1999). Le Menestrel and Perkins (2007) suggest that engagement in risky behaviours is largely dictated by how “coaches, parents, officials, and the youth themselves behave, as well as through the established norms of the particular sports context” (p. 17). Therefore, it is important for adults to facilitate healthy sport and activity environments that will support children’s positive social and physical development (e.g., Fuoss & Troppmann, 1981; Haney, Long, & Howell-Jones, 1998).

Education for Adults: A Prevention Tool?

Given that children and youth spend a considerable amount of time with adults in sports and activity programs, these environments provide a unique context in which adults can engage in teaching and prevention practices. However, there is limited research investigating the role adults play in preventing and intervening with interpersonal problems in sport and activity contexts, in comparison to school contexts, where evidence clearly shows that teachers play an instrumental role in preventing and intervening with such issues (e.g., Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Nonetheless, Twemlow, Fonagy and Sacco (2002) argue that recreation and community programs may be ideal contexts in which children and youth can enhance their feelings of safety.

The Coach Effectiveness Training (CET) is a US-based intervention designed to assist coaches in facilitating a sport environment, which fosters the personal, social, and athletic development of athletes. The CET program underwent a systematic evaluation to examine the effect of coaches' behaviour on athletes' psychosocial development (Smoll & Smith, 2006). Participants in this study included Little League coaches and athletes in the Seattle, Washington area. Data was collected using direct observation of the coaches on the baseball field and self-report interviews with the coaches and athletes. Results indicated that the trained coaches showed more reinforcement and encouragement of their athletes when compared to the control group. In addition, they provided more democratic technical instruction and were less punitive towards athletes when compared to the control group. Athletes who played for the CET-trained coaches reported greater enjoyment of their experience and more liking of both their coach and teammates. Results also indicated significant increases in general self-esteem and significant decreases in performance anxiety over time among athletes coached by CET-trained coaches.

Generally speaking, there is a paucity of research examining the role coaches play with respect to interpersonal problems in sports and on the psychosocial development and performance of athletes. However, there is a body of literature documenting the role teachers have in preventing and intervening in interpersonal problems in schools, and it could be hypothesized that this research could potentially generalize to sport contexts. For example, teachers play a primary role in creating an heightened sense of school safety and belonging for students (e.g., Abecassis, Hartup, Haselager, Scholte, & van Lieshout, 2002; Beran & Tutty, 2002), and increasing students' academic achievement (e.g., Fonagy, Twemlow, Verberg, Sacco, & Little, 2005; Twemlow et al., 2001). Teachers also affected students' social-emotional functioning such as decreasing feelings of personal risk, increasing school participation, making

friends easier, expressing ideas and feelings in a group, and following classroom rules and norms (see Johnson, Lutzow, Strothoff, & Zannis, 1995; Osterman, 2000; Wentzel, 1998).

Although there is evidence documenting the benefits of programs which train teachers as prevention agents (e.g., Abecassis et al., 2002; Fonagy et al., 2005), there is also evidence that lack of adult education on interpersonal problems, specifically bullying prevention, can have detrimental effects. Bauman and Del Rio (2006) found that teachers and students both felt that teachers did not know how to effectively intervene with bullying, consequently limiting the extent to which students turn to teachers for help, and also contributing to teachers ignoring bullying. Further, Smith and Shu (2000) found that students were reluctant to seek help from teachers as they felt it would fail to improve, or may even worsen, the bullying situation.

In summary, although the sport context is an ideal environment in which adults can engage in social-emotional preventative education, there is limited research investigating the role that coaches play in enhancing the psychosocial development of athletes. Given the positive results reported for the CET program (Smoll & Smith, 2006), as described above, it is expected that the Respect in Sport program may also hold promise as a program focused on training of coaches as prevention agents. Similarly, given research demonstrating the positive effects of involving teachers and schools in social and emotional prevention efforts, it is anticipated that it may be equally important to consider the potential impact of sport environments and the important role of coaches in fostering social and emotional growth.

The Role of a Coach

The role of the coach is generally aimed at teaching technical aspects of a sport. However, a more comprehensive role includes the responsibility to create a positive social environment that promotes the psychosocial development of an athlete (Dubin, 1990) and

facilitates good interactions among athletes and between athletes and the coach (Smith, 2006). As Dubin suggests, coaches should not only value physical excellence, but also ensure that an athlete develops in such a way “that will ensure a balanced integrated individual” (p. 509). A positive social environment, however, has not always been considered the norm in sports. For example, live sports coverage (e.g., hockey, lacrosse, etc.) on television often displays aggression, both verbal and physical, among athletes as well as from coaches (e.g., Theberge, 2003). Similarly, the image of a dictating and frustrated coach, subordinate and compliant athletes, and the over-involved, aggressive parent is often perpetuated in movies such as *Varsity Blues* and *Kicking and Screaming*. Murray and Mann (2006) argue that athletes learn to respond to authority (i.e., coaches) through observations of coaches’ behaviour in movies, books, and television. However, these images are not always conducive to either good sportsmanship or positive sport environments.

Coach-athlete relationships and the type of leadership provided by coaches are associated with the quality of athletes’ participation in sports (e.g., Smoll & Smith, 1989) and has been found to impact team cohesion (e.g., Gardner, Shields, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1996; Pease & Kozub, 1994; Shields, Gardner, Bredemeier, & Bostrom; 1997; Westre & Weiss, 1991). Specifically, greater team cohesion was found to be associated with coaches having higher levels of training and instruction, providing participants with more feedback and support, and utilizing democratic leadership behaviours in teaching and instruction. In contrast, coach-athlete conflict has been associated with poor team cohesion and performance (e.g., Greenleaf, Gould, & Dieffenbach, 2001).

Although there is evidence regarding the role of leadership behaviour and coach-athlete relationships in team cohesion, it appears that there is a dearth of research examining how

coaches may have an impact on athletes' behaviour and their social and emotional functioning (e.g., feelings of victimization, externalizing and internalizing problems, etc.). Further research in this area could assist in the development or refinement of prevention programs targeted for sport environments.

To summarize, the role of the coach not only includes teaching technical components of a game, it includes creating positive environments to facilitate the psychosocial development of athletes. However, books, television, and the media often display negative behaviours such as verbal and physical aggression, which are not conducive to creating positive sport environments as athletes often emulate this behaviour. Positive coach-athlete relationships and good leadership qualities have been found to be associated with greater team cohesion, though further empirical investigation is needed to examine the social-emotional impacts of coaches' behaviour on athletes. A critical next step is to evaluate programs that are being implemented in sport environments in order to make systematic changes to existing programs if needed or develop new prevention programs for sport environments. Currently, there is a lack of program evaluations for programs that are being implemented in sport environments (e.g., Gilbert & Trudel, 1999).

Respect in Sport

Respect in Sport is a preventative education program that is intended for coaches to create safe and healthy environments for their participants. Specifically, RiS is a 3-hour, online training program presented via audio-video media with printable handouts, that teaches coaches how to effectively identify and deal with signs of bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect in sport. The program consists of six modules, including video scenarios that are typically found in the sport environment, followed by simple multiple choice questions that the coaches must

answer before continuing on to the next module. Each module takes approximately 30 minutes to complete and must be completed in sequential order. Coaches are encouraged to complete the course at their own pace. Coaches are also encouraged to keep a note pad or journal with them while completing the training to make notes and personal relevance to the course context. A Respect in Sport certificate number is issued to the coach once all the modules have been completed.

The RiS program runs on a five-year cycle. The initial RiS certification is considered *Year 1*. Once a coach has been RiS certified, he or she will be able to access the program as an “on-line resource” in *Year 2*. In *Year 3*, coaches are requested to take the RiS recertification program, which is a summary version of the course that takes approximately 45 minutes to complete. Again, the program becomes an online resource, available to participants throughout *Year 4*. In *Year 5* coaches take the full program for ‘recertification’, which may be updated with new information.

Respect in Sport is an organization committed to providing education in the area of sport ethics. The program is currently mandatory for Sport Manitoba, Gymnastics Canada, Hockey Canada, Karate Canada, Cross Country Skiing Canada, and Alberta Lacrosse, comprising of approximately 53,200 coaches who have taken or are taking the RiS program. This number does not include the coaches who are taking the program in provinces or sport organizations where the program is considered “optional.” Partners of RiS include the Canadian Red Cross and RespectED (www.redcross.ca), Essentialtalk, and PREVNet.

RiS is intended to better protect athletes in coaches’ care, as well as the coach. According to Respect in Sport (2009), the program has several benefits for coaches and provincial organizations. For example, RiS asserts that “coaches will be more confident in identifying,

dealing with, and reporting signs of bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment, and creating a safer and more respectful environment for coaches and athletes.” However, at the present time, there is no evidence to support this claim as Respect in Sport has not undergone systematic program evaluation to date.

In the sections that follow, research relevant to the critical themes of the Respect in Sport program is addressed. These critical themes include power, bullying, abuse and harassment, and neglect in sports.

Power

Power is a central construct underlying relationships among athletes and coaches, and is also considered an underlying element of bullying (e.g., Olweus, 1993). Coaches can use power positively to create safe and healthy sport environments but can also use power negatively by using control, punishment, and coercion to influence athletes (e.g., Janssen & Dale, 2002). Murray and Mann (2006) describe power as a coach being successful at influencing another individual by virtue of his or her position, since they may be viewed as superior to members of a team. In a similar vein, Respect in Sport (2009) defines power as the ability of coaches to influence the behaviour, feelings, or thoughts of others simply by virtue of their position.

Within the Respect in Sport program, different types of power are distinguished within the sport context, including legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, expert power, information power, and personal (persuasive/enthusiastic) power (Respect in Sport, 2009). There are several factors that influence power held by coaches, including first impressions (e.g., physical nature/fit, being well-groomed), charisma, allocation of rewards and resources (e.g., scholarships, room/board, tuition, sports wear and equipment, indirect rewards such as

behavioural reinforcement), and the expectations that coaches set for their athletes (Murray & Mann, 2006).

In sum, power imbalances can occur in sport environments, not only among athletes, but also in the relationships between coaches and their athletes (e.g., Murray & Mann, 2006; Respect in Sport, 2009). There are several factors that influence the power held by coaches, yet coaches may not recognize the influence they have on athletes given their position of power (Haney et al., 1998). This is particularly problematic because they are often seen as role models by athletes. Power is a critical underlying theme in the Respect in Sport training program. Accordingly, in the present RiS evaluation, participants were asked if the training helped them to increase their use of positive power, for example, accentuating the fun aspects of sports.

Bullying in Sports

Bullying is a pervasive concern expressing itself in many contexts, including the sport environment. It has been a growing area of research, with scientists seriously attempting to understand the complex social problem of bullying since the early 1970s (Hymel & Swearer, 2009). A number of negative outcomes of bullying have been documented (Card et al., 2007), including academic (e.g., Nansel, Haynie, & Simons-Morton, 2003), social (e.g., Boivin, Hymel, & Bukowski, 1995) and psychological problems such as externalizing and internalizing disorders (e.g., Boivin et al.; Craig, Pepler, & Atlas, 2000; Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpela, Marttunen, Rimpela, & Rantanen, 1999; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001). The goal of this section is to present a broad review of bullying and then discuss the literature on bullying as it is manifested in sport environments.

A widely-cited definition of bullying comes from the pioneering work of Dan Olweus (1993, 1997), who indicated that “a person is being bullied when he or she is exposed, repeatedly

and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other persons. It is a negative action when someone intentionally inflicts, or attempts to inflict injury or discomfort upon another...” (1993, p. 9). Similarly, Frey, Hirschstein, Edstrom, and Snell (2009) describe bullying as an imbalance in power used to secure material and social benefit, or cause harm, through an intentional aggressive process. Researchers appear to have reached a consensus that bullying involves three main elements: repetition, intentionality, and power imbalance (e.g., Olweus, 1993; Vaillancourt et al., 2008). However, Olweus (1993) argues that a single victimization should not be excluded from what is considered bullying, largely because of the long-term detrimental effects it may have on the victim. In short, although there are still varying definitions of bullying, common to all definitions of bullying is the intentional abuse of power against another individual.

Bullying can take on many forms, including physical bullying (e.g., hitting, pushing, grabbing, physical threats), verbal bullying (e.g., name-calling, teasing, threats, comments based on one’s sexual orientation, race, or disability, questioning one’s technical and skill ability in a sport), relational bullying (e.g., ignoring, gossiping, teasing, excluding, being rejected from teammates), and cyber bullying (e.g., sending hurtful messages through internet sources such as Facebook, MSN Messenger). Respect in Sport (2009) argues that all forms of bullying occur in sport environments and, although many physical acts are naturally seen in sports (e.g., hockey, football), it is the role of the coach and athletes to ensure that physical contact does not escalate into forms of physical bullying.

A large body of research examining gender differences in bullying has shown that boys are more commonly victimized than girls, although this largely depends on the type of bullying examined (Card et al., 2007). For example, boys are more likely to be victims of physical

bullying such as hitting, punching, and pushing, and verbal bullying (e.g., teasing), whereas some research has shown that girls are often victims of social and relational bullying (e.g., group exclusion, eye-rolling, whispering) (Mynard & Joseph, 2000). However, the overall consensus based on recent research has indicated that boys and girls are equally victimized by social and relational aggression (e.g., Schwartz, Chang, & Farver, 2001).

The sport environment may be a particularly vulnerable context in which bullying and victimization occur (e.g., Besag, 1989; Peguero, 2008). Currently, five million children in Canada are playing organized sports under the direction of 325,000 recognized coaches, yet Canada has no clear picture of the extent of bullying and related problems occurring in sport environments (Pepler & Yamada, 2008). The competitive nature of sport creates an environment that may inadvertently support incidents of bullying. For example, Besag (1989) argued that bullying may take on a form that appears to be socially acceptable, such as competitive behaviour, which may be quite gratifying to some athletes yet cause distress and feelings of inferiority for less capable or less competitive athletes who feel victimized. A recent study by Peguero (2008) revealed that students who participated in intramural sports were more likely to be bullied than students who did not participate in intramural sports. Interestingly, the same study showed that students who participated in interscholastic sports (i.e., official school sports teams with greater structure than intramural sports) were less likely to be victims of bullying. Although sports participation has many benefits, this study highlights the need for bullying prevention programs in sport environments.

Bullying is well understood as a social or group process and sports teams and many sport activities operate as social groups. Bullying is strongly influenced by peers and bystanders (individuals that witness the bullying) who can have a positive or negative effect on such

behaviour depending on how they react to the situation (e.g., Salmivalli, 1999; Salmivalli, Lagerspet, Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 1996; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004; Swearer & Doll, 2001). Bullying can be perpetuated and exacerbated by bystanders giving attention to the bully through watching and laughing as well as through more active reinforcement or encouragement for such behavior (Craig & Pepler, 1997). Further, Hymel et al. (2005), considering Bandura's (2002) notion of "moral disengagement" in bullying, has shown that many individuals who bully others are able to justify and rationalize such behavior, viewing bullying as okay or effective in helping others to "toughen up." This may also include blaming the victim or diffusing responsibility for such behaviour.

Within the sport context specifically, *hazing* has become a common occurrence among sports teams, especially at the college and university level (Eys, Burke, Carron, & Dennis, 2006). Hazing refers "to any activity expected of someone joining a group (or to maintain full status in a group) that humiliates, degrades or risks emotional and/or physical harm, regardless of the person's willingness to participate" (e.g., verbal abuse, threats, social isolation, sleep deprivation, public nudity, burning, brazing, paddling which may lead to sexual assault, exposure to cold weather without appropriate clothing, forced or coerced consumption of intolerable foods, alcohol, or drugs, water intoxication) (Finkel, 2002; Keating et al., 2005; www.stophazing.org). Researchers contend that hazing involves reinforcing status in a group (i.e., social hierarchy), stimulating forms of social dependency, and eliciting social deviance, embarrassment and humiliation (Cialdini, 2001; Keating et al.). In a study examining self-reported hazing/initiation experiences among 269 undergraduate students, Keating and colleagues (2005) found that the student-athletes reported more physically challenging and pain-inflicted initiation practices when compared to the students in Greek-letter groups (i.e., fraternities and sororities). Although hazing

has not been documented in the bullying literature per se, the power imbalance and intentional, repetitive act of inflicting harm on an individual that characterizes hazing is concomitant with current definitions of bullying (e.g., Olweus, 1993).

In summary, bullying is a form of aggressive behaviour consisting of three underlying elements: repetition, intentionality, and power imbalance (e.g., Hymel et al., 2005; Vaillancourt et al., 2008). Bullying takes on many forms (e.g., verbal, physical, relational, and cyber bullying) and occurs in both male and female groups (e.g., Card et al., 2007). Bullying has been associated with a number of negative outcomes including academic, social, and internalizing and externalizing problems (e.g., Boivin et al., 1995; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 1999; Nansel et al., 2003). The competitive nature of sports makes the sport environment a vulnerable context which may elicit acts of bullying. Bullying intervention is a critical component of the Respect in Sport program. To this end, participants of this current evaluation were asked to what extent the training made them more aware of bullying in their sport environments, and whether the program assisted them in identifying and effectively responding to bullying.

Abuse in Sports

Abuse can be expressed in sports in many ways. Joan Ryan, an investigative reporter, wrote a poignant story about “legal, even celebrated child abuse” in sports:

In the dark troughs along the road to the Olympics lay the bodies of the girls who stumbled on the way, broken by the work, pressure and humiliation. I found a girl whose father left the family when she quit gymnastics at age thirteen, who scraped her arms and legs with razors to dull her emotional pain and who needed a two-hour pass from a psychiatric hospital to attend her high school graduation. Girls who broke their necks and backs. One who so desperately sought the perfect, weightless gymnastics body that she starved herself to

death...I found a girl who felt such shame at not making the Olympic team that she slit her wrists...A father who handed custody of his daughter over to her coach so she could keep skating...A mother who hid her child's chicken pox with makeup so she could compete. Coaches who motivated their athletes by calling them imbeciles, idiots, pigs, cows (Ryan, 1995 as cited Sage, 1998, p. 267).

Abuse can take on many forms, including emotional abuse, physical abuse, and sexual abuse (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2009; World Health Organization [WHO], 1999). Emotional abuse, including teasing, name-calling, and rejection, is a form of abuse that impacts a person's emotional well-being (CDC, 2009). Physical abuse is injury from force (e.g., hitting, kicking, shaking, burning) inflicted by an adult such as a parent or a person with responsibility, power, or trust (WHO, 1999). Sexual abuse involves a child or adolescent engaging in sexual activity with an adult without fully understanding or providing consent.

Although abuse manifests in many forms (i.e., emotional, physical, sexual), the next section solely focuses on sexual abuse and harassment. Sexual abuse and harassment in sports is a largely neglected area, even though researchers argue that it may well be on the rise in the sport community (Jowett, Paull, Pensgaard, Hoegmo, & Riise, 2005). This lack of awareness is largely due to other prolific issues that receive more attention in the media compared to reports of sexual abuse, including eating disorders, performance-enhancing drug use, and physical and verbal abuse (Brackenridge, 1994). Therefore, the aim of the next section is to provide the reader with further understanding of sexual abuse and harassment in sports.

Sexual Abuse. According to the World Health Organization (1999), sexual abuse is defined as a child or youth engaging in sexual activity that 1) that the child does not fully comprehend; 2) that he or she is unable to give informed consent to; 3) that he or she is not developmentally prepared for, or 4) that violates the laws or social taboos of society. The perpetrator is usually an adult or a child who is at least five years older than the victim and is in a relationship of trust and power (WHO, 1999). Sexual abuse may include rape, fondling, exposure of genitalia, and other sexual activities.

Perpetrators of child sexual abuse are most commonly male, but can also be female (Friedrich, 1990) and occurs in both same-gender and cross-gender relationships (Brackenridge, 1994; Sundgot-Borgen, Fasting, Klungland, Berlund, & Brackenridge, in press). The case of Sheldon Kennedy and Graham James as illustrated in the introduction of this paper provides a poignant example of a same-gender case of child sexual abuse.

There are several negative outcomes associated with child sexual abuse including acute physical symptoms and chronic health problems (e.g., headaches, stomachaches, sensitivity to genital areas, and urinary tract infections) (Frothingham et al., 2000; Wekerle & Wolfe, 2003) and long-term negative effects such as fears, and depressive and post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms (Fiering, Taska, & Lewis, 1998; Wolfe, Gentile, & Wolfe, 1989; Zuravin & Fontanella, 1999). Child sexual abuse is also associated with poor classroom, academic, and behavioural functioning. In a study of females (ages 6-16), sexual abuse was negatively related to ratings of classroom performance, both social and academic, and positively related to school avoidance and measures of depression, destructiveness and dissociation (Trickett, McBride-Chang, & Putnam, 1994).

Sexual abuse is a recognized concern in the sport environment (e.g., Brackenridge, 1994; Haney et al., 1998; Jowett et al., 2005), even among coaches. For example, Haney and colleagues (1998) examined areas of ethical concern reported by coaches and identified nine themes of unethical behaviour, with abuse being the theme most reported by coaches. Examples of abuse reported in this study include sexual abuse/sexual harassment, abusive treatment of players (e.g., motivating through fear, pushing injured players on the court, and verbally and physically abusing players), and advocating harmful eating practices.

Unfortunately, research on sexual abuse in sports is limited for a number of reasons (Brackenridge, 1994), including lack of public awareness, varying definitions of sexual abuse, and the age differential between the perpetrator and victim. First, sexual abuse in sports has not been “problematized” like other forms of deviance such as performance-enhancing drug-use, resulting in a lack of public awareness. Second, although national and global organizations provide definitions of abuse (e.g., CDC, WHO), the definition of child sexual abuse varies (anywhere from non-contact exhibitionism to rape) largely due to the sensitive nature of the topic, the political nature of disclosure, the lack of reporting, and low referrals to appropriate agencies, and the difficulty in defining what exactly constitutes child sexual abuse, making it challenging for research to be conducted in this area. Third, the age differential between the perpetrator and victim presents challenges in the sport community. Sport organizations typically use coaches that can be as young as early teens for training and often training involves a certain degree of touching for instructional and training purposes.

Sexual Harassment. Sexual harassment is a function of social control that involves “intrusive, unwanted, and coercive sexual attention from which there is frequently no viable escape” (Fitzgerald, 1996, p. 1071). Sexual harassment is observed in the sport environment at

various sport and performance levels, with coaches often being implicated in such behaviour (Jowett et al., 2005; Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 2003; Sundgot-Borgen et al., in press).

Sexual harassment leads to both physical and psychological problems for the victim (e.g., Letourneau, Holmes, & Chasedunn-Roark, 1999; Paludi & Barickman, 1991; Richman, Flaherty, Rospenda, & Christensen, 1992; Street et al., 2007). Letourneau and colleagues found that victims of sexual harassment reported more migraine headaches, gastrointestinal problems, musculoskeletal problems, hypertension, tobacco use, and various gynecological problems. Richman and colleagues found that a sample of medical students who were victims of sexual harassment experienced a significant level of depressive symptoms and were more likely to consume alcohol. Similarly, in study of 1,025 students in Albertan high schools, participants who reported being victims of frequent sexual harassment reported higher levels of suicidal thoughts and attempts in the past six months in comparison to those who did not experience sexual harassment (Blagley, Blitho, & Bertrand, 1997).

The sport environment may have particular characteristics that make athletes especially vulnerable to sexual harassment (Lumpkin et al., 2003). For example, coaches may “befriend” their athletes, providing them with rewards and resources (e.g., taking them out to eat) to gain their trust, and the trust of athletes’ parents (p. 120). Coaches may also use their power differential to manipulate athletes into a sexual relationship by providing them with extra opportunities or resources (Lumpkin et al.). Often an athlete’s respect and admiration for his or her coach can lead to romantic feelings, but it is the coach’s ethical and professional responsibility to ensure that these feelings do not evolve into an unethical relationship, even if the athlete initiates such behaviour and provides consent to participate in intimate relations

(Jowett et al., 2003). Coaches are in a care-giving position, making efforts to train coaches to prevent sexual harassment “essential and urgent” (Vokewein-Caplan & Sankaran, 2002, p. 69).

A coach’s leadership style is also associated with sexual harassment behaviour (Maier & Laurakis, 1981). In a study examining authoritarianism and coaching, coaches of the authoritarian nature (e.g., demanding, controlling) expressed the “win at all expenses” attitude, lacked sportsmanship, and had negative attitudes towards female athletes over male athletes (Maier & Laurakis, 1981). Related to this, Begany and Milburn (2002) found that men with authoritarian personalities were associated with self-reported sexual harassment. As one example, Bobby Knight, an Indiana basketball coach stated:

I don’t like people very much...women in particular bother me. I don’t like women at all. I can’t bear all the social talk and social amenities that women put you through...I told him to take a picture of his testicles so he’d have something to remember them by if he ever took a shot like the last one. For you ladies, that’s t-e-s-t-i-c-l-e-s (Murray & Mann, 2006, p. 112).

To summarize, sexual abuse and harassment are seen in all levels of sport and in both cross-gender and same-gender coach-athlete relationships (e.g., Jowett et al., 2005; Lumpkin et al., 2003; Street et al., 2007; Sundgot-Borgen et al., in press). Sexual abuse is associated with a number of negative physical and psychological outcomes for its victims (e.g., Letourneau et al., 1999; Richman et al., 1992), yet it is an issue that is often neglected due to the sensitive nature of the topic, lack of disclosure, and lack of consensus regarding its definition (Brackenridge, 1994). Given their care-giving role as well as their position of power, coaches need to be cognizant of their behaviour while coaching, ensuring that romantic feelings towards an athlete or from an athlete do not escalate into unethical sexual behaviour, and avoiding the mis-use power and authority they naturally hold by virtue of their position by befriending athletes for personal gains

(e.g., Jowett et al., 2005; Lumpkin et al., 2003). Addressing sexual abuse and harassment are major components of the Respect in Sport program. Accordingly, participants in the current study were asked whether the RiS program assisted their ability to recognize and effectively deal with and report such behaviour.

Neglect in Sports

Neglect is the failure to provide for a child through “physical and mental health, education, nutrition, shelter, and safe living conditions, in the context of resources reasonably available to the family or caretakers...which has a high probability of causing harm to the child’s health or physical, spiritual, moral, or social development” (WHO, 1999). Similarly, Respect in Sport (2009) defines neglect as failure to meet a child’s basic necessities of life appropriate to age or development. Like abuse in sports, the way neglect may manifest itself in sports is largely elusive, thus requiring coaches to be educated on how their coaching practice may be considered neglectful when working with athletes. There are many issues in sports that can lead to neglect by coaches if not carefully monitored, such as holding unrealistically long or challenging practice sessions, failing to provide opportunities for rest, nutrition, and sleep, or failing to encourage abstinence from using performance-enhancing drugs.

Coaches need to be cognizant of the intensity, frequency, and duration of team practices and training sessions, as unrealistic training can increase the risk of fatigue, poor and limited performance, injury, and death (Bergeron, 2007). As well, practices need to be monitored and appropriate to the developmental level of the athlete, including physical maturation and fitness levels (e.g., cardiorespiratory fitness) (Bergeron). Often, athletes can be pushed to a point of exhaustion and physical injury, particularly if a coach has the “win at all costs” mentality that is often evident in the elite/competitive sport environments (e.g., Duda, 1989; Fortier, Vallerand,

Briere, & Provencher, 1995; Sturmi & Diorio, 1998). In a recent case study, an athlete described her relationship with her coach as follows:

My coach did not understand how I felt and he pushed me, something I could not tolerate at the time...I carried on training and competing through the seasons under his instructions resulting in suffering exhaustion, failing to qualify at a major championship and injuring myself' (Jowett, 2003, p. 453).

During extreme heat conditions in the summer of 2008 in Kentucky, a 15-year-old high school football player had trouble breathing during practice and eventually collapsed. He died three days later in a hospital from heat exposure. His coach was charged with reckless homicide, meaning that an intention for death was not present, but his coaching practice was classified as negligent (Fox Sports, 2009).

It is the role of the coach to help ensure that an athlete gets sufficient nutrition. Pressure to maintain optimal body composition is often perpetuated by a coach's misuse of power and authority. For example, coaches may coerce athletes to attain a particular body size, weight, and muscle density that is unrealistic and unhealthy (Jowett et al., 2005). Poor dietary practices and malnutrition are often characteristic of female athletes (e.g., gymnasts, swimmers, figure skaters) (Jowett et al.), and gymnasts in particular will often resort to "chronic mild undernutrition" to maintain body weight for their performances (Bergeron, 2007). This can be exacerbated by a coach who pressures his or her athletes to maintain a certain body composition (Goss, Cooper, Stevens, Croxon, & Dryden, 2005). Such practices are all considered negligent behaviour on the part of the coach.

Performance-enhancing drug use is clearly evident in the sport community (e.g., Melia, Pipe, & Greenberg, 1996; Sturmi & Diorio, 1998) and pressure from coaches to use

performance-enhancing drugs or pain killers is common, particularly among elite and professional male athletes (Bacon, Lerner, Trembley, & Seestedt, 2005). This pressure may also come from high-status individuals in the sport community, such as trainers, officials, parents, fans or the media who encourage athletes to use performance-enhancing drugs for their own personal goals (Bacon et al). An anecdotal case illustrating a coach's role in performance-enhancing drug use is that of Tommy Chaikin, a former football lineman at the University of South Carolina. Chaikin engaged in prolonged steroid use because he felt that he "had the coach's encouragement" and that the coach told him "do what you have to do, take what have to take" (p. 88). The steroid use resulted in depression, increased aggression, testicular shrinkage, poor vision, hypertension, heart murmur, and benign tumors requiring surgery, counselling, and complete cessation of steroids to save his life (Chaikin & Telander, 1988).

Studies have examined the extent to which athletes would use or are currently using performance-enhancing drugs (e.g., Melia et al., 1996; Sturmi & Diorio, 1998). A study involving 16,119 Canadian students (grades 6-12) examined the prevalence of anabolic-androgenic steroid use in sports (Melia et al.). Results indicated that 2.8% of the sample reported steroid use for sport performance enhancing reasons; 29.4% of this sample reported that they injected the drugs and 29.2% indicated that they shared needles. Based on the results, the authors estimated that approximately 83,000 children in Canada between the ages of 11 and 18 engaged in steroid use in the previous year in which the study was conducted. This study, however, did not examine to what extent coaches had a role in performance-enhancing drug use, though the authors contend that prevention programs are needed to target drug-use in sport environments, particularly for school-aged children. Further, in a striking survey of 198 current or aspiring US Olympic athletes by Sturmi and Dioro (1988), 98% of participants indicated that they would use

a banned substance if it would guarantee a win and they would not get caught. Out of that sample, 50% of participants reported that they would use a banned substance if it would guarantee a win and they wouldn't get caught, even though the substance would kill them in five years.

Unfortunately, research on drug-use in sports is largely based on anecdotal and case-study evidence, making it challenging to determine the exact amount of drug-use in sports and the motivation behind usage (Anshel, 2006). Given the fact that drug-use in sports is clandestine behaviour that carries ethical and legal implications, it is likely that such drug-use is underreported (Anshel). At the present time, the extent to which coaches encourage the use of performance-enhancing drugs is not known, although their potential to discourage such behavior remains an important focus in preventive education.

To summarize, neglect manifests itself in sports indirectly, making it challenging for this behaviour to be clearly recognized by the public. Most examples of neglect in sports have focused on coaches holding unrealistic practice sessions, and pressuring athletes to engage in disordered eating practices and to use performance-enhancing drugs (e.g., Bacon et al., 2005; Bergeron, 2007; Chiaken & Telander, 1998; Goss et al., 2005; Jowett, 2003). Much of the literature on neglect in sports is based on anecdotal evidence, case studies, and speculation, therefore further empirical investigation is needed to examine the role coaches may have on neglectful behaviour and the impact it may have on athletes. Respect in Sport includes issues of neglect as a major component of their program. Therefore, the current research study asked participants whether the RiS program enhanced their ability to effectively identify and respond to issues of neglect in their sport environments.

Summary

Overall, the preceding sections of this paper addressed the key foci related to social and emotional development in youth sports, and key issues that emerge in the sport environment. In particular, those issues relevant to the Respect in Sport program were highlighted including, adult training in prevention programs, the role of the coach, and power, bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment in sports. The purpose of this review was to provide the reader with a firm understanding of current issues that are occurring in sport environments and suggest roles that prevention programs may play in ameliorating such issues.

The review identified several advantages in participating in youth sports, including physical, physiological, and psychological benefits (e.g., Baumert et al., 1998; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Le Menestrel & Perkins, 2007; Perkins et al., 2004). On balance, the review also identified youth sports as an environment that is vulnerable to victimization, substance use, sport attrition, injury, and other psychological risk-factors such as anxiety and depression (e.g., Bartko & Eccles, 2003; Hansen et al., 2003). Adults, particularly coaches, were identified as potential agents in creating safe and healthy environments for participants and in ensuring that bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect do not occur between athletes or between coaches and athletes (e.g., PREVNet, 2009; Respect in Sport, 2009). Preventative education for adults has been shown to have potential for increasing adults' skill in recognizing and intervening with interpersonal problems (e.g., Abecassis et al., 2002; Alsaker, 2004; Beran & Tutty, 2002; Johnson et al., 1995; Osterman, 2000; Twemlow et al., 2001). Although the predominant research has focused on the teachers' role in preventing and intervening with social and emotional issues, it is hypothesized that such success could also be seen with coaches in sport environments. Further research is needed to explore this possibility. Although the review

indicated some evidence of effective prevention programs, it is still necessary to evaluate prevention programs to ensure that the programs being implemented have strong theoretical and practical evidence in accomplishing what they are purported to do.

Reflecting on the need for program evaluation and evidence in developing and implementing effective prevention programs, Part II of this review focuses on a hierarchical evidence-based framework for program evaluation proposed by Biglan and colleagues (2003) and highlights important elements of evidence-based practice and prevention.

Part Two: Evaluation of Prevention Programs

Prevention and intervention programs can target a large body of students at early stages in development to promote learning, to reduce the likelihood of problem behavior, and to also bring forward students that are already at-risk or are experiencing social and emotional difficulties for further, individualized intervention (Hymel et al., 2006). Greenberg, Domitrovich, and Bumbarger (2001) note that prevention and intervention efforts in social and emotional learning have grown throughout North America. In fact, over the last two to three decades, there have been significant advances in prevention science, and the development and evaluation of prevention and intervention programs in child and youth problem behaviours and social and emotional learning (La Greca, Silverman, & Lochman, 2009; Prevention Research Center for the Promotion of Human Development, 2005).

Although prevention programs are being implemented in schools and communities, there is a history of educational programs being widely implemented without evidentiary support to verify their purpose, validity, and outcomes (Slavin, 2008). Though, researchers contend that recent progress is being made with respect to integrating evidence-based practice into prevention efforts (e.g., Biglan et al., 2003; Weissberg et al., 2003). Biglan and colleagues also argue that,

although the gap is narrowing between science and practice, new evaluation efforts should be undertaken for every preventative intervention effort. With this, schools and communities should implement programs that have been subjected to sound research scrutiny, revealing strong empirical support to validate their purpose, outcomes, and effectiveness.

Evidence-Based Practice

The concept of evidence-based practice is important in ensuring that programs, treatments, and interventions are based on scientifically sound evidence to support their purpose and implementation. Although the term “evidence-based” is commonly used among the media, public, practitioners, researchers, and program stakeholders, the definition of “evidence-based” varies (Norcross, Beutler, & Levant, 2006). The American Psychological Association’s (APA) (2009) through its *Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology*, defines evidence-based practice as “the integration of best research evidence with clinical expertise and patient values” (APA, 2005, p.1). The No Child Left Behind Act (2001) in the US defines evidence-based programs as those that have undergone scientifically-based research through rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures, that provide reliable and valid results. Within the program evaluation literature, the term “evidence based” includes reference to terms such as the efficacy and effectiveness of programs, research designs, implementation integrity, program monitoring, and treatment acceptance (see Flay et al., 2005; Nation et al., 2003; Perepletchikova & Kazdin, 2005; Roach & Elliot, 2008; Upah, 2008; Weissberg et al., 2003 for reviews). Overall, the term “evidence-based” is loosely referred to and our understanding of what constitutes evidence-based practice varies. Nevertheless, most definitions share similar notions of evidence-based practice (Prevention Research Center for the Promotion of Human Development, 2005), including utilizing strategies and implementing programs that have been subjected to scrutinized

research to verify its purpose and outcomes. Determining the evidence of programs is best conducted through the process of systematic program evaluations.

Program Evaluations as a Process

Prevention research has evolved over the past few decades, starting with the development and implementation of programs that were grounded in sound theory (based on knowledge of causes and outcomes) through to evaluation of these programs using sound scientific methods. More recently, policy makers and stakeholders have encouraged and now require implementation of prevention programs to be supported by rigorous scientific evaluation (Prevention Research Center for the Promotion of Human Development, 2005). Conducting a program evaluation is best described as a process, requiring the collaboration of many individuals, including the researchers, program developers, program implementers, and stakeholders. Although conducting program evaluations is an ongoing process, Biglan and colleagues (2003) have provided a useful conceptual framework for increasingly rigorous evidence yielded from program evaluations.

Specifically, Biglan and colleagues (2003) propose a hierarchy of evidence when evaluating prevention programs. This hierarchy provides standards that can be used to develop methodology for evaluation projects and to determine the quality of information derived from evaluations. Seven levels or “grades” are outlined in this hierarchy, with “Grade 1” yielding the most scientifically rigorous results and “Grade 7” yielding the weakest scientific results, but valuable information nonetheless. “Grade 7” is largely based on endorsements, typically from the clinical experience of individuals who are respected in the area, from descriptions of the program, or from case reports. Data may also be gathered through satisfaction surveys, client testimonials, or from self-report measures completed by participants of programs. “Grade 6” refers to pre-post intervention data from program participants from one implementation of an

intervention. To receive a grade of “5”, evidence from comparisons of groups that were not randomly assigned to conditions is needed. “Grade 4” requires evidence from one randomized controlled trial (RCT) or an interrupted time-series design (ITSD) that was replicated at least three times. To obtain a grade of “3” evidence from multiple RCTs or ITSDs conducted by a single research team is required. “Grade 2” requires multiple RCTs or ITSDs conducted by two or more independent research teams. Lastly, “Grade 1” includes multiple RCTs or ITSDs plus evidence of effectiveness when the program is implemented in “real-world” settings, with sufficient training of program implementers and program monitoring.

The hierarchical model of evidence presented by Biglan and colleagues (2003) considers evaluation of a program as an ongoing process that is multifaceted and involves a range of orchestrated empirical investigations. Evidence from one research study is unlikely to provide sufficient information on a program’s effectiveness. Evaluation involves conducting numerous studies and investigating various research questions in order to reach conclusions on a program’s effectiveness. Timing of the evaluation also plays a role in the research design. For example, a newly developed program or a program that has not been subjected to any evaluation may first establish initial evidence with a less rigorous (but also less costly) research design in order to determine whether the program shows promise and warrants more extensive evaluation. Subsequent evaluations should reflect an increasingly more rigorous level of empirical investigation. Keeping Biglan and colleagues’ (2003) hierarchy of evidence in mind, there is not a prescribed set of steps in conducting program evaluations. Rather, evaluation of programs is an ongoing process with each research study contributing to a greater understanding of a program’s effectiveness.

Conducting program evaluations is a critical step in understanding the development, implementation, and outcomes of programs, as results from program evaluations may help practitioners select, modify, or develop prevention programs for a target population (Nation et al., 2003). Researchers contend that priority should be given to implementing programs that have been proven to be effective through clinical and evaluation research, especially with the increasing call for evidence-based practice (Hymel et al., 2006). Greenberg and colleagues (2003) assert that there is a “solid and growing empirical base indicating that well-designed, well-implemented child and youth prevention programs can positively influence a diverse array of social, health, and academic outcomes” (p. 470).

The Present Study

Adults play a major role in preventing, identifying, and dealing with interpersonal problems among children and youth (e.g., Alsaker, 2004; Osterman, 2000; Twemlow et al., 2001). Given the documented success of adult training in social and emotional prevention programs in schools, the Respect in Sport online program represents one effort to help coaches create safe and healthy sport environments.

The purpose of the proposed study was to provide an initial evaluation of the Respect in Sport program by examining the extent to which coaches perceived the Respect in Sport program to have enhanced their knowledge and practice of the key objectives of the program. Using the Biglan et al. (2003) hierarchical model of evaluation, the present study represents an initial, “Grade 7” level of evaluation, capturing the experience of coaches who took the RiS program. Specifically, the evaluation involved a post-test only, self-report assessment of coaches’ perceptions of the impact of the program on their coaching practice. The strength of this

approach is that it captures the experience of participants who have completed the program and who may have reflected on its implementation in their own sport context.

A large pre-study focus was identifying, post-hoc, the primary objectives of the Respect in Sport program. To this end, the primary researcher carefully reviewed the program several times to extract and verify key learning outcomes associated with each element of the program. The identified objectives were then reviewed by the RiS developers, representatives of PREVNet and the research team, who together created a final list of program objectives (see Appendix A). The identified objectives helped form the outline for the literature review and provided the framework for the development of the research questions for this evaluation. The research questions are presented below in two parts. The first set of questions focus on the key RiS program objectives and provide descriptive data on participants' perceptions of RiS:

- 1) Did the participants of the RiS program perceive themselves to have gained knowledge and awareness of bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect in their sport environment?
- 2) Did the participants perceive the RiS program to enhance their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment?
- 3) Did the participants report that the RiS program made them more aware of a coach's role in teaching respect in the sport environment?
- 4) Did the coaches report that, since the original RiS training, they are more likely to respond to bullying, abuse, harassment, or neglect with positive strategies that teach athletes about respecting others?
- 5) Did the participants perceive the RiS program to increase their awareness of being a model of emotional control and regulation, including increasing their use of positive power?

In addition to interest in participant perceptions of impact, a further interest in the study was to examine differences in coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment, as a function of various demographic characteristics. To this end, the following research questions were examined:

6) Are there significant differences between coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect and harassment as a function of type and level of sport coached?

7) Are there significant differences in coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment for coaches as a function of the sex and age of the coach?

8) Are there significant differences in coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect and harassment as a function of the sex and age of athletes coached?

9) Are there significant differences in coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment as a function of the sex of coach and sex of athletes they coach?

10) Are there significant differences in ratings of ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment as a function of the time at which coaches were certified for the Respect in Sport program?

Given the exploratory nature of the present investigation, no specific hypotheses were stated regarding these research questions. Instead, analyses were conducted to examine and better understand how coaches perceived the Respect in Sport program to have impacted their coaching practice in a variety of program domains.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the Respect in Sport program based on reports from coaches across Canada who are RiS certified. The primary source of evidence was responses to survey questions completed by the coaches, which showed the extent to which coaches perceived the Respect in Sport program to have enhanced their knowledge and skills in key objectives of the program. This chapter includes a description of the study participants, measures, and methods that were used to conduct this evaluation. This study was approved by the Behavioural Research Ethics Board at the University of British Columbia (see Appendix B for Certificate of Approval).

Evaluation Stakeholders

There were several stakeholders involved in this evaluation process and in the development of the evaluation survey. Foremost, the individuals at Respect Group Inc. (corporation holders of Respect in Sport), hereafter referred to as the “program developers,” were the primary facilitators of this research study. The program developers created the Respect in Sport program and were the key individuals involved in implementing this program, assisting in the development of the evaluation survey for the present study, and sending the survey out to participants. Second, the coaches who participated in the evaluation study were important stakeholders, hereafter referred to as the “participants.” Third, researchers from PREVNet (Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence Network), a National Centre of Excellence New Initiative, as partners with Respect Group Inc., participated in the development of the survey measure for this study through conference calls and email exchanges. Finally, the researchers at the University of British Columbia, including the author and Drs. William McKee

and Shelley Hymel (committee members) were also involved in the development of the evaluation survey and made every effort to create a collaborative network in this evaluation process, including the thoughts, opinions, and expertise of all stakeholders involved. The UBC and PREVNet collaborators are hereafter referred to as the “researchers,” along with the author

Participants and Recruitment

Participants included coaches who had previously taken the RiS program, anywhere from 0-36 months prior to the date at which they were invited to participate in the evaluation study. The sample included coaches from Alberta Gymnastics, Ontario Gymnastics, and Sport Manitoba. The ages of the participants ranged from 19-90, including both male (N = 678) and female (N= 413). The participants included coaches of 51 different sports from Manitoba, with Alberta and Ontario participants only coaching gymnastics. Of the 19,000 coaches who were asked to participate in this study, 1,091 (approximately 6% of the total sample) provided consent and participated in the study. A description of study participants is provided in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1

Affiliation of Participants

Participants	Sample Size (N)
Alberta Gymnastics	36
Ontario Gymnastics	106
Sport Manitoba	949
Total	1091

Participants were recruited by the program developers through a letter of initial contact distributed by electronic mail to all coaches registered with Alberta Gymnastics, Ontario Gymnastics, and Sport Manitoba (see Appendix C). The letter described the nature of the study,

the benefits of completing the survey, and the option to refuse or withdraw from the study at any time. As well, contact information for the researchers, information with respect to debriefing and confidentiality, and assurance that participation in the survey is entirely voluntary was provided in the letter. After participants read the letter of initial contact, there was a link to a secured area to complete the self-report survey online, with implied consent given by virtue of completion of this online survey.

Measures

All participants completed a self-report survey addressing their perceptions of the impact of the RiS program on their knowledge and coaching behavior. The self-report survey was developed in two stages. First, as noted previously, key objectives of the RiS program were identified post-hoc by the primary researcher and reviewed and revised in light of feedback from the program developers and researchers. Second, self-report survey items were developed from a subset of the key objectives of the program, as determined by the researchers in consultation with program developers. The identification of program objectives and development of the self-report survey are described below.

Identification of Program Objectives. The first step in this program evaluation study was to identify a clear set of program objectives that reflected the goals and purpose of the Respect in Sport program as understood by the original program developers. Identifying program objectives was instrumental in creating self-report survey questions and research questions for this study. In collaboration with the program developers and researchers from PREVNet, the primary researcher identified an initial set of program objectives based on a comprehensive review of the content of the program. Then, extended discussions between researchers and program developers were undertaken to identify key objectives to be considered in the current evaluation, with the

recognition of the need for a brief survey with a limited number of questions (i.e., 10 or less).

Ultimately, the program developers had the final say on the number of survey questions, with the requirement that the survey must take very little time on the part of program participants. The subset of program objectives for this program evaluation is specified in Table 3.2 and served as the focus of the survey questions included in the present evaluation.

Table 3.2

Respect in Sport Subset of Program Objectives

Subset of Program Objectives
Gaining better awareness and understanding of power relations. Using positive power; by virtue of their position, coaches/activity leaders can influence the behaviour, feelings, and thoughts of others.
Addressing knowledge in identifying bullying, harassment, abuse and neglect.
Addressing the ability to identify and respond effectively to bullying, harassment, abuse and neglect.
Understanding and awareness of self in context; understanding emotions in leadership and their effect on participants; creating healthy and respectful environments through positive coaching/leadership strategies.
Addressing the ability to <i>identify</i> and <i>respond</i> effectively to bullying/addressing the ability to <i>report</i> harassment, abuse or neglect.
Examining the overall effectiveness of defining, distinguishing, and responding to bullying, harassment, abuse, and neglect.
The impact of different leadership styles on coaching and teaching respect in sport; using effective leadership styles to teach kids about respect in sport.

Development of the Self-Report Survey. After the key program objectives were identified and defined, several survey questions were developed to address each objective by the researchers, in collaboration with the program developers, through numerous conference calls,

discussions, and revisions using the expertise of all stakeholders involved over a period of nine months. Discussions continued until a consensus was reached regarding the content and wording of the survey questions. The final self-report survey included seven demographic questions and ten questions relating to the knowledge, understanding, and application of the key objectives of the Respect in Sport program. A copy of the final evaluation survey is provided in Appendix D.

Demographic information requested included the sex and age of coaches; the sport coached under the organization that required coaches to take the RiS program; the sex and age of the athletes coached; and an indication of when the coaches were RiS certified. The remaining survey items utilized a multiple choice format. Three survey questions addressed coaches' ability to effectively be aware of, recognize/identify, and respond to/report bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment. Four survey questions addressed the notions of coaches as models of emotional control, responding with positive strategies to issues such as bullying, and teaching respect in sport environments. For example, for the item, "To what extent did the original Respect in Sport training help you to increase your use of *positive* power (e.g., accentuating fun aspects of sports, finding positive stress zones)?" participants checked one of four response options, "0" – Not at All; "1" - Very Little; "2" – Some; "3" - A Lot. The response options varied across questions, but most were presented as a likert scale. The remaining three survey questions were of logistic interest to the program developers, asking participants when would be an appropriate time to be Respect in Sport recertified, whether or not they would recommend the program to other coaches, and an open-ended question (see Appendix D).

Procedures

Participants accessed the survey through a secured email link and took approximately 7-10 minutes to complete. After the participants completed the survey, nothing else was required of

them. Data collection occurred for a period of 14 days. Once the 14-day period elapsed, program developers extracted the responses from the surveys and prepared a spreadsheet with random participant identification numbers and corresponding response data. The data was sent for analysis to the researchers at UBC through a secured email link.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Responses to the survey, tapping coaches' perceptions of the Respect in Sport program, were analyzed in three stages. The first stage involved analysis of the demographic characteristics of the survey participants, as reported in the first seven questions of the survey. The second stage of data analysis involved descriptive data on coaches' responses to questions regarding the perceived impact of the Respect in Sport Program on their knowledge and practice (Questions 8-16). In the third stage, Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine whether coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment varied as a function of key demographic characteristics, including sex and age of athletes and coaches, sport and level coached, and the time of their RiS certification, with follow-up post-hoc analyses conducted when appropriate.

Demographic Characteristics

The first seven questions of the self-report survey asked participants to provide information on various demographic characteristics, including their sex and age, and the level, sex, and age of the athletes they coach. Participants were also asked to indicate when they were Respect in Sport certified, which could range from 0-36 months prior to the time they participated in the research study.

With regard to sex and age of participants, coaches who were male represented a larger proportion of the sample ($n = 678$; 62.1%) than coaches who were female ($n = 413$; 37.9%). The majority of coaches were between the ages of 41-59 years ($n = 655$), representing 60.0% of the total sample. Descriptions of the survey participants are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

Sex and Age of Coaches

Demographic Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
<i>Sex of Coaches</i>		
Male	678	62.1
Female	413	37.9
Total (N)	1091	100.0
<i>Age of Coaches</i>		
21-30 years old	136	12.5
31-40 years old	255	23.4
41-59 years old	655	60.0
60+ years old	45	4.1
Total (N)	1091	100.0

Responses regarding the sport coached under the organization that required them to take the Respect in Sport program indicated 51 different sports. Of these, the most commonly reported sport was Hockey (n = 179; 16.6%), followed by Soccer (n = 166; 15.4%), Gymnastics (n = 155; 14.4%), Baseball (n = 83; 7.7%), Basketball (n = 73; 6.8%), Football (n = 65; 6.0%), Softball (n = 45; 4.2%), Ringette (n = 43; 4.0%), and Volleyball (n = 39; 3.6%). The following table reports the frequencies and percentage of all the sports reported by the participants.

Table 4.2

Sport Coached by Survey Participants

Sport	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
1. Hockey	179	16.6
2. Soccer	166	15.4
3. Gymnastics	155	14.4
4. Baseball	83	7.7
5. Basketball	73	6.8
6. Football	65	6.0
7. Softball	45	4.2
8. Ringette	43	4.0
9. Volleyball	39	3.6
10. Bowling- 5 pin	30	2.8
11. Curling	26	2.4
12. Athletics	20	1.9
13. Figure Skating	17	1.6
14. Special Olympics	14	1.3
15. Swimming	13	1.2
16. Lacrosse	12	1.1
17. Bowling- 10 pin	9	0.8
18. Badminton	8	0.8
19. Rhythmic Gymnastics	6	0.6
20. Karate	6	0.6
21. Archery	5	0.5
22. Golf	5	0.5
23. Rifle	5	0.5
24. Judo	4	0.4
25. Synchronized Swimming	4	0.4
26. Racquetball	3	0.3
27. Rugby	3	0.3
28. Alpine Skiing	3	0.3
29. Table Tennis	3	0.3
30. Tae Kwon Do	3	0.3
31. Cycling	3	0.3
32. Tennis	3	0.3
33. Triathlon	2	0.2
34. Water Polo	2	0.2
35. Squash	2	0.2
36. Baton Twirl	2	0.2
37. Handgun	2	0.2
38. Sailing	2	0.2
39. Rowing	2	0.2
40. Fencing	2	0.2

Sport	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
41. Bodybuilding	1	0.1
42. Boxing	1	0.1
43. Darts	1	0.1
44. Horse Council	1	0.1
45. Paddling	1	0.1
46. Skeet Shooting	1	0.1
47. Cross County Skiing	1	0.1
48. Soaring	1	0.1
49. Speed Skating	1	0.1
50. Weightlifting	1	0.1
51. Disc Sport	1	0.1
Total (N)	1079	100.0

Survey responses regarding the level of sport coached, which included community activity or sport, school-based activity or sport (including university level), competitive/elite, professional, or other, indicated that the majority of participants coached at the Community Sport or Activity level (n = 606; 56.5%), with Competitive/Elite representing the next highest category (n = 301; 28.1%). Subsequent questions asked coaches to indicate the sex (male, female, or both), and the age group (children 0-12 years, youth 13-19 years, adults 20+ years or, all ages) of the athletes coached. The distribution of responses was relatively equal across the three categories of sex of athletes coached, with 38% of participants (N= 405) reporting that they coached athletes that were both male and female. Most participants reported that they coached youth between the ages of 13-19 (n = 440; 41.3%) and children between the ages of 0-12 years (n = 435; 40.8%). Table 4.3 below provides a detailed description of the level, sex, and age of athletes with whom the present sample of participants worked.

Table 4.3

Level, Sex, and Age of Athletes Coached

Demographic Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
<i>Level of Sport/Activity Coached</i>		
Community Sport or Activity	606	56.5
School-based Sport or Activity	125	11.6
Competitive/Elite	301	28.1
Professional	5	0.5
Other	36	3.4
Total (N)	1073	100.0
<i>Sex of Athletes Coached</i>		
Male	335	31.4
Female	326	30.6
Both Male and Female	405	38.0
Total (N)	1066	100.0
<i>Age of Athletes Coached</i>		
Children (0-12 years old)	435	40.8
Youth (13-19 years old)	440	41.3
Adults (20+ years old)	62	5.8
All Ages	129	12.1
Total (N)	1066	100.0

The final demographic question asked participants to indicate when they were last certified for Respect in Sport, which could vary from 0-36 months prior to the time they were asked to participate in the present study. For this question, responses were evenly distributed across the categories, with 28% of participants (N= 301) indicating that they took the program anywhere from 12-18 months prior to the time they participated in the study. The following table reports the frequencies and percentages for all the response categories for the participant sample.

Table 4.4

Time of Respect in Sport Certification

Demographic Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
30-36 months ago	104	9.8
24-30 months ago	128	12.1
18-24 months ago	198	18.7
12-19 months ago	301	28.4
6-12 months ago	187	17.7
0-6 months ago	141	13.3
Total (N)	1059	100.0

In summary, with regard to demographic characteristics, the majority of the present sample was male (62.1%), and between the ages of 41-59 years (60.0%). Of the 51 sports reported, the most commonly reported sports were Hockey (16.6%), Soccer (15.4%), and Gymnastics (14.4%), with fewer participants coaching Baseball (7.7%), Basketball (6.8%), Football (6.0%), Softball (4.2%), Ringette (4.0%), and Volleyball (3.6%). Most of the participants reported coaching at the Community Sport or Activity level (56.5%), with the Competitive/Elite level representing the next highest category (28.1%). With regard to the athletes coached, the largest portion of participants reported that they coached both male and female athletes (38.0%), and children between the ages of 0-12 years (40.8%) and youth between the ages of 13-19 (41.3%). The time at which participants were Respect in Sport certified was evenly distributed, with the majority indicating that they took the program anywhere from 12-19 months ago from the time they participated in the study (28.4%).

Analysis of Research Questions

First considered in evaluating the research questions posed for the present study was an examination of the distribution of responses for each of the survey questions. These descriptive data are summarized for each research question below.

Research Question One: Did the participants of the RiS program perceive themselves to have gained knowledge and awareness of bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect in their sport environment?

Participant responses regarding the extent to which the RiS program enhanced their knowledge and capacity to effectively identify bullying, harassment, abuse, and neglect among their athletes (Question 9) are summarized in Table 4.5. As shown in the table, the vast majority of participants (83.6%), reported that, as a result of taking the Respect in Sport program, they now have the knowledge to be aware of and effectively identify bullying (responses of “agree” or “strongly agree”). Similarly, the vast majority of participants indicated that the Respect in Sport program enhanced their knowledge (“agree” and “strongly agree” responses) to be aware of and effectively identify instances of harassment (84.4%), abuse (81%), and neglect (79.3%) among their athletes.

Table 4.5

Participants' Knowledge for Awareness and Identification of Bullying, Harassment, Abuse, and Neglect

Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
<i>Bullying</i>		
Strongly Disagree	47	4.5
Disagree	125	11.9
Agree	636	60.6
Strongly Agree	241	23.0
Total (N)	1049	100.0
<i>Harassment</i>		
Strongly Disagree	47	4.5
Disagree	116	11.1
Agree	650	62.1
Strongly Agree	234	22.3
Total (N)	1047	100.0
<i>Abuse</i>		
Strongly Disagree	47	4.5
Disagree	151	14.5
Agree	640	61.3
Strongly Agree	206	19.7
Total (N)	1044	100.0
<i>Neglect</i>		
Strongly Disagree	49	4.7
Disagree	167	16.0
Agree	643	61.6
Strongly Agree	185	17.7
Total (N)	1044	100.0

Research Question Two: Did the participants perceive the RiS program to assist their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment?

Two survey questions addressed this issue (Questions 12 and 13b). Question 12 of the self-report survey asked participants to report their competence in recognizing and dealing with observation or disclosure of bullying. Of particular interest was whether participants identified

themselves as competent in *reporting* observations or disclosure of harassment, abuse, or neglect, as this behaviour may have legal implications. Of the 1,043 participants who responded to this question, the majority (n = 546; 52.3%) indicated that they felt “Competent” in *recognizing* and *dealing* with observation or disclosure of bullying and another 31.9% (n=333) indicated that they felt “Very Competent” in this area. With regard to *reporting* observation or disclosure of harassment, abuse, or neglect, most of the participants reported that they felt “Competent” (n = 513; 49.2%) or “Very Competent” in this area (n = 299; 28.7%). The following table provides frequencies and percentages for all the results from this question.

Table 4.6

Competence in Recognizing and Dealing with Bullying, and Reporting Observations/Disclosures of Harassment, Abuse, or Neglect

Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
<i>Recognizing and Dealing with Bullying</i>		
Not Competent	4	0.4
Somewhat Competent	160	15.3
Competent	546	52.3
Very Competent	333	31.9
Total (N)	1043	100.0
<i>Reporting Harassment, Abuse, or Neglect</i>		
Not Competent	14	1.3
Somewhat Competent	217	20.8
Competent	513	49.2
Very Competent	299	28.7
Total (N)	1043	100.0

When asked about the degree to which the RiS program assisted them in identifying and responding to bullying, harassment, abuse and neglect among their athletes (Question 13b) the majority of the participants reported that the RiS program assisted them “Somewhat” in this area (n = 604; 58.4%), with another 16.8% (n=174) reporting that the RiS program assisted them “To a Great Extent.” Only a few participants (n=61; 5.9%) indicated that the RiS program was “Not at All” helpful in this regard. A full distribution of responses is provided in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7

Identifying and Responding to Bullying, Harassment, Abuse, and Neglect

Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
Not at All	61	5.9
Very Little	196	18.9
Somewhat	604	58.4
To a Great Extent	174	16.8
Total (N)	1035	100.0

To summarize, the majority of participants perceived themselves to be competent in recognizing and dealing with observations or disclosures bullying, and reporting observation or disclosure of harassment, abuse, and neglect in their sport environment. Coaches also perceived that the Respect in Sport program assisted them in identifying and responding to bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment.

Research Question Three: Did the participants report that the RiS program made them more aware of a coach's role in teaching respect in the sport environment?

Survey question 14 asked participants to evaluate the extent to which the RiS training made them more aware of their role in teaching respect in their sport environment. Out of the 1,035 participants who answered this question, the majority of participants reported that the program assisted them "Somewhat" (n = 491; 47.4%) or "To a Great Extent" (n = 356; 34.4%). Only a small percentage of participants (n=48, 4.6%) indicated that the RiS program was "Not at All" helpful in this regard. A full distribution of responses to this item (Question 14) is presented in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8

Awareness of a Coach's Role in Teaching Respect in the Sport Environment

Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
Not at All	48	4.6
Very Little	140	13.5
Somewhat	491	47.4
To a Great Extent	356	34.4
Total (N)	1035	100.0

Research Question Four: Did the coaches report that, since the original RiS training, they are more likely to respond to bullying, abuse, harassment, or neglect with positive strategies that teach athletes about respecting others?

When asked if participants were more likely, as a result of taking the Respect in Sport program, to respond to incidents of bullying, harassment, abuse, or neglect with positive

strategies that teach athletes about respecting others (Question 10), the majority of the 1,048 participants reported that they “Agree” (n = 680; 64.9%) or “Strongly Agree” (n = 208; 19.8%) with this statement. A full description of responses is provided in Table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9

Using Positive Strategies to Teach Respecting Others

Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
Strongly Disagree	35	3.3
Disagree	125	11.9
Agree	680	64.9
Strongly Agree	208	19.8
Total (N)	1048	100.0

Research Question Five: Did the participants perceive the RiS program to increase their awareness of being a model of emotional control and regulation, including increasing their use of positive power?

Survey questions 8 and 11 were paired to form this research question as they share common program objectives. Question eight of the self-report survey asked participants to evaluate the extent to which the original RiS training helped them to increase their use of *positive power*, for example, accentuating fun aspects of sports and finding positive stress zones. Out of the total of 1,055 participants who responded to this question, the majority of the participants indicated “Some” (n = 591; 56.0%) or “A lot” (n=172; 16.3%) to this question. Table 4.10 provides a full description of responses to this question.

Table 4.10

Increasing the use of Positive Power

Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
Not at All	73	6.9
Very Little	219	20.8
Some	591	56.0
A Lot	172	16.3
Total (N)	1055	100.0

Survey question 11 also provided responses that help address Research Question Five. Participants were asked to indicate whether the Respect in Sport training helped them to recognize their role as a model of emotional control and regulation for the athletes of their team. Out of the 1,045 participants who responded to this question, the majority reported that they “Agree” (n = 650; 62.2%) or “Strongly Agree” (n=218; 20.9%) with this statement. Table 4.11 provides a full description of responses to this question.

Table 4.11

A Model of Emotional Control and Regulation

Category	Frequency (No. of Participants)	Percent (%) of Participants
Strongly Disagree	31	3.0
Disagree	146	14.0
Agree	650	62.2
Strongly Agree	218	20.9
Total (N)	1055	100.0

Three other questions were included in the survey but were not used to address the research questions for this study. One of the three questions yielded less clear results, owing in part to some lack of clarity in the question, response options, or both. Specifically, Question 13a asked participants how often they are aware of bullying, harassment, abuse, and neglect among their participants. After reviewing the data from this question, it came to our attention that the question could be interpreted by participants in one of two ways. First, it could be viewed as a prevalence question, asking them to provide an indication of the percentage of bullying, harassment, abuse, and neglect incidents that are perceived to occur in coaches' sport environments. Alternatively, the question might be interpreted as asking coaches to indicate how often coaches are actually aware of this behaviour happening in their sport environment. Given this ambiguity of interpretation, results for this question were not evaluated further.

Question 15 of the self-report survey asked participants if they would recommend the Respect in Sport program to another coach or activity leader. Out of the 1,035 participants who responded to this question, the majority either "Agreed" (n = 524; 50.6%) or "Strongly Agreed" (n = 395; 38.2%) that they would recommend the Respect in Sport program to another coach or activity leader. Only about 10% of the sample indicated that they would not likely recommend the RiS Program (Disagree, n = 81, 7.8%; Strongly Disagree, n = 35, 3.4%).

The last self-report survey question asked participants when they felt would be the most appropriate time to be recertified with Respect in Sport, including anywhere from three to five years after initially taking the program. Nearly half of the participants reported that five years would be the most appropriate time to be Respect in Sport recertified (n = 510; 49.3%). Approximately 13% of participants (n=136) recommended a 4-year time frame and, over one-third of the participants advocated for a 3-year time frame (n=389, 37.6%).

Variations in Perceived Impact of the Respect in Sport Program

Stage three of data analysis examined whether coaches' perceptions and experiences with the RiS program varied as a function of key demographic variables, including the sex and age of coaches and athletes, sport and level coached, and time at which coaches were RiS certified. Of primary interest was whether perceptions of the Respect in Sport program, in particular, how the program assisted coaches in recognizing and effectively dealing with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment (a single survey item), varied as a function of the type and level of sport coached, the sex and age of coaches and athletes, and the time at which participants took the Respect in Sport program. To this end, a series of four two-way and a single one-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted, for the demographic variables listed above, using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 17.0. A p value of .05 was chosen to determine statistical significance and effect sizes are represented using partial eta squared (η_p^2). Post-hoc comparisons were conducted using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD).

Prior to conducting these analyses, the data from the self-report survey were first examined for assumptions, including normality (through visual inspection of histograms) and homogeneity of variance (using Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances). In most cases, assumptions were met. Although the ANOVA procedures used are relatively robust to violations of assumptions, where these occur below, caution in interpretation is noted. Tests of skewness and kurtosis were also conducted and the data were found to be within normal limits. With respect to missing data, given the large sample size for the study, no effort to replace missing data with group or individual means was undertaken.

Research Question Six: Are there significant differences in coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect and harassment as a function of type and level of sport coached?

This analysis examined whether coaches from different sports and level of sports responded differently on their reports of the Respect in Sport program assisting them in recognizing and effectively dealing with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment (Question 13b). Given that 51 different sports were identified by participants, this analysis was conducted using only the three most commonly identified sports – gymnastics, hockey, and soccer. Similarly, the most commonly identified levels of sport were used - community, school-based, and competitive/elite. Specifically, a 3 (type of sport: gymnastics vs. hockey vs. soccer) \times 3 (level of sport: community vs. school-based vs. competitive/elite) ANOVA was conducted, examining the extent to which coaches felt that the RiS program assisted them in recognizing and effectively dealing with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment, with scores ranging from 0 (not at all) to 3 (to a great extent), and higher scores indicating more positive perceptions of the impact of the program. The results revealed non-significant main effects for type of sport, $F(2, 452) = 1.542, p > 0.05$ and level of sport $F(2, 452) = 1.542, p > 0.05$. The interaction between type of sport and level of sport was also non-significant $F(4, 452) = 1.542, p > 0.05$. Table 4.12 below summarizes the ANOVA results. Thus, the degree to which participants perceived the RiS program to help them recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment did not differ significantly across the type of sport (hockey, gymnastics, soccer) or level of sport (community, school, competitive/elite).

Table 4.12

Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Type and Level of Sport Coached

<i>Type of Sport Coached</i>	n	M (SD)
Gymnastics	133	2.75 (.753)
Hockey	174	2.91 (.752)
Soccer	154	3.03 (.704)
<i>Level of Sport Coached</i>		
Community Activity or Sport	282	2.93 (.770)
School-based Activity or Sport	19	2.95 (.705)
Competitive/Elite	160	2.86 (.700)

Research Question Seven: Are there significant differences in coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment as a function of coaches' sex and age?

To examine whether there were differences between age and sex of coaches with regard to their reports of the Respect in Sport program assisting them in recognizing and effectively dealing with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment (Question 13b), a 2 (sex of coach: male vs. female) \times 4 (age of coach: 21-30 years vs. 31-40 years vs. 41-59 years vs. 60+ years) ANOVA was conducted. Results, as presented in Table 4.13 below, indicated no significant main effect for sex of coach, $F(1, 1026) = 2.847, p > 0.05$, and a significant main effect for age of coach,

$F(3, 1026) = 2.847, p < 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$ and no interaction effects for sex of coach and age of coach, $F(3, 1025) = 2.847, p > 0.05$. To assess differences among the four levels of age examined, Tukey's post-hoc analysis was performed. The results indicated that the responses for coaches between the ages of 31-40 and 41-59 differed significantly from that of coaches from 21-30 years of age, indicating that coaches in the youngest age group reported significantly lower ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment than their counterparts in the age ranges of 31-59 years. This analysis is one where the Levene's test showed that the assumption of equality of error variances was violated. Although the violation of this assumption is not generally a concern when cell sizes are similar, the number of coaches in the 60+ group is much smaller ($n=42$) than the group of coaches in the other age groups (n varies from 131 in the 21-30 year group to 619 in the 41-59 group). This difference in cell size is more so for the interaction test where there were only six female coaches in the 60+ group and other cells vary from $n=36$ to $n=430$. This violation of assumption suggests that the result must be interpreted with caution.

Table 4.13

Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Age and Sex of Coaches

Age of Coach	n	M (SD)
21-30 years	131	2.61 ^a (.856)
31-40 years	242	2.96 ^b (.745)
41-59 years	619	2.89 ^b (.727)
60+ years	42	2.83 (.824)
Sex of Coach		
Male	645	2.86 (.768)
Female	389	2.87 (.743)

Note: Significant differences in means across age of coach, as reflected in significant post-hoc analyses are denoted by different superscripts.

Research Question Eight: Are there significant differences in coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect and harassment as a function of the sex and age of athletes coached?

To examine whether there were differences between coaches' reports of the Respect in Sport program assisting them in recognizing and effectively dealing with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment (Question 13b) as a function of age and sex of athletes coached, a 3 (sex of athletes coached: male vs. female vs. both male and female) \times 4 (age of athletes coached: 0-12 years vs. 13-19 years vs. 20+ years vs. all ages) ANOVA was conducted. Results, as presented in Table 4.15 below, indicated that coaches' reports did not differ significantly as a function of

either the sex of athletes coached, $F(2, 449) = .145$, $p > 0.05$ or the age of athletes coached, $F(3, 449) = .145$, $p > 0.05$. The interaction of sex and age of athletes was also nonsignificant, $F(6, 449) = .145$, $p > 0.05$.

Table 4.14

Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Age and Sex of Athletes Coached

Age of Athletes Coached	n	M (SD)
Children (0-12)	267	2.92 (.724)
Youth (13-19)	145	2.88 (.781)
Adults (20+)	16	2.88 (.885)
All Ages	33	2.91 (.678)
Sex of Athletes Coached		
Male	156	2.88 (.822)
Female	153	2.90 (.676)
Both Male and Female	152	2.93 (.725)

Research Question Nine: Are there significant differences in coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment as a function of the sex of coach and sex of athletes they coach?

To examine whether there were differences between coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment (Question 13b) as a function of the sex of coach and sex of athletes they coach, a 2 (sex of coach: male vs. female) ×

3 (sex of athlete: male vs. female vs. both male and female) ANOVA was performed. Results, as presented in Table 4.15 below, indicated no significant main effects for sex of coaches, $F(1, 455) = .726, p > 0.05$ or sex of athletes, $F(2, 455) = .726, p > 0.05$, and there were no interaction effects for sex of coaches and athletes, $F(2, 455) = .726, p > 0.05$. This analysis is also one where the Levene's test (of equality of error variances) showed that the assumption was violated. Again, although the violation of this assumption is not generally a concern when cell sizes are similar, the number group of female coaches who coach male athletes ($n=12$) is substantially smaller than the other cells in the analysis (other cells vary from $n=62$ to $n=144$). Although the results of this analysis are null, this violation of assumption suggests that the result must be interpreted with caution.

Table 4.15

Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Sex of Coaches and Athletes

Sex of Coaches	n	M (SD)
Male	645	2.86 (.768)
Female	389	2.87 (.743)
Sex of Athletes		
Male	156	2.88 (.822)
Female	153	2.90 (.676)
Both Male and Female	152	2.93 (.725)

Research Question Ten: Are there significant differences in ratings of ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment as a function of the time at which coaches were Respect in Sport certified?

To examine whether there were differences in ratings of ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment (Question 13b) as a function of the time at which coaches were Respect in Sport certified (30-36 months ago, 18-24 months ago, and 0-6 months ago), a one-way ANOVA was performed. Results indicated that responses differed significantly across the time at which coaches were Respect in Sport certified, $F(2, 433) = 10.528, p < 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.05$. Tukey's post-hoc analysis revealed that the mean response for coaches who took the program 0-6 months ago were significantly higher than the coaches who were certified 18-24 and 30-36 months ago with respect to their reports of the RiS program assisting them in recognizing and effectively dealing with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment.

Table 4.16

Perceptions of Impact as a Function of Time of Respect in Sport Certification

Time of RiS Certification	n	M (SD)
30-36 Months Ago	100	2.81 ^a (.748)
18-24 Months Ago	196	2.75 ^a (.767)
0-6 Months Ago	140	3.13 ^b (.785)

Note: Significant differences across time of RiS certification, as reflected in significant post-hoc analyses are denoted by different superscripts.

In summary, the third stage of data analysis examined whether coaches' reports of their ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment varied as a function of key demographic characteristics. Variables investigated included the sport and level coached, the age and sex of participants coached, the age and sex of coaches, and the time at which coaches were Respect in Sport certified. Results revealed no significant main effects or interactions for type and level of sport coached, sex and age of athletes coached, and sex of coaches and athletes. Significant main effects were found for sex and age of coach, with a higher mean response for coaches between the ages of 31-40 and 41-59 than coaches between the ages of 21-30 in their reported ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment. However, the small effect size associated with this significant difference in ratings suggests a non-meaningful finding. No significant interaction effects were found. Significant effects were found for time at which coaches were RiS certified, with higher mean response for coaches who were certified 0-6 months ago (i.e., from the time they participated in this study) than coaches who were certified 18-24 and 30-36 months ago. However, the effect size for this finding was also small. Overall, the responses from the self-report survey were all positive in nature.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

The Respect in Sport program was developed to educate coaches on how to promote safe and healthy sport environments for their athletes, with an emphasis on recognizing and effectively dealing with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment. The present study explored coaches' perceptions of the RiS program and to what extent they perceived the program to have impacted their practice with respect to attainment of key objectives of the program. The findings from this study are all generally positive, though continued and more in-depth evaluation of the Respect in Sport program is recommended, given that this evaluation is limited to perceptions of program impact as reported by past coach participants. A summary of the findings is presented below, followed by limitations of this research study, discussion of the collaboration with Respect in Sport and other partners in the evaluation process, and implications for further research, policy, and practice.

Evaluation Findings

The results of this study included examination of various demographic characteristics of the participant sample, examination of responses to the self-report survey items in the context of the first five research questions, and investigation of group differences based on specific demographic characteristics on coaches' reports of the Respect in Sport program assisting them in effectively identifying and responding to bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment (the remaining research questions). A discussion of the results is presented below.

Characteristics of the Participant Sample. An initial aim in this evaluation study was to obtain a greater understanding of the participant sample by examining the demographic characteristics of participants who responded to the self-report survey. This provided an

indication of the types of coaches who participated in the Respect in Sport program and the types of coaches and athletes in three provinces of Canada- Alberta, Manitoba, and Ontario. Overall, the sample of participants was relatively evenly distributed across all the levels of demographic characteristics.

The majority of the sample (60%) was male. This is not surprising as the top two sports reported in the self-report survey were hockey and soccer, sports that are more traditionally staffed by male coaches. Nearly 40% of the participants were female. Again, this is a reflection of the large sample number of coaches in gymnastics, a sport that has a high female representation.

Although there was a range of coaches from 21- 60+ years of age, the majority of survey participants were between the ages of 41 and 59, representing over half of the sample. Thus, the majority of the participants likely have considerable life experience working with people (given their age) and perhaps relatively sound coaching experience. Therefore, it could be possible that their positive rating of perceived impact of the Respect in Sport program is even more notable. It is worth noting that nearly 15% of the sample population included coaches between the ages of 21-30 years; suggesting that the program is also reaching this new generation of coaches.

The most commonly reported sports coached by survey participants were hockey, soccer, and gymnastics. It is not surprising that hockey and gymnastics were highly reported, given that the Respect in Sport program is mandatory for Hockey Canada and Gymnastics Canada coaches. As well, gymnastics solely represented Alberta and Ontario for this study. Soccer is a widely recognized sport and could be considered a “mainstream” sport. Interestingly, a total of 51 sports were reported in this study. Although the percentages of coaches were small for most of these

sports, it provides insight into the wide range of sport environments that may be vulnerable to athletes' prosocial development as well as maladaptive development.

With respect to the level of sport coached, over half of the sample were participants who coach at the community level, followed by the competitive/elite level and the school-based level. It is not surprising that professional and "other" levels of sport were under-represented in the research sample. Professional coaches may not be RiS certified as they may have their National Coaching Certification Program (NCCP) training, other "in-house" training required by their professional organizations, and/or copious amount of experience that is often required of professional coaches. As well, Respect in Sport is not a mandatory program for the professional teams in Canada.

Most coaches indicated that they coached both male and female athletes, and over 80% of the participants indicated that they coach children and youth (between the ages of 0-19 years). This suggests that prevention efforts in the area of social and emotional development in youth sports have the potential to be impacting a large number of children and youth in Canada.

Lastly, an important consideration in this study was to examine when participants were Respect in Sport certified. The responses were relatively distributed evenly anywhere from 0-36 months prior to the time coaches participated in the study. Examining when coaches participated in the program has implications for the program developers to determine the most appropriate time for recertification, which will be discussed in further paragraphs.

Regarding the perceived impact of the RiS program, the survey participants perceived the Respect in Sport program to have impacted their practice in key areas of the program. Specifically, the majority of the survey participants either agreed and strongly agreed that the RiS program enhanced their knowledge and awareness of bullying, abuse, harassment, and

neglect. As documented in the literature review of this paper, bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment all share common underlying elements such as the mis-use of power, yet each also has unique characteristics in its manifestations and presentations. The present results suggest that the Respect in Sport program targets information common and specific to each of these issues in sport environments for coaches.

The second research question targeted the extent to which participants perceived themselves to have the ability to recognize and effectively dealing with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment. Of key interest was whether participants were able to distinguish between their responsibility to recognize and effectively deal with bullying versus *reporting* abuse, harassment, and neglect. Often bullying can be dealt within the sport organization (given coaches feel prepared and are equipped to do so), though abuse, harassment, and neglect may require reporting as it has legal implications and often involves the larger infrastructure of the sport organization and external agencies. In general, the majority of participants perceived themselves to have the ability to recognize and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect. In fact, over 80% of the survey participants indicated that they perceived themselves to be competent or very competent in recognizing and dealing with bullying. Similarly, nearly 75% of the survey participants indicated that they think they are competent or very competent in *reporting* abuse, harassment, and neglect. These results are particularly noteworthy as issues such as abuse, harassment, and neglect are often overlooked due to the clandestine nature of the behaviour, the sensitive nature of the topic, and the general lack of disclosure (Brackenridge, 1994). The fact that the majority of survey participants indicated that they think they are competent in reporting such behaviour demonstrates a good potential preventive impact in creating greater awareness in the sport community on abuse, neglect, and harassment.

Third, the majority of participants indicated that the program made them “somewhat” more aware of their role in teaching respect in the sport environment, and notably, another 17% of participants indicated that the program assisted them to a great extent. These results are particularly favorable as the “win at all costs” attitude has historically prevailed in the sport community, particularly in hockey environments (Halliwell, Zaichkowsky, & Botterill, 2006). As indicated in earlier chapters, some coaches will go to great lengths to ensure victory in their sport, and this attitude and behaviour could lead to abuse or negligence (e.g., Duda, 1989, Sturm & Diorio, 1998). The fact that the majority of participants indicated that the Respect in Sport program made them more aware of their role in teaching respect in the sport environment is a good indication that the program is addressing the deleterious issue of “winning at all costs” that has become widely characteristic of the North American sport community (Halliwell et al., 2006).

Research question four targeted whether coaches are, as a result of taking the Respect in Sport program, likely to respond to bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect with positive strategies that teach athletes about respecting others. Over 84% of the participants indicated that they agreed and strongly agreed. However, when asked whether they perceived the Respect in Sport program to have increased their awareness of being a model of emotional control and regulation, such as increasing their use of positive power, only 56% of participants indicated that the program helped them increase their use of positive power and nearly 21% indicated that the program helped them very little with respect to increasing their use of positive power. It may be that the notion of positive power may be an elusive and more difficult concept to some coaches, especially if they are not provided with sufficient examples or context to understand what positive power “looks like.” Although the survey item provided examples of positive power

(e.g., accentuating fun aspects of sports, finding positive stress zones), coaches may not have had enough direct instruction (e.g., through the RiS program or through their coaching experience) to effectively deliver coaching using positive power. Still, overall the majority of coaches indeed responded that they have increased their use of positive power when working with athletes.

The final aim of the present study was to investigate whether perceptions and experiences with the RiS program varied as a function of key demographic variables, including the sex and age of coaches and athletes, sport and level coached, and time at which coaches were RiS certified, particularly on whether the RiS program assisted them in identifying and responding to bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect.

Results of this study indicated that perceptions of the impact of the RiS program did not vary significantly as a function of the sport and level coached, the sex or age of athletes coached, nor the sex of coaches and athletes. Given that hockey, soccer, and gymnastics are very different sports, bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect may manifest and present themselves in different ways across their contexts. For example, one may witness more overt signs of bullying in hockey, based on the nature of the sport. Hockey has largely prevailed as a sport where being “tough, persistent, extremely competitive, and able to defend oneself” was considered vital to success of a team (Halliwell et al., 2006, p. 404). Soccer is a team sport where the actions and decisions of other team members and coaches is “fundamental to understanding what is occurring within the group” (Dasil, 2006, p. 139). Gymnastics is largely considered an individual sport and does not always require their athletes to work in unison with a team (Cogan, 2006). Despite these differences in sport contexts, coaches perceived the RiS program has having a similar effect, suggesting that its impact may well generalize to a wide range of sports.

Similarly, the perceived impact of the RiS program did not differ significantly across the level of sports coached (i.e., community activity or sport, school-based activity or sport, and competitive/elite), nor across the sex and age of athletes coached (i.e., male, female, and both male and female; children, youth, adults, and all ages), nor the sex of coaches and athletes. Thus, the RiS program appears to deliver content in such a way that it is applicable to a wide range of sport contents, and coaches, both male and female, in different age groups.

However, when examining responses as a function of sex and age of coaches, significant differences were evident across coaches of different age categories. Coaches between the ages of 21-30 years reported a less favorable impression of the impact of RiS than coaches between the ages of 31-59 years. However, the effect size was small, suggesting that the difference may not be meaningful. Nonetheless, coaches who are in older age groups perceived the program to have impacted them more in effectively identifying and responding to bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect, owing perhaps to their life experience (given their age) and possibly more coaching experience. Why the younger age group reported less favorably is unclear at this time, although it is worth noting that the average response for the younger age group is still very positive.

Significant differences were also observed across groups of coaches who were Respect in Sport certified at different times. Evaluations by coaches who took the program 0-6 months ago were significantly more positive than evaluations of the coaches who took the program 18-24 months ago and 30-36 months ago, in terms of the program assisting them in effectively identifying and responding to bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect. Again, the effect size was small, making it challenging to infer any practical implications from this difference. Still, the majority of responses were generally positive across the groups. Interestingly, the majority of participants indicated that five years would be a good recertification period, even though the

participants who took the program nearly three years ago did not respond as favorably as the participants who took the program in the last six months. These findings may be important for the program developers in deciding the most appropriate time to recertify coaches (i.e., every three, four, or five years).

In summary, the results of this Respect in Sport program evaluation study indicated that an overwhelming percentage of survey participants perceived the program to have positively impacted their knowledge and behaviour in various key objectives of the program. These results are particularly noteworthy given the wide range of characteristics of the research sample. Across questions, the majority of coaches from various backgrounds (e.g., different sports and level of sports, varying ages and sex of athletes coaches work with) reported favorable responses, indicating that a large representation of coaches with different levels of experience perceived the program to be beneficial. Although there were significant differences for age of coaches and time at which coaches were RiS certified, these differences are not meaningful enough to derive any practical implications or recommendations. Nonetheless, coaches' perceptions suggest that the program delivers its content in such a way that targets a wide range of coaches who are working in environments where bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect may potentially manifest and present itself in different ways. In addition, the content of the Respect in Sport program is parallel with the general issues documented in the research literature regarding bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect (with the exception of performance-enhancing drug use and disordered eating practices, to be discussed in further sections).

As indicated in earlier chapters, this evaluation study was intended to be an initial study in an ongoing evaluation process for Respect in Sport. Using Biglan and colleagues' (2005) model of hierarchical evidence for program evaluations, this study represents a "Grade 7"

evaluation, capturing the important perceptions of the program through the coaches' perspectives. Future studies should focus on more scientifically rigorous research designs. Implications for future research are presented in later sections of this paper.

Noted Observations of the Respect in Sport Program

The purpose of the literature review in this paper was to examine if there was congruency between the Respect in Sport program content and the current research documented in the areas of bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect. Overall, the review of the literature was supportive of the content presented in the Respect in Sport program. However, two areas that were not captured sufficiently are the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sports, particular drug use that may be attributed to undue pressure from coaches, and disordered eating practices.

As indicated in the literature, the use of performance-enhancing drugs is rampant in the sport community, particularly among male athletes. Of particular concern, Melia and colleagues (1996) found that a significant percentage of school-aged children and adolescents, as young as seventh graders, are using anabolic-steroids, via sharing needles, for performance enhancement in sports. Similarly, the pressure from coaches for athletes to use performance-enhancing drugs has been documented through numerous case studies and anecdotal evidence, although few research studies have been reported. Like abuse and harassment, using performance-enhancing drugs is surreptitious behaviour, which contributes to the lack of awareness and reporting of such behaviour. Therefore, the possibility of adding information to the Respect in Sport program regarding the negative instigations and repercussions of performance-enhancing drug use could prove to be helpful in addressing and preventing this indirect, negative behaviour. Similarly, adding program content with respect to disordered eating practices could target athletes, particularly females that may alter their eating habits for sport performance reasons.

Limitations of the Research Study

Generally speaking, there are often limitations associated with research studies. Although this evaluation study revealed valuable results, there were limitations associated with the development and use of the self-report survey, participant response rates, and the research design.

The self-report survey was developed as collaboration between the program developers and researchers, both from UBC and PREVNet. The process involved developing survey items with appropriate response options and systematically amending and eliminating questions that did not seem to be appropriate or relevant. Unfortunately, the scale developed for the study did not undergo any piloting as a means of validity screening a priori, with respect to its content and what it was purported to do. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the results from one of the survey items (Question 13a) were non-interpretable based on the lack of interpretability of the question's meaning. Now that an initial study has been conducted using this particular survey, subsequent studies can examine each survey question (a priori) in depth to determine if it is a valid item to include in future evaluations.

Second, utilizing self-report surveys contains a certain degree of subjectivity and potential bias in responses. This includes the challenge of constructing survey items that would distinguish between the amount of coaches' prior knowledge before being RiS certified and the amount of knowledge acquired that is attributable to the program content. Although self-report measures are often used in intervention studies, they may not provide sufficiently valid and accurate reflections of the constructs the study is intending to measure (Swearer et al., in press). This could be addressed using a multi-method approach, noted below.

Third, this study was based on responses from only six percent of the coaches who were asked to participate, leading to questions of generalizability. Although the researchers included a cover letter, indicating an affiliation with UBC and researchers, and provided a follow-up reminder to complete the survey, this response rate is very low and the findings may not be representative of the large population of coaches. However, a low response rate with email surveys is not uncommon, and in fact, research has indicated a general decline in response rates from surveys distributed electronically, particularly in the United States (e.g., Bickart & Schmittlein, 1999; Sheehan, 2001). Nevertheless, electronic surveys are still commonly used by researchers because of efficiency of data collection and cost effectiveness (e.g., Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004; Sheehan, 2001). Future studies may want to include compensation for participants (to increase response rates), a longer window to respond to the survey with multiple reminders, and data collection through a multi-method approach (e.g., online surveys in combination with paper surveys).

A fourth limitation in this study was the use of a single informant perspective (coaches alone) in the research design. Some researchers contend that gathering information from multi-informants (such as including the perspective of the athletes themselves) provides a better estimate of what researchers are attempting to measure than results from single-informants (Ladd and Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2002). It would be beneficial in future evaluations to examine perceptions from individuals other than coaches, including, for example, from athletes or from parents of athletes coached by RiS certified coaches. In addition, investigating perceptions of relevance and impact from diverse ethnic and cultural groups may enhance our understanding of the perceived effectiveness of the program.

Perhaps the most significant limitation was the lack of a control group and a pre-post research design. Unfortunately, according to Respect Group Inc., it was not feasible at the time of this study to recruit a participant sample that was ready to take the Respect in Sport program, limiting our ability to conduct a pre-post evaluation study. In addition, a major goal of the stakeholders was to gather evaluation data in a short time-frame so results could be shared with key partners. Thus, the decision was made to implement a post-test self-report survey only, with intentions to implement a pre-post survey in the future.

Despite these limitations, it was common understanding that the current study was an initial evaluation project for Respect in Sport, and may have contained limitations as many research studies do. It is recommended that future evaluation studies for Respect in Sport take into account the issues raised above.

Discussion of the Evaluation Process

This evaluation study provided several benefits for the primary researcher including working with a strong research committee from the University of British Columbia, working with Respect Group Inc., and working with PREVNet, a national network of researchers and non-governmental organizations committed to eliminate bullying in Canada. Often working with a large number of individuals or organizations can present natural challenges, including working with different time constraints and expectations, different goals, and different levels of knowledge and expertise. Nevertheless, there were important factors that contributed to the relatively smooth and productive evaluation process with such a large research team. These factors included effective communication and follow-through, and sharing a common purpose and set of goals.

Effective communication was established from the outset of this project. During the development of the survey, all the research team members participated in a series of conference calls over a period of nine months. After each call, the primary researcher and PREVNet completed meeting minutes that were distributed to all the members of the research team to enhance effective communication. As well, pertinent email correspondence was sent to key members of the research team to facilitate open communication and to provide updates on the progress of the evaluation project. Throughout, any amendments or assignments discussed at the conference calls were completed in 24-72 hours and sent to the entire research team.

Second, effective follow-through and discussion of short-term goals was established. For example, scheduling of subsequent meetings was always conducted at the end of each conference call, as it was the optimal time for each member to view their calendars and immediately establish a meeting time. If meetings were to be conducted with some members of the team as opposed to the entire team, meeting minutes were distributed to the entire research team.

Lastly, the entire research team shared a common set of goals and objectives making communication clear and effective. Although different members of the team had slightly different viewpoints on the best way to proceed with the evaluation, everyone's various levels of knowledge and expertise contributed a unique perspective to the project. Overall, the above noted factors facilitated a relatively smooth evaluation process and presented very few major roadblocks for the completion of this project.

Implications for Future Research, Policy, and Practice

As discussed in previous chapters, evaluation of a program is an ongoing systematic process that is complex and multi-faceted. A single evaluation study is not sufficient to determine whether or not a program is worthy of being considered “good” or “effective.” Rather, programs need to be tested through systematic research over an extended period of time (Weissberg et al., 2003). In an effort to bridge research and practice, results from systematic program evaluations can help guide future research, allocation of prevention programs, and help inform policy and practice in various domains of programming for children and youth in Canada, topics to be discussed here.

Implications for Future Research. Given that the current study was Respect in Sport’s first evaluation study, future studies to investigate the program’s effectiveness is highly warranted. To date, RiS is mandatory for coaches in several provinces and organizations in Canada. With the social responsibility to implement prevention programs that are empirically validated, *it is of greater importance to ensure that RiS continues to undergo systematic research evaluations given that it is currently targeting large populations in Canada.* In keeping with Biglan and colleagues’ (2003) model of hierarchical evidence for program evaluations, subsequent studies should focus on the “effects” of the Respect in Sport program on the behaviour of coaches using experimental and control conditions in order to derive causal interpretations. Additionally, studies including multi-informants may provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the program’s effects, including the impact on athletes’ whose coaches have participated in the RiS program. Given that Respect in Sport is a relatively new program that has not been subjected to rigorous scientific research, it is important to use a

research design that is most appropriate and feasible for a new program, with the aims of eventually conducting a study with strong scientific rigor.

Implications for Policy Development. Respect in Sport is currently mandatory for several organizations and provinces. Once the program has been further exposed to rigorous program evaluations, the opportunity to implement and mandate the program in other environments may prove to be beneficial, such as universities, schools, and for parents of athletes. For universities, collegiate athletics could benefit from prevention efforts, for example, targeting coaches of university teams that are members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA).

Implementing Respect in Sport in school environments and for parents of athletes would target a large population of children and youth and help facilitate a social-ecological framework with respect to prevention efforts. Instituting a social-ecological approach to prevention and intervention efforts may provide further insight into the impact of various social contexts, including the impact of schools, families, peer relationships, neighborhoods and communities, parent-school relationships, and teacher-student relationships on social and emotional development (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1979, Swearer et al., in press).

Lastly, two tenable considerations include the exploration of a formal examination for the Respect in Sport program and follow-up RiS activities within sport environments. First, given that the program is mandatory for some organizations, instituting a formal examination for organizations that have mandated the program may facilitate greater accountability on the coaches' behalf in creating safe and healthy environments. Second, follow-up activities (e.g., a Respect in Sport lesson plan that coaches can use as a guideline throughout the year with their

teams) may prove to be beneficial in maintaining any positive effects (e.g., perceived impact or actual impact) that the program may have on coaches and their sport teams.

Implications for the Practice of School Psychology. The historical role of school psychologists has largely focused on assessment and identification of students with special needs. However, particularly in British Columbia, the role of school psychologists has broadened, focusing on a three-tiered service delivery model, including prevention, intervention, and assessment. As well, in BC, there is an emphasis on social responsibility in our school system. Thus, school psychologists play a key role in prevention efforts in schools. Given the increased recognition and responsibility for evidence-based practice, psychologists are at the forefront in assisting the implementation of prevention programs and individualized interventions that are engrained in strong theoretical and practical evidence and supported by strong scientific research. Further, psychologists are in the position to help train teachers, parents, administrators, and other educators on how to effectively implement programs. Given that Respect Group Inc. is currently developing a program for the school environment, in the future, school psychologists could play an instrumental role both in program implementation and in evaluating the impact of the program designed for schools.

Conclusion

Interpersonal problems such as bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment are complex social problems that affect children, youth, and adults in several environments such as schools and sports, and present several negative implications as highlighted in this paper. Children and youth spend a considerable amount in time in sport environments, whether it is at recess, lunch, school sport teams or after-school activities. Although sports participation provides several positive short- and long-term benefits such as physical, physiological and psychological benefits

(e.g., Bartco & Eccles, 2003; Bowker, 2006; Colcombe & Kramer, 2003; Eccles & Templeton, 2002; Le Menestrel & Perkins, 2007; Warburton et al., 2006), these environments are also susceptible to interpersonal problems, including abuse, harassment, and neglect (e.g., Frothingham et al., 2000; Haney et al., 1998; Jowett et al., 2005; Sturmi & Diorio, 1998). As summarized in previous chapters, sports participation is also associated with victimization, substance use, and injury as examples (e.g., Baumert et al., 1998; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Weiss, 1999).

The need for preventing child and youth problem behaviours has stimulated prevention efforts, and the need for supporting such prevention efforts through empirically supported research has been emphasized in order to narrow the gap between research and practice. The need for prevention programs in the area of social and emotional development has been well-documented, given the serious and negative sequelae associated with problems such as bullying, abuse, harassment, and neglect (e.g., Boivin et al., 1995; Card et al., 2007). As noted in earlier chapters, implementation of SEL prevention programs can assist in targeting large and at-risk populations from developing maladaptive behavioural problems such as internalizing and externalizing problems, and also promote the development of prosocial and academic skills (e.g., Durlak et al., in press; Greenberg et al., 2003; Jaffe et al., 2004; Weissberg et al., 2003).

There is also evidence to support the notion that adults (e.g., teachers, coaches) have an instrumental role in preventing and intervening in issues such as interpersonal problems (e.g., Abecassis et al., 2002; Beran & Tutty, 2002; Smoll & Smith, 2005), thus capitalizing on the professional and ethical role adults have in creating safe and healthy environments for children. With the implementation of prevention programs, there is also a heightened recognition of the importance of prevention programs to be supported by evidence-based research, to ensure that

the programs being implemented have strong theoretical and practical evidence to support their purpose, implementation, and outcomes (e.g., Biglan et al., 2003; Slavin, 2008). Indeed, the gap between research and practice appears to be narrowing as programs are undergoing systematic evaluation efforts and such findings are being used in practice (Biglan et al., 2003).

The purpose of this current study was to evaluate the Respect in Sport program using Biglan and colleagues “Grade 7” criteria for quality of evidence. This study investigated coaches’ perceptions of their attainment of key objectives of the Respect in Sport program, and was intended to be an initial evaluation study as part of a larger ongoing evaluation project for Respect in Sport. As demonstrated in the results of this study, an overwhelming percentage of coaches perceived the Respect in Sport program to have assisted them in their coaching role through various objectives of the program, suggesting that coaches feel the Respect in Sport program delivers content that may generalize and benefit participants who coach a variety of sports at different levels and with different age and sex groups. Similarly, with a growing body of evidence that adults play a primary role in preventing and intervening with bullying and related problems, the results of this study also indicated that coaches perceive themselves to have the knowledge to be aware of and effectively deal with bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment, which is the first step in adults intervening this negative behaviour. The results of this study have stimulated the need for an ongoing cycle of evaluation research for the Respect in Sport program, as the program holds promise in targeting detrimental issues known as bullying, abuse, neglect, and harassment in sports.

References

- Abecassis, M., Hartup, W. W., Haselager, G. J. T., Scholte, R., & van Lieshout, C. F. M. (2002). Mutual antipathies and their significance in middle childhood and adolescence. *Child Development, 73*, 1543-1556.
- Alsaker, F. (2004). Bermese programme against victimisation in kindergarten and elementary schools. In P. K. Smith, D. Pepler, & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 289-306). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- American Psychological Association (2009). *Policy Statement on Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology*. Retrieved July 24, 2009, from <http://www.apa.org/practice/ebp.html>
- Anshel, M. H. (2006). Drug abuse in sport: Causes and cures. In J. M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (pp. 505-540). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Bacon, V. L., Lerner, B. S., Trembley, D., & Seestedt, M. (2005). Substance abuse. In J. Taylor, & G. Wilson (Eds.), *Applying sport psychology: Four perspectives* (pp. 229-248). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education, 31*, 101-119.
- Bartko, W. T., & Eccles, J. S. (2003). Adolescent participation in structured and unstructured activities: A person-oriented analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 32*, 233-241.
- Bauman, S. & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 219-231.
- Baumert, P. W., Henderson, J. M., & Thompson, N. J. (1998). Health risk behaviours of adolescent participants in organized sports. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 22*, 460-465.
- B.C. Ministry of Education (2009). *British Columbia Educational Performance Students*. Retrieved July 24, 2009, from http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/perf_stands/
- Begany, J. J., & Milburn, M. A. (2002). Psychological predictors of sexual harassment, authoritarianism, hostile sexism, and rape myths. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3*, 119-126.
- Beran, T. N. & Tutty, L. (2002). Children's reports of bullying and safety at school. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 17*, 1-14.
- Bergeron, M. F. (2007). Improving health through youth sports: Is participation enough? *New Directions for Youth Development, 115*, 27-41.

- Besag, V. E. (1989). *Bullies and victims in schools. A guide to understanding management*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Bickart, B., & Schmittlein, D. (1999). The distribution of survey contact and participation in the United States: constructing a survey-based estimate. *Journal of Marketing Research*, Spring, 286-294.
- Biglan, A., Mrazek, P. J., Carnine, D., & Flay, B. R. (2003). The integration of research and practice in the prevention of youth problem behaviours. *American Psychologist*, 58, 433-440.
- Blagley, C., Bolitho, F., & Bertrand, L. (1997). Sexual assault in school, mental health and suicidal behaviors in adolescent women in Canada. *Adolescence*, 32, 361-366.
- Boivin, M., Hymel, S., & Bukowski, W. M. (1995). The roles of social withdrawal, peer rejection, and victimization in peers in predicting loneliness and depressed mood in childhood. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 765-786.
- Bowker, A. (2006). The relationship between sports participation and self-esteem during early adolescence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 38, 214-229.
- Brackenridge, C. H. (1994). Fair play or fair game? Child sexual abuse in sport organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 29, 287-299.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.
- Brown-Chidsey, R., & Steege, M. W. (2005). *Response to intervention: Principle and strategies for effective change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Byrne, B. (1994). Bullies and victims in a school setting with specific reference to some Dublin schools. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 15, 73-87.
- Canadian Red Cross (2009). *RespectED: Violence and abuse prevention*. Retrieved September 2, 2009 from www.redcross.ca
- Card, N. A., Isaacs, J., & Hodges, E. V. (2007). Correlates of school victimization: Implications for prevention and intervention. In J. E. Zins, M. J. Elias, & Maher, C. A. (Eds.), *Bullying, victimization, and peer harassment. A handbook of prevention and intervention* (pp. 339-366). New York: Haworth Press.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2009). *Child maltreatment: Definitions*. Retrieved September 4, 2009 from www.cdc.gov
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (1996). *Physical activity and health. A report of the surgeon general*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

- Chiakin, T., & Telander, R. (1988). The nightmare of steroids. *Sports Illustrated*, 84-102
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice. Fourth edition*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cogan, K. D. (2006). Sport psychology in gymnastics. In J. Dosil (Ed.), *The sport psychologist's handbook. A guide for sport-specific performance enhancement* (pp. 641-664). West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Colcombe, S., & Kramer, A. F. (2003). Fitness effects of the cognitive function of older adults: A meta-analytic study. *Psychological Science*, 14, 125-130.
- Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1997). Observations of bullying and victimization in the schoolyard. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 13, 41-59.
- Craig, W. M., Pepler, D. J., & Atlas, R. S. (2000). Observations of bullying in the playground and in the classroom. *School Psychology International*, 21, 22-36.
- Dosil, J. (2006). Psychological interventions with football (soccer) teams. In J. Dosil (Ed.), *The sport psychologist's handbook. A guide for sport-specific performance enhancement* (pp. 139-158). West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dubin, C. L. (1990). *Ethics and morality in sport*. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Center.
- Duda, J. L. (1989). Goal perspectives, participation and persistence in sport. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 19, 117-130.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, R. B. (in press). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*.
- Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14, 10-43.
- Eccles, J., & Templeton, J. (2002). Extracurricular and other after-school activities for youth. *Review of Education*, 26, 113-180.
- Eys, M. A., Burke, S. M., Carron, A. V., & Dennis, P. W. (2006). The sport team as an effective group. In J. M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (pp. 157-173). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Fiering, C., Taska, L., & Lewis, M. (2002). Adjustment following sexual abuse discovery: The role of shame and attributional style. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 79-92.

- Findlay, L., & Bowker, A. (2009). The link between competitive sport participation and self-esteem in early adolescence: A consideration of gender and competitive orientation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 29-40.
- Finkel, M. A. (2002). Traumatic injuries caused by hazing practices. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 20, 228-233.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1996). Sexual harassment: the definition and measurement of a construct. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power* (pp. 25-47). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Flay, B. R., Biglan, A., Boruch, R. F., Castro, F. G., Gottfredson, D., Kellam, S., et al. (2005). Standards of evidence: Criteria for efficacy, effectiveness and dissemination. *Prevention Science*, 6, 151-174.
- Fonagy, P., Twemlow, S. W., Vernberg, E., Sacco, F. C., & Little, T. O. (2005). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: The impact of an antibullying program on educational attainment in elementary schools. *Medical Science Monitor*, 11, 317-325.
- Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., Briere, N. M., & Provencher, R. J. (1995). Competitive and recreational sport structures and gender: A test of their relationship with sport motivation. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 26, 24-39.
- Fouss, D. E., & Troppmann, R. J. (1981). *Effective coaching: A psychological approach*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Fox Sports (2009). *High school coach charged in player's death*. Retrieved January 22, 2009 from <http://msn.foxsports.com/cfb/story/9120016?MSNHPHCP>I=39002>
- Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Edstrom, L. V., & Snell, J. L. (2009). Observed reductions in school bullying, nonbullying aggression and destructive bystander behavior: A longitudinal evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, 466-481.
- Friedrich, W. N. (1990). *Psychotherapy of sexually abused children and their families*. New York: Norton.
- Frothingham, T. E., Hobbs, C. J., Wynne, T. M., Yee, L., Goyal, A., & Wadsworth, D. J. (2000). Follow up study eight years after diagnosis of sexual abuse. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 83, 132-134.
- Gadbois, S., & Bowker, A. (2007). Self-esteem and participation in extracurricular activities. *Sex Roles*, 56, 675-689.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York: Basic Books.

- Gardner, D. E., Shields, D. L., Bredemeier, B. J., & Bostrom, A. (1996). The relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and team cohesion among baseball and softball players. *The Sport Psychologist, 10*, 367–381.
- Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (1999). An evaluation study for coach education programs. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 22*, 234-251.
- Goss, J., Cooper, S., Stevens, D., Croxon, S., & Dryden, N. (2005). Eating disorders. In J. Taylor & G. Wilson (Eds.), *Applying sport psychology* (pp. 207-227). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C., & Bumbarger, B. (2001). The prevention of mental disorders in school-aged children: Current state of the field. *Prevention & Treatment, 4*, 1-62.
- Greenberg, M.T., Weissberg, R.P., O'Brien, M.U., Zins, J.E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H. et al. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*, 466-474.
- Greenleaf, C., Gould, D., & Dieffenbach, K. (2001). Factors influencing olympic performance: Interviews with Atlanta and Nagano U.S. olympians. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 13*, 154–184.
- Halliwell, W., Zaichkowsky, L., & Botterill, C. (2006). Sport psychological consulting in ice hockey. In J. Dosil (Ed.). *The sport psychologist's handbook. A guide for sport-specific performance enhancement* (pp. 403-426). West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Haney, C. J., Long, B. C., & Howell-Jones, G. (1998). Coaching as a profession: Ethical concerns. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 10*, 240-250.
- Hansen, D. M., Larson, R. W., & Dworkin, J. B. (2003). What adolescents learn in organized youth activities: A survey of self-reported developmental experiences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 32*, 233-241.
- Hymel, S., Rocke-Henderson, N., & Bonanno, R. A. (2005). Moral disengagement: A framework for understanding bullying among adolescents. *Journal of Social Sciences, 8*, 1-11.
- Hymel, S., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., & Miller, L. D. (2006). Reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic and relationships: Considering the social side of education. *Exceptionality Education Canada, 16*, 149-192.
- Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. (2009). Bullying: An old-aged problem that needs new solutions. Retrieved October 28, 2009 from <http://www.education.com/reference/article/bullying-about-power-and-abuse-of-power/>
- Janssen, J., & Dale, G. (2002). *The seven secrets of successful coaches*. Tuscon, AZ: The Mental Game.

- Jaffe, P. G., Wolfe, D., Crooks, C., Hughes, R., & Baker, L. L. (2004). The fourth R: Developing healthy relationships through school-based interventions. In P. G. Jaffe, L. L. Baker, & A. J. Cunningham, (Eds.). *Children from domestic violence* (pp. 200-218). New York: Guildford Press.
- Johnson, L., Lutzow, J., Strothoff, M., & Zannis, C. (1995). Reducing negative behavior by establishing helping relationships and a community identity program. Rockford III.
- Jowett, S. (2003). When the honeymoon is over: A case study of a coach-athlete dyad in crisis. *The Sport Psychologist, 17*, 444-460.
- Jowett, S., Paull, G., Pensgaard, A. M., Hoegmo, P. M., & Riise, H. (2005). Coach-athlete relationship. In J. Taylor & G. Wilson (Eds.). *Sport psychology: Four perspectives* (pp. 153-170). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpela, M., Marttunen, M., Rimpela, A., & Rantanen, P. (1999). Bullying, depression and suicidal ideation in Finnish adolescents: School survey. *British Medical Journal, 319*, 348-351.
- Kaplowitz, M. D., Hadlock, T. D., & Levine, R. (2004). A comparison of web and mail survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 68*, 94-101.
- Keating, C. F., Pomerantz, J., Pommer, S. O., Ritt, S. J., Miller, L. M., & McCormick, J. (2005). Going to college and unpacking hazing: A functional approach to decrypting initiation practices among undergraduates. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, Practice, 9*, 104-126.
- Kratochwill, T. R., & Stoiber, K. C. (2000). Empirically supported interventions and school psychology: Conceptual and practice issues, II. *School Psychology Quarterly, 15*, 233-253.
- Ladd, G., & Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2002). Identifying victims of peer aggression from early to middle childhood: Analysis of cross-informant data for concordance, estimation of relational adjustment, prevalence of victimization, and characteristics of identified victims. *Psychological Assessment, 14*, 74-96.
- La Freniere, P., & Charlesworth, W. K. (1983). Dominance, attention, and affiliation in a preschool group: a nine-month longitudinal study. *Ethology & Sociobiology, 4*, 55-68.
- La Greca, A. M., Silverman, W. K., & Lochman, J. E. (2009). Moving beyond efficacy and effectiveness in child and adolescent intervention research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 77*, 373-382.
- Landers, D., & Landers, D. (1978). Socialization via interscholastic athletics: Its effect on delinquency. *Sociology of Education, 51*, 299-301.

- Le Menestrel, S., & Perkins, D. F. (2007). An overview of how sports, out-of-school time, and youth well-being can and do intersect. *New Directions for Youth Development, 115*, 12-22.
- Letourneau, E. J., Holmes, M., & Chasedunn-Roark, J. (1999). Gynecologic health consequences to persons of interpersonal violence. *Women's Health Issues, 9*, 115-121.
- Lumpkin, A., Stoll, S. K., & Beller, J. M. (2003). *Sport ethics: Applications for fair play*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Maier, R., & Laurakis, D. (1981). Some personality correlates of attitudes about sports. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 12*, 19-22.
- Melia, P., Pipe, A., & Greenberg, L. (1996). The use of anabolic-androgenic steroids by Canadian students. *Clinical Journal of Sports Medicine, 6*, 9-14.
- Merrell, K. W. (2008). *Helping students overcome depression and anxiety*. New York: Guildford Press.
- Metlife. (2002). *The metlife survey of the American teacher 2002- student life: School, home, and community*. New York: Author.
- Murray, M. C., & Mann, B. L. (2006). Leadership Effectiveness. In J. M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: personal growth to peak performance* (pp. 109-139). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Myers, J., Kaykha, A., George, S., Abella, J., Zaheer, N., Lear, S., et al. (2004). Fitness versus physical activity patterns in predicting mortality in men. *American Journal of Medicine, 117*, 912-917.
- Mynard, H., & Joseph, S. (2000). Development of the multidimensional peer-victimization scale. *Aggressive Behaviour, 26*, 169-178.
- Nansel, T. R., Haynie, D. L., & Simons-Morton, B. G. (2003). The association of bullying and victimization with middle school adjustment. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*, 45-61.
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B. G., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*, 2094-2100.
- Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., et al. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist, 58*, 449-456.

- Norcross, J. C., Beutler, L. E., & Levant, R. F. (2006). *Evidence-based practice in mental health: Debate and dialogue on the fundamental questions*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Olweus, D. (1997). Tackling peer victimization with a school-based intervention program. In D. P. Fry & K. Bjorkqvist (Eds.), *Cultural variation in conflict resolution* (pp. 215-231). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research, 70*, 323-367.
- Otto, L. B., & Alwin, D. (1977). Athletics, aspirations, and attainments. *Sociology of Education, 50*, 102-113.
- Paludi, M. A., & Barickman, R. (1991). In their own voices: Responses from individuals who have experienced sexual harassment and supportive techniques for dealing with victims of sexual harassment. In M. A. Paludi & R. Barickman (Eds.), *Academic and workplace sexual harassment- A resource manual* (pp. 27-39). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Pease, D. G., & Kozub, S. (1994). Perceived coaching behaviors and team cohesion in high school girls basketball teams. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology: NASPSPA Abstracts, 16*, S93.
- Peguero, A. A. (2008). Bullying victimization and extracurricular activity. *Journal of School Violence, 7*, 71-87.
- Pepler, D & Yamada, S. (2008). Sports are rife with bullying, but parents are key to a solution: researchers. Toronto, ON: Canadian Press.
- Perepletchikova, F., & Kazdin, A. E. (2005). Treatment integrity and therapeutic change: Issues and research recommendations. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 12*, 365-383.
- Perkins, D. F., Jacobs, J. E., Barber, B. L., & Eccles, J. S. (2004). Childhood and adolescent sports participation as predictors of participation in sports and physical fitness during young adulthood. *Youth and Society, 35*, 495-520.
- Prevention Research Center for the Promotion of Human Development (2005). *Technical assistance fact sheets: Evidence-based programs*. Retrieved September 22, 2009 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/28/0a/fe.pdf
- PREVNet (2009). *Bullying statistics*. Retrieved December 12, 2008 from <http://prevnet.ca/Home/tabid/36/Default.aspx>

- Respect in Sport (2009). *Respect in sport coach program*. Retrieved on August 10, 2009 from <http://www.respectinsport.com/riscoach>
- Richman, J. A., Flaherty, J. A., Rospenda, K. M., & Christensen, M. L. (1992). Mental health consequences and correlates of reported medical student abuse. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 267*, 692-694.
- Roach, A. T., & Elliott, S. N. (2008). Best practices in facilitating and evaluating intervention integrity. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.). *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 195-208). Bethesda, MD: NASP.
- Sagatun, A., Sogaard, A. J., Bjertness, E., Selmer, K., & Heyerdahl, S. (2006). The association between weekly hours of physical activity and mental health: A three-year follow-up study of 15-16 year-old students in the city of Oslo, Norway. *BMC Public Health, 7*, 155-162.
- Sage, G. H. (1998). *Power and ideology in American sport: Second edition*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Salmivalli, C. (1999). Participant role approach to school bullying: Implications for interventions. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 453-459.
- Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Bjorkqvist, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior, 22*, 1-15.
- Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms and behavior associated with bullying in schools. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*, 246-258.
- Schmalz, D. L., Deane, G. D., Birch, L. L., & Davison, K. K. (2007). A longitudinal assessment of the links between physical activity and self-esteem in early adolescent non-Hispanic females. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, 559-565.
- Schwartz, D., Chang, L., & Farver, J. M. (2001). Correlates of victimization in Chinese children's peer groups. *Developmental Psychology, 37*, 520-532.
- Sheehan, K. (2001). E-mail survey response rates: A review. *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication, 6*, 1-18.
- Shields, A., & Cicchetti, D. (2001). Parental maltreatment and emotional dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*, 349-363.
- Shields, D. L. L., Gardner, D. E., Bredemeier, B. J. L., & Bostrom, A. (1997). The relationship between leadership behaviors and group cohesion in team sports. *Journal of Psychology, 13*, 196-210.

- Silent Edge (2009). *The sheldon kennedy/graham james case: Sexual abuse in Canadian junior hockey*. Retrieved September 2, 2009 from <http://www.silent-edge.org/kennedy.html>
- Slavin, R. E., (2008). Perspectives on evidence-based research in education: What works? Issues in synthesizing educational program evaluations. *Educational Researcher*, 37, 5-14.
- Smith, R. E. (2006). Positive reinforcement, performance feedback, and performance enhancement. In J. M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (pp. 40-50). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Smith, P. K., & Shu, S. (2000). What good schools can do about bullying: Findings from a survey in English schools after a decade of research and action. *Childhood*, 7, 193-212.
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1989). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 1522-1551.
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (2006). Enhancing coach-athlete relationships: Cognitive-behavioral principles and procedures. In J. Dosil (Ed.), *The sport psychologist's handbook: A guide for sport-specific performance enhancement* (pp. 19-37). West Sussex, England: John Wiley.
- Stophazing.org (2005). Hazing defined. Retrieved October 30, 2009 from <http://www.stophazing.org/definition.html>
- Sturmi, J. E., & Diorio, D. J. (1998). Anabolic agents. *Sports Pharmacology*, 17, 261-283.
- Street, A. E., Gradus, J. L., Stafford, J., & Kelly, K. (2007). Gender differences in experiences of sexual harassment: Data from a male-dominated environment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 75, 464-474.
- Sundgot-Borgen, J., Fasting, K., Klungland, M., Berlund, B., & Brackenridge, C. (in press). Sexual harassment and abuse in elite female athletes: A controlled study. *Medical Science of Sports and Exercise*.
- Swearer, S. M., & Doll, B. (2001). Bullying in schools: An ecological framework. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2, 7-23.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (in press). Challenges facing educators and researchers regarding school bullying: Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher*.
- Theberge, N. (2003). "No fear comes:" Adolescent girls, ice hockey, and the embodiment of gender. *Youth & Society*, 34, 497-516.
- Trickett, P. K., McBride-Chang, C., & Putnam, F. W. (1994). The classroom performance and behavior of sexually abused females. *Development and Psychopathology*, 6, 183-194.

- Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., & Sacco, F. C. (2002). Feeling safe in school. *Smith Studies in Social Work, 72*, 303-327.
- Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., Sacco, F. C., Gies, M. L., Evans, R., & Ewbank, K. (2001). Brief report: creating a peaceful school learning environment: A controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 158*, 808-810.
- Upah, K. R. (2008). Best practices in designing, implementing, and evaluating quality interventions. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds). *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 209-224). Bethesda, MD: NASP.
- U.S. Department of Education (2002). *No Child Left Behind: A Desktop Reference*. Prepared by the Office of the Under Secretary. Jessup, MD: Education Publications Center.
- Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying is power: Implications for school-based intervention strategies. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*, 157-176.
- Vaillancourt, T., McDougall, P., Hymel, S., Krygsman, A., Miller, J., Stiver, K., et al. (2008). Bullying: Are researchers and children/youth talking about the same thing? *International Journal of Behavior, 32*, 486-495.
- Volkwein-Caplan, K. A., & Sankaran, G. (2002). *Sexual harassment in sport*. Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Sport (UK).
- Warburton, D. E., Nicol, C. W., & Bredin, S. S. (2007). Health benefits of physical activity: The evidence. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 174*, 801-810.
- Weiss, S. M. (1999). A comparison of maladaptive behaviours of athletes and non-athletes. *The Journal of Psychology, 133*, 315-322.
- Weissberg, R. P., Kumpfer, K. L., & Seligman, M. E. (2003). Prevention that works for children and youth: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 58*, 425-432.
- Wekerle, C., & Wolfe, D. A. (2003). Child maltreatment. In E. J. Mash & R. A. Barkley (Eds.). *Child psychopathology* (pp. 632-684). New York: Guildford Press.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 202-209.
- Westre, K. R., & Weiss, M. R. (1991). The relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and group cohesion in high school football teams. *The Sport Psychologist, 5*, 41-54.
- Wolfe, V. V., Gentile, C., & Wolfe, D. A. (1989). The impact of sexual abuse on children: A PTSD formulation. *Behavior Therapy, 20*, 1183-1193.

- World Health Organization (WHO). (1999). *Report of the consultation on child abuse prevention*. Geneva: Author.
- Zaff, J. F., Moore, K. A., Papillo, A. R., & Williams, S. (2003). Implications of extracurricular activity participation during adolescence on positive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 18*, 599-630.
- Zuravin, S. J., & Fontanella, C. (1999). The relationships between child sexual abuse and major depression among low-income women: A function of growing up experiences? *Child Maltreatment, 4*, 3-12.

Appendix A

Respect in Sport Program Objectives and Corresponding Self-Report Survey Questions

Program Objectives	Survey Questions
Better awareness and understanding of power relations - using positive power; by virtue of their position, coaches can influence the behaviour, feelings, and thoughts of others.	8
The impact of different leadership styles on coaching and maintaining respect in sport; using effective leadership styles to teach kids about respect in sport.	14
Addressing knowledge in identifying bullying, abuse, harassment and neglect.	9
Addressing the ability to identify and respond effectively to bullying, harassment, abuse and neglect.	10
Understanding and awareness of self in context; understanding emotions in leadership and the effect on participants/creating healthy and respectful environments through positive coaching strategies	11
Addressing the ability to <i>identify and respond</i> effectively to bullying/Addressing the ability to <i>report</i> abuse, harassment, or neglect.	12
Examining the overall effectiveness of defining, distinguishing, and responding to abuse, neglect, bullying, and harassment.	13a, 13b
Examining other what ways the RiS training has impacted coaching	15, 16, 17a, 17b, 17c
Understanding the developmental needs of athletes at various age ranges; recognizing the importance of teaching respectful social relationships in addition to sport skills.	-
Understanding the professional responsibility to intervene in cases of bullying/Understanding the legal responsibility to intervene in cases of abuse, neglect, or harassment.	-
Determining the level of efficiency and convenience of taking the training.	-
Examining the importance of teaching respectful social relationships as well as sport skills; acknowledging the importance of teaching both areas.	-
Creating healthy and respectful environments through positive coaching strategies	-

Recognizing the signs and symptoms of abuse (emotional abuse, sexual abuse, physical abuse, and verbal abuse)	-
---	---

Confidence in defining, distinguishing, and identifying abuse, neglect, bullying, and harassment.	-
---	---

Appendix B

Behavioural Research Ethics Board Certificate of Approval

The University of British Columbia
Office of Research Services
Behavioural Research Ethics Board
Suite 102, 6190 Agronomy Road, Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z3

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL - MINIMAL RISK

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William McKee	INSTITUTION / DEPARTMENT: UBC/Education/Educational & Counselling Psychology, and Special Education	UBC BREB NUMBER: H09-00669
INSTITUTION(S) WHERE RESEARCH WILL BE CARRIED OUT:		
Institution	Site	
UBC	Vancouver (excludes UBC Hospital)	
Other locations where the research will be conducted: The subjects of this study will be completing a survey online and a small selection of subjects will be participating in a follow-up telephone interview. The participants will be recruited from several provinces across Canada and will complete the survey in various settings such as their home, office, school, or other locations where they have access to a computer. The remaining components of the research study (e.g., data analysis, writing of research results, etc.) will take place at the University of British Columbia.		
CO-INVESTIGATOR(S): Rashmeen Nirmal		
SPONSORING AGENCIES: N/A		
PROJECT TITLE: Evaluating the Impact of the Respect in Sport (RiS) Program on Bullying in Sports		

CERTIFICATE EXPIRY DATE: June 10, 2010

DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN THIS APPROVAL:	DATE APPROVED: June 10, 2009	
Document Name	Version	Date
Protocol:		
Respect in Sport Program Evaluation Study Protocol	v.2.0	May 21, 2009
Questionnaire, Questionnaire Cover Letter, Tests:		
Respect in Sport Telephone Interview Script	v.1.0	May 19, 2009
Respect in Sport Phase 2 Survey	v.2.0	May 19, 2009
Respect in Sport Phase 1 Survey	v.2.0	May 19, 2009
Letter of Initial Contact:		
Respect in Sport Letter of Initial Contact	v.2.0	May 19, 2009
The application for ethical review and the document(s) listed above have been reviewed and the procedures were found to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human subjects.		

*Approval is issued on behalf of the Behavioural Research Ethics Board
and signed electronically by one of the following:*

Dr. M. Judith Lynam, Chair
Dr. Ken Craig, Chair
Dr. Jim Rupert, Associate Chair
Dr. Laurie Ford, Associate Chair
Dr. Anita Ho, Associate Chair

Appendix C

Letter of Initial Contact

Respect Group Inc.

Respect in Sport (a division of Respect Group Inc.), Sport Manitoba, Gymnastics Alberta, Gymnastics Ontario and PREVNet (a national network of Canadian researchers, non-governmental organizations and governments committed to stop bullying), are conducting a brief survey to follow-up your experience with the Respect in Sport program. This collaborative research survey is also being conducted with Dr. William McKee, Principal Investigator, and Ms. Rashmeen Nirmal, Graduate Student, at the University of British Columbia.

The goal of this survey is to assess the impact Respect in Sport has had:

- On you as a person
- On you as a coach
- On the youth involved your sport or activity
- On the overall sport environment you are an integral part of
- On your ability to recognize and deal with abuse, bullying, harassment and neglect

By becoming a coach, giving of your time and energy and by completing Respect in Sport, you have demonstrated your commitment to your sport community. As an extension of this, we are hoping you would be kind enough to take just 7-10 minutes to answer the following questions. You will also have an option to provide an email address and indicate your willingness to have a researcher contact you directly for a telephone interview. If you agree, a qualified researcher may contact you. Please note that only a small number of those who indicated willingness will be randomly selected for a follow-up interview.

All responses to this survey are submitted anonymously and answers will be treated confidentially. No individual information will be reported to anyone. Of course, you have the right to refuse to answer any question or withdraw from the survey at any time. Your honest feedback will be very helpful to us in improving our program and helping all partners in sport to create a safer more welcoming environment for all participants.

Information from this research study will be available on the Respect in Sport website. If you have any questions or concerns before proceeding with the survey, please contact Dr. McKee at william.mckee@ubc.ca or Ms. Nirmal at mirmal@interchange.ubc.ca. By proceeding with the survey at this time, you are giving consent to participate in this research study.

Thank you.

Respect, Responsibility, Reward
Respect in Sport

Appendix D

Respect in Sport Self-Report Survey

Respect Group Inc.

Respect in Sport (RiS) Self-Report Survey

1. Are you:
 - a. Male
 - b. Female

2. What age group do you fall in:
 - a. 19-30 years of age
 - b. 31-40 years of age
 - c. 41-59 years of age
 - d. 60+ years of age

3. Please indicate what sport you are currently coaching most of the time:

4. Within your sport or activity, at what level do you mostly coach or lead: (choose the most appropriate option)
 - a. Community Activity or Sport
 - b. School-based (including university) Activity or Sport
 - c. Competitive/Elite
 - d. Professional
 - e. Other

5. Sex and Age of Participants you are currently coaching most of the time: (choose the most appropriate option)
 - a. Male
 - i. Children (ages 0-12)
 - ii. Youth (ages 13-19)
 - iii. Adults (age 20+)
 - iv. All Ages
 - b. Female
 - i. Children (ages 0-12)
 - ii. Youth (ages 13-19)
 - iii. Adults (age 20+)
 - iv. All Ages
 - c. Both Male and Female
 - i. Children (ages 0-12)
 - ii. Youth (ages 13-19)
 - iii. Adults (age 20+)
 - iv. All Ages

7. Please indicate when you took your original Respect in Sport training:
 - a. 30-36 months ago
 - b. 24-30 months ago
 - c. 18-24 months ago
 - d. 12-18 months ago
 - e. 6-12 months ago
 - f. 0-6 months ago

8. To what extent did the original Respect in Sport training help you to increase your use of *positive* power (e.g., accentuating fun aspects of sports, finding positive stress zones)?

Not at all	Very Little	Some	A Lot
0	1	2	3

9. As a result of the Respect in Sport training, I have the knowledge to be aware of and effectively identify:

Bullying

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	2	3

Harassment

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	2	3

Abuse

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	2	3

Neglect

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	2	3

10. Since my original Respect in Sport training, I am more likely to respond to incidents of bullying, harassment, abuse, or neglect with positive strategies that teach participants about respecting others.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	2	3

11. The Respect in Sport training helped me recognize my role as a *model* of emotional control and regulation for the participants of my team or organization.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	2	3

12. How competent do you think you are in:

a. *recognizing* and *dealing* with observation or disclosure of bullying?

Not Competent	Somewhat Competent	Competent	Very Competent
0	1	2	3

b. *reporting* observation or disclosure of harassment, abuse or neglect?

Not Competent	Somewhat Competent	Competent	Very Competent
0	1	2	3

13. a. As a coach or activity leader, how often are you aware of the following among your participants?

Bullying	Never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always
	0	1	2	3
Harassment	Never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always
	0	1	2	3
Abuse	Never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always

	0	1	2	3
Neglect	Never	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always
	0	1	2	3

b. To what extent did the Respect in Sport training assist you in identifying and/or responding to bullying, harassment, abuse, and neglect?

Not at All	Very Little	Somewhat	To a Great Extent
0	1	2	3

14. To what extent did the training make you more aware of a coach's role in teaching respect in the sport environment?

Not at All	Very Little	Somewhat	To a Great Extent
0	1	2	3

15. I would recommend this program to another coach or activity leader.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	2	3

16. What period of time do you feel would be most appropriate to recertify in this program with existing and updated information?

- a. 3 Years b. 4 Years c. 5 Years

17. a. Are there other ways the RiS training has impacted the way you coach? If so, how?

b. When you think of the RiS training, what is the main idea that you have taken from the program?

c. In what way could we improve the training to maximize its impact on coaches and the athletes with whom they work?

Thank You