

Athletes' Values, Attitudes and Justifications for the Doping Ban: An Analysis of  
Canadian Retired and Current National Volleyball Team Players' Perspectives

by

Olivia A. Durst

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
The University of Manitoba  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management  
The University of Manitoba  
Winnipeg

Copyright © 2013 by Olivia A. Durst

### **Abstract**

This thesis examines the attitudes and justifications athletes have in regards to doping in sport, and specifically the current doping ban. A historical analysis of anti-doping policy development in Canada was completed to determine how the current anti-doping system operates in Canada. Semi-structured interviews were then conducted with retired and current members of the Women's and Men's Canadian National Volleyball Teams. Content analysis was used to analyze the interview transcripts and to draw out the resulting themes. From the interviews it emerged that the Canadian volleyball athletes participating in this study viewed the doping ban as a list of rules they must follow in order to remain eligible to compete. The athletes' perspectives on the doping ban differ from the reasons historically and currently provided by anti-doping organizations, as the athletes participating in this study did not discuss values in their reasons for following the doping ban in sport.

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to acknowledge and thank the people who made the completion of this thesis possible. First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Sarah Teetzel, my thesis supervisor, for her support, guidance, and feedback throughout the writing of my thesis. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Russell Field and Dr. Arthur Schafer for being part of my thesis committee and providing me with comments and direction on my research project. I also acknowledge the MITACS Accelerate program and the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, which allowed me access to core documents that shaped the historical chapter of my thesis. I thank the Canadian National Volleyball Team for their cooperation and for permitting me to recruit participants from their current and former players. Finally, I would like to thank my family, Guy, Judy and Keegan Durst, for their love and encouragement.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	4
Methods.....	7
Literature Review.....	12
Athletes and the Public’s Perceptions and Attitudes .....	12
Policymakers and Anti-Doping Organizations’ Justifications.....	16
Summary of the Literature.....	20
Limitations.....	21
Delimitations.....	22
Chapter Layout.....	23
Chapter II: A Historical Examination of Anti-Doping Initiatives in Canada.....	25
Doping in Canada Pre Seoul.....	26
Background Politics: The Government and Sport.....	30
The Dubin Inquiry.....	32
Following the Inquiry.....	37
A Globalized Anti-Doping Approach.....	40
The Impact of the Dubin Inquiry – Two Decades Later.....	45
Summary.....	47

Chapter III: Understanding Athletes' Perspectives through Semi-Structured Interviews.....	48
The Recruitment Process.....	48
Participants.....	50
The Interview Process.....	52
Transcription, Content Analysis and Coding.....	53
Reflections on the Interview Process.....	61
Summary.....	63
Chapter IV: Discussion of Interview Themes.....	64
Theme #1: Doping is Cheating.....	64
Theme #2: Health and Protection of Athletes.....	67
Theme #3: Respect for the Rules.....	70
Theme #4: Fear.....	72
Theme #5: Perception of Differences.....	75
Theme #6: Silence and Doping.....	81
Theme #7: Suspicion.....	82
Theme #8: Knowledge and Education.....	85
Theme #9: Feelings of Frustration.....	90
Theme #10: Pressure.....	93
Theme #11: Fairness and Values.....	98
Theme #12: A Gap Exists.....	100
Summary.....	101
Chapter V: Conclusion.....	104

Main Findings.....	105
Contributions to Research.....	112
Future Directions.....	113
Conclusion.....	115
Literature Cited.....	117
Appendices.....	125
Appendix A: Letter to the Managers and Coaches of the Male and Female Canadian National Volleyball Teams.....	125
Appendix B: Invitation to Participate Letter.....	128
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form.....	131
Appendix D: Interview Questions.....	134
Appendix E: Participant Recruitment Poster.....	137

## Chapter I: Introduction

In Canada the 1988 Seoul Olympics marked the beginning of a period of change in the anti-doping movement. The scandal that occurred in Seoul, involving the now infamous failed drug test by sprinter Ben Johnson, led to the Canadian government requesting an inquiry into doping in sport. The resulting report, entitled *Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance* (Dubin, 1990), and commonly referred to as the *Dubin Inquiry*, was the first thorough analysis of drug use in Canadian sport. The key themes of the report continue to motivate discussions about the ethical ramifications of using performance-enhancing substances and methods in sport. While this report is now more than twenty years old, it continues to be referenced and analyzed for its impact on Canadian anti-doping policy.

Since the release of Dubin's report the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) has emerged as the worldwide leader in anti-doping education, policy, and the administration of doping tests. To help protect sport's integrity from the threat of doping, members of the amateur high-performance sporting community must turn to the *World Anti-Doping Code (WADC)* for guidelines. The *WADC* was created and developed to "resurrect the moral standards of sport by restoring the ideals of fair play, health and purity of soul" (Moller, 2010, p. 72) of international sport, just as Dubin had called for in the recommendations in the *Dubin Inquiry*. Before the creation of WADA, countries and sporting events, such as the Olympic Games, were responsible for developing and implementing their own anti-doping policies and arranging for anti-doping testing. However, there was little consistency between the anti-doping guidelines and rules between countries and events, which resulted in an ineffective and disjointed

international anti-doping system. One of the first tasks completed after government leaders, International Olympic Committee (IOC) members, and International Federations leaders joined forces to create WADA in 1999 was to increase the consistency and transparency of anti-doping policies, by developing and implementing a worldwide harmonious anti-doping policy (David, 2008). After five years of discussions and input from sport stakeholders, the *WADC* came into effect in 2004 (WADA, 2011a). Described as “the core document that provides the framework for harmonized anti-doping policies, rules and regulations within sport organizations and among public authorities” (WADA, 2011b), the *WADC* sets standards applicable to all International Federations and professional sports leagues that choose to endorse the *WADC*, thereby preventing the problems associated with the disjointed and uncoordinated anti-doping efforts in the past (WADA, 2011b).

Included in the *WADC* is the statement, “anti-doping programs seek to preserve what is intrinsically valuable about sport” (WADA, 2009a, p. 14), which WADA officials refer to as the ‘spirit of sport.’ To define the spirit of sport the document provides a list of descriptors, including: “ethics, fair play and honesty, health, excellence in performance, character and education, fun and joy, teamwork, dedication and commitment, respect for rules and laws, respect for self and other participants, courage, and community and solidarity” (WADA, 2009a, p.14). Only a list is provided; additional information on what actions or attitudes constitutes the spirit of sport is not included. It is unclear if athletes share the same values and reasons as anti-doping agencies for enforcing a ban on performance-enhancing substances and methods in sport. Moreover, the reasons that athletes in Canada use to justify their compliance with and support or opposition to the



ban is unknown. Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to identify and understand the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban and how they justify their support of or opposition to current anti-doping rules.

Some terms and concepts used in this thesis require clarification. The term ‘doping’ includes the use of banned performance-enhancing substances and methods included on the *Prohibited List* (WADA, 2013), which is updated yearly and includes nine categories of banned substances as well as the ‘methods’ that constitute doping violations. Banned methods include acts such as transfusing blood and tampering with urine or blood samples (WADA, 2009a). Athletes’ use of performance-enhancing supplements, drugs, or methods that are not banned by WADA and included on the *Prohibited List*, such as caffeine, aspirin, or altitude chambers, is permitted and not considered doping.

In this thesis, certain assumptions have been made about doping in sport. Because a doping ban and anti-doping policies already exist, it is assumed that doping in sport should be banned. The philosophy of sport literature contains a thorough and lengthy discussion of reasons why doping bans should or should not be enforced in sport for health, moral, legal, and social reasons, and many of the key arguments, both for and against doping bans in sport and drug testing, were published in the early 1980s (e.g. Brown, 1984; Simon, 1984; Thompson, 1982). This debate continues in the recent philosophy of sport literature (e.g. Gleaves, 2010; Hemphill, 2009; Morgan, 2008; Tamburrini, 2007), but is not the focus of this thesis. The purpose of this project is not to critique or defend the practice of banning performance-enhancing substances and methods in sport. I start from the position that the bans in place are acceptable, will

remain in place for the foreseeable future, and are morally defensible; however, I recognize that this position is contested by some philosophers who oppose these rules (e.g. Miah, 2004; Savulescu, 2007). This thesis explores what values and attitudes athletes hold towards the doping ban in sport required by WADA and enforced in Canada by Canada's national anti-doping agency, the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES). The objective is to determine if athletes' justifications for the doping ban are in line with the justifications provided by anti-doping organizations, such as WADA and the CCES, and to gain insight into any discrepancies between the athletes' and the sport administrators' perspectives.

### **Methodology**

A phenomenological-based interview study was designed to gain insight into athletes' perspectives on the doping ban. As a qualitative research methodology, a phenomenology-based approach emphasizes "studying empirical phenomena directly, as they are perceived by the senses" (Bekker, 2009, p. 674). Consequently, this type of approach "describes the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon" (Creswell, 2007, p. 57). Describing lived experiences is the starting and end point of phenomenological research (van Manen, 1990). Researchers use this type of framework to describe what all participants in their studies have in common in regard to their shared experiences. The researcher does not assume that he or she knows or understands the phenomenon the participants are experiencing that is being studied (Douglas, 1976). When collecting data, the researcher focuses on describing the shared experience of the participants and the description of the phenomenon consist of 'what' the participants experienced and 'how' they experienced it (Creswell, 2007). The

overall aim of phenomenological research is to describe the lived experiences in such a way that the experiences are transformed into textual expressions (van Manen, 1990). The participants in this study are current and retired Canadian National Team volleyball players who share the lived experience of representing Canada while participating in national and international-level competitions, and are thus required to adhere to the standards, guidelines and policies outlined in the *WADC* as enforced by WADA and the CCES, or were required to do so before they retired. Participants were asked take part in a phenomenological interview to share their lived experience of being required to adhere to the anti-doping rules required of them as members of the Canadian National Team and to describe their values, attitudes, and justifications for or against the doping ban.

Two types of phenomenological interviews are used in qualitative research: 1) empirical or transcendental phenomenology, and 2) hermeneutic phenomenology (Creswell, 2007). Traditionally, phenomenology as a research method, involved setting aside any and all assumptions about the subject being researched in an attempt to gain a comprehensive description of the phenomenon from the research undertaken (McLeod, 2001). Today, this approach is more commonly known as empirical or transcendental phenomenology, which seeks to focus less on “the interpretations of the researcher and more on a description of the experiences of the participants” (Creswell, 2007, p. 59). When researching a phenomenon with an empirical or transcendental phenomenological qualitative research methods approach, the concept of bracketing is used. Bracketing involves the researcher setting aside his or her experiences to examine the phenomenon from a fresh perspective (Creswell, 2007). The transcendental phenomenology methodological framework consists of identifying the phenomenon to be researched,

bracketing out personal experience with the phenomenon, and collecting data from several individuals who have experienced the phenomenon. The analysis of the data involves developing a textual description of the experiences of the participants and describing what the participants experienced; then a structural description of participants' experiences is developed by the researcher, which identifies how the participants experienced the phenomenon. The structural description is the researcher's interpretation of how the participants experienced the phenomenon, while the textual description is the actual interview transcript, which contains the participants' descriptions of their experiences. By combining the textual and structural descriptions provided by the participants, the overall essence of the phenomenon is conveyed (Creswell, 2007; van Manen, 1990).

For this thesis, transcendental phenomenology is an appropriate methodological approach to use. Hermeneutic phenomenological approaches involve interpreting the phenomenon to which one has pre-understandings and prejudices towards the subject matter being researched (McLeod, 2001). Because I have no experience being drug tested or participating in sport at a level requiring compliance with anti-doping policies and procedures it was possible for me to bracket out my experiences and take a fresh perspective in order to develop textual and structural descriptions of the participants' lived experiences. Because I do not have a strong relationship to the topic, and do not need to mediate between different meanings of the lived experiences (Creswell, 2007) a hermeneutic phenomenology approach was not necessary and a transcendental phenomenology approach was utilized.

## Methods

The methods used for conducting this study include a historical analysis of the development of anti-doping policy in Canada and semi-structured interviews with athletes. The historical analysis determined the sport organizations' justifications for the doping bans. The historical analysis was also important because it provides a point of comparison between the anti-doping system the retired players were accountable for and the current system that the active players are following. The justifications for the doping ban provided by the athletes in their interviews were compared and contrasted with the justifications provided by anti-doping organizations. By comparing and contrasting the justifications provided by the athletes with the justifications for banning doping in sport in the anti-doping literature from the World Anti-Doping Agency and the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, conclusions can be drawn regarding whether or not athletes and anti-doping organizations provide the same or different justifications for banning doping in sport.

The first step involved a historical analysis of the Canadian anti-doping system. This analysis involved reviewing documents pertaining to the creation of the current anti-doping system that chronicled its growth, starting with the *Dubin Inquiry* (Dubin, 1990) and ending with the policies in place today, with the goal of uncovering policymakers' and anti-doping organizations attitudes, values, and justifications for the doping ban in Canada. Specifically, the historical analysis provides context for the possible attitudes, values and justifications athletes provide for endorsing or opposing the current doping ban in sport.

The second phase of the project involved conducting in-depth, open-ended, semi-structured one-on-one interviews with a sample of athletes to establish their perspectives on the doping ban and their reasons why they adhere to or opt to break the anti-doping rules. According to Bloodworth and McNamee,

There is a dearth of studies that address the attitudes of athletes toward performance enhancing drugs. One reason is that access to the population is extremely difficult. Another is the difficulty in getting athletes to open up to discussion with researchers on such a taboo topic. The majority of studies utilise questionnaire methods not conducive to 'thick' or 'rich' data. (Bloodworth & McNamee, 2010, p. 281)

Therefore, interviews were deemed the most appropriate form of data collection for this study as this method provides richer data than a survey or questionnaire. Research ethics approval was obtained from the Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board (ENREB) at the University of Manitoba before potential participants were recruited from the Men's and Women's Canadian National Volleyball Teams. Following ENREB's requirements, I contacted the manager and coaches of the female and male Canadian National Volleyball Teams to conduct the study with volleyball players (Appendix A). The National Team coaches and managers were asked to facilitate the recruitment of the participants by forwarding letters of invitation to the current and retired members of Canada's National Volleyball Teams (Appendix B). The men's team coaches and manager did not respond to my request. I sent two requests for participation by email and attempted to contact the team manager by telephone; however, my emails and phone calls were not returned. Because I did not have access to the list of names and e-mail addresses

for the athletes, and ENREB requirements would not allow me to contact players directly, I relied on ‘snowball referrals’ from the female participants. Snowballing recruitment techniques involve, “nomination of other potentially eligible people by study participants” (Patrick, Pruchno, & Rose, 1998, p. 297). In this case, the female participants forwarded the invitation to participate (Appendix B) to male players who were eligible and possibly interested in participating in the study. This resulted in three men contacting me to participate in this study. Participants were recruited to participate until a point of data saturation had been reached and subsequent interviews were unlikely to yield additional information (Francis, Johnston, Robertson, Glidewell, Entwistle, Eccles & Grimshaw, 2010).

Seven athletes (3 current female players, 1 current male player, 1 former female player and 2 former male players) were interviewed. Participation was voluntary and individuals could opt to discontinue participation, without consequence, at any point throughout the study if they felt uncomfortable with the nature of the study. To ensure his or her anonymity and confidentiality, each participant chose a pseudonym before beginning the interview. The participant was then only identified by his or her pseudonym throughout the interview, as well as in the transcribed document, and in this thesis. Before partaking in the study, participants were required to verify they were over age 18 and willing to sign an informed consent form. The form included a detailed outline of the study and informed the participant of his/her right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences (Appendix C). The interviews were recorded using a digital recorder, and the resulting files were uploaded to my computer to transcribe. Once each interview was transcribed an electronic copy was sent to the

participant for him/her to review. The revision of the interview transcript by the participant is known as member checking, which involves “inviting participants to clarify and confirm the researcher's initial interpretations of their data, which enhances credibility in the process” (Sinclair, 2011, p. 181). The participants reviewed the transcript, and were able to modify it if they felt it was not an accurate representation of the interview. Participants then sent the transcript back to me for analysis. None of the interviewed athletes modified their transcripts. The approved transcripts were used in the subsequent analysis of data.

To analyze the transcripts after the member checking process was complete, content analysis and coding methods were used. Content analysis focuses on “the frequency with which words or concepts occur in texts or across texts” (Carley, 1993, p. 81). The researcher counts the number of times a concept repeats in a set of texts, and from the differences in distribution across the texts provides insight into the similarities and differences in the content of the studied texts (Carley, 1993). More specifically, content analysis can be used “to develop inferences about a subject of interest in any type of communication” (Kondracki, Wellman & Amundson, 2002, p. 224). Conventional content analysis was used to describe more than just the similarities and differences among the interview transcripts, in order to gain insight into the phenomenon of athletes’ thoughts on, and experiences with, doping in sport.

The interview transcripts were analyzed using a priori and emergent coding to discover regularities in the data (Punch, 2005). Indexing the data by labeling and categorizing the quotes from the individual transcripts allows for more advanced analysis as it “enables the summarizing of data by pulling together themes, and by identifying



patterns” (Punch, 2005, p. 199). A priori coding represents the “elements that are physically present and countable” (Berg, 1998, p. 225) from the data source. This coding was adopted for the first part of analyzing the responses to help draw out the different responses provided by the participants, and to organize the reasons and values athletes provide for supporting the doping ban. However, a priori coding is limiting as it can pre-figure the analysis and ignore the reflected views of the participants (Creswell, 2007). In this study, relying exclusively on a priori coding could result in only compiling the reasons and values athletes provide for the doping ban, but not the explanations and deeper reasoning behind their responses. Therefore, once the interview answers were coded initially, the transcripts were re-read and emergent coding techniques were used to identify themes from the responses. Emergent coding involves “an interpretive reading of the symbolism underlying the physically presented data” (Berg, 1998, p. 225). The coded data was then compared to the justifications, values and reasons that anti-doping organizations, specifically the World Anti-Doping Agency and the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, provide for banning doping in sport. The athletes’ justifications for the doping ban were contrasted with the justifications of the anti-doping organizations for the doping ban to identify if anti-doping organizations and athletes share the same, similar or different justifications for or opposing banning drugs in sport. Differences between the reasons, values and justifications provided by the athletes, and those provided by WADA and the CCES, can indicate that there is a disconnect between the anti-doping education the organizations are providing and what athletes are obtaining from the other sources elsewhere. If athletes and the anti-doping organizations do not provide the same reasons, values and justifications for banning doping, then how anti-doping information and

education on the values associated with banning doping in sport is being delivered could benefit from being revised.

### **Literature Review**

To find the literature relevant to this topic, I searched SPORTDiscus, Sage Journals, and Google Scholar to identify articles pertaining to doping in sport, the doping ban, and athletes and the public's attitudes towards the doping ban. I searched for various combinations of the following: athletes and doping, perspectives on doping in sport, anti-doping and athletes, public and doping, and justifications for the doping ban. From this search it became clear that very few studies have examined athletes' attitudes toward the doping ban and the reasons why they support or oppose the anti-doping rules. This section includes a review of the literature that has investigated attitudes towards doping in sport from the general public and from athletes' perspectives. It then reviews policymakers' and anti-doping organizations' perceptions and rationales for the ban that can be found in the literature. Finally, it demonstrates how this study will help fill the identified gaps in the literature.

#### *Athletes and the Public's Perceptions and Attitudes*

A review of the literature yielded only seven studies that have examined athletes' or the public's attitudes toward doping and doping bans in sport, none of which include the perspectives of Canadian athletes. Six out of these seven studies used structured surveys; the seventh involved focus group discussions with top athletes. What is known about athletes' perspectives of the doping ban comes from studies on American, Swiss and British athletes. Moreover, because six of the seven relevant studies relied on surveys and questionnaires, analysis into the meaning behind the participants' answers has been

limited. In this section, I describe the conclusions of each study to determine what the literature reports about athletes and the public's perceptions of the doping ban.

A study conducted shortly after the Salt Lake City Olympics in 2002 concluded that the majority of the public perceived the present level of punishment for athletes caught doping, at the time, was fair or 'about right', while very few people supported more strict punishment for doping. This information was gathered by surveying 258 randomly selected members of the general public at a shopping centre in the United States (Woodruff, Thompkins, Mottram, & Williamson, 2002). However, a later study by Stamm, Lamprecht, Kamber, Marti, and Mahler (2008) in Switzerland demonstrates a different public perception, which shows support for stricter anti-doping rules and policies in sport. Stamm et al.'s (2008) results indicate that the general public's awareness of the doping problem in Switzerland grew, and attitudes towards doping in sport changed, between 1995 and 2004. The authors concluded that the majority of Swiss people surveyed changed from thinking that doping should be liberalized or medically supervised to believing that doping should be prohibited in sport (Stamm, et al., 2008). Stamm et al. (2008) found that the majority of Swiss top-level athletes thought that doping should be prohibited. The study concludes that doping awareness in sport increased significantly over the course of the study (1995-2008), and that an effective approach to doping in sport involves controls, sanctions, education, research and information. In general there was support from the public for a strict anti-doping policy, even if it meant that athletes' performances would decrease (Stamm, et al., 2008).

Following Stamm et al.'s (2008) study, Lamprecht, Gebert and Stamm (2010) surveyed 1044 Swiss top athletes on doping information and doping controls. These

researchers focused solely on Swiss athletes' perceptions of the doping information available and the controls applied to the athletes. Swiss athletes found their national anti-doping program provided sufficient, accessible and useful information (Lamprecht et al., 2010). However, complaints raised by athletes in Lamprecht et al.'s study focused on the online whereabouts system, referred to as the Anti-Doping Administration & Management System (ADAMS), being hard to use. Furthermore, the authors concluded that many athletes were inadequately informed about the control pool in which they belonged. Despite this lack of information on testing pools and the complaints about the whereabouts requirements, the 1044 Swiss athletes surveyed still reported a positive view of the doping controls in place. Very few athletes reported that they felt like they were being tested too frequently in or out of competition. Additionally, many athletes reported that they would like more doping controls put in place. Overall, athletes held a positive opinion of Anti-Doping Switzerland. However, athletes did perceive that as the fight against doping has persisted, the rules and procedures have become more complicated (Lamprecht, et al., 2008).

Additional perceptions from the United States general population, members of National Governing Bodies (NGB) of sport organizations, coaches, teachers and children aged 8-17 on doping in sport are available in the 2011 United States Anti-Doping (USADA) report. According to the USADA report, "doping, at its core, is not just a drug problem but also a values issue, USADA understands that cheating by doping is just one manifestation of a fundamental ethical problem—the willingness to win in sport at all costs" (USADA, 2011, p. 1). Moreover, this attitude undermines the intrinsic value of sport (USADA, 2011). Using an online survey, USADA assessed the average American's

attitudes towards sport. Findings indicate that the average American polled agreed that the use of performance-enhancing substances is a violation of ethics in sport and the use of performance-enhancing substances is the most serious problem facing sport (USADA, 2011). While the USADA had 8934 participants answering the survey, it is unclear how many of the respondents were athletes.

One relevant study focused solely on the attitudes of British high-performance athletes towards doping (Bloodworth & McNamee, 2010). British athletes did not perceive drug use as a widespread problem at the national level. However, there was agreement among the 40 athletes that participated in the focus groups that doping in sport was a greater problem in other countries outside of the U.K., as the athletes perceived the U.K. to have more stringent testing procedures than other countries (Bloodworth & McNamee, 2010).

The final study addressing athletes' attitudes to doping found that athletes who opt to dope see doping as a means to an end and a way to gain a competitive advantage (Petróczi, 2007). An athlete's attitude towards doping, and his or her subsequent doping behaviour, is ultimately linked to his or her attitude towards competition and winning. In this study, 199 American male college athletes completed a survey on their orientations towards doping to determine if, and to what extent, athletes' personal traits such as competitiveness, win and goal orientation, and attitudes and beliefs towards doping related to their doping behaviours. The findings of this study indicate that the importance of winning might influence an athlete's attitude towards doping, but does not necessarily result in doping behaviours. The study also reveals that attitudes towards doping included athletes' view that using banned performance-enhancing substances was "expected to be

against their standards as sportsmen” (Petróczi, 2007, p. 10) but at the same time athletes viewed doping as “a means to an end; a ‘tool’ that is bad but necessary to ensure success in competition” (Petróczi, 2007, p. 10-11). The study indicates that there are two competing factors that influence an athlete’s decision to dope: “1) the general social norms, such as fair play, condemnation of cheating and 2) the special norms held by the athletes' immediate subcultures” (Petróczi, 2007, p. 11). The conclusions stemming from this analysis are that sport governing bodies and anti-doping organizations need to recognize that doping is not necessarily the result of deviant behaviour within sport, but instead can be linked to rational, outcome optimizing behaviour. Consequently, a value-based anti-doping approach will only be useful if changes in attitudes to doping occur at all levels and in all stakeholders (Petróczi, 2007).

The literature on athletes’ and the public’s perceptions of doping in sport reveal that most past research used surveys to gather information on the public and athletes’ perceptions. Commonalities include support for the idea that doping should be prohibited in sport, and a desire for stricter punishments for doping in sport. The reviewed literature also reveals that Swiss athletes believe they are receiving sufficient information and education on anti-doping. British athletes did not perceive doping as a problem on the national level, but thought that outside of the U.K. that doping was a major issue facing sport. This thesis will add the perspective of Canadian athletes to this small but growing body of literature.

#### *Policymakers and Anti-Doping Organizations’ Justifications*

According to the *World Anti-Doping Code*, doping bans function to protect athletes’ health, shield them from harm, and preserve what is meaningful and valuable in

sport. This preservation is often referred to as the ‘spirit of sport’ by WADA. As clarified above, the spirit of sport “is the essence of Olympism; it is how we play true. The spirit of sport is the celebration of the human spirit, body and mind” (WADA, 2009a, p. 14) and includes “ethics, fair play, honesty, health, excellence in performance, character and education, fun and joy, teamwork, dedication and commitment, respect for rules and laws, respect for self and other participants, courage, and community and solidarity” (WADA, 2009a, p.14) as the meaningful and valuable elements of sport. From this list of values, one can attempt to understand and interpret WADA’s reasons for banning the use of performance-enhancing substances and techniques in sport.

While the CCES endorses the *WADC*, it includes its own rationale for supporting doping-free sport. Specifically, the CCES states on its website that doping is cheating and harmful to the ethics of fair play in sport (CCES, 2011d). Doping is viewed as harmful to the athlete taking the banned-substance and harmful to his/her sport and fellow athletes and competitors. Moreover, the CCES views doping as being harmful to the communities and nations that stand behind the athletes, supporting them, motivating them and living through them (CCES, 2011d). The CCES also supports banning doping in sport based on its strong belief in values-based sport for Canadians and as a way to help level the global playing field (CCES, 2011d). The CCES’s values-based reasoning behind banning doping in sport is incorporated in the True Sport initiative. Values-based sport reflects the spirit of sport Canadians desire for sport to live up to its full potential (CCES, 2009). The core values embraced by the True Sport initiative include fairness, excellence, inclusion and fun (CCES, 2009). These core values are also present in the list of descriptors representing the spirit of sport put forth by WADA (WADA, 2009a).

Like the CCES and other national anti-doping agencies, as a signatory of the *WADC*, the Federation International de Volleyball<sup>1</sup> (FIVB) supports anti-doping initiatives in sport. Similar to the language used by both the CCES and WADA, the FIVB also addresses the goal of preserving the spirit of sport (FIVB, 2011a). Specifically, the FIVB's anti-doping program seeks to "maintain ethics, fair play, honesty and the health of the Athletes" (FIVB, 2011a, p. 1). The FIVB views doping as contrary to the spirit of sport and "wants to keep a clean and level playing field" (FIVB, 2011a, p. 1). To do so, the FIVB provides its athletes with an anti-doping manual, *We Play It Clean* (2011), which informs athletes with what they need to know about anti-doping, and includes three main reasons for prohibiting doping in sport:

- 1) because it considers a danger to the health of the Athletes;
- 2) because it undermines the joy of sport and the pursuit of human and sporting excellence; and
- 3) in order to protect Athletes from other Athletes taking unfair advantage and from the possibly harmful side effects of drugs. (FIVB, 2011b, p. 4)

These three reasons printed in the FIVB's anti-doping guide are similar to the reasons provided by the CCES and WADA.

The CCES, WADA and FIVB all indicate that the use of drugs in sport constitutes cheating, violates the principle of fair play, is unnatural, and is incompatible with the nature of sport. The use of performance-enhancing substances and techniques is deemed incompatible with the basic principles of athletic competition and the preservation of what is meaningful and valuable in sport (CASA, 2000). The idea that doping is

---

<sup>1</sup> The FIVB is the International Federation responsible for all forms of volleyball. See <http://www.fivb.org/EN/FIVB/>



unnatural and incompatible with the nature of sport stems from the notion that sport is about natural ability and “drugs should be banned because they introduce artificial, foreign substances into the body to help produce training or performance enhancements that could not be achieved otherwise” (Hemphill, 2009, p. 314). However, the idea that performance-enhancing drugs are unnatural is ambiguous, as many performance-enhancing substances and methods involve substances already known and produced in the body, such as testosterone and blood (Simon, 1995). While these substances may be natural, they can still be very harmful in large doses.

Anti-doping organizations also express concern that “the use of certain drugs or other performance-enhancing methods poses significant short- and/or long-term health hazards to athletes” (Hemphill, 2009, p. 314). Justifying the ban on doping from a health and welfare perspective is convincing for athletes who are under age and incapable of making informed decisions, but considered a paternalistic, yet acceptable, intervention for adult athletes (Brown, 1984). The CCES, WADA, and FIVB’s positions that using performance-enhancing substances in sport constitutes cheating and violates the principles of fair play rests on the idea that “the use of a prohibited substance gives the user an unfair training and performance advantage over other athletes” (Hemphill, 2009, p. 314). By using performance-enhancing drugs, athletes disobey the rules of sport, and change “the condition of play without the consent of other athletes, which can be considered unfair in its own right” (Hemphill, 2009, p. 314). Gaining advantage by doping is considered cheating, as the use of drugs in sport is a violation of the rules stipulated as acceptable means to be used in sport.

### *Summary of the Literature*

The literature reviewed in this section establishes that athletes and the general public's attitudes and views on doping in Great Britain, Switzerland and the United States generally support the prohibition of performance-enhancing drugs in sport. However, while the literature indicates that athletes generally support banning the use of drugs in sport, all this information has been gathered through surveys and thus it does not delve very far into the reasons athletes give for supporting a doping ban, and none of the literature reviewed includes the perspectives of Canadian athletes. The reviewed literature indicates that there is agreement that doping is cheating. Yet little is known about why high-performance athletes support the doping ban and what, if any, values and justifications they associate with the ban.

Anti-doping organizations and governing bodies of sport, such as WADA, CCES and FIVB, justify banning doping based on the premises that the use of drugs in sport constitutes cheating, violates the principle of fair play, is unnatural, and is incompatible with the nature of sports (CCES, 2009a; FIVB, 2011a; WADA, 2011a). These reasons are based on the underlying values associated with sport, described as the spirit of sport by WADA. From the documents available from WADA, CCES, and FIVB that address doping in sport, it is clear that these organizations believe strongly that doping goes against the nature of sport, threatens the level playing field and is a form of cheating. However, it is possible that athletes will view the doping ban differently and their reasons and attitudes towards it may differ. Thus this thesis seeks to fill in this gap to help establish whether or not a sample of current and former Canadian National Volleyball

Team players' views on doping match or contrast with the rationale provided by the sport organizations that design, implement, and police sport's anti-doping rules.

### **Limitations**

One limitation of this study was that it relied on athletes' self-report responses to uncover information on doping. Past social science studies on doping in sport, which asked athletes to report on their attitudes, and to confess to their own compromising behaviours, typically relied on athletes agreeing to provide truthful responses to researchers. Petróczi, Aidman, Hussain, Deshmukh, Nepusz, et al (2010) suggest that athletes' self-reports may be characterized by under-reporting. This is because doping is a socially stigmatized action, and athletes have little incentive to confess their knowledge or doping behaviours to researchers. Therefore, there is a possibility that the participants in this study under-reported, or downplayed their attitudes towards doping in sport. This possibility could have been greatest for an athlete who is currently on the National Team and critical of the current regulations, but fearful of the repercussions of voicing his/her objections. I attempted to decrease the influence of this limitation by conducting in-depth, one-on-one interviews that focused on asking questions that required descriptions, and by avoiding questions that asked participants to discuss doping rule violations possibly committed by themselves or others. The interview questions focused on their perceptions of the rules, rather than their actions (see Appendix D). To gain rich responses in the one-on-one interviews, probes were used to ask participants to elaborate in hopes of extracting more complete answers. Participants were assured of their anonymity by the use of pseudonyms.

Another limitation impacting this study was that it took place in an Olympic year. It is possible that the extra pressure of attempting to qualify for the 2012 London Olympics influenced athletes' willingness to take the time to participate in academic research. For those athletes who agreed to take part, the fact that it was an Olympic year might have impacted their responses to questions about their experiences with, and attitudes towards doping in sport. Doping rules and regulations might be stressed more than in non-Olympic years leading to irritation or fatigue with discussing doping.

### **Delimitations**

I have imposed limitations to help focus the study and to set boundaries on the scope of the project. First, due to time and geographical constraints, this project focused exclusively on Canadian athletes. It would be unfeasible to analyze the various reasons, values and justifications provided for banning doping from anti-doping organizations and athletes outside of Canada. I also limited the number of participants to a maximum of 10 participants. Limiting the number of participants was due to the in-depth, semi-structured interview format needed to elicit rich responses. By limiting the study to a maximum of 10 participants, I focused on the quality and richness of the data instead of the quantity.

Participation in the interview component of this study was restricted to athletes who have been involved with the Canadian National Volleyball Team. A study of volleyball players' attitudes and perceptions of doping rules and requirements was selected for several reasons. One reason was the ease of access to potential participants with the women's National Team training in Winnipeg. However, access was not the sole determinant; I sought a sport that does not have a history or tradition of prevalent doping use and violations, but one in which performance-enhancing drugs could provide

a competitive advantage (unlike, for example, curling where doping is not thought to increase performance). Volleyball players can gain performance benefits in power (jumping height) and endurance (particularly in long matches) from doping, but do not have the same history of being under suspicion for doping as athletes in some sports. I suspected that there would, potentially, not be as much frustration with their sport's reputation or stigmas. Furthermore, volleyball was introduced as an Olympic sport at the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games, so volleyball players have been required to follow anti-doping policies and procedures since doping tests were first used in the Olympics in 1968. While volleyball was an appropriate population to draw from for this study, other sporting populations would also have been appropriate, and might have provided even richer data.

An alternative study could include recruiting a few participants from multiple sports instead of drawing all participants from one sport. By including five different sports, for example, it would be necessary to account for each of their different doping histories, cultures, and traditions. Furthermore, by using one sport, I was hoping to find consistency in the answers provided by participants as I examined their shared experiences. Consistency and similarities in interview responses among players from the same sport could be indicative of a shared underlying mentality towards doping in the sport. For these reasons, the population included in this study was limited to only high-performance Canadian volleyball athletes.

### **Chapter Layout**

The remainder of this thesis is divided into four chapters. Chapter II focuses on the history of anti-doping in Canada and analyzes how the current anti-doping system

operates in Canada, how it emerged, and why it emerged. In doing so, the rationale for doping-free sport in Canada is established. Next, the third chapter examines what attitudes and values a sample of Canadian athletes hold regarding the current anti-doping system by drawing out the themes and sub-themes that represent the participants' opinions and interactions with the doping ban. Chapter III draws on the information provided by current and former male and female Canadian National Team volleyball players compiled during the interviews. In Chapter IV, athletes' justifications for supporting or opposing the doping ban are compared to the CCES and WADA's justifications. Finally, this thesis concludes with a fifth chapter that includes a review of the concepts presented throughout the thesis, draws conclusions, and summarizes the findings, potential objections, and future directions for additional studies.

## **Chapter II: A Historical Examination of Doping in Sport and Anti-Doping Initiatives**

The Olympics mark the highest level of international competition for many high-performance athletes. Every four years during the two weeks that encompass Olympic competition, top athletes from all over the world are given a chance to represent their countries and compete to bring home a medal. However, in the struggle to win a medal and make their nations proud, some athletes and other sporting personnel struggle with the pressure of being or producing the fastest, highest and strongest performances, and turn to banned performance-enhancing drugs to help them achieve their goals. While the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) enforces a full-fledged doping ban, sport is continually plagued by athletes testing positive for performance-enhancing substances. For example, Canadians surged with joy and national pride when Ben Johnson crossed the finish line first in the 100 meter sprint in 1988 to become the new world record holder, only for many people to feel crushed and humiliated the next day when news of his positive test surfaced (Pound, 2004).

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a historical context for the possible attitudes, values and justifications athletes provide for endorsing or opposing the current doping ban in sport. Understanding the roots and development of the Canadian anti-doping movement and doping history will help to contextualize the answers provided by participants about their attitudes, values and justifications surrounding the doping ban and to see if they match the values espoused by WADA and the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES). Specifically, this chapter will chronicle the development of the Canadian anti-doping movement as it grew out of the embarrassment of the 1988 Seoul Olympics,

through the recommendations made by Chief Justice Charles Dubin in the *Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance* (1990), to the anti-doping system in force today. The historical evolution of anti-doping in Canada chronicles the anti-doping movement from in its beginning, when the interviewed retired participants were playing, to the system in force today.

Additionally, this chapter will provide an overview of the creation of the CCES, its roles and responsibilities, and how the anti-doping movement in Canada has changed since the publication of the *Dubin Inquiry*. While the main focus of this chapter is on doping and anti-doping programs within the Canadian context, there is some discussion about international doping and anti-doping initiatives. This discussion acknowledges Canada's position as an international competitor on the world stage, and recognizes that Canadian doping policies have been intertwined with international standards and policies set by WADA since WADA's creation in 1999. Therefore, Canadian and international anti-doping agencies and policies are not completely independent entities.

### **Doping in Canada Pre Seoul**

The flurry of activity in Canada surrounding doping and anti-doping initiatives in sport after the 1988 Olympics made it appear that doping in sport had escalated to an unmanageable problem that, given the events in Seoul, needed immediate attention and action. However, doping has roots in sport dating back to the ancient Olympics, and was an issue well before the International Olympic Committee (IOC) became worried about doping in sport after drugs were thought to play a role in the death of 23-year-old Danish cyclist Knud E. Jensen at the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome (Teetzel, 2004). Doping at the 1988 Seoul Olympic thus did not reflect a new problem arising in sport. Instead, it



could be argued that Ben Johnson's failed drug test at the 1988 Seoul Olympic brought the issue of doping in sport to the Canadian public's attention. According to Houlihan (2001), prior to Ben Johnson's disqualification in Seoul, the Canadian public was passive when it came to the problem of doping in sport. This greater attention after Johnson's failed drug test resulted from the public's perception that doping in sport had become a bigger threat to sport and was out of control (MacAloon, 1990).

In actuality, the IOC was well aware of the doping problem facing sport, and it passed its first anti-doping resolution in 1962 (Dowbiggin, 2010). However, even with the IOC's anti-doping resolution, there was rampant use of steroids among high-performance athletes in various sports, such as cycling and weightlifting, during the 1960s and 1970s (Cashmore, 2005). A high rate of steroid use by athletes during this time was due to drug tests being unable to detect the presence of steroids in urine samples until later in the 1970s. In 1987, the IOC's records showed 521 positive drug tests for steroid use throughout the year from international competitions (Cashmore, 2005). Additionally, some athletes were also engaging in recreational drug use; many National Basketball Association players were thought to be using cocaine, and numerous boxers, football players, and other athletes had also been penalized for their use of recreational drugs (Cashmore, 2005). Despite the differences between performance-enhancing drugs, such as steroids, and recreational drugs, like cocaine, "the term 'drugs' was used indiscriminately" and heightened "the feeling that sport was adrift in a moral sea with no terra firma in sight" (Cashmore, 2005, p. 232).

At the 63<sup>rd</sup> Congress of the IOC in Tokyo in 1964, the IOC members unanimously voted to condemn doping in sport after recognizing that doping was a serious issue facing

Olympic sport. The IOC resolved to: 1) “formally condemn the use of drugs;” 2) “sanction each person or national organizing committee who uses or promotes the use of drugs;” 3) “ask athletes to sign a pledge on non-drug use as part of their application process;” and 4) “ask national organizing committees to inform athletes that they are subject to examination and testing” (Todd & Todd 2001, p. 67). The IOC created a Medical Commission in 1968, whose members were responsible for organizing drug testing to take place at the Mexico City Olympics later that year (Dubin, 1990; Todd & Todd, 2001). Testing athletes at the Olympic Games was the policy from 1968 forward.

In 1974 the IOC decided to not only condemn doping, but to forbid it officially. In support of this decision the IOC prepared a list of prohibited drugs, required all Olympic competitors to participate in medical controls and examinations if selected, and disqualified any Olympic competitor who refused to take a doping test or failed the test. Additionally, if the athlete participated in a team sport, the team was required to forfeit, and would be disqualified from the Olympic Games if more than one member of the team refused the drug test or failed the test. With these resolutions in place, over the next several years drug testing occurred regularly at major international competitions and several athletes were caught doping (Todd & Todd, 2001). In 1984 the Canadian Olympic Association arranged for doping testing to be conducted on selected amateur and Olympic athletes in Canada. The rationale behind the decision was to allow the COA to monitor Canada’s top athletes outside of the Olympics (Kidd, Edelman & Brownell, 2001).

Even though the IOC attempted to be proactive in its resolution to forbid doping in sport, and encouraged each country to implement national drug testing programs,

numerous scandals plagued sport, which resulted in public criticism of the Medical Commission's efforts. In order to remain credible, the IOC needed to demonstrate that it could catch some drug cheats in Olympic sport (Teetzel, 2004). Scholars now explain that Ben Johnson was used as a scapegoat to show that the IOC took doping seriously and could catch 'drug cheats' (Cashmore, 2005). Leading up to the 1988 Games, the chief medical officer of the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) told reporters he believed that athletes had found a new masking agent and were able to beat the drug tests: "I have got to believe what the athletes are telling me. They tell me our drug-testing program is a joke. Until we begin some kind of unannounced testing, essentially surprising the athletes, what we're doing is a waste" (as cited in Todd & Todd, 2001, p. 89). The belief that testing and forbidding athletes to dope was insufficient to eliminate banned drug use in sport caused the IOC to come down firmly on athletes testing positive for substances at the Seoul Games.

Ben Johnson's positive test for stanozolol, as well as the numerous other positive drug tests among the Canadian Track and Field Team and Canada's Weightlifting Team, resulted in the Canadian government appointing Chief Justice Charles Dubin, a senior judge, to investigate the use of drugs in Canadian sport (Dubin, 1990; Todd et al, 2001). An investigation into drug use by the 1988 Canadian Olympic teams, and doping in general in Canada, was conducted (Dubin, 1990). While Johnson's positive drug test was not the sole reason for Dubin's investigation, Johnson is the athlete most commonly linked to the inquiry. Often it is forgotten that four out of the seven members of the Canadian Olympic Weightlifting team were disqualified before even competing in Seoul because they failed pre-Olympic drug tests, or that the Canadian Track and Field

Association was circulating rumours that Canadian athletes were doping in order to gain a competitive edge (Dubin, 1990). By the time Dubin started his investigation, Canadians were no longer passive or in denial about doping in sport, as the sport system had been pre-Seoul (Houlihan, 2001).

### **Background Politics: The Government and Sport**

In September 1961, Bill C-131, the Fitness and Amateur Sport Act was passed in the Canadian House of Commons. This bill was meant to address the low level of fitness of Canadians and to rectify this fitness deficiency. It consisted of having the government enter into “cost-sharing agreements with the provinces and making grants to national sport governing bodies” (Macintosh, Bedecki & Franks, 1988, p. 10). However, there was also a parallel concern about Canadian international athletic performance, as Canada’s standing at international sporting events, and specifically in Olympic and World Cup hockey, was falling behind. The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act was adopted in 1961 after Members of Parliament during the late 1950s, specifically fitness advocate J. R. Taylor, convinced John Diefenbaker and the Canadian federal government to take action and provide financial support for Canadian sport. The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act had wide acceptance among politicians. However, over the next decade, through the terms of Diefenbaker and Pearson, the Act was of little importance to the government as the importance of sport as a Canadian symbol for unity was less of a priority (Macintosh et al., 1988).

In 1969 Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau had the vision that sport could serve as a symbol to “unite Canadians despite regional and cultural differences” (Macintosh et al., 1988, p. 3). Therefore, the 1970s turned out to be a decade that shaped the government /

sport relationship. In 1970 John Munro, minister of national health and welfare, released a *Proposed Sports Policy for Canadians*. Embedded in this policy was the new idea that “the Canadian federal government had a legitimate role in the pursuit of ‘excellence’ in elite sport” (Macintosh et al., 1988, p. 42). Furthermore, this document legitimized the steps and organizations the federal government had created that allowed it to “exert more direct influence on the development of elite athletes” (Macintosh, et al., 1988, p. 42). Canadian performances at both the Winter and Summer Olympic Games throughout the 1970s demonstrated Canada’s increasing ability to be a strong competitor on the international stage. By 1984 Canada’s prowess as a sporting competitor was established with its victory at the World Cup in hockey (Macintosh et al., 1988).

Because of the recognition Canada received on the world stage from international competition, and specifically based on Olympic performance and medal acquisition, the federal and provincial governments created an ambitious financial incentive scheme in 1984 to support high-performance athletes ranking in the top eight in the world in their events (Kidd, 1988). While this financial incentive stemmed from the Fitness and Amateur Sport Act, which already had the federal government providing grants to national sport governing bodies, it was named the federal Athlete Assistance Plan (AAP) and provided \$650 per month to the athletes ranking in the top eight in the world as a basic stipend, and then provided monetary assistance and allowances for special training, day care for children, special equipment, moving and travel expenses, facility rentals, and university or college tuition, books, and instruments (Kidd, 1988). The federal and provincial governments transformed the formerly volunteer-based sports governing bodies into professionally administered corporations, which are now referred to as the

National Sport Federations, such as Volleyball Canada and Swimming/Natation Canada. This transformation also resulted in centralized training centres for national and provincial teams, and regular offshore training camps and tours (Kidd, 1988).

While the above steps by the federal and provincial governments were taken to be reactive against the public's dismay over Canada's performance decline at international competitions, and a belief that successful athletic teams enhanced a nation's image abroad, the use of performance-enhancing drugs by Canadian athletes at international competition, specifically the Olympics, was not only threatening to Canada's image abroad, but also the image at home (Kidd, 1988). The Canadian government could not be seen by Canadians and other countries to be endorsing or condoning athletes' use of performance-enhancing drugs in order to achieve top-level performances. Thus the Canadian federal government appointed Chief Justice Dubin to study doping in sport and create the *Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance*.

### **The Dubin Inquiry**

According to Rob Beamish (forthcoming), the *Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance* (1990) is "one of the most systematic and thorough analyses of Olympic sport ever conducted" (p. 425) for five specific reasons. First, the inquiry was initiated due to the public concern over the use of drugs and banned practices to increase athletic performance in sport. Second, the inquiry was to examine the facts and circumstances surrounding the use of performance-enhancing substances and practices by Canadian athletes in general. Third, the inquiry was to include the recent cases of athletes who had qualified and/or competed

in the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games. Fourth, the inquiry was also to provide recommendations regarding the issue of the use of drugs and banned practices in sport. Finally, Beamish's fifth point is that it was up to the Commissioner, Charles Dubin, to determine the appropriate methods and procedures for conducting the inquiry (Beamish, forthcoming). Ultimately, the goal of the inquiry was to investigate the state of doping in sport in Canada, specifically leading up to, and during the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games.

The resulting *Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance* (1990), informally titled the *Dubin Inquiry*, had two main focuses: 1) an overview of government involvement in sport; and 2) a discussion of ethics and morality (Beamish, forthcoming). Dubin addressed these objectives in six sections: 1) Overview of Government and Sport in Canada; 2) Overview of Doping; 3) The Sports and Events Examined; 4) Use and Control of Banned Substances; 5) Rights and Ethical Considerations; and 6) Conclusions and Recommendations (Dubin, 1990).

While the main goal for the inquiry was to investigate the state of doping in Canadian sport leading up to, and during the Seoul Olympics, MacAloon (1990) argues that the Canadian government was also trying to stave off the threats brought upon it from the events in Seoul. MacAloon states that the

disgrace of Johnson and the other Canadian athletes in Seoul immediately implicated and threatened Ottawa through four major channels of association: federal government domination of Olympic organizational structure, the ideological nationalism and federalism which made it possible to turn Olympic Canada into the 'East Germany of the Commonwealth' in the first place, the

upcoming national elections and the public personalities of particular government sport officials. (MacAloon, 1990, p. 44)

The inquiry, in part, was also to establish if the Canadian government had any part in the state of doping in Canada. As discussed above, high performance sport and Canadian politics were closely related (Beamish & Borowy, 1988). The problem of doping in Canadian sport was a serious problem not only facing the sporting world but the Canadian political world as well. Broadly, Canadian sport and politics intertwine because international competition provides a vehicle for publicity and a source of revenue for Canada (Beamish & Borowy, 1988). By competing and doing well at international competition, Canada is publicized and as a result can generate revenue from the interest of non-Canadian citizens through tourism. As international competitors, Canadian amateur high-performance athletes are a “focal point for international prestige and it is partly on the basis of [their] performances that many international governments weigh and consider the strength of Canada in the world community” (Beamish & Borowy, 1988, p. 10). Canadian politics and sport are also closely related because sport negotiates for a legitimate share of the nation’s resources (Beamish & Borowy, 1988). For example, the government is involved in providing financial resources for different groups of Canadian citizens, and sport is in competition for a portion of these resources. The Canadian sport system has a greater chance of receiving more financial support from the government if athletes are performing well internationally.

Dubin did address the government’s involvement in funding and developing sport. He acknowledged that government funding had originally emphasized “broad-based support of sport for the general community of ordinary Canadians” but the funding



and focus on sport had shifted to athletes competing in “high-level competitive sports” (Dubin, 1990, p. 64) capable of the skill level needed to win medals and recognition for Canada. Varda Burstyn’s (2000) review and critique of the *Dubin Inquiry* suggests the inquiry failed and was not as effective or as thorough as it could have been. She claims the inquiry minimized the importance of governmental policy and funding in promoting performance-enhancing drugs, as well as ignored the role of commercial and media interests in the evolution of an athletic drug culture. Moreover, she suggests that Dubin merely scratched the surface on the possible influence of the government when he concluded:

How is it that this sorry state of affairs has been allowed to continue for so long? We must consider whether there are other factors that have contributed to it – whether, we, as a society, and those who govern sport must also share the responsibility. [...] We have placed pressured on our young men and women which have tempted them to cheat, even at the risk of their own health. (Dubin, 1990, p. 517 as cited in Burstyn, 2000)

Burstyn argues that Dubin failed to highlight how the government and the media had contributed to the state of doping in Canadian sport. She commented that while the Dubin report recommended that a broader net of responsibility needed to be cast, it did not include the government or the media in that net of responsibility. Dubin claimed that coaches, physicians, trainers and officials should also be held responsible as the inquiry made it clear that they, as well as athletes, were involved in the doping scandal; however, Burstyn concluded that it was not enough for the inquiry to only solicit detailed accounts

of who proscribed what and for whom, but needed to address the government's and the media's role in perpetuating the problem of doping in sport in greater detail.

While Dubin did not fully address the role of the media and the government in relation to the doping problem in Canadian sport, he did conclude his report with a total of 70 recommendations to improve Canadian sport and create a more effective anti-doping policy. Dubin also pointed out that the shortcomings of testing procedures, such as the inability to test for all known performance-enhancing substances was well known and that these limitations had allowed athletes and their support teams to make a mockery of the doping control procedures. In order to regain control over testing, drug testing protocols needed to occur both in-competition and out of competition, to not allow athletes to use banned substances when there was no fear of being tested and the substance detected in their systems. Finally, educating athletes and members of the sporting community about the dangers of doping was recommended (Dubin, 1990).

The *Dubin Inquiry* was the Canadian government's response to the public's call for action after their collective embarrassment and anger over the 1988 Seoul doping scandal. While the release of the *Dubin Inquiry* initially calmed the fears about the issue of doping in sport, those who thought the report would solve the problem of doping in sport were disappointed, as reports of systemic doping and suppressed positive tests continued to emerge after its release (Teetzel, 2004).

### **Following the Inquiry**

This history of what took place following the *Dubin Inquiry* has not been chronicled using the policies and reports from the CCES. These policies and reports, which are available in the CCES's archive of sources in Ottawa, include the annual reports, statements and policies published during the time that Canada was trying to develop its anti-doping organization, known today as the CCES. The following section chronicles what happened following the inquiry, and how the CCES came to be what it is today.

The *Dubin Inquiry* elicited a two-phase response from the Canadian government. In the first phase, the government dealt with the individuals named in the inquiry and developed a penalty framework to sanction the guilty individuals. The second phase implemented a “significantly enhanced Canadian anti-doping campaign” (Danis, 1991, p. 2). Marcel Danis, the Minister of State for Youth, Fitness and Amateur Sport at the time, announced that an anti-doping organization would be created to build on past anti-doping efforts and move beyond doping controls (Danis, 1991). The new anti-doping organization was to be an independent, non-profit organization outside the control of the Canadian federal government, with the responsibilities of coordinating, developing and implementing policies and programs for athlete testing, research and the coordination of appeals, as well as be responsible for the development of education programs for athletes, coaches and sport leaders. Finally, a main goal for the new anti-doping organization was the government's intention to establish a common penalty framework for sanctioning and penalizing Canadian athletes, coaches and supporting members of the sporting

populations who violated Canadian and IOC anti-doping rules. Penalties for doping infractions would be applied all across the Canadian sport system (Danis, 1991).

From the second phase of the government's response to the inquiry emerged the *Canadian Policy Against Doping in Sport* (1991). This policy was developed in partnership by the Federal-Provincial-Territorial governments in consultation with their constituents (Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1991). The *Canadian Policy Against Doping in Sport* reflected the first anti-doping policy in Canada that had the full support of the governments (federal, provincial and territorial) but that was run by an independent body known as the Canadian Anti-Doping Organization (CADO) (Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1991). The new policy was applied all across Canada with each province, referred to as a jurisdiction, responsible for developing and implementing its own policy on doping at the provincial sports federation level. The idea was that each province or jurisdiction would be responsible for its own anti-doping policies. CADO would help them develop these policies and make sure that there was continuity between provinces. Specifically, CADO ensured that all jurisdictions were to use consistent terminology and a consistent definition of doping that was based on the list of prohibited substances and banned methods put forth by the IOC. In addition, CADO assisted each jurisdiction in developing sanctions that were fair and harmonious with international and/or national sanctions and regulations where appropriate (Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1991).

While the definition of doping may have been consistent throughout Canada, the individual provinces' policies were inconsistent. Recognizing the need for harmonization and cohesiveness of anti-doping policies, not only within the country but throughout the world as well, the governments of Canada, the United Kingdom and Australia reached an

agreement to harmonize their doping penalties and doping control procedures. This agreement was created in 1990 and was named the International Anti-Doping Agreement. By 1998, the agreement had grown to encompass the governments of New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland and the Netherlands (Houlihan, 2001). With this agreement, CADO began working as part of an international network as well as nationally.

On the national scale, in 1991, CADO implemented an anti-doping policy, and was forged as an independent, federally-incorporated, non-profit body responsible for anti-doping initiatives in Canada. Before CADO became fully operational in January 1992 its name was changed to the Canadian Centre for Drug Free Sport (CCDS). The CCDS's first mission statement explained its role was "to achieve drug-free sport in Canada" (CCDS, 1993, p 3).

Most early anti-doping efforts around the world focused solely on the science behind performance-enhancing drugs (Pound, 2004); however, in 1995, after the CCDS partnered with Fair Play Canada, there was a shift from science-based anti-doping rules to a generalist anti-doping approach that dealt specifically with the subject of doping as an ethical issue in sport (Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1991). Fair Play Canada's mission was to promote "integrity, fairness and respect in sport through education, research and special initiatives, in partnership with the Canadian sport system and other organizations, to ensure a safe, ethical and accessible sport and recreation environment for all Canadians" (Fair Play Canada, 1995, p. i). Together, Fair Play Canada and the CCDS developed and implemented educational programs for athletes that informed them of the dangers of doping as well as how doping was against the ideals of fair competition (CCES, 2011a). These programs went beyond listing what was and was not banned, and

in the process expanded the CCDS's role to move beyond the science of doping and drug testing.

The CCDS and Fair Play Canada merged in 1996 to form the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES). The creation of the CCES combined the individual responsibilities of the CCDS and Fair Play Canada into one organization that would control both the testing procedures and the athlete education programs (CCES, 2011a). While mainly concerned with anti-doping policy, the CCES is also concerned with the broader issues of justice, fairness, equity and inclusivity in sport, and the ways in which more specific applications of these concepts could be applied to its main focus of protecting the rights of athletes and promoting and ensuring fair play and drug-free sport (CCES, 1997).

Though Sport Canada was striving for clean sport, attempting to solve the problem of doping in sport domestically was having little effect on the problem of doping internationally. While individual countries were attempting to rectify the doping situation within their borders, the IOC was struggling to prevent doping on the international stage. Because the IOC only had jurisdiction to conduct doping tests during the two weeks of Olympic competition, its efforts to fight doping in sport were limited. The IOC could not reasonably be expected to ensure doping-free sport on its own. It was clear that a more harmonized and global approach was needed to combat doping in sport.

### **A Globalized Anti-Doping Approach**

When the IOC implemented drug testing at the Olympics in 1968 it established itself as the leader when it came to doping control in sport (Halchin, 2006). However, enforcement of anti-doping rules was left entirely up to the various sports organizations

except during the Olympics, with the IOC only being responsible for testing during the Olympics. The International Federations and National Sporting Organizations followed the policies and procedures put in place by the IOC (Pound, 2004) but it was not the IOC's responsibility to organize or pay for drug tests. The International Federations focused mainly on in-competition testing, which proved only useful for certain drugs, such as stimulants or beta-blockers, that were taken at the time of the world championships, but were ineffective for detecting long term drug use during training, such as the use of steroids (Pound, 2004). A significant gap remained available to cheaters to use muscle and endurance-boosting drugs in the off-season because the International Federations were doing little to test during these times. The lack of testing outside of major competitions sent a message that could be interpreted to mean they did not care about the doping problem facing sport (Pound, 2004).

Weeks after the 1998 Tour de France cycling scandal, the IOC held a press conference announcing it would begin developing an IOC Anti-Doping Code (Pound, 2004). At this time, the IOC's anti-doping rules remained applicable only at the Olympic Games. With that in mind, the IOC asked each International Federation to adopt its new IOC Anti-Doping Code into its own rules in November 1998 (Pound, 2004). The IOC's next move was the suggestion that an independent anti-doping agency needed to be created, which would not be controlled by the IOC or stakeholders within the Olympic movement exclusively, but would involve the governments of competing countries (Pound, 2004). This suggestion was made as a means to help diffuse the suspicion and criticism the IOC was facing due to new allegations in 1998 that the IOC had suppressed positive tests at the 1984 Los Angeles Games (Pound, 2004).

In February 1999 the IOC hosted a World Conference on Doping in Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland. In attendance were representatives of the Olympic movement, governments, International Federations, and international agencies involved in drug enforcement (Pound, 2004). What resulted was a plan to create a World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA). Sport's international anti-doping agency, WADA, was created under Swiss civil law, but as a separate legal entity with a foundation board that governs its affairs. Control of WADA is divided equally between the IOC and governments, with equal numbers of representatives named by the sports movement and by the governments (Pound, 2004). The role of the newly formed organization was to “promote, coordinate and monitor the fight against doping in sport in all its forms” (David, 2008, p. 1), and to be responsible for establishing and maintaining unified standards for testing, imposing sanctions for violations, and coordinating the various organizations and governments involved in the anti-doping movement (David, 2008).

Since its creation in 1999, WADA has led the fight against doping in sport by creating and introducing the World Anti-Doping Program and developing and implementing the *World Anti-Doping Code* (David, 2008). While the WADP and the *WADC* are complimentary to one another, the WADP was “developed and implemented to harmonize anti-doping policies and regulations among anti-doping organizations and governments,” while the *WADC* is the “core document that provides the framework for harmonized anti-doping policies, rules, and regulations within sports organizations and among public authorities” (WADA, 2010). Officially and unanimously adopted in Copenhagen, Denmark in March 2003 at the second World Conference on Doping, the *WADC* represents WADA's aim for harmonized rules, disciplinary procedures and



sanctions. Ultimately the *WADC* is the central point of the World Anti-Doping Program (David, 2008), and seeks to “preserve what is intrinsically valuable about sport” (WADA, 2009a, p. 14).

It is from the *WADC* that a unified approach to doping control has been achieved. Athletes and other members of sporting communities on the international and national levels are bound to the *WADC* once the organizations for which they compete become signatories of the *WADC*. Signatories of the *WADC* include the IOC, National Olympic Committees, the International Paralympic Committee, National Paralympic Committees, International Federations, National Sports Federations, national anti-doping organizations and major event organizations (David, 2008). Accepting the *WADC* results in both national and international athletes being bound to the requirements outlined in the *WADC*. Athletes from signatory countries to the *WADC* are subject to being tested in and out of competition, and are further subject to investigation if they violate the anti-doping rules and regulations. Furthermore, countries and International Federations that are not signatories to the code are ineligible to compete at the Olympic Games. The *WADC* also accounts for athlete support personnel, for example coaches and trainers, by binding them to the *WADC* to be subject to investigation for trafficking or administering prohibited substances (David, 2008).

The *WADC* is divided into 25 articles, beginning with defining doping and then detailing the various anti-doping rule violations, testing, sanctions and other relevant information surrounding the anti-doping movement (i.e. the practices and initiatives to prevent and deter doping in sport) (WADA, 2009a). The 25 articles that make up the *WADC* compose the “fundamental and universal document upon which the World Anti-

Doping Program in sport is based” (WADA, 2009a, p. 11) and serve the purpose of advancing the “anti-doping effort through universal harmonization of core anti-doping elements” (WADA, 2009a, p. 11). One of the goals of this harmonization is so that all athletes and sporting support staff are treated equally and similarly when it comes to anti-doping rule violations, regardless of their sport, the competition they are competing at, or their level of performance. Each athlete and member of the support staff, under the articles of the *WADC*, will have to face sanctions for their actions. The *WADC* is meant to provide the rules and regulations that are acceptable and fair for all athletes (Chappelet & Kubler-Mabbott, 2008).

Countries and International Federations adopted the *WADC* in 2003 in order for the agreement to come into effect for 2004 (WADA, 2009a). Canada was a signatory of the 2004 *WADC* and, like other signatories, formally adopted the second edition of the *WADC* when it was revised and came into effect in 2009 (CCES, 2011b). Revisions for the third edition are currently underway and the next version is expected to be in effect by 2015. The Canadian Anti-Doping Program (CADP), encompasses the rules that govern doping control in Canada, and is compliant with the *WADC* in order to ensure a level global playing field (CCES, 2011b). The CADP describes how the *WADC* is carried out and explains the results management process. Furthermore, the CADP targets and provides services and information on other aspects pertinent to a comprehensive anti-doping strategy, including: education, athlete services, test distribution planning, sample collection, and results management. The CADP is now in its third version, which came into effect March 1, 2011 (CCES, 2011b).

It has been almost 25 years since Ben Johnson was caught doping, 22 years since Dubin conducted and published his inquiry, 16 years since the CCES was formed, and 13 years since WADA was created and became the leader in the anti-doping movement. However, while the anti-doping movement has advanced over the last quarter century, doping in sport remains a problem facing sport.

### **The Impact of the Dubin Inquiry – Two Decades Later**

Beamish (2012) asks, “in the two decades since the report of the Commission of Inquiry was released, what has changed?” and responds, “In short: little to nothing and everything” (p. 450). Specifically, the Canadian government is continuing to fund high-performance sport, going against Dubin’s recommendation:

that the mandate for the government funding of sport must ‘reflect a commitment to those principles on which government funding was originally based’ – broad participation, not solely elite sport, increased access to all Canadians, the encouragement of women to participate in sport ensuring equal access to sport and athletic facilities, support for the disabled, and an amelioration of the regional disparities in access to facilities and sport programs. (Beamish, 2012, p. 450)

Furthermore, some Canadian athletes continue to use performance-enhancing substances and practices in order to gain a competitive edge as they compete on the national and international stage (Beamish, 2012). For example, in February 2012, Benjamin Martel, a Canadian cyclist, was sanctioned for the presence of testosterone in his doping sample. He will be ineligible to compete until August 2013. In November 2011, Miguel Agreda, another cyclist, received a 2-year ban from sport after testing positive for EPO. And cycling coach Andre Aubut received a lifetime ban for administering EPO to one of his

athletes, Genevieve Jeanson, throughout her career. Jeanson, in turn, received a 10-year ban from sport (CCES, 2011c).

In regard to changes in sport since the inquiry, the emphasis on ‘pursing the podium’ and winning gold medals has intensified (Beamish, forthcoming). The ‘Own the Podium 2010’ campaign for the Vancouver 2010 Olympics and beyond is an example of the continued emphasis on winning, as it “ties funding directly to success measured in medal counts” (Beamish, forthcoming, p. 451). Other aspects that have changed since the publication of the *Dubin Inquiry* (1990) include significant changes in the anti-doping movement, for example the creation of WADA and worldwide harmonious anti-doping policies. Dubin’s claim that more testing was not the answer has been ignored. Testing athletes has reached a new intensity, with drug tests consisting of both urine and blood samples, in and out of competition, and athletes being required to submit their whereabouts information for unannounced testing to occur at any time in any place.

Pound’s assertion that the issue of doping in sport and the framework for anti-doping rules and enforcement “should have been seen as a series of ethical considerations, combined with the concern for the health of athletes” (Pound, 2004, p. 57) has taken effect, as both WADA and the CCES support a values-based sport system to deter and prevent athletes from doping. WADA presents ethics as a value that characterizes the spirit of sport (WADA, 2009a) and the CCES considers doping an ethical issue facing sport (CCES, 2011j). However, it is unclear whether athletes also view doping in sport as an ethical issue that is supported by values and justifications, or if they simply interpret the doping ban as a set of rules they must follow in order to remain eligible to compete.

## Summary

The *Dubin Inquiry* (1990) remains one of the most systematic and thorough analyses of Olympic sport ever conducted (Beamish, forthcoming). However, as Beamish argues, few of the recommendations have been implemented, and some have been completely ignored. This chapter has provided a historical context for the development of anti-doping policy in Canada through the analysis of primary source documents available at the CCES's office in Ottawa. It has also pieced together how Canadian anti-doping policy ties into the international policies on doping in sport. An understanding of Canadian anti-doping history provides context for what the retired players experienced dealing with in terms of adhering to the rules of the anti-doping movement, as well as the differences the current players are subjected to. All three of the retired players were playing on the Canadian Team during and right after the *Dubin Inquiry*, and thus were subjected to the new and changing Canadian anti-doping policies following Seoul. Moreover, reviewing the history of anti-doping in Canada clarifies that Canadian athletes must comply with an international anti-doping code, and could encounter similar experiences with the doping ban as their competitors in other countries. Moving forward, Chapter III examines the attitudes Canadian athletes hold in regards to participating in sport at a high-performance level and adhering to the doping ban. From this chapter's historical overview of the doping ban in Canada, and how the rules are integrated into WADA's international anti-doping code, coupled with the analysis of the interview transcripts from athletes, I will be able to assess if the way the anti-doping code is implemented and carried out at the level of the anti-doping organizations is registering with athletes.

### **Chapter III: Understanding the Athletes' Perspectives through Semi-Structured Interviews**

This chapter describes and analyzes the interview data collected during seven one-on-one, semi-structured interviews with seven volleyball players from the Men's and Women's Canadian National Volleyball Teams (see Appendix D for interview questions). More specifically, this chapter describes the recruitment process, the participants, the interview process, how the data was analyzed using content analysis and coding, and the codes and themes that emerged during this process.

#### **The Recruitment Process**

The goal outlined in Chapter I was to interview up to ten participants, five women (three current, two former) and five men (three current, two former). However, I encountered considerable problems with recruitment. To obtain research ethics approval I was required to contact the coaches of both the Men and Women's National Volleyball Teams for approval to allow their players to participate in my study. Approval was granted one week after my request from the women's head coach and the team manager emailed my invitation to participate to current and former players. While I attempted to contact the coaches and manager of the men's team, my request for approval was unacknowledged. I attempted to contact the National Men's Volleyball Team head coach and manager three times, twice via email and once by phone, but received no reply. I was not allowed to contact or approach players directly and ask for their participation or to attend a practice and describe my study and request participation due to concern that if I had contact with the players before they agreed to participate in my study, they could feel coerced or pressured into participating. Because of this perceived potential for

coercion, the research ethics board did not grant me permission to attend a practice to describe my study and request voluntary participation. However, I was granted an amendment to my research protocol to display recruitment posters in the Frank Kennedy Centre at the University of Manitoba (see Appendix E for recruitment poster).

Three current members and one former member of the Canadian National Women's Volleyball Team contacted me by email to set up an interview. After each interview I asked the participants if they could provide my contact information and the details about the study to their teammates who may be interested. This form of recruitment is known as the snowball effect, and generates participants for studies based on the word of mouth of people who have already participated in the study and suggest to people they know who fit the criteria of the study that they might be interested in participating as well (Patrick et al., 1998). Through contacts of the former women's team player, two former members of the male National Team contacted me and agreed to be interviewed. The final participant, the current male team member heard about the study from his friend and contacted me about volunteering for this study.

In total, the recruitment and data collection spanned five months. Only seven potential participants responded to my letter of invitation. A possible factor affecting participation included the fact that it was an Olympic year, and at the onset of my recruitment both the Men's and Women's National Teams were preparing for their Olympic qualification tournaments. It is possible that the training schedule, travel schedule, and the pressure of preparing for the Olympic qualifier deterred potential participants from volunteering to participate in the study. For the retired members, recruitment was difficult because I was also not able to contact them directly. The retired

players were also contacted by the team manager of the women's team. It is possible that the manager lacked contact information for several players, or perhaps the retired players who were contacted felt too far removed from their lives as athletes to participate. It is also possible that now being out of sport they had other responsibilities, such as work and families, which resulted in them deciding they did not have time to participate.

Recruitment of retired male players was hindered because I was never able to get in touch with the manager or coaches of the National Men's Volleyball Team, who would have been able to send my request for participants to current and retired players. However, it is my belief that the subject matter of discussing doping in sport was a deterrent for some athletes to participate as well as for the managers and coaches to pass on the information. This possibility will be described below in my reflections on the interview process.

### **Participants**

In total, four female players (three current, one former) and three male players (two former, one current) agreed to participate in this study and take part in an interview. Four out of the seven interviews were conducted in person, two interviews were conducted over the phone, and one participant answered the interview questions by e-mail. This participant and I tried to arrange an in-person interview, but we were unable to meet due to this participant's schedule. In the case of all the interviews, except the interview by e-mail, each interview was recorded with an audio recorder and transcribed, and then the transcript was returned by e-mail to the participant to review and make any changes if the participant wanted to alter or delete any of his/her statements made in the interview (Creswell, 2007; Sinclair, 2011).



On average the female participants were members of the Canadian National Volleyball team for three and a half years. Sarah,<sup>2</sup> the former National Team member, played for a total of three and a half years, while Jane, who at the time of the interview had just retired the week before, and was therefore counted as a current member, had just finished her fourth year as a member of the National Team. Amanda and Betty were both still currently playing for the Canadian National Team and had been team members for two and three years, respectively. Neither Amanda nor Betty knew when they would retire. While the women's team members averaged 3.5 years on the National Team, the men participating in the study played much longer. Both Paul and Steve, the two former National Team members, each represented Canada for 13 seasons. Dexter had only completed one year with the National Team at the time of his interview. The male participants, with the exception of Dexter, also played on professional European teams during the off-season when they were not representing Canada. The women did not mention this same experience, as corresponding professional women's leagues did not exist in the time these participants were playing on the National Team. A similarity between all the participants was that they all played at the university level before playing for the Canadian National Volleyball team.

Despite all seven athletes representing Canada at the international level, it emerged through the interview process that only four of the seven participants have been drug tested. Only one player who is a current player at this time had been tested. The other three participants who had been tested were the former members of the National Team. All three of the former members reported being tested at least ten times during their careers. Two of the three retired members joined the National Team in the early

---

<sup>2</sup> Names used in this chapter are the pseudonyms selected by the participants at their interviews.

1990s, shortly after the release of the *Dubin Inquiry* (1990), while the third joined in the mid-1990s; during the time Canada was implementing new anti-doping strategies and organizations. The fact that the retired participants were playing during and after the *Dubin Inquiry* highlights the importance of understanding and analyzing the historical examination of anti-doping initiatives within Canada, as the interviewed retired players experienced the anti-doping system as it was being constructed and implemented. The interviewed current athletes are following an anti-doping system that was already in place when they started playing. It is possible that these three participants were tested frequently due to the new proactive attitude towards doping that was transpiring in Canadian amateur high-performance sport at the time. On the other hand, the current members of the National Team attribute not being tested to the fact that selection for drug testing is random and by chance they had not yet been selected, but also expressed the belief that because doping is not thought to be prominent in volleyball compared to sports like cycling and football, there could be less frequent testing than in other sports.

### **The Interview Process**

In-person interviews were conducted in a local coffee shop of the participant's choice, during non-peak hours where they felt most comfortable and were unlikely to be overheard. Phone interviews were conducted from my apartment using the telephone landline. Interviews lasted between 30 and 60 minutes and were recorded using a digital audio recorder. In order to make the participants feel comfortable I offered to get them something to eat or drink from the coffee shop's menu. I then proceeded to make light introductory conversation, including asking how they were, where they had come from, and told them a little about myself. The initial ice-breaking conversations were not

recorded. Once we had talked for a few minutes and gotten to know each other we started the interview. I reviewed the informed consent form with each participant (Appendix C), and had him or her sign the form. Before turning on the recorder I asked him or her to choose a pseudonym to be referred to throughout the analysis and in this thesis. I then informed them that the recorder was being turned on and started the interview.

Guided by a list of interview question (Appendix D), I employed a semi-structured interview format, which allowed for the interview to have a natural flow and for me to ask for clarification or more detail about their answers. Adopting a semi-structured format also allowed me to explore if their answers could be expanded or enriched by asking more questions. When the interview was over, I asked if they had anything else they would like to add, thanked them for participating in my study and informed them that I was turning off the recorder. The interviews were transcribed and returned to the individual participants within two weeks of the interview for review. At this time, the participants could change or add any information on the interview transcript.

### **Transcription, Content Analysis and Coding**

In order to transcribe each interview, the audio files were uploaded to my computer from the audio recorder and saved in password-protected files using the pseudonym the participant chose at the beginning of the interview. The transcript included the date of the interview, the pseudonym of the participant and whether the participant was a female or male, current or former player. I also created a word

document with the pseudonym key to keep track of which pseudonym belonged to each participant.

The interview that was completed by e-mail did not require transcription. However, because I did not get to ask additional questions or ask for clarification of certain concepts, I read through the interview transcript thoroughly and identified the areas I wanted to clarify. I sent my additional questions via e-mail back to the participant, and he responded with the information requested. Once each transcript was complete, I sent it back to the participant for verification and member checking (Sinclair, 2011). At this time the participants were invited to delete, expand or clarify any of the information they provided if they were uncomfortable with it or felt they had been misinterpreted. None of the participants chose to alter their interview responses.

The interview questions were asked in an open-ended manner so that participants could elaborate and describe their lived experiences with the anti-doping initiative. Open-ended interview questions and a semi-structured interview format lend themselves to a conventional content analysis approach because the process allows for a natural flow to the interview and for questions to be specific to participants' answers instead of based on preconceived theories (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). According to Tesch (1990), immersing oneself through reading the data is the first step to analyzing interview transcripts. From there, codes can be developed to categorize the information from each interview (Tesch, 1990).

I labeled all the quotes and wrote them under the headings of the code / theme to which they belonged. Important to note is that when conducting content analysis and coding data, prespecified codes can be used or coding can be started with no prespecified

codes in place (Punch, 2005). For the purpose of coding the text data from the interview transcripts, no prespecified codes were used. By not prespecifying codes for the data, the initial analysis of the transcripts aligned with Creswell's (2007) definition of priori coding. Next, using emergent coding allowed for themes to be derived from the categories of data, which in turn allowed for more meaningful and rich data to be analyzed.

According to Burnard (1991), "the aim is to produce a detailed and systematic recording of the themes and issues addressed in the interviews" (p. 462), when analyzing interview transcripts. Then, link the themes from the interviews together by categorizing the similar or same themes. Conventional content analysis and Burnard's 14-stage model for analyzing interview data were used to code the transcripts. The first step involved immersing myself in the data by rereading the interview transcripts and by making notes about potential categories and codes that could be used. Once fully immersed in the data from the transcripts, coding can begin. Each transcript was read individually and headings and codes that encompass all the data are identified and attached to the pertinent data (Burnard, 1991). Next, similar categories or codes that encompass similar content were collapsed together based on what fit best together. This new list was then analyzed to make sure it is not repetitive and sub-headings were developed. With the final list, the transcripts were colour coded to identify which quotes belong to each category and each code was assigned a colour. The assigned code colour highlights the quotes belonging to each individual coding category (Burnard, 1991).

When analyzing the seven interview transcripts from my study, I followed Burnard's (1991) design. Because I was using a conventional content analysis approach,

no prespecified codes or categories were created beforehand. Each transcript was treated as a *tabula rasa*, a blank slate, for information and codes. Before coding each transcript, I read through it three times so that I was familiar with the information that the participant had provided. I then coded each interview transcript independently of the others by identifying words, sentences and quotations that reflected a theme and gave them a code. For example, when I came across text that mentioned being afraid, I coded it under the heading 'fear'. Similarly, when the participants discussed the anti-doping system or other aspects of sport in terms of rules, I coded it under the heading 'rules'. I continued using one-word headings for other themes that emerged while reading the interview transcripts; for example I also created headings of 'education', 'knowledge', 'cheating', 'fairness' and 'health'. Once I had coded all seven transcripts, I compared the transcripts and identified the codes that were the same or similar between the seven transcripts. At the time of coding I did not account for differences between the current and retired players. Comparison of the content of individual transcripts is discussed in Chapter IV. By comparing the coding headings from each transcript, the following list of codes/themes emerged based on the headings I had used to code the data:

1. Fear/Scared
2. Funding/Money
3. I'm Different Perception
4. Lack of Education
5. Lack of Knowledge
6. Rule Based System
7. Doping is Cheating
8. Silence Surrounding Doping
9. Protection of Athletes
10. Suspicion
11. Frustration
12. Canada is Different
13. Testing is Inconsistent
14. Effectiveness of Anti-Doping System

15. Own the Podium Pressure
16. Doping is Not Useful in Volleyball
17. Lack of Emphasis on Ethics/Morals/Values
18. Fairness and Level Playing Field
19. Game of Catch-Up / Gap Exists
20. Health
21. Reasons for Doping
22. Unconcerned with the Distant Future

According to Morse and Field (1995), the initial coding should aim to produce between 10 and 15 clusters so that the clusters of codes are broad enough for a large number of codes to be sorted. The 10 to 15 clusters are meant to be the result of collapsing the initial codes or themes into broader more all-encompassing codes or themes.

The next step in coding the data was to identify the quotations that could be classified under each of the above coding headings. This process included re-reading each transcript and identifying the section or sections of text that belonged to each heading. I knew where to find these quotations from my initial coding where I had written down the codes near the blocks of transcript that discussed the theme. I then wrote each quotation from each interview transcript under its pertinent heading. For example, under the coding heading ‘Rule Based System’ I included all of the quotations from each interview that reflected that the participants considered the anti-doping initiative to be grounded in rules. For example,

I think the rules are... I think everybody knows the rules because it is very rules based, you know, you either make a choice to either follow the rules or to not follow the rules. - Paul (retired player)

Quotes that did not specifically use the word ‘rule’ but alluded to rule following were also included. For example, two participants noted:

And I totally understand that drugs, well first it’s illegal, so why would it be allowed for athletes. – Amanda (current player)

Drugs aren't allowed in sport. – Paul (retired player)

Therefore, quotations that reflected that the participant was talking about rules without explicitly stating the word 'rule' were also included in the 'Rule Based System' coding category. For each coding category, all quotations containing the code specifically, as well as quotations that referenced the code without stating it explicitly, were included under the coding category heading.

After sorting the quotations under the appropriate coding headings, I collapsed some of the initial codes into each other to allow for a broader coding category of a similar theme. For example, while re-reading the list of quotations under the headings 'Lack of Knowledge' and 'Lack of Education,' I noticed that discussion of one most often included discussion of the other. Also, the quotations under these two coding headings did not just reflect a lack of knowledge or education, but also included sources of knowledge and education. These two coding headings were thus collapsed into the heading 'Education and Knowledge.' If the quotes included under a coding heading mentioned more than one coding heading, as in the case of knowledge and education, or espoused a similar theme, the coding headings were collapsed together. This was the case when I decided to collapse the three coding headings of 'I'm Different Perception,' 'Canada is Different,' and 'Doping is Not Useful in Volleyball' into one coding heading: 'Perceptions of Differences.' All three of these coding headings contained quotations that reflected that the participants perceived themselves, volleyball, and Canada as being different from other players, sports and countries. The following list of coding headings resulted from this stage of my coding analysis:

1. Fear
2. Perceptions of Differences



3. Suspicion
4. Knowledge and Education
5. Health and Protection of Athletes
6. Frustration
7. Rules
8. Doping = Cheating
9. Pressure
10. Fairness and the Level Playing Field
11. Ethics, Morals and Values
12. Silence Surrounding Doping
13. Game of Catch Up / Gap Exists

The second round of coding analysis rendered a coding heading list that was roughly half of the initial coding list. However, because I had collapsed several of the coding headings, the next step was to identify the coding sub-headings belonging to each coding category (Burnard, 1991).

I re-read the coding headings and the list of quotations a second time. This time, as I read through the various quotations under each coding category, I made notes beside each quote about the main point of the quote. For example under the coding heading for fear, when re-reading the quotes I read them with the question ‘fear of what?’ My notes in the margins attempted to answer to that question. With that question in mind, I decided that the coding category of fear could be divided into the following sub-categories:

- a) fear of false accusations / false positive tests
- b) fear of loss of accomplishments and medals
- c) use of fear

The third and final list of coding categories and sub-categories includes the following:

1. Fear
  - a. Fear of false accusations / false positive tests
  - b. Fear of loss of accomplishments
  - c. Use of fear
2. Perception of Differences
  - a. I’m different
  - b. Volleyball is different
    - i. Volleyball is clean

- ii. Doping is not useful in volleyball
  - c. Canada is different
    - i. More strict
    - ii. Competitive attitude / focus
    - iii. Sport structure
- 3. Suspicion
  - a. Opponents
  - b. Countries / governments
  - c. Testing
- 4. Knowledge and Education
  - a. Lack of knowledge and education
    - i. Due to assumption of knowledge and education
  - b. Sources of knowledge and education
  - c. Accessibility to information on anti-doping policies and procedures
  - d. Blind faith
- 5. Health and Protection of Athletes
  - a. Doping is dangerous for health
  - b. Health argument is irrelevant
- 6. Frustration
  - a. When sick
  - b. Testing protocol
  - c. Different expectations
- 7. Rules
- 8. Doping is Cheating
- 9. Pressure
  - a. Funding and money
  - b. Society
  - c. Own the Podium
- 10. Ethics, Morals and Values
  - a. Fairness and the level playing field
  - b. Honesty and integrity
- 11. Silence Surrounding Doping
  - a. Not talked about with teammates
  - b. Media
- 12. Game of Catch Up / Gap Exists

This list encompasses all the main ideas that were shared by most of the participants.

The main themes that came across in all the participants' answers were that they perceived themselves, volleyball, and Canada as different from other players, sports and countries. Additionally, the theme of being suspicious of others was also common and repeated by the participants. Perhaps most importantly for this analysis is the fact that all

of the participants considered anti-doping to be very rules based. All of the participants mentioned the rules of anti-doping, or used language in their interviews that portrayed that they considered the doping ban to be grounded in following rules. None of the participants discussed any values or ethical reasons for not doping without being asked explicitly to think of any. Moreover, when asked if certain values were associated with the doping ban during their education sessions, none of the participants could remember. This indicates that the participants interpret the doping ban on a singular level, only seeing it as dictating what they can and cannot take, but fail to recognize that morals and values are associated with the ban as well, unless asked directly. Both WADA and the CCES list reasons for not doping that encompass values, namely the ‘spirit of sport.’ Therefore, it would appear that there is a gap between the reasons anti-doping organizations give for the doping ban and how athletes interpret the ban. This gap will be discussed in much more detail in Chapter IV.

### **Reflections on the Interview Process**

The former players had a more reflective outlook when answering the interview questions. While interviewing the former players, it seemed clear that they had had time to reflect on their experiences in sport and to take a more thoughtful look at their experiences. The former players were more open to discussing both sides of the doping issue in sport. They could see beyond doping simply being cheating and could understand why some athletes might choose to engage in doping practices despite knowing they would be cheating. In contrast, the current players were not as reflective. The current players could not really discuss the doping ban beyond it being a rule and that doping is cheating.

In general, all the participants were open to discussing their personal experiences in sport. Out of the seven participants, only one expressed discomfort and unwillingness to address certain aspects of the interview questions while being recorded. It should be noted that this participant, while careful with his answers during the interview, engaged in 60 minutes of additional un-recorded interview, during which he revisited several topics discussed during the official interview to give a more candid opinion. The other five participants who participated in in-person interviews did not express discomfort verbally or non-verbally with the interview questions and did not provide answers off the record. For the seventh participant, Dexter, who answered the interview questions via e-mail, I was unable to judge his comfort level with the interview questions. However, he answered all the interview questions in detail.

The experiences and stories the athletes shared were all quite positive. The only time a severe critique was expressed during the interviews was when the participants discussed their suspicion that other countries were not held to the same testing standards as Canadian athletes, or that these athletes might receive support from their governments to cheat. Paul, a former National Team member, expressed frustration about the random at-home drug tests he experienced as a player, noting they were invasive and an annoyance. However, these were the only examples of severe critiques of the drug testing system expressed.

### **Summary**

Through the content analysis and coding of the interview transcript data, 12 themes emerged. While the purpose of this thesis is to explore what values and attitudes athletes hold towards the doping ban in sport, through the analysis of the data collected

by interviewing seven Canadian National Team volleyball players, I discovered that the participants of this study do not view the doping ban as much more than a list of rules of what they can and cannot ingest or use while preparing for and competing at the high-performance level. Each of the themes will be analyzed in Chapter IV. As the objective of this thesis is to determine and understand if athletes' justifications for the doping ban are in line with the justifications provided by anti-doping organizations, such as WADA and the CCES, the fifth chapter of this thesis addresses the gap between anti-doping organizations' justifications for the doping ban and the justifications athletes provided for the ban.

#### Chapter IV: Discussion of Interview Themes

This thesis explores what values and attitudes athletes hold towards the doping ban in sport required by WADA and enforced in Canada by Canada's national anti-doping agency, the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES). The overall objective is to understand if athletes' justifications for the doping ban are consistent with the justifications provided by anti-doping organizations, such as WADA and the CCES. The previous chapter described the one-on-one, semi-structured interviews that were conducted with seven Canadian National Volleyball Team players. Of these seven athletes interviewed, three of the athletes were retired players playing during and after the *Dubin Inquiry* and four were current players. Four participants were female and three were male. While I initially compared all seven of the athletes' responses as one group, due to the athletes playing for the National Teams at different times and on different teams, the discussion that follows addresses not only the overall themes emerging from the interviews but also differences attributed to age and gender. The participants' attitudes towards the ban reflect that the ban is grounded in a rule-based system, but participants also expressed frustration, acceptance, approval and fear when discussing doping and the doping ban in sport.

The following discussion will concentrate on the categories and themes that emerged from the analysis of the athletes' interview transcripts in Chapter III. The 12 themes include 1) doping is cheating, 2) health and protection of athletes, 3) respect for the rules, 4) fear, 5) perception of differences, 6) silence and doping, 7) suspicion, 8) knowledge and education, 9) feelings of frustration, 10) pressure, 11) fairness and values, and finally, 12) a gap exists. This chapter addresses all of the major themes as well as the

sub-themes that emerged through an analysis of the participants' interview transcripts in order to provide insight on the athletes' experiences with the anti-doping program in Canada. Of these 12 themes that represent the participants' attitudes towards the *World Anti-Doping Code* and to the rationale for banning doping in sport, similarities between the participants' rationales and WADA and CCES's rationales for the doping ban were only apparent for the first three themes (doping is cheating, health and protection of athletes, and respect for the rules). Therefore, during the discussion of themes one, two and three, the discussion will focus on the similarities and differences between the athletes' attitudes and WADA and the CCES's outlooks on the doping ban and doping in sport.

### **Theme #1: Doping is Cheating**

WADA's fundamental rationale for banning doping in sport is centered in the intrinsic value of sport, which the association refers to as 'the spirit of sport.' As noted in Chapters I and II, WADA characterizes the 'spirit of sport' by the following values: 1) ethics, fair play and honesty; 2) health; 3) excellence in performance; 4) character and education; 5) fun and joy; 6) teamwork; 7) dedication and commitment; 8) respect for rules and laws; 9) respect for self and other participants; 10) courage, and 11) community and solidarity (WADA, 2009a). In a similar vein, the CCES characterizes doping as a threat to sport, with the rationale:

when athletes cheat by doping, they harm themselves, they harm their sport and they harm their fellow athletes who compete clean. And, they harm the individuals, communities and nations that have stood behind them, supporting

them, motivating them and, in some ways, living through them (CCES, 2011d, p. 1).

While only three participants explicitly expressed the view that doping is cheating, it was clear that all seven participants recognized that doping is cheating, as each participant stated similar ideas, such as doping in sport is unfair or alters the level playing field.

Sarah and Steve state openly that doping is cheating in sport:

the guys that are cheating are always one step ahead of the guys trying to catch them – Steve (retired player)

They just totally wrecked whatever they did because then we, and the athletes they compete [against] look at them with like... you know you totally cheated. – Sarah (retired player)

These two quotes demonstrate that both Sarah and Steve recognize that athletes who use performance-enhancing drugs are cheating. A current member of the National Women's Team, Amanda, explained that doping in sport is cheating because the use of performance-enhancing substances or methods reflects preparing for competition differently from your competitors: "It is cheating because it's not the same way of training." Amanda's statement that doping is cheating because it reflects a different way of training in order to gain a competitive advantage was echoed by the other research participants' comments on doping being unfair and hindering the pursuit of a level playing field. While the CCES states that doping is cheating (CCES, 2011d), and WADA refers to fair play and the level playing field (WADA 2009a), WADA also considers doping in sport as cheating, even if it does not explicitly use the word cheating in its rationale for its bans. Cheating has been defined as "gaining a disallowed advantage over other participants in an activity" (Kirkwood, 2012, p. 223). Furthermore, according to Kirkwood's argument, doping is the intentional breaking of anti-doping rules. Even



though the athletes interviewed did not always state that doping was cheating, based on Kirkwood's conception of cheating in sport, athletes' comments on fair play and the level playing field support the fact that doping is cheating:

Me personally, I would never consider going beyond... going beyond that to find a means through doping or otherwise where you could gain an advantage. I guess just, you know, the spirit of fair play – Paul (retired player)

The goal is to have a level playing field for all athletes – Dexter (current player)

I think it's... it's just about fair play as well, right? Like you want to keep as much you can on an equal playing field – Jane (current player)

All of the above quotes reflect the athletes' opinion that competition in sport should be equal amongst competitors so that a winner can be chosen based on hard work, training, coaching, dedication and perseverance. WADA and the CCES strive for an equal playing field because doping in sport is cheating and introduces additional inequality and unfairness into the sporting competition (Houlihan, 2002). Therefore, when it comes to athletes' opinions on doping, cheating, and how doping affects the playing field, the participants interviewed, WADA, and the CCES are of the same opinion.

## **Theme #2: Health and Protection of Athletes**

The second shared theme between the athletes interviewed, WADA, and the CCES consisted of the argument that the doping ban helps protect athletes and their health. Six of the seven research participants discussed the doping ban being in place to protect athletes' health. The seventh athlete did not comment on the relationship between the doping ban and protecting athletes' health. While two current players on the National Team recognized that the banned substance list was in effect to help keep them healthy, two retired players, as well as the two other current players were somewhat more reflective. Dexter stated his belief that,

there are substances that lead to harmful outcomes, either short or long term. By banning the substances, the organization is preventing athletes from seeking instant gratification - Dexter (current player)

Dexter's acknowledgement that part of the ban on doping in sport was about preventing instant gratification for athletes, not just protecting their health, demonstrates a fairly critical interpretation of the rationale behind the ban. A retired player recognized that WADA, the CCES, and anti-doping organizations in general are trying to protect athletes, and that these organizations have the health of the athletes in mind when banning doping. Yet this athlete also suspects that not all the substances on the banned list are proven to have health related concerns:

I understand that they are trying to protect athletes. [pause] I wouldn't do it differently for myself, but I think that I am a lot more open to the idea that maybe they should just leave it, just let it and, and just let people... [do what they want]. Yeah in some ways. Because I think they are spending all this money, all these resources, all this stuff, and I think it's almost a losing battle. Like, you know, maybe if there are some things they can prove actually have health related concerns, eliminate those, you know, and get them out of there. As an athlete you should be considering your health –Steve (retired player)

Through Steve's comments, it became clear that while he agrees that athletes and anti-doping organizations should be concerned about health, he does not believe that all of the banned substances are harmful to athletes' health and consequently that all should be banned based on the health argument only. He noted that the fight against doping, while well intended, is a losing battle because athletes seek advantages. Moreover, according to Steve, fair play and competition are ideals for sport, but nothing more: "Fair play and competition is nice, but it's just that."

Two players commented that they recognized that doping is harmful to athletes' health, but admit they do not think that the health-related arguments for banning doping in sport are convincing to all athletes:

How can pumping drugs into your system or steroids into your system, how can that be healthy? I think overall we lose that sight as an athlete, of the healthy part of our lifestyle and we are just so desperate to be better that we are willing to do whatever it takes – Jane (current player)

Jane's quote demonstrates that she recognizes that doping is harmful to athletes health, but that in general athletes can lose sight of the ways of good health. Some athletes become so desperate that they lose sight of what being healthy means (eating right, training properly, getting proper rest, etc.), and instead will do whatever it takes, possibly even doping, regardless of the health risks or concerns as long as there is a chance that the athlete will gain an advantage in their sport and experience being a better competitor than before. Sarah, a retired player, on the other hand, while personally recognizing the harmful effects doping can have on an athlete's health, states:

You know what, you say about health... as an athlete, I think athletes completely aren't convinced if you tell them you take this, it will make you better for now but in the long run it's going to deteriorate your muscle, it's gonna... affect your brain. I think for an athlete who wants to be the best in the world, I don't think they A) believe you, they are in denial it will actually affect them. I think it's completely unconvincing to many athletes if you say that this can affect your health. If you tell me I am going to get sick later, it's like, well, it will be worth it. Heck, if I won a gold medal it'd be worth it. I'd get sick later. I think when you're 20, 30 it isn't even a reality – Sarah (retired player)

Sarah's statement makes it clear that she believes that many athletes are not overly concerned about the health risks involved with doping and that the argument about doping affecting athletes' health is unconvincing for athletes who make the decision to dope.

The above two quotes indicate that athletes who are going to dope in order to win or improve are not overly concerned with the possible effects their actions might have on their health or quality of life in the future, but are more concerned with winning. The doping ban is in effect based on the rationale that "the use of certain drugs or other

performance-enhancing methods poses significant short- and/or long-term health hazards to athletes” (Hemphill, 2009, p. 314). With this reasoning, doping bans and drug testing protocols are justified if they function to prevent harm to the athletes (Schneider, 2004). However, substances ingested for doping purposes are not all unnatural and harmful to athletes’ health, as many of the substances used in doping practices, such as testosterone, are already present in and produced by the body (Simon, 1995). Instead, it is the quantity ingested that makes these substances harmful to athletes’ health. The desire to win and be the best, for some athletes, overshadows the possible health issues they may experience in the future. Therefore, based on the interview responses, athletes choosing to engage in doping care more about winning than about the health risks they are taking by ingesting banned substances or using banned methods. The reality that they could possibly be compromising their health and future is not of immediate concern to them.

### **Theme #3: Respect for the Rules**

There is also a similarity between WADA’s characterization of the ‘spirit of sport’ and the responses provided by the participants in the study. WADA characterizes the ‘spirit of sport’ as having respect for the rules (WADA, 2009a). Six of the seven athletes interviewed directly referenced the doping ban in relation to rules. Below are examples of how the athletes considered the doping ban to be a list of rules they must follow in order to remain eligible for competition. Moreover, when asked the question “what do you understand the doping ban to involve” the athletes talked about the ban’s rules. Amanda, a current player, distinctly showed that she considered the ban about rules, by asking if the ban meant all the rules they had to follow about doping: “What’s a ban first? All the rules?”

Current player, Dexter, made it clear he thought of the doping ban in terms of rules athletes had to follow: “I feel that the education is really a list of commandments that we must follow.” Dexter’s use of the term ‘commandments’ makes it clear that he feels he is being provided with a set of rules he must follow in order to remain eligible to compete in sport. Finally, Paul, a retired player, discusses the rules noting:

I think the rules are... I think everybody knows the rules because it is very rules based, you know, you either make a choice to either follow the rules or to not follow the rules – Paul (retired player)

Based on Paul’s quote, he sees following the anti-doping rules as a choice that each athlete has to make, but that all athletes know they should follow the listed rules about doping in sport.

These six athletes considered the doping ban to be a list of rules dictating what they could and could not take in order to remain eligible to compete. The seventh athlete interviewed did not comment directly on the doping ban as relating to rules, but used different terminology to describe what the doping ban included beyond the things athletes can and cannot take:

When you get drug tested it’s not about what... or what else you were taking, its pretty much about what you took and if it comes back positive or negative” – Jane (current player)

Jane’s quote demonstrates that not only does she consider the doping ban a list of rules athletes have to follow in order to main eligible to compete, but that the rules are unforgiving. Based on the anti-doping rules, the substance ingested or the method used to seek an advantage is irrelevant. All that matters is that an athlete went against the rules by engaging in doping.

The above quotes reflect that the athletes associate the doping ban with a list of rules of what they can and cannot take. WADA’s characterization of the ‘spirit of sport’

as having respect for the rules stems from its goal of having an anti-doping program that preserves what is intrinsically valuable about sport (WADA, 2009a).

The notion that there is something, be it extrinsically or intrinsically, valuable about sport is not new. For example, in the late 1800s and early 1900s in Canada, sport was valued for its nation building ability as well as for its ability to prepare men for war (Kidd, 1996). While all the athletes interviewed appear to value sport because they choose not to dope, the responses they provided in their interviews indicate that their choice to forgo engaging in doping practices was simply to remain eligible to compete. Therefore, their respect for the anti-doping rules in sport is not value driven, but a reflection of sport being about rules.

#### **Theme #4: Fear**

Excluding Betty, a current National Team member, the other six participants referenced fear when discussing the doping ban. The sub-themes that emerged from the theme of fear include: 1) the fear of false accusation and positive tests, 2) the fear of loss of accomplishments and 3) the use of fear by WADA and the CCES to motivate athletes not to dope. The way the participants talked about their fears related to doping made it evident that part of their motivation not to engage in doping practices was out of fear of getting caught and suffering the resulting negative repercussions:

I think most players they don't wanna use drug because, well if you test positive you are going to lose whatever you did – Amanda (current player)

For me the fear of getting caught is everything. I think that the education is all about scare tactics. Even the education online focuses on side effects and that is one of the major themes. It doesn't stop at physical ones either. It says you can become a chronic liar – Dexter (current player)

You know what, I was actually terrified. Like I didn't use any banned substances or anything, but I was always terrified that I was going to unfortunately take

something because that was the story that came from Ben Johnson. [...] I started playing in international competitions in '88, so it was like right throughout the whole time and it was just, I think, they scared the crap out of all of us. - Steve (retired player)

I remember them focusing on the penalties if you get caught and that's almost more of a fear thing, you know. You've trained all this time right, and if you do this you are going to lose everything you've trained for... I think that's a serious motivation for athletes who choose not to. – Sarah (retired player)

From my point of view it seemed more of a... from a supervisory kind of role I guess, you know, someone just... almost judgmental, you know standing back from an arms-length and basically telling you what you can and cannot do. – Paul (retired player)

The above quotes demonstrate that the athletes experienced fear in many forms when dealing with the doping ban. Specifically, for some of them, fear was a motivation not to dope because they feared the loss of their accomplishments, feared being judged by their fellow teammates, competitors, and competitors, and feared being falsely accused of doping.

Anti-doping organizations' intentional use of fear was discussed by three of the athletes. Jane and Dexter, two current players, as well as Steve, a retired player, all stated they think that fear is used to prevent doping in sport. Dexter even went so far as to dub the education methods as being based on fear:

I think that the education processes are more scare tactics. If you get caught you won't be able to play anymore. – Dexter

Jane also believed that anti-doping organizations use fear intentionally in their education programs, and thought that the information sessions on doping instilled fear in athletes based on the fact that they would publically disgrace themselves if they failed a drug test:

I think they put it on us like you're gonna publically disgrace yourself if you do. You're not going to get away with it. Someone is going to catch you. – Jane

Jane's quote not only demonstrates her perception that anti-doping organizations use fear to intentionally scare athletes about the consequences of what choosing to use drugs could mean for them, but also demonstrates that athletes recognize the CCES and WADA's position of power over them to participate in sport. Paul echoes this acknowledgment:

You know one of the first things it says in all of that documentation is that if, for some reason, you did test positive, any sort of inquiry was on your own. You know, you had to bear the expense of that yourself and the first thing they would do was put your name up on their website and send out an email saying that you are somebody [pause] you've had a doping ban. You're guilty until proven innocent and I always thought that was backwards. – Paul (retired player)

This quote makes it clear that some athletes are unaware of the resources at their disposal should they ever experience a positive test, be it an accurate positive test or a false positive. WADA lists athlete outreach as one of its functions, explaining,

WADA educates athletes at major international and multi-sport events through direct one-on-one interaction with anti-doping experts, answering their questions about the dangers and consequences of doping; empowers stakeholders to implement high-impact athlete outreach programs (WADA, 2009b, p. 1)

According to Paul, many athletes are unaware of their rights and the recourses they have when they are under investigation for a positive test finding. Yet the CCES's mission statement states that CCES employees "work for, and on behalf of athletes, players, coaches, parents, officials and administrators" (CCES, 2011e, p.1). While both organizations focus on keeping sport clean from doping, the descriptions and mission statements indicate that both WADA and the CCES seek to be perceived as advocates for athletes as well. Based on the above quotes from the athletes, while claiming to be on the side of the athletes, the information supplied by WADA and the CCES does not always



include the resources that athletes need to confront a positive test. From the athletes' responses, athletes would have less fear about doping and false positives if WADA and the CCES provided resources and information on what happens after a positive test and whom athletes can turn to for help when faced with doping allegations, instead of focusing on punishments. For these athletes, the fear of breaking anti-doping rules contributed to their decisions to compete drug free.

Bloodworth and McNamee's (2010) study found that feelings of shame play a role in British athletes' decisions not to dope. While the athletes in this study did not discuss associating feelings of shame with being caught doping explicitly, their references to fearing the disgrace of a positive drug test supports Bloodworth and McNamee's results that shame is strongly associated with doping by athletes. In addition, the athletes' experiences shared in this thesis reveal that the use of fear, or scare tactics, by WADA and the CCES to dissuade athletes from doping creates the shame associated with doping in sport.

#### **Theme #5: Perceptions of Differences**

The athletes interviewed viewed Canada as being different from other countries; specifically, the athletes viewed Canada as having a stricter anti-doping policy than other countries. While the athletes interviewed held this view, considering all competing countries must endorse the *WADC*, Canada and all other countries should be following and enforcing the same anti-doping rules and standards. Moreover, they perceived Canada's competitive attitude and focus as being different from other countries', and also touched on the fact that they thought Canada has a different sporting structure from some

other countries. All three of these differences were attributed to Canada's unique culture and the history of sport in Canada. In discussing these differences, participants noted:

I think that there is some teams out there that would try to bend the rules if they could and maybe do bend the rules [pause] and maybe even have the assistance of their volleyball federation [pause] to do that. I just don't think that's the norm in Canada. – Betty (current player)

I think we got tested more in Canada than we did overseas. – Steve (retired player)

Russia, and there's some other countries like that, that are, you know, they've been the medal leaders at the Olympics for so long and it means a lot more, we're just trying to get into that light. - Steve (retired player)

I think overall, I think Canadian athletes [pause] I don't know. I know a lot of Canadian athletes [pause] we connect on a personal basis. Just quality people. I think the society in Canada is, you know, it's not so, it's very... refined is not the right word [pause] Well we [pause] our society is just a developed country, developed society [pause]. So that whole attitude I think definitely permeates Canadian athletes, I think we are brought up to [pause] you know [pause] You sense the attitude in those countries and what it means to them to play international sport [pause] their motivation is different than mine. – Sarah (retired player)

When I was in Europe, [European athletes] couldn't believe the standards that we were held to in Canada as far as drug testing and doping and things like that. I think maybe it's a cultural difference, I mean, you know, European cultures in general tend to be a little bit more permissive than [pause] than ourselves here in Canada ... I think maybe we have taken our eye off of performance and put it onto ethics, and perhaps elsewhere others have the focus on performance ahead of ethics [...] I think maybe we're more concerned with being clean [pause] and the performance is secondary. – Paul (retired player)

The finding that the athletes perceived Canada as being different from other countries supports Bloodworth and McNamee's study on British athletes' attitudes towards doping. Like the Canadian athletes, British athletes did not see doping as a widespread problem at the national level in their own country, but perceived doping to be a greater problem in other countries (Bloodworth & McNamee, 2010).

The athletes interviewed viewed doping as a greater problem in other countries. Both current and retired players mentioned Russia and Cuba as countries applying a lax approach to enforcing doping rules. This perception is likely due to the fact that in the past, both Cuba and Russia have been the subjects of doping scandals in sport. Comments of this nature overlap with the theme of suspicion (discussed below), as the athletes noted some misgiving about other countries and governments' attitudes toward doping in sport. The quotes above from Sarah, Steve, Paul and Betty reflect not only their perceptions that Canada's approach to doping in sport is different from other countries but that they are also suspicious of some of their international opponents' anti-doping requirements and testing systems and the possible assistance they receive from their countries or sports federations. Additional remarks expressing the belief that not all countries' anti-doping agencies are as thorough as Canada's include:

I guess I would just hope that WADA could better monitor different countries and anti-doping policies [pause] it would bug me if other countries could kind of get away with it because you know, as a country they were unethical – Betty (current player)

It seems like some countries just keep turning out these incredible volleyball players and you're like, what are they doing? – Steve (retired player)

And it crosses my mind, what is making all these athletes bigger and stronger? – Sarah (retired player)

Yeah, and the thought I often have too, I've heard this a lot in sport, that some countries or some whatever just have better masking agents right, you take that drug but I have a masking agent that it would come out in your blood or your urine or whatever. – Sarah (retired player)

These quotes reflect that there is some misgiving among Canadian athletes that some other countries might have resources that allow athletes to use banned substances but remain undetected because of inadequate controls. These fears echo those expressed by athletes competing against East German athletes in the 1960s. According to the former

head of the German anti-doping commission, Hans Ever, in the 1960s no fewer than “16 Olympic affiliated German sport federations were not even following their own rules” (Hoberman, 2001, p. 247). Not following the rules included not testing at competitions, and not reporting or keeping record of positive tests (Hoberman, 2001). The fear that some countries continue to protect their athletes from failing doping tests persists today.

Another perceived difference that was commented on by the athletes was that they considered volleyball different from other sports. The athletes shared the belief that volleyball was different because obvious performance-enhancing benefits would not occur from gaining the power, strength, and speed associated with, for example, doped athletes competing in the 100 m sprint. Instead, they believed volleyball to be relatively ‘clean’ in terms of drug use for performance enhancement purposes compared to sports with a reputation for doping.

Well for volleyball, if you take mass, then you jump less high and if you take something to get more aggressive, which like football and hockey they do, like volleyball is a not a contact sport, so there is no point. So I feel that we don’t need necessarily one thing [...] From what I know from anti-doping from doping agents, from stuff available, I would not even know what to take. It’s just a sport where you need all your things, and you cannot enhance only one thing without decreasing another. – Amanda (current player)

Volleyball is just not a sport where there is a lot of substance abuse. I am in a sport where it’s like fairly clean and no one really gets caught that often – Betty (current player)

In volleyball it is less likely because it requires a lot of skill, not just raw power. – Dexter (current player)

I often wondered why bother having a ban in volleyball. I never heard about a lot of women taking banned substances in volleyball. I never heard a lot about it in volleyball, now that doesn’t mean it wasn’t happening right, but maybe it depends too on your sport a little bit. – Sarah (retired player)

In our sport, in particular, in volleyball, I don’t think there is much of an advantage to be gained. – Paul (retired player)

The lack of reported doping scandals in volleyball in comparison to other sports, such as track and field, football and cycling, probably helps perpetuate the perception that doping is not as popular or useful in volleyball as it is in other sports. However, when asked what he thought of the other participants' claims that volleyball was clean, Steve responded that there was no real use for doping in volleyball, but also attributed this perception to athletes lacking the knowledge about how performance-enhancing drugs are used:

Well I think that's a misperception about how to use performance-enhancing drugs. You want to jump higher, you want to be more powerful, more dynamic, more explosive, tell me how that is any different than a track athlete? Like are you telling me that a high jumper, there is no advantage to taking some sort of performance-enhancing drug? Like if they are thinking that you are just going to become a big muscle head, ok I can see how that's not an advantage in volleyball. But if it makes you stronger and if it makes you more dynamic and it makes you recover faster and it makes you... well then I think that they're wrong. – Steve (retired player)

Steve's perspective, as well as the other athletes' perceptions, that doping is not really present or useful in volleyball, indicates a lack of knowledge surrounding doping practices amongst athletes. The efficacy of performance-enhancing drug use to heal injuries, decrease recovery time between training sessions, and enhance explosiveness without acquiring excess bulk can be found in the sport science literature (Lenehan, 2003). Yet the participants in the study seemed to associate performance-enhancing drug use only with muscle-building agents such as anabolic steroids. They did not seem to recognize the training and performance benefits for volleyball that could be obtained through the use of drugs such as human growth hormone and erythropoietin.

The current Canadian Sport Sanction Registry from the CCES does not currently list any volleyball players sanctioned for doping in Canada (CCES, 2011c). The lack of volleyball players sanctioned indicates that doping is not prevalent in volleyball, and supports the athletes' assertions that in volleyball there is no advantage to be gained by

doping. A doping campaign that focused on doping not being useful could provide a better alternative to the scare tactics and the health arguments currently used, which, based on the athletes' perceptions discussed above, are frustrating and/or irrelevant to athletes.

Finally, an additional difference noted by the athletes was that they perceived themselves to have a more 'pure' outlook on and approach to training. During the interviews, the athletes used phrases that reflected that they were trying to distinguish themselves from their opponents and teammates. All the athletes interviewed made reference to being a person who would never consider doping, to having a very strong stance against doping, or to thinking they had more knowledge than other athletes:

I have more information than I would say a usual volleyball player. – Amanda (current player)

I think there might be some people who are like 'Oh I wish maybe I could take some substances' but maybe not like steroids [pause] sort of push that boundary a little more. So I think that's where [pause] maybe I [pause] like wouldn't fall out of line. – Betty (current player)

I wouldn't take it. I think that's part of [pause] you know me taking a step back and looking at the situation and being like is this the right thing to do here for myself. – Jane (current player)

I think that I am a special case because I don't engage myself in any kind of banned substances, nor do I take any medications for anything, nor do I consume alcohol ever. I feel that keeping my body clean will result in longevity and I won't have to deal with the stress associated with those substances. Because of that, I may have a stricter mindset than a lot of my teammates. – Dexter (current player)

I think for me it was never a question [...] Me, personally, I would never consider going beyond [pause] going beyond that [natural ways of training] to find means through doping. – Paul (retired player)

The perception of being individually different from their teammates and opponents also tied into the theme of being suspicious of other countries and players (Theme #7 discussed below). Seven of the quotations, out of 18 quotes belonging to the theme of

differences under the sub-heading ‘I’m different,’ also addressed the theme of suspicion. Even though the athletes were asked if they thought they shared the same or similar values with their teammates in terms of doping in sport, the seven participants explained that they thought they were a special case or that they really could speak only for themselves and not for their teammates. The fact that the athletes interviewed could not pinpoint if they shared similar or the same opinions on doping and the doping ban in sport tied into the theme of there being a silence surrounding doping, which is discussed next.

### **Theme #6: Silence and Doping**

Four of the seven athletes interviewed discussed the silence surrounding doping in sport, and acknowledged that they did not discuss their opinions on doping with their teammates. According to the athletes, discussions of doping at a deeper level, such as why it is wrong or how it impacts the spirit of sport, simply do not occur among teammates:

We don’t really talk about this on our team as in like oh who’s been selected. How many times? So it’s like hard to know. – Betty (current player)

Well, we don’t really often talk about ‘do you really believe in anti-doping bans?’ – Amanda (current player)

I don’t remember seeing anyone or hearing even of anything getting drug tested and testing positive, other than for recreational drugs. Like I heard people for marijuana or you know whatever other stuff I guess, but that’s it. Like I never heard of anything that was performance-enhancing or steroids or growth hormone or any of that stuff. – Steve (retired player)

Amanda and Betty reflected on their belief that doping bans and testing are not discussed amongst their team, demonstrating that there is a silence surrounding doping in sport at least on the teams included in this sample. It is possible that athletes do not discuss doping in sport with their teammates for fear of not sharing the same opinion or casting

suspicion on themselves. However, none of the athletes interviewed elaborated on why doping was not openly discussed amongst their team. Steve's quote demonstrated that the silence surrounding doping is perceived to expand beyond sports teams and affects spectators and the general public as well. According to the athletes, doping in sport is discussed in the media if a well-known athlete tests positive on the international stage. This scenario occurs mainly during Olympic years, or if a high-profile athlete tests positive at a well-known or broadcasted event, such as the Tour de France.<sup>3</sup> This silence could reinforce the perception that doping is not as prominent in Canada, or in the sport of volleyball, due to the lack of media attention given to volleyball. Moreover, if other countries' media report on amateur sport and doping more than Canada's, athletes competing on the international stage who are travelling to these other countries could develop a skewed perception of doping in sport because they are only hearing about the doping cases in other countries. Just because doping at the amateur high-performance level of sport is not often reported in Canada, unless committed by a renowned athlete, it does not necessarily mean that Canadian athletes are doping any less than athletes from other countries. The lack of discussion amongst athletes about doping detection tests ties into the broad theme of suspicion, and the sub-theme of suspicion about the testing procedures.

### **Theme #7: Suspicion**

Out of the seven athletes interviewed, only four of the athletes had been required to take part in a drug test prior to the time of the interview. All three of the former athletes were tested, and this is likely a reflection of the time period in which they were

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, as I write this thesis, doping in sport is making headlines in the media, as Lance Armstrong has admitted to committing doping violations, and has been stripped of his Tour de France titles and banned from competing in any sport that is a signatory of the *World Anti-Doping Code*.



participating in sport, with stricter anti-doping controls being imposed after the release of the *Dubin Inquiry*, but only one current player had been tested. Participants' responses about drug testing demonstrate their suspicion of testing procedures, detection methods, testing randomness and testing technology:

I've been to three international tournaments and usually after every game someone gets randomly selected to a drug test, and again I've never been randomly selected. Like it's been completely random and so you know this shows that you, know... can slip through the cracks. I think that if we were in a sport that was known for steroid use... I feel like we wouldn't slip through the cracks so much. -- Betty (current player)

It is common knowledge that the testing body is underfunded and that they aren't able to test whole winning teams. They target test. – Dexter (current player)

So they just, I think, looked at athletes who were still in our training centres, athletes who were in the testing pool who were still in our training centre [...] I don't think they were prepared to do a completely random test of all the athletes in our testing pool. Sometimes it gave the perception that it was more out of convenience than actually trying to monitor the entire pool of athletes. – Paul (retired player)

Paul, Dexter and Betty's remarks indicate distrust of the current testing procedures and suggest that the random testing method currently supported by WADA and the CCES is not instilling faith in clean athletes that all, or even most, doping cheats are being caught. As Betty points out, if you are not tested, you could be using banned performance-enhancing substances and slip through the cracks of the system. In contrast, Steve questions whether or not other countries are doing something different than Canada with their volleyball players:

It seems like some countries just keep turning out these incredible volleyball players and you're like what are they doing? Because if they're doing something you'd think in this day and age that the information would have been shared and we would have figured it out and brought it back here. Or are they just better? – Steve (retired player)

Steve's quote demonstrates that he is suspicious of other countries and their training methods. He also questions how, if other countries' players are doing things differently, how the information on what they are doing different has not reached the ears of Canadian volleyball athletes.

With the exception of Dexter, all the current National Team members believed that testing for drugs in sport was conducted in an intentionally random manner. However, Betty's quote demonstrates that she perceives a bias in testing procedures, with athletes competing in sports that are known for doping being tested more often than athletes participating in sports with less of a doping history. Whether or not there is an actual bias, or it is due to a reasonable priority to test sports known for doping, Betty is correct in her observation. Reports from the CCES show that 1199 urine tests and 427 blood tests were conducted on Canadian athletes from January to September 2012. While CCES's 2012 Annual Report has not yet been released, the 2010-2011 Annual Report indicates that only 10 drug tests were conducted in the sport of volleyball. There were zero in-competition tests conducted, and all 10 of the tests were taken out of competition. In comparison, 329 tests were conducted on track and field athletes and 200 samples were taken from speed skating athletes (CCES, 2011f).

One athlete in the study noted that athletes who did not play professional volleyball in Europe were targeted for more testing. He expressed that the athletes selected for drug testing were the ones most convenient to access, because the testing bodies were not ready or able to test the athletes residing outside of Canada. This player provides a unique perspective because he played for the Canadian team from 1995 to 2008. He thus played before, during and after the creation of WADA. However, his

perception, as well as the other athletes' experiences with testing, reveals a lack of knowledge about anti-doping organizations, testing, and the anti-doping movement in general.

### **Theme #8: Knowledge and Education**

The athletes participating in this study were in agreement that they did not, or still do not, receive an adequate amount of current information about performance-enhancing substances, the testing protocols, and the anti-doping movement. The athletes believe that the CCES and WADA assume that they receive enough education, but this is not the case:

I think they just assume we know that you are not supposed to take certain substances. - Betty (current player)

For National Team, the rules are more or less assumed by the athletes and it is up to us to ensure that we aren't taking anything banned. There aren't formal courses we need to take or handouts that provide the rules. It is up to the athlete to be smart. – Dexter (current player)

In my current role now, I am involved with national, uh... international women's players, we haven't conducted our seminar yet and we are already into our competitive season, so maybe it is... maybe there are more gaps than I think there are. – Paul (retired player)

The above three quotes demonstrate that the athletes feel that they are not getting information or education about anti-doping procedures in sport. However, Jane, Amanda and Betty mentioned receiving information on testing procedures in university while playing at the Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) level:

The CIS did give us some information, it wasn't very extensive [...] it was like one time in my university career that we got this workshop. – Betty (current player)

You have it in university were they kind of go through it because you can actually be tested. – Jane (current player)

With the CIS class and test online, it lasts like maybe 45 minutes and we had to do it every year and you would have one if it was the first time you took the class and one if you were like return and you've already done the first one. – Amanda (current player)

With Amanda being the exception, neither Jane nor Betty mentioned receiving information on testing procedures more than once in their university careers. None of the current National Team players in the study stated that they had participated in an education or information session on drug testing or anti-doping since being on the National Team. Sarah, the former National Team member, also did not remember ever receiving any formal education or information about doping. Dexter, the current men's National Team member, could not remember receiving or participating in formal sessions on anti-doping education and testing outside of university; however, both Steve and Paul, the retired men's National Team members, remember receiving annual information sessions on testing procedures while on the National Team. Paul noted that while he attended information sessions as a player, in his current role working with a women's International Team, he has not held a doping information sessions for his current players.

From this small sample of seven athletes it can seem like men's teams receive more regular education, but it should be noted that none of the male athletes interviewed mentioned that any of the education or information they had received in a formal setting encompassed more than the information on the testing procedures. When asked, none of the athletes recalled any of their anti-doping education revolving around more than the testing procedure specifics. This finding indicated that though WADA and CCES promote a values-based educational program for doping in sport, the athletes are merely receiving the facts on the physical concrete steps of being tested. The roles of WADA and CCES were not discussed, nor were the reasons and values for supporting and

promoting drug-free sport discussed. While it is important that athletes understand how the testing procedures work and what they can expect to transpire if they find themselves selected for random testing, information beyond practical tips about what to avoid and what to expect were not provided. Both WADA and CCES claim that the doping ban is values-driven and that information on these values should be provided and discussed with athletes (WADA, 2011a; CCES, 2011a). However, according to the participants, this component of anti-doping education is absent from what the athletes actually receive. If banning doping in sport is about more than just rules, then the values, morals and ‘spirit of sport’ need to be openly discussed and communicated to athletes.

Part of informing athletes about the various aspects of the anti-doping movement includes providing accessible information to the athletes. Through talking with the current and retired athletes it became clear that there is a lack of knowledge and education easily accessible to them. For example, Betty remarked the Sport Centre Manitoba does not have much information for athletes:

There’s not that many [high-performance] athletes to be honest in Manitoba, but at the same time what they offer at Sport Centre Manitoba is little to nothing... it’s like the bare minimum if that. – Betty (current player)

Based on Betty’s statement, two pointed questions emerge. First, does the number of high-performance athletes in a region influence the quality and amount of accessible information for athletes? And second, why is there not an extensive resource of information at a provincial sport centre? If formal information and education seminars are not going to be held for athletes, this information needs to be accessible, and athletes need to receive instructions on how to find these resources. Providing athletes with access to information that they can research on their own enables them to be accountable for their drug-free sport participation.

According to the *Canadian Anti-Doping Policy* and the *World Anti-Doping Code* athletes are responsible for making sure that they stay drug-free and do not take anything banned accidentally or inadvertently. An element of ‘blind faith’ was present in the athletes in this study’s discussions of responsibility and accountability. The athletes reported that they seldom questioned the reasons for competing drug free, and instead relied on the advice and directions of their coaches, trainers and doctors. Four of the seven athletes interviewed indicated they trust their coaches and medical staff to give them accurate information and prevent them from inadvertently testing positive for a banned substance:

Well we have access to a trainer and doctors, so if we do have questions they are there to help us and they do inform us. – Amanda (current player)

For the past few years if it’s not prescribed by our team doctor or if it’s not provided in the sports centre I just don’t take it. [...] I will only ever take anything prescribed to me by my doctor or our team doctor because he knows what’s banned and what’s not banned. [...] As athletes you just kind of do what you are told, you don’t question anything [...] if the doctor prescribes me this, then he knows that I’m safe. – Jane (current player)

I was in the hospital because my lung collapsed... we had to be very careful about what I was taking. Obviously I could take big painkillers and you know, dopamine then [...] it was pretty much the off-season so weren’t training very hard. [*did you have to submit to the CCES for a therapeutic use exemption?*] Um, honestly I don’t know because I was so out of it in the hospital that was really not my concern. So I’m hoping... actually looking back I have no idea if it ever happened... but I’m hoping that... um, my Team Canada doctors were very aware of everything that was going on and saw me in the hospital and stuff so I’m assuming that they would have submitted something if that was needed. – Betty (current player)

I played professionally in Europe for 10 years, and a lot of the guys played professionally in Europe or South America and, you know, you see different ways of doing things, you know, there’s different modalities for treatments, you know, different forms of therapies, acupuncture, you know, you have ultrasound, there’s lots of different ways of doing things in the world and a number of professional teams at the end, training, would have vitamin supplements. I mean some of the teams I played on, you know, in the winter months, when there wasn’t that much

sun, we would all go to the sport physician and we'd get the flu shot, we'd get things right after practice and these were just you know [pause] I never [pause] I didn't know whether they met CCES standards or not. – Paul (retired player)

The above quotes demonstrate that the athletes rarely, if ever, question what they are told to take or the information they receive from people they trust. The athletes interviewed seem to assume that their team doctors and trainers are up to date on the banned list.

Betty recounted an incident where her medication was on the banned list, but her team doctors and trainers did not catch it:

Before the Pan Am Games... I take acne medicine like both by mouth but also topical creams. I have always told her exactly what drugs I take for whatever, and before the Pan Am Games I guess one of these drugs popped up as a banned substance because the oral pill could mask if I was taking any steroids, so I wasn't allowed to take it. But it was funny because I have always submitted that on my medical forms and one of the doctors with the Pan Am Games noticed it and was like you're not allowed to take this and I was like I've been taking this for how long. Yeah, they're like you've got to stop taking this right now. Um, but none of the Team Canada doctors have ever caught that and were, like, well how long have you been taking it and I was, like, well pretty much my whole career almost. – Betty (current player)

Betty's anecdote shows that if athletes rely solely on team doctors and trainers when it comes to the banned substance list, things may slip through the cracks. It is fortunate that Betty was not tested before someone caught her unintentional doping rule violation; if tested, she could have received a two-year ban for her use of a drug she did not realize was banned. Betty's example demonstrates that athletes do not always take full responsibility for what they ingest and instead rely on others to catch things that they might miss. These athletes are competing at the highest level of competition; it does not seem unreasonable to hold them accountable for what substances can and cannot be ingested based on the banned substance list. Moreover, it would appear that the athletes forget that the defense of 'I didn't know' is unacceptable under the World Anti-Doping Agency's strict liability conditions, which means that athletes are held accountable for

whatever is in their bodies. Passing off this responsibility to their team doctors and trainers can potentially lead to an inadvertent doping rule violation. To this day, Ben Johnson maintains that he did not know he had ingested anything that could be tested for right after his race in Seoul. Dubin questioned his coach, Charlie Francis, and physician, Jamie Astaphan, during the inquiry about their roles in the doping scandal of the Canadian Track and Field Team. Despite Johnson's claims he did not know how the detected stanolozol entered his system, his ban from sport demonstrates that the anti-doping agencies are unyielding in their fight against doping in sport, and do not give athletes the benefit of the doubt. Unlike other areas of life, after a positive doping test result athletes are guilty until proven innocent. Athletes, therefore, need to assume more responsibility for what they are using, instead of blindly following or believing the advice of their doctors without checking their prescriptions themselves, as there is always room for oversight and human error.

#### **Theme #9: Feelings of Frustration**

Through the analysis of the interview transcripts it became apparent that athletes experience an element of frustration with the doping rules. The athletes interviewed expressed frustration when it came to the prohibited substance list, the expectations placed on them by WADA and CCES, and the invasive requirements of the testing protocol. Specifically, the athletes were frustrated with the restrictions of the banned list when it came to medications that the general population uses when they are sick with common illnesses, such as colds and flus. What several athletes found exasperating was that athletes are expected to do more and perform at higher levels than the average person, but with less assistance when ill:



There's one thing I would say has been really difficult because everybody is human, athletes are human too and we get sick and we get colds and there have been some really difficult times when you've had a cold and literally all you can take is Advil because you can't take decongestants because there's stimulants in them – Betty (current player)

Because there are so many [pause] you know wishy-washy things that you never know what's in there, and sometimes... the, the rules are always changing like sometimes you can have the... the drowsy kind... sometimes you can't. You know? It's just always changing. – Jane (current player)

Well some if it's ridiculous [...] That always bothered me to tell you the truth. Because, like I said, I worked hard, I did a good job, I think, to try and educate myself and tried to make sure I didn't take [pause] but when I feel sick I just want to get better so I can get back to what I am doing. And some of the best stuff that helps you get better... you can't use it. – Steve (retired player)

Probably my most inconvenient experience with it would be an out of competition test at my house. Two people announced themselves and came in, and basically I had to entertain them for an hour and a half until I was ready to produce a sample and then they kind of went on their ways. That [pause] I found a little bit invasive, especially since I had up to that point submitted about 8-10 collections or samples and I had never had anything, I assume, remotely close to a positive test. – Paul (retired player)

Well, when you are training six to seven hours a day, your time is, you are either training or you are recovering, you know. And it's nice in theory to say well you should be cooking chicken breast and pasta and eating all this but what is the reality, and are there ways that you can supplement what you are doing with, whether it be a protein shake or a vitamin or... you know, it's just simply not... you know I've had this discussion a number of times with teammates, it's just simply not possible to consume that much. And to find natural ways to do that, you know, and we would ask and a lot of times it was left back up to us... could we take a multivitamin? Well, you could take a multivitamin but ultimately the responsibility is yours and if the multivitamin is tainted then you're responsible for it. So that leads you back to, well ok, I'll just eat my regular meals as if I am a regular person but I'm expected to train as something different, as a high performance athlete. You know and the fact that we would have a cold or something, you know, can I take histamine? Well, the answer is always no. I have to naturally overcome a cold; I can't use something to help me sleep at night to recover, I just, you know, I just basically have to exist in my natural state, but doing the demands... you know, doing 3, 4, 10 times the work of what a normal person would do. - Paul (retired player)

Paul's quote addresses his frustration with athletes having to assume all the responsibility for what they are allowed to use within the rules to help them meet the demands of their

training, as well as frustration with the inability to take medication to help recover from illness faster. Unlike the other participants, Paul's frustration is not just with the restraints of the doping ban, but with the fact that anti-doping agencies do not help athletes navigate these situations. Paul discussed that if athletes are interested in trying to find a supplement that is within the confines of the rules to help them recover from training or illness, it is up to the athlete and there is little support from anti-doping agencies. He suggests that part of the CCES's role should be to research and recommend alternatives for high-performance athletes, so that they can sustain their level of training and performance:

When it came down to things like protein, then it became a question of cost. Which, you know, was then born, had to be born, by the athlete who didn't have an over-abundance of money. Eventually they would say there is this protein that we would recommend, but the answer was always, well you can't guarantee that there wasn't something in it when it was made in the factory in China. So then we would say, ok well what can we do about it? And they would say, well we could buy a large batch and have it tested. But then they would say well that's... you're going to have to pay for it, that's cost prohibited, so I think that's someplace, you know, perhaps the CCES or whomever could say, you know, this is of benefit to our high performance athletes so let's, you know, let's bring this in and if this works and it's helping them achieve something let's make sure it's clean and nobody gets caught up in doing something they didn't intend to do and then support it that way. - Paul (retired player)

Paul's idea for the CCES to test large batches of substances could help with the perception that the CCES and anti-doping agencies only control doping in sport but do not offer athletes support. The CCES's mission states that the organization works for and on behalf of athletes (CCES, 2011e); by absorbing some of the costs and funding research for alternatives to doping, that includes nutrition and natural remedies for illness, the CCES could be more helpful to Canadian athletes. Moreover, part of the perception of Canada being different, discussed above in Theme 5, tied into the belief that Canada was stricter and took more of an ethical stance on doping than other countries. Thus, Canadian

athletes feel frustrated that they are being held to a perceived different standard than athletes in other countries, and that Canada's ethical stance on doping is overshadowing the high performance aspect of athletic competition. Additionally, it became evident that the interviewed retired men in this study were experiencing more frustration in terms of what they could and could not ingest when sick to help them recover than the interviewed female participants.

### **Theme #10: Pressure**

Pressure also emerged as a theme from the interview transcripts. More precisely, athletes noted they feel or felt pressure from many sources: Sport Canada's funding model,<sup>4</sup> the need to generate income to support their daily needs, the Own the Podium program,<sup>5</sup> and society all place pressure on athletes to succeed. The athletes interviewed understood how these various pressures could impact an athlete's decision to engage in doping practices. The following quotes from the athletes highlight the financial, peer, and coercive pressures they feel or have felt in the past:

Around the world there is different sport policies or ways to see sport. So every society wants to have the best athletes, so this competition between [pause] like makes you always want to win [pause] people do choose this [doping] because it is the society that pushed them towards this [doping]. – Amanda (current player)

Like for me, it's just pressure, it's just pressure from the outside or that you put on yourself because you want a success so much that you want to take this extra thing to get you there. So, so like, a society that just accepts, oh, the winner, we want to have more gold medals we want to have more this, this, this, and when you lose [pause] society pressure. – Amanda (current player)

---

<sup>4</sup> The funding model refers to the way the Canadian government divides the monetary funds between each sport in Canada. Athletes have to receive high international rankings for their sports to receive more money.

<sup>5</sup> Own the Podium has the vision for Canada to be a world leader in high-performance sport. It was created to bring together the key parties involved in leading and funding excellence in Canadian sport, with specific emphasis on achieving excellence at Summer and Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games. See <http://ownthepodium.org/> for more information.

If it seems like 50% or more are doing it [doping in sports in general], well it seems like how am I going to possibly win when those guys are cheating and then so all of a sudden the pressure changes. – Steve (retired player)

You don't really know. And it [athletes who choose to dope] breaks my heart for them as people, because I've been an athlete and you know when you are at that level of sport it's everything that you are. As much as, I mean, yes we have our faith, we have our families and we have real life, but you get a little... like when you are in it that is your life. Like tunnel vision, you are only focused on that. When you are in sport you want it so bad [...] I can understand the passing being that much, that you know [...] And often you hear about these athletes, it often came about by who they were surrounded by. – Sarah (retired player)

Sarah's quote acknowledges that athletes are often not alone in making the decision to dope, but are impacted by their peers, associates, team doctors, trainers, coaches and even teammates, and whether or not those people condone doping practices. Moreover, Sarah has had time to reflect on her life as an athlete and recognize that athletes can take on an aspect of tunnel vision as they pursue international success. Sarah's statement aligns with the findings from Petróczi's (2007) study, which concludes there are two competing factors that influence an athlete's decision to dope: "1) the general social norms, such as fair play, condemnation of cheating and 2) the special norms held by the athletes' immediate subcultures" (Petróczi, 2007, p. 11). In addition, Steve's quote above describes his perception that believing a lot of other athletes engage in doping influences other athletes' decisions to engage in doping practices, which echoes Petróczi's finding that the immediate subculture of an athlete influences his/her doping practices.

Jane echoes Petróczi's conclusion that the condemnation of cheating can influence an athlete's decision about engaging in doping practices:

The fact that you kind of have more on you, or you are representing your country so you kind of have more obligations to play fair. Like I think when you hear about that [doping], you are kind of disgracing your country. – Jane (current player)

Jane's experience is also reflective of Petróczi's conclusion that doping practices tie into general social norms. Society can pressure athletes in different ways. First, the pressure from society to win can lead athletes to consider doping in order to achieve their goals and win to make their countries proud. Second, the pressure from society could alternatively serve as a positive reinforcement not to engage in doping for fear of disgracing one's country and letting down the society that supports one's athletic pursuits. However, it is clear that whatever their decision, to dope or not, societal pressure plays a role in athletes' decision making processes. Jane's comment that doping disgraces your country, as well as the comments about fearing the loss of their accomplishments (Theme #4) supports Bloodworth and McNamee's (2010) findings that the feeling of shame also influences athletes not to engage in doping practices. When caught doping, an athlete has not only failed to comply with the rules of competition, but has also failed to live up to the agreed upon social norms (Bloodworth & McNamee, 2010).

The pressure from money and funding was evident in the athletes' thoughts and comments on the Own the Podium program that rewarded athletes with a monetary incentive for winning medals at the Vancouver 2010 Olympics. Rewarding athletes with a monetary incentive for their athletic performance is not a new form of pressure that athletes are facing, as policies of this nature have been in effect since the Canadian government became more involved in funding sport, as discussed in the historical examination in Chapter II. Amanda recognized that financial support could add pressure to win international competitions:

If you don't win the medal, then you don't get the money for this medal, then you cannot keep playing your sport, so... or you don't have the sponsor [pause] with

volleyball it's not so much an issue because we don't really have sponsors[pause] but maybe we could be better. [...] Because there is money in it and there are some sports where it's not regulated. Like in hockey, like NHL, you can test positive but there is nothing that is going to happen, so there is money to make over there. And they have players that can take and use this medication and, to know if it's going to work or not and then they can give it to the other players. So there is money to make over there, but, where there's money there is going to be people doing it – Amanda (current player)

Amanda's perspective indicates that some athletes choose to engage in doping practices to gain financial rewards. While she distances herself and amateur sport from choosing doping as an option based on money by using the example of the NHL, for Amanda money functions as an incentive to dope. Paul also acknowledged that more money could lead to more pressure to succeed and perform at a high level, when he discussed the financial pressures professional athletes face:

You can see that in the professional sport realm. I think where we come from, you know the angle, you know that volleyball or some of those other lower profile sports where there's not a huge benefit to be gained from it, I mean sure, you know, you can be a world champion but you know if you are hitting 60 home runs in a year that's going to be worth 21 million dollars and I think that's a whole other discussion. So... yeah I think at some levels of sport there is a performance... you know if you are participating in a marquee event, you know like Ben Johnson was in the 100 meters, or you know really high profile sport, baseball or ice hockey or anything, where there is significant personal gain to be had by doing that, then I think it becomes a different question entirely – Paul (retired player)

Unlike Amanda, Paul viewed money as being more of an incentive for professional athletes, but recognizes that some amateur events, the marquee events as he calls them, can include a higher level of personal gain due to the winnings and sponsorships that would come from winning the event. For example, the Diamond League awards track and field athletes with considerable payouts. Furthermore, the winners of tournaments, such as Wimbledon, also receive substantial payouts and often also receive endorsement deals.

The original interview questions did not address the athletes' funding situations specifically; however, some of the athletes discussed their personal funding issues. None of the athletes discussed the Own the Podium Campaign outright, as the original interview guide did not include questions about Own the Podium, and the open-ended nature of the interviews only resulted in Sarah and Steve being asked to elaborate on their thoughts on Own the Podium as it was relevant to their previous responses. Both athletes saw the positive side of the Own the Podium Campaign until I asked if they thought it might create increased pressure on the athletes and might result in more doping:

That's an interesting question... uh, because I'll tell you my first thought about Own the Podium, was like finally! Canada is giving me some real incentive so that athletes will go above and beyond and try even harder than they think they can. There's actually some incentive, right, because when I played, pfft I don't know, I went into debt when I played [...] So my first reaction was like: 'Oh! Now we are going to win some more! Right? Because there is more pressure and there's more...' Funny hey? Like as an athlete I saw that only as a positive, like, oh, you're putting your money where your mouth is, finally somebody is giving us... our athletes money to perform. They should reward it. So I never thought that right off the hopper, but now that you bring it up [pause] ohhh I could see, [pause] I mean you put money in the mix and the extra pressure of we [pause] cause they set bold statements, right: 'we are going to win this many golds, we are going to' [pause] right. But that's where, in my mind, that makes us finally more like USA [pause] let's expect that of our athletes [...] You have to be tough to compete against the world, because they don't care about you, they just want to beat you. So I think any pressure you add, would add the pressure of taking something to make yourself better [...] And anytime you add money, money is such a powerful thing. And the motivation is beyond, they'll do anything to get more money. – Sarah (retired player)

I think that the Own the Podium program is phenomenal. I think it's something that we're well behind in. I think we do a great job researching in Canada, so I think [pause] like you know I'm a little bit distanced from it now, but when I was playing I felt there was a lot of good research coming out of Canada on it [pause] so the information was there. But I think that the support system for sports is not there. So I think it's a little bit misleading to talk all the time about Own the Podium this, Own the Podium that, the support is just not nearly the same [pause] at least it wasn't, and I see it getting better and Own the Podium is part of it getting better. – Steve (retired player)

These two quotes from Sarah and Steve demonstrate that they view the Own the Podium Campaign in a positive light and that they think it is needed in order to further Canada as a successful competitor on the international stage.

### **Theme #11: Fairness and Values**

In terms of morals and values, very little was said by the athletes that indicated that they considered the doping ban to involve more than rules. When asked directly if they associated any values or ethical code with the doping ban, the athletes' responses focused on following the rules. When prompted to recall the doping information they received throughout their careers and think about factors beyond simply following the rules, three additional areas emerged: 1) the level playing field; 2) honesty; and 3) integrity.

Several players discussed the idea that promoting a level playing field appealed to them:

I think it's [anti-doping's] a way of keeping athletes clean and the playing level equal and just honouring natural human sport – Betty (current National Team player)

I guess just, you know, the spirit of competition or the spirit of fair play. – Paul (retired player)

Lots of people aren't honest these days and they just do things to get ahead and if they're [pause]if they're doing shady things to get ahead they do get ahead, then it's fine. Whereas [pause] I think that's the type of value that the anti-doping is trying to encompass [pause] is making sure that we are being honest in our play and the way we train. – Jane (current player)

Well I think that honesty and fair play are associated with the doping ban. Integrity is another value that I think goes well with the bans. – Dexter (current player)

The reasons? Well I think in Canada, you know, we're [pause] I think Canadian values in general are like equality. I think equality and fair play really come in big time. You know, it's almost what I was saying before, which is just the level



playing field and then let's see and, you know, we'd be happy to congratulate the winner if we got beat, we'd be upset if we got cheated on, you know. I think that that's something that both of those agencies [WADA / CCES] have at the heart of what they are trying to do there. – Steve (retired player)

These responses reflect both the fact that the athletes have little to say when it comes to the values and reasons behind the doping ban, but when prompted, their responses are similar to the reasons WADA and the CCES use to defend their anti-doping policies. However, Betty added that she does not recall ever hearing why anti-doping agencies support drug-free sport:

Ok, honestly I am sure they give reasons and I am sure they are very valid and maybe similar to what I just said, but it's not like any stick out in my mind so they haven't been made very clear.– Betty (current player )

Betty's remark demonstrates that some athletes are unfamiliar with the ethical and values-driven aspects of the doping ban. Consequently, athletes like Betty associate the doping ban with rules that they must follow in order to remain eligible to compete. However, upon reflection they can see the connections between the anti-doping rules and the values associated by WADA and the CCES to the ban.

Paul emphasized this observation when he stated he believes that values, morals, ethics and fair play do not factor into an athlete's equation when considering whether or not to engage in doping practices. He argued that athletes who make the decision to dope engage in an entirely different thought process that does not explicitly acknowledge values or morals in their decision making process:

You know, I mean if somebody was going to dope to gain an advantage... I think it's a different question entirely. I think your thought process or your mindset is uh... uh it's not about fair play or morals or ethics, I think it's something different. I know at the [University] there were a couple of football players that has tested positive for taking steroids and I believe that they are fully aware of the... the ethics and morals associated with sport and fair play and I don't think that even comes into [the decision making process] I don't think so, you just want to be bigger and stronger and faster, and I think, to me, the

decision is do you want to be bigger and faster or do you not want to be bigger and faster. I don't think fair play comes into the equation. – Paul (retired player)

Paul highlights that athletes who choose to dope do so without much thought to fair play and the values that are supposedly behind the doping ban.

### **Theme #12: A Gap Exists**

Athletes discussed the idea that a constant game of catch up between the dopers and the anti-doping rules exists, which results in a gap that is never fully crossed. This theme was not one of the most prevalent themes emerging from the coding process as only two athletes discussed this idea. However, the history of doping in sport shows that there have always been new methods for doping or for doping to go undetected (Dimeo, 2007). For example, athletes were blood doping before WADA and anti-doping organizations discovered that this was going on in sport and that athletes were gaining an advantage from it. As long as new doping methods are available to athletes seeking to enhance their athletic performance, WADA has to try to catch up with the science used and develop tests for new performance-enhancing drugs and methods as they become available to athletes. The following quote from Amanda demonstrates that she is aware that there are gaps between the available drugs and methods to dope in sport, and the ones that are banned and on the anti-doping list:

I studied in chemistry and I did research, like you know when you are at school and you have to do a little research. I was always doing it on, like, anti-doping products or doping agents or whatever. So I just, I just learned how it's easy to take a molecule and change it so it's not detectable anymore. So it's easy this little modification so the anti-doping test won't work. So it's always this little, I don't know, war between the bad scientist and the good ones. – Amanda (current player)

Amanda explains that there are two sides to the doping war working in opposition to each other; those against doping working to prevent it and those trying to develop new ways to dope undetected in sport. Jane also acknowledges a gap by stating:

If it became legal for everyone to use steroids, I'm sure that some people would take full advantage of it. But if everyone's using, there is still going to be someone that because they were a physical specimen without steroids, well imagine them with steroids, you know, ... so there is always going to be the gap. – Jane (current player)

Jane's comment indicates that there will always be a gap in sport because, with or without drugs, some athletes are just going to be naturally better. Moreover, while the other athletes interviewed did not use the language of a gap, quotes above in Theme 7 about athletes' suspicion of others indicate that all the athletes in this study believe gaps exist in the amount of testing to which athletes are subject, the amount of funding athletes receive, and the ability of anti-doping agencies to detect new drugs circulating within the sporting world as they hear rumors about certain countries having better masking agents.

### **Summary**

In conclusion, several themes emerged from the analysis of the interview transcripts. The theme of fear is a prominent point of consensus among the athletes interviewed as they all sense that fear is being used to deter doping in sport. Another common theme amongst the athletes is that the doping ban does not register as much more than a set of rules that they must follow in order to remain eligible to compete and train at their level. Moreover, athletes had to be asked specifically to think about values and reasons for banning doping in sport beyond the mere fact that it was a rule. While the athletes answered that honesty, integrity and fair play were mixed in as part of the values and reasons for competing drug free, they could not recall if there were more reasons and they considered these aspects secondary to rule following in their decisions not to dope.

Through analyzing the interview transcripts, it also became apparent that the health argument, which states that doping is harmful to athletes' health, lacks relevance to athletes who feel they live in the present and are comparatively unconcerned about their future health. If something is not going to make them sick immediately or affect them negatively, several athletes admitted that they are unconvinced doping is so harmful that they should risk losing by abstaining.

All the athletes interviewed discussed differences: personal differences, differences in their sport, differences from other competitors, and Canada being different from other countries. Based on the interviews, it is apparent that athletes consider Canada to be stricter than other countries about doping in sport. They distance themselves from doping by claiming that there is no use of drugs in their sport. Finally, it was also apparent that athletes lacked some important education and knowledge about doping and the anti-doping movement.

No significant gender differences were found when analyzing the participants' interview transcripts. The only apparent gender difference was that the male participants reported receiving anti-doping seminars yearly while on the National Team, while the women could only remember having one seminar while on the National Team. Furthermore, the main difference between the current players and retired players interviewed was that the retired players were more reflective on the subject of doping in sport and the doping ban. When prompted, they could see beyond the doping ban being a list of rules that they had to follow, but were also reflective on the doping ban's role in sport.

This chapter analyzed the 12 themes that emerged through the analysis of the participants' interview transcripts. The next chapter will conclude this thesis with a discussion of the main findings and how this thesis contributes to the research on doping in sport.

## Chapter V: Conclusion

This thesis sought to answer the question of what attitudes, values and justifications athletes hold towards the current doping ban in sport. Whether or not athletes and anti-doping agencies, specifically WADA and the CCES, have similar approaches towards the doping ban was also investigated. In order to gain insight into these two questions I conducted a historical examination of the development of Canadian and international anti-doping policy and interviewed seven athletes from the Canadian National Volleyball Teams. The examination in Chapter II of the history of doping in Canada and internationally provides historical context for the attitudes the athletes interviewed provided when questioned about the doping ban. The message that WADA and the CCES seek to communicate to athletes about the doping ban and doping in sport is not the message that the athletes are receiving.

As Chapters III and IV describe, seven athletes participated in one-on-one semi-structured interviews, in which they engaged in discussion about their experience with and their thoughts on the doping ban. Three of the participants are retired players, and four are current members of the Canadian National Volleyball Team. Interviewing retired and current players enabled me to draw comparisons between the athletes' experiences. For example, the three retired players were playing for the Canadian National Volleyball Team during the 1990s, and thus experienced the impact of the 1988 Olympic Games and the Dubin Inquiry. All three of the retired players reported being drug tested over 10 times during their careers. In contrast, out of the four current players interviewed, only one participant had been tested. This current athlete has, so far, been tested three times.

This chapter summarizes the main findings that emerged from this study and discusses the contributions to the research field of doping in sport. In addition, future directions for research on athletes' attitudes and perspectives towards the doping ban and doping in sport are considered.

### **Main Findings**

Six main conclusions stem from my analysis and discussion of the themes in Chapter IV. According to the perspectives shared by the athletes participating in the study, they are not fully on the same page as WADA and the CCES when it comes to the anti-doping policy.

First, the athletes interviewed considered WADA and the CCES to be the 'doping police,' rule makers, and enforcers. In contrast the CCES states that it "work[s] for, and on behalf of athletes, players, coaches, parents, officials and administrators" (CCES, 2011e, p. 1), which indicates that the CCES as an organization views itself not solely as the 'doping police' but as a source of support for Canadian athletes. WADA does not explicitly state that it works for the athletic community, but does maintain its mission is to "ensure that athletes benefit from the same anti-doping protocols and protections, no matter the nationality, the sport, or the country where tested" (WADA, 2009c, p. 1). Furthermore, WADA's published sources suggest that the organization's main goal is safe and fair competition worldwide (WADA, 2009a). While the protection of athletes is important to WADA, the athletes interviewed felt that some strategies it employs to achieve the ultimate goal of safe and fair competition worldwide are invasive, and make them feel as if they are being policed. This finding indicated that there is a disjunction between how the interviewed athletes view anti-doping organizations, specifically

WADA and CCES, and how WADA and CCES want to be perceived by athletes. With the athletes, WADA and CCES not on the same page, there is a lack of cohesion. This disjuncture could result in athletes being resistant to working with WADA and CCES for clean sport, and make athletes more averse to complying with and supporting anti-doping initiatives.

By comparing the list of themes developed from the analysis of the interview transcripts with the list of values that characterize the spirit of sport and the CCES's stance on doping, overlap can be identified. The fact that doping is cheating and against the level playing field was shared by all the interviewed athletes and falls well in line with WADA and CCES's views on doping. Interestingly, one of the retired athletes recognized that while doping is cheating, it did not mean that the athlete did not still train hard or put in a huge effort to win:

But they don't just take the drugs and then win an Olympic gold right?! They still give their lives and work really hard. I mean, cause... I mean they're not winning... most of them are not winning by 5 miles, they are winning by 100ths of a second or whatever, and they just totally wrecked whatever they did. – Sarah (retired player)

This statement resulted in my own questioning of the actual impact of doping on an athlete's performance, and as pointed out by the above participant, leads to the question of whether or not a winning athlete caught doping could have won without the use of performance-enhancing drugs. While I found this information interesting, it did not change how I analyzed the interview transcript data.

Second, while the CCES and WADA both promote anti-doping because doping substances and methods are considered harmful to athletes' health, the athletes interviewed did not find the harm to health argument convincing. WADA and the CCES



are correct to acknowledge the harmful effects doping may have on the health of athletes, particularly as more knowledge and newer drugs are determined by scientists, but it might not be in either organization's best interest to rely on the health argument for banning doping. Based on the perspectives shared by the participants, for athletes this argument is less convincing and relevant if they are planning to engage in doping practices.

The third important finding from this study is that the athletes interviewed did not consider the doping ban and anti-doping initiatives as much more than a set of rules and regulations that they must follow in order to remain eligible for competition. In contrast, WADA and the CCES support a values-based anti-doping initiative, and both organizations list honesty, integrity, accountability, courage, and fun as part of the foundation for the anti-doping movement (CCES, 2011h; WADA, 2009a). All the participants described the ban as rules they had to follow concerning performance-enhancing substances and methods in sport. The athletes did not expand on whether the doping ban also consisted of associated values, such as the ones described by WADA and the CCES until they were asked directly about the education they received and what reasons they think WADA and the CCES offer for competing clean. However, the athletes then mentioned honesty and integrity, but they downplayed the role of values being the reason they choose not to dope. This finding indicates that while WADA and the CCES are targeting the problem of doping in sport as a broader issue that goes beyond just the rules of fair and clean competition, these athletes viewed doping in sport as an action that breaks a rule.

Fourth, the interviews and subsequent analysis of the transcripts also indicated that athletes experience many forms of fear stemming from the doping ban. The participants reported being scared of being falsely accused of doping or producing a false-positive test. The athletes also feared what a positive doping test would mean for their careers, namely the loss of all their accomplishments and honour. Finally, in terms of fear, the participants believed that WADA and the CCES use fear as a tool to motivate athletes not to engage in using banned substances or methods. The use of fear ties into the knowledge and education findings from this study. The athletes report that while the education they receive on anti-doping is infrequent, it centres on how the testing procedures take place and what happens if an athlete tests positive. Fearing the repercussions of committing a doping violation motivates many athletes from using banned substances; however, the athletes do not appreciate the CCES and WADA's use of fear tactics. While the scare tactics used may be effective, having the athletes trust in WADA and CCES and not fear them would benefit these organizations as it might reduce the resistance the athletes feel towards them and their initiatives.

The use of fear by WADA and the CCES ties into the athletes' perceptions that WADA and CCES are not advocates for the athletes and clean sport, but instead are 'doping police' out to catch and punish drug cheats. The implication of athletes viewing WADA and the CCES as 'doping police' results in athletes being fearful of these two organizations, and, in turn, results in a lack of trust of these organizations. WADA and CCES could work on building trust with athletes. If WADA and the CCES want to change their image from 'doping police' to advocates, they could change how they communicate with athletes. Using a different approach, one that does not focus

exclusively on what athletes fear about testing positive, could help WADA and CCES build trust with the athletes and may reduce the fear the athletes' experience, making the athletes more receptive to anti-doping initiatives. Providing athletes with information on what recourses they have if they do test positive might also help WADA and CCES foster an imagine that is more in line with being advocates for athletes' rights in sport.

Fifth, the interview transcripts also reveal that the participants are suspicious about doping testing procedures, detection methods, testing randomness and testing technology. Volleyball players are tested less often than athletes from some other sports (CCES, 2011f); however, the interviewed athletes' perceptions that testing is not random and that detection methods are not working are difficult to confirm or refute. The athletes acknowledged that drug testing is supposed to be random, but the fact that some athletes have been tested several times, and others have never been tested, demonstrates that there is the possibility that athletes who are doping could slip through the cracks and not get caught because they are never tested. The athletes also suspected that other countries might have better masking agents and performance-enhancing substances that still remain undetected to WADA scientists. Moreover, Betty, a current player, suspected that volleyball players are tested less often than athletes in other sports that are known for having doping violations or have a history of doping infractions. For these reasons, athletes do not have 100% trust in the anti-doping testing system, and are skeptical that all drug cheats will be caught.

The suspicion of the testing procedures and other countries' practices stems from an apparent lack of knowledge about how the *WADC* is applied in sport. It would be beneficial if WADA and CCES were to incorporate information on the *WADC* and how it

applies worldwide into their education systems. Currently, the focus of anti-doping education is directed towards testing procedures and the process of being tested. By incorporating the information that all countries that are signatories to the *WADC* have to follow the same rules in the education provided to athletes, WADA and CCES may be able to decrease the confusion and suspicion athletes hold toward other athletes, countries and sports.

The final key finding from this study is that the athletes considered themselves as Canadian National Volleyball Team players to be unique. They perceived themselves as different from other athletes, perceived volleyball as different from other sports, and perceived the Canadian sport system as being different from other countries' systems. Moreover, each athlete believed that he or she had more knowledge than others or had a better understanding of competing clean than other competitors. Finally, all the athletes interviewed viewed Canada as being different from other countries because they believed that Canada had stricter anti-doping rule than other countries. This means that the athletes lack knowledge and understanding of the *WADC*. It would appear that the participants interviewed, and possibly other athletes as well, do not understand that all athletes from all countries that are signatories to the *WADC* are subject to the same rules and regulations about doping in sport. The athletes do not perceive a harmonized worldwide anti-doping approach is applied, which is ultimately the main goal of WADA.

This finding is important because it reinforces the fact that athletes are not well informed about the anti-doping system, and the fact that there is a serious lack of trust in WADA and the CCES. As discussed above, incorporating information on how the *WADC* works and influences athletes worldwide in anti-doping education programs could help

decrease this difference perception. Athletes would be informed that they are being held to the same standards as their competitors within and outside of their country. Releasing a yearly report comparing the number of athletes tested per sport in each country could give athletes a visual representation of the similarities between countries.

Chapter II contributed to the overall goal of this project by providing detailed information on how anti-doping initiatives and policies developed within Canada, as well as how Canada's anti-doping rules and policies integrate with world anti-doping rules and policies. Chapter II highlights the differences between WADA and the CCES, how the two organizations work together and how athletes are affected by these two agencies. By chronicling the historical development of the CCES and WADA, it is clear that both organizations seek to be advocates for athletes' rights in sport. However, while the literature that the CCES and WADA publish states these organizations are advocates for the athletes, the athletes do not see them in this light, and view them instead as the 'doping-police' of sport. Chapter II also contextualizes what the retired interviewed players were subjected to versus what the current interviewed players are being held accountable to in terms of following anti-doping protocol.

The analysis of the athletes' values, attitudes, and justifications for the doping ban provides further insight into athletes' perspectives on anti-doping controls in sport. The finding that the participants viewed Canada as a country with less doping that is stricter about doping in sport than other countries shows similarities to Bloodworth and McNamee's conclusion about British athletes perceiving doping to be problematic outside of their country (Bloodworth & McNamee, 2010). Similarly, Canadian athletes interviewed in this thesis perceived doping to be a greater problem outside of Canada.

## **Contributions to Research**

This study contributes to research in the field of doping in sport because it addresses a population, Canadian volleyball players, previously unexamined in the literature. As the literature review in Chapter I indicated, little research on perceptions of doping in sport and athletes' experiences and thoughts on doping and anti-doping has been conducted. The available literature and research comes from the United States, the U.K., and Switzerland only and mainly used surveys. Focusing on Canadian athletes' experiences allows for comparisons among countries to be made, and allows for a richer data set to be consulted as this study used interviews instead of surveys. A comparison that can be made between this study and Bloodworth and McNamee's (2010) study is the finding that athletes in both populations distinguish doping differences based on their country. However, the present study reveals that athletes do not only distinguish differences in terms of their country, but also distinguish their sport and themselves, individually, as being different than others as well.

While there has been considerable research on why doping should be prevented based on the arguments from harm (e.g. Brown, 1984; Schneider, 1993) this thesis reveals that athletes find this argument unconvincing. While athletes are aware that doping can be dangerous to their health, they indicate that if athletes have already made the decision to engage in doping practices, they are not concerned about the potential harms or risks they are taking with their health. Moreover, this disregard for the potential harmful side effects of doping is because the athletes focus mainly on the present. The athletes describe a form of tunnel vision where they focus on what they want to achieve

and accomplish in sport; they are less concerned with the potential impacts doping might have on their health and lifestyle in their future outside of sport.

Past research has focused on the justifications for banning doping in sport (Brown, 1984; Hemphill, 2009; Schneider, 1993 & 2004). Focus has been on the moral and ethical justifications for a doping ban. However, this thesis discovered that the interviewed athletes are not concerned or acutely aware of the values that WADA and the CCES claim to be the driving force behind the doping ban. Instead, these athletes understand and interpret the doping ban as a list of rules they must follow in order to remain eligible to compete. These main findings contribute to the research literature on doping in sport by demonstrating that some athletes do not interpret the doping ban as WADA, CCES and other anti-doping organizations intend. It also indicates that athletes are not overly concerned with the reasons or justifications for the doping ban beyond the rule aspect of the ban. Therefore, in justifying the doping ban, WADA and the CCES might want to move away from justifying the ban in terms of values and the spirit of sport, but emphasize the importance and impact following the doping ban has on complying with the rules of sport, competition and games. Alternatively, WADA and CCES might want to figure out a better way to convey the values of the values-based system they are supporting and implementing in sport.

### **Future Directions**

This study included athletes on the Canadian National Volleyball Team only. While choosing such a small participant pool was intended to help focus the study and to set boundaries on the scope of the project, in the future it would be beneficial to interview athletes from various sports to see if their perspectives match those shared by the

volleyball players. Including the perspectives of athletes from other sports, and specifically from sports with a reputation for higher rates of doping, could allow for a richer comparison to be made among athletes' answers. Moreover, it would help to distinguish whether athletes from different sporting backgrounds share similar or different opinions on doping in sport and the doping ban.

While I found the semi-structured interview format appropriate for collecting data for this project, future studies could include a focus group format. By bringing the participants together to discuss the interview questions, more information from the participants might be drawn out throughout the discussion. In a focus group, more evidence may emerge of similarities and differences between the athletes' opinions. Additionally, interviewing WADA and CCES employees about their perspectives on doping in sport and anti-doping initiatives would provide another source of data to be analyzed. Currently WADA and the CCES's rationales are interpreted from published documents. Adding the voices of the decision-makers who make the policy decisions for these organizations could add another dimension to studies in this area.

Additionally, content analysis of the anti-doping education that athletes receive and the format in which it is provided to them could also be conducted. By taking an in depth look at the education about doping in sport and anti-doping protocols that athletes receive and what messages they receive, the claims that the interviewed athletes in this study made about their anti-doping education could be further contextualized. More importantly, a future study looking at anti-doping education could provide a framework for what changes need to be brought to anti-doping education programs in order to make them more effective.



## **Conclusion**

The purpose of this thesis was to answer two research questions. First, what attitudes, values and justifications do athletes have towards the current doping ban? Second, are WADA, the CCES and athletes on the same page in terms of attitudes towards justifications for the doping ban? By interviewing seven athletes from the Canadian National Volleyball team, comprised of four women (3 current players, 1 retired player), and three men (2 retired players, 1 current player), insight was gained to address these questions. I conclude that, ultimately, the athletes interviewed considered doping in sport to be a form of cheating that violated the rules of competition, that the doping ban was a list of rules they must follow in order to remain eligible to compete, and that the athletes do not have 100% trust in the current testing procedures. Moreover, I also conclude that athletes and anti-doping agencies, namely WADA and the CCES, are not on the same page in terms of the doping ban. As discussed in Chapter II, WADA and the CCES, historically, consider themselves as advocates for athletes' rights in sport, and seek to protect them from the dangers of doping. However, the athletes view WADA and the CCES as the police of sport, whose job is to ensure they comply with the rules and compete cleanly. The athletes were also suspicious of WADA and the CCES; they wondered if the random testing procedures and approach to anti-doping education was fully effective and appropriate.

The findings from this thesis are relevant to WADA and the CCES, and both organizations could use the knowledge described above to inform future policy revisions. This thesis indicates that WADA and the CCES are not being perceived as advocates for athletes, but instead are considered the 'doping police.' Knowing that they are not being

perceived in line with how they want to be perceived can allow WADA and the CCES to take steps to change the image they are presenting to athletes. Furthermore, the finding that athletes mainly associate the doping ban with rule following, not values, can also be used by WADA and the CCES to influence the content and approach for educating athletes about the doping ban. WADA and the CCES could benefit from listening to the comments and concerns of the athletes. If athletes' voices are not heard by WADA and the CCES, these organizations will lose the trust of athletes and the fight against doping in sport will likely remain a major contested issue in sport.

### Literature Cited

- Beamish, R. & Borowy, J. (1988). *Q. What do You do for a Living? A. I'm an Athlete*.  
Kingston: The Sport Research Group.
- Beamish, R. (forthcoming). The dialectic of modern, high-performance sport:  
Returning to Dublin to move forward. In R. Field (Ed.). *Contested Terrain: The  
Continuing Struggle for Sport and Recreation (Essays in Honour of Bruce Kidd)*  
[working title] Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bekker, J. I. (2009). Phenomenology. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe  
(Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (pp. 674-678). Thousand Oaks, CA:  
Sage.
- Berg, B. (1998). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Needham  
Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bloodworth, A. & McNamee, M. (2010). Clean Olympians? Doping and anti-doping:  
The views of talented young British athletes. *International Journal of Drug  
Policy*, 24 (1), 276-282.
- Brown, W. M. (1984). Paternalism, drugs, and the nature of sports. *Journal of the  
Philosophy of Sport*, 11, 14-22.
- Burnard, P. (1991). A method of analyzing interview transcripts in qualitative research.  
*Nurse Education Today*, 11, 461-466.
- Burstyn, V. (2000). The sporting life. In P. Donnelly (Ed.). *Taking Sport Seriously:  
Social Issues in Canadian Sport* (pp. 22-28). Canada: Thompson Educational.
- CASA. (2000). *Winning at any cost: Doping in Olympic sports – A report by the CASA  
commission on sports and substance abuse*. New York, NY: CASA Columbia.

- Cashmore, E. (2005). *Making Sense of Sports*. New York: Routledge.
- Canadian Centre for Drug-Free Sport. (CCDS) (1993). Annual Report. Retrieved from  
CCES archives.
- Carley, K. (1993). Coding choices for textual analysis: A comparison of content analysis  
and map analysis. *Sociological Methodology*, 73, 75-126.
- CCES. (1997). Annual Report. *Partners in Excellence*. Retrieved from CCES archives.
- CCES. (2009). Canadian Anti-Doping Program. Ottawa, ON: CCES Publishing.
- CCES. (2010). *Anti-Doping Sanctions*. Retrieved from  
<http://www.cces.ca/en/sanctions>
- CCES. (2011a). Early History of Anti-Doping in Canada. Retrieved from  
<http://www.cces.ca/en/historyadic>
- CCES. (2011b). Canadian Anti-Doping Program. Retrieved from  
<http://cces.ca/en/antidoping/cadp>
- CCES. (2011c). Canadian Sport Sanction Registry. Retrieved from  
<http://www.cces.ca/en/sanctionreg>
- CCES, (2011d). Doping. Retrieved from: <http://www.cces.ca/en/doping>
- CCES. (2011e). Mission and vision. Retrieved from <http://www.cces.ca/en/mission>
- CCES. (2011f). Canadian sport: Fair, safe and open. *Annual Report 2010-2011*.  
Retrieved from <http://www.cces.ca/files/pdfs/CCES-AR-2010-2011-E.pdf>
- CCES. (2011g). Anti-doping statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.cces.ca/en/statistics>
- CCES. (2011h). Values and principles. Retrieved from <http://www.cces.ca/en/values>
- CCES. (2011j). Threats to sport. Retrieved from <http://www.cces.ca/en/threatstosport>

- Chappelet, J. L. & Kubler-Mabbott, B. (2008). *The International Olympic Committee and the Olympic System: The Governance of World Sport*. New York: Routledge
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Danis, M. (1991). *Anti-doping strategy*. Government of Canada News Release. Retrieved from CCES archives.
- David, P. (2008). *A Guide to the World Anti-Doping Code: A Fight for the Spirit of Sport*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dimeo, P. (2007). *A History of Drug Use in Sport 1876-1976*. New York: Routledge.
- Douglas, J. (1976). *Investigative Social Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dowbiggin, B. (2010). Playing fair. *The Beaver*, 23-26.
- Dubin, C. L. (1990). *Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Fair Play Canada. (1995). *A handbook of activities for teaching fair play*. Retrieved from CCES archives.
- Fitness and Amateur Sport. (1991). *A Canadian Policy Against Doping in Sport*. Retrieved from CCES archives.
- FIVB. (2011a). *Anti-doping programme*. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.fivb.org/EN/Medical/>
- FIVB. (2011b). *We Play It Clean!* Retrieved from: [http://www.fivb.org/EN/Medical/Document/FIVB\\_Medical\\_We\\_play\\_it\\_clean\\_Athletes.pdf](http://www.fivb.org/EN/Medical/Document/FIVB_Medical_We_play_it_clean_Athletes.pdf)
- Francis, J., Johnston, M., Robertson, C., Glidewell, L., Entwistle, V., Eccles, P. & Grimshaw, J. M. (2010). What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data

- saturation for theory-based interview studies. *Psychology & Health*, 25 (10), 1229-1245.
- Gleaves, J. (2010). No harm, no foul? Justifying bans on safe performance-enhancing drugs. *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy*, 4 (3), 269-283.
- Halchin, L. E. (2006). Anti-doping policies: The Olympics and selected professional sports. In C. N. Burns (Ed.). *Doping in Sports* (pp. 1-36). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Hemphill, D. (2009). Performance enhancement and drug control in sport: Ethical considerations. *Sport in Society*, 12 (3), 313-326.
- Hoberman, J. (2001). How drug testing fails: The politics of doping control. In W. Wilson & E. Derse (Eds.). *Doping in Elite Sport: The Politics of Drugs in the Olympic Movement* (pp. 241-260). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Houlihan, B. (2001). The World-Anti-Doping Agency: Prospects for success. In J. O'Leary (Ed.). *Drugs and Doping in Sport: Socio-Legal Perspectives* (pp.125-145). London: Cavendish Publishing.
- Houlihan, B. (2002). *Dying to win: Doping in sport and the development of anti-doping policy*. Germany: Council of Europe.
- Kidd, B. (1988). The philosophy of excellence: Olympic performance, class power and the Canadian state. In P. J. Galasso (Ed.). *Philosophy of Sport and Physical Activity: Issues and Concepts* (pp. 11-31). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Kidd, B. (1996). *The Struggle for Canadian Sport*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kidd, B., Eldelman, R. & Brownell, S. (2001). Comparative analysis of doping scandals: Canada, Russia, and China. In W. Wilson & E. Derse (Eds.). *Doping in Elite*

- Sport: The Politics of Drugs in the Olympic Movement* (pp. 153-188). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Kirkwood, K. (2012). Defensive doping: Is there a moral justification for “if you can’t beat ‘em - join ‘em?” *Journal of Sports and Social Issues*, 36 (2), 223-228.
- Kondracki, N. L.; Wellman, N. S. & Amundson, D. R. (2002). Content analysis: Review of methods and their applications in nutrition education. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behaviour*, 34 (4), 224-230.
- Lamprecht, M., Gebert, A. & Stamm, H. (2010). Athlete survey 2010: Summary. *Anti-Doping Switzerland*, 1-8.
- Lenahan, P. (2003). *Anabolic Steroids and Other Performance-Enhancing Drugs*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Inc.
- MacAloon, J. J. (1990). Steroids and the state: Dubin, melodrama and the accomplishment of innocence. *Public Cultures*, 2 (2), 41-64.
- Macintosh, D., Bedecki, T., & Franks, C. E. S. (1988). *Sport and Politics in Canada: Federal Government Involvement Since 1961*.
- Mazanov, J. & McDermott, V. (2009). The case for a social science of drugs in sport. *Sport in Society*, 12 (3), 276-295.
- McLeod, J. (2001). Hermeneutics and phenomenology: The core of qualitative method. In *Qualitative Research in Counseling and Psychotherapy* (pp. 55-63). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morgan, W. (2008). Some further words on Suits on play. *Journal of Philosophy of Sport*, 35 (2), 120-141.
- Morse, J. M., & Field, P. A. (1995). *Qualitative Research Methods for Health Professionals* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Patrick, J. H., Pruchno, R. A., & Rose, M. S. (1998). Recruiting research participants: A comparison of the costs and effectiveness of five recruitment strategies. *The Gerontologist*, 38 (3), 295-302.
- Petróczi, A. (2007). Attitudes and doping: A structural equation analysis of the relationship between athletes' attitudes, sport orientation and doping behaviour. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*, 34 (2), 1-15.
- Pound, D. (2004). *Inside the Olympics: A behind-the-scenes look at politics, the scandals and the glory of the Olympic Games*. Toronto, ON: Wiley & Sons.
- Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schneider, A. (1993). Drugs in sport, the straight dope: A philosophical analysis of the justification for banning performance-enhancing substances and practices in the Olympic Games. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.
- Schneider, A. (2004). Privacy, confidentiality and human rights in sport. *Sport in Society*, 7 (3), 438-456.
- Simon, R. L. (1995). Good competition and drug-enhanced performance. In W. J. Morgan & K. V. Meier (Eds.). *Philosophic Inquiry in Sport* (pp. 209-214). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Sinclair, S. (2011). Impact of death and dying on the personal lives and practices of palliative and hospice care professionals. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 183 (2), 180-187.
- Stamm, H., Lamprecht, M., Kamber, M., Marti, B. & Mahler, N. (2008). The



- public perception of doping in sport in Switzerland, 1995 – 2004. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 26 (3), 235 – 242.
- Tamburrini, C. (2007). Are doping sanctions justified?: A moral relativistic view. In A. J. Schneider & F. Hong (Eds.). *Doping in Sport: Global Ethical Issues* (pp. 23-35). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Teetzel, S. (2004). The road to WADA. In K. B. Wamsley, S. G. Martyn & R. K. Barney (Eds.). *Cultural Relations Old and New – The Transitory Olympic Ethos* (pp. 213-224). London: International Centre for Olympic Studies.
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools*. Bristol, PA: Falmer.
- Todd, J. & Todd, T. (2001). Significant events in the history of drug testing and the Olympic movement 1960-1999. In W. Wilson & E. Derse (Eds.). *Doping in Elite Sport: The Politics of Drugs in the Olympic Movement* (pp. 65-128). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- USADA. (2011). Outreach education research. Retrieved from <http://www.usada.org/outreach-research>.
- van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*. London, ON: Althouse Press.
- WADA. (2009a). *World Anti-Doping Code*. Montreal, QC: WADA.
- WADA. (2009b). Priorities. Retrieved from <http://www.wada-ama.org/en/About-WADA/History-Mission-Priorities-and-Strategic-Plan/Priorities/>
- WADA. (2009c). Anti-Doping Community: Athletes. Retrieved from <http://www.wada-ama.org/en/Anti-Doping-Community/Athletes/>

WADA. (2010). World Anti-Doping Program. Retrieved from

<http://www.wada-ama.org/en/World-Anti-Doping-Program/>

WADA. (2011a). General Information. Retrieved from

<http://www.wada-ama.org>

WADA. (2011b). The Code. Retrieved from [http://www.wada-](http://www.wada-ama.org/en/World-Anti-Doping-Program/Sports-and-Anti-Doping-Organizations/The-Code/)

[ama.org/en/World-Anti-Doping-Program/Sports-and-Anti-Doping-Organizations/The-Code/](http://www.wada-ama.org/en/World-Anti-Doping-Program/Sports-and-Anti-Doping-Organizations/The-Code/)

WADA. (2013). *The 2013 Prohibited List International Standard*. Montreal, QC:

WADA.

Woodruff, H., Thompkins, A., Mottram, D. & Williamson, P. (2002). Public perceptions

on doping in sport. *The International Journal of Pharmacy Practice*, 10 (1), 28.

## Appendices

### **Appendix A: Letter to the Managers and Coaches of the Male and Female Canadian National Volleyball Teams**

April 2012

Dear (Insert Manager and Coaches Names),

My name is Olivia Durst and I am a Masters of Arts candidate in the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management at the University of Manitoba. I am conducting research as part of the requirements to fulfill my MA degree. The research project is entitled **Athletes' Values, Attitudes and Justifications for the Doping Ban: A Canadian Perspective** and seeks to understand the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban and how they justify their support of or opposition to current anti-doping rules.

The research will be guided by the following research questions:

- How do the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban relate to their justification for their support or opposition to the current anti-doping rules?
- Do the values and justifications that athletes' have for supporting the doping ban align with the values and justifications provided by anti-doping organizations for the doping ban?

I am seeking your permission to interview six (3 women and 3 men) current and four (2 women and 2 men) former members of the Canadian National Volleyball Team in order to understand the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban and how they justify their support or opposition of current anti-doping rules. I would like to use the women and men's National Volleyball Team as a case study in order to try and answer

the above research questions using a semi-structured, one-on-one interview format I will determine if athletes identify the same values and justifications for the doping ban as anti-doping organizations. Athlete answers will be compared and contrasted to justifications provided by anti-doping organizations, specifically the World Anti-Doping Agency and the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, to see if athletes and anti-doping organizations have the same, similar or different justifications for banning doping in sport.

Participation is completely voluntary, and participants will be able to withdraw from the study at any point in time by indicating his or her decision to withdraw to the researcher in person, over the phone or by email. The interviews will require one hour of each participant's time. Interviews will be conducted in person, however, if the participant is unable to meet for an in person interview, the option to complete the interview over Skype or the phone is also an option. The interviews will be recorded using a digital recorder, and then uploaded to my computer. The interviews will then be transcribed by me. Both the audio and transcribed word document versions of the interviews will be saved in password protected files that only I will have access to. The same protocol will be used for recording interviews conducted over the phone or through Skype as in person interviews. The digital recorder has the capacity to capture over the phone and Skype interviews. Phone interviews will need to be conducted using the speakerphone feature of the phone. For this reason, phone and Skype interviews will be conducted from my apartment, where they will not be overheard by anyone. Once the interview has been transcribed, I will email it back to the participant for him or her to review and add or change any information. Having the participant review his or her transcript will also allow him/her to identify if there is any information he or she no

longer wants to be included in the study. My MA supervisor will have access to printed copies of the transcripts only after the participants have approved their transcripts.

If you agree to allow your members to participate, I am asking that you forward the invitation to participate letter to the current and former members of your team. Anonymity and confidentiality will be kept by having participants select a pseudonym before the interview starts. No distinguishing characteristics will be used that could potentially identify any of the participants in any publications or presentations. With the exception of my MA thesis, no other articles, reports, or presentations will identify the participants as current or former members of the Canadian volleyball team.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your time and consideration of my request,

Sincerely,

Olivia Durst  
MA Candidate  
Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management  
University of Manitoba  
[umdurst@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:umdurst@cc.umanitoba.ca)

Advisor:

Dr. Sarah Teetzel  
(204) 474-8762  
[teetzel@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:teetzel@cc.umanitoba.ca)

**Appendix B: Invitation to Participate Letter**

April 2012

Dear Potential Participant,

My name is Olivia Durst and I am a Masters of Arts candidate in the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management at the University of Manitoba. I am conducting research as part of the requirements to fulfill my MA degree. The research project is entitled **Athletes' Values, Attitudes and Justifications for the Doping Ban: A Canadian Perspective** and seeks to understand the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban and how they justify their support of or opposition to current anti-doping rules.

The research will be guided by the following research questions:

- How do the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban relate to their justification for their support or opposition to the current anti-doping rules?
- Do the values and justifications that athletes' have for supporting the doping ban, align with the values and justifications provided by anti-doping organizations for the doping ban?

I request your participation to participate in a one-on-one semi-structured interview to discuss the values, attitudes and justifications you hold that influence your support or opposition of the doping ban. I would like to interview six (3 women and 3 men) current and four (2 women and 2 men) former members of the Canadian National Volleyball Team in order to understand the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban and how they justify their support or opposition of current anti-doping rules. I would like to use the women and men's National Volleyball Team as a case study in order to try and

answer the above research questions. Using a semi-structured, one-on-one interview format I will determine if athletes identify the same values and justifications for the doping ban as anti-doping organizations. Athlete answers will be compared and contrasted to justifications provided by anti-doping organizations, specifically the World Anti-Doping Agency and the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, to see if athletes and anti-doping organizations have the same, similar or different justifications for banning doping in sport. The interview would require one hour of your time. If you are unable to meet for an in person interview, the interview can be conducted over the phone or through Skype. All your answers will be kept confidential, and anonymity will be ensured.

The interviews will be recorded using a digital recorder, and then uploaded to my computer. The interviews will then be transcribed by me. Both the audio and transcribed word document versions of the interviews will be saved in password protected files that only I will have access to. The same protocol will be used for recording interviews conducted over the phone or through Skype as in person interviews. The digital recorder has the capacity to capture over the phone and Skype interviews. Phone interviews will need to be conducted using the speakerphone feature of the phone. For this reason, phone and Skype interviews will be conducted from my apartment, where they will not be overheard by anyone. Once the interview has been transcribed, I will email it back to you to review and add or change any information. Having you review your transcript will also allow you to identify if there is any information you no longer want to be included in the study. My MA supervisor will have access to printed copies of the transcripts only after the participants have approved their transcripts.

No distinguishing characteristics will be used to identify your answers and you will choose a pseudonym to further protect your anonymity and confidentiality. Furthermore, if at any point throughout the interview you feel uncomfortable answering the questions or no longer want to participate, you are able to withdraw and discontinue participating without consequence at any time by indicating your decision to withdraw to the researcher in person, over the phone or by email. No distinguishing characteristics will be used that could potentially identify any of the participants in any publications or presentations. With the exception of my MA thesis, no other articles, reports, or presentations will identify the participants as current or former members of the Canadian volleyball team.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my request,

Sincerely,

Olivia Durst  
MA Candidate  
Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management  
University of Manitoba  
[umdurst@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:umdurst@cc.umanitoba.ca)

Advisor:

Dr. Sarah Teetzel  
[teetzel@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:teetzel@cc.umanitoba.ca)



## **Appendix C: Informed Consent Form**

**Research Project Title:** Athletes' Values, Attitudes and Justifications for the Doping

Ban: A Canadian Perspective

**Researcher:** Olivia Durst, MA candidate, Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation

Management, University of Manitoba

**This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.**

This project seeks to understand the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban and how they justify their support or opposition of current anti-doping rules.

The study will be guided by the following research questions:

- How do the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban relate to their justification for their support or opposition to the current anti-doping rules?
- Do the values and justifications that athletes' have for supporting the doping ban, align with the values and justifications provided by anti-doping organizations for the doping ban?

I understand that my participation will require one hour of my time to answer the interview questions and that I will be given the opportunity to review my answers once they have been transcribed, roughly one week or two after my original interview. I also understand that I can withdraw, without consequence, from the study at any time by

informing the researcher of my decision. Furthermore, if I opt to withdraw at any time, I can choose to allow the answers already provided to be used or I can choose to have all my answers removed from the study.

I understand to help protect my anonymity I will be asked to read and revise the interview transcript. This process will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my sport, volleyball, will only be used in the MA thesis, but that all other subsequent publications will not include my sport. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that only the researcher and her MA thesis supervisor will have access to the information collected during the interview. I understand that this information will be used in the researcher's MA thesis and possibly in academic presentations, publications, and reports. I understand that direct quotes from my interview transcript may be used but my identity will be protected through the use of a pseudonym, and that there is no anticipated benefit for my participation. I understand the data for the project will be destroyed 1 year after the completion of the research in June 2013 through the shredding and deletion of all files.

**Approval for this project has been received from the Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board at the University of Manitoba. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-mentioned persons or the Human Ethics Secretariat at 474-7122, or e-mail [margaret\\_bowman@umanitoba.ca](mailto:margaret_bowman@umanitoba.ca). A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.**

**The University of Manitoba Research Ethics Board(s) and a representative(s) of the University of Manitoba Research Quality Management/Assurance office may also require access to your research records for safety and quality assurance purposes. Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researcher from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, orally or in writing, and/or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.**

Participant Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Researcher Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I would like a summary of the findings: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If you chose Yes:

\_\_\_ I would like to receive a summary of the findings by email.

Email \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ I would like to receive a summary of the findings in hard copy. Address: \_\_\_\_\_

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the researcher

Olivia Durst: [umdurst@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:umdurst@cc.umanitoba.ca), or advisor.

Advisor: Dr. Sarah Teetzel, [teetzel@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:teetzel@cc.umanitoba.ca)

## Appendix D: Interview Questions

“Hello, my name is Olivia Durst and I am a current MA student at the University of Manitoba. I am conducting research for my thesis entitled **Athletes’ Values, Attitudes and Justifications for the Doping Ban: A Canadian Perspective**. Before beginning the recorded portion of the interview, I would like to go over a few things first to ensure that you are comfortable and ready to begin the interview. First, I would like to remind you that the interview will be recorded and that I will be taking notes during the interview. When the interview is over I will transcribe the recorded interview and provide you with a copy of the transcript to review and approve. Secondly, although you have read and signed the informed consent form, I would like to review some of the details outlined in the form. Do you understand that this interview is being taped and that measures are in place to protect your anonymity and confidentiality, that you can choose not to answer any one of the questions being asked, and that at any point, should you feel uncomfortable continuing the interview and no longer wish to participate, you can end the interview and the tape recorder will be turned off and your answers deleted?”

If the participant does not agree to continue participating: “Thank you for your time and interest in the study.”

If yes, “Please pick a pseudonym you would like to be known as”

“I am turning the recorder on now.”

“Please state the pseudonym you would like to be known as now: \_\_\_\_\_”

Before we begin, please verify for me, are you 18 years of age or older?

If yes, continue with question 1

If no, turn off recorder, thank participant and end interview explaining all participants must be 18 years of age or older.

1. Please describe your participation in sport.
  - a. How long have you participated in your sport?
  - b. Do you have any unique experiences from your time participating in sport?
2. What do you understand the doping ban to involve?
  - a. How would you describe what the ban against drugs in sport involves to a friend or younger player?
3. Could you describe your experience in sport and your interaction with the anti-doping policies and procedures?
  - a. Have you been selected for drug testing? / Were you selected for drug testing when you were an active player?
  - b. If yes, how many times or how frequently?
  - c. If no, can you explain why you think you were not selected?
4. Where does your knowledge of anti-doping policies, restrictions, and test protocols come from?
  - a. Can you pinpoint how you learned about competing drug-free?
  - b. Have you participated in formal presentations or other forms of education about doping in sport? If yes, what did these involve?
5. What values do you associate with the doping ban?
  - a. Are these values you personally support?
  - b. Has doping education formed any of your values? How?

6. Thinking of the education you've received about doping, what reasons/values do you think the CCES and WADA offer to athletes to compete cleanly?
  - a. Do you agree with these reasons/values?
  - b. Would you offer different reasons/values for justifying drug free competition?
  - c. What are your reasons for offering these different reasons/values?
7. Have your attitudes towards doping in sport and the doping ban changed since you began your athletics career?
  - a. Has the formal/informal education you've received at different times influenced these changes? Why? How?
8. Do you think you share similar or the same reasons/values for supporting the drug ban as your teammates?
  - a. Do you think you share similar or the same reasons/values for supporting the drug ban as your opponents?
9. Are there reasons some people give for supporting drug free sport that you find unconvincing or less convincing?

**Appendix E: Participant Recruitment Poster****NATIONAL TEAM VOLLEYBALL PLAYERS  
WANTED!!!****ATHLETES' VALUES, ATTITUDES AND JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE  
DOPING BAN: A CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE****Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management MA Thesis Project****Researcher: Olivia Durst**

My name is Olivia Durst and I am a Masters of Arts candidate in the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management at the University of Manitoba. I am conducting research as part of the requirements to fulfill my MA degree. The research project is entitled **Athletes' Values, Attitudes and Justifications for the Doping Ban: A Canadian Perspective** and seeks to understand the values and attitudes athletes have towards the doping ban and how they justify their support of or opposition to current anti-doping rules.

**Participants sought:**

- Current or former members of a Canadian National Volleyball Team
- Over 18 years old

**What's Involved?:**

- Participate in a one-on-one interview lasting approximately 30-60 minutes
- Interview will take a place at a time and location most convenient for you
- Answer questions on your experience with and thoughts on the doping rules
- Anonymity of your responses ensured

If you are interested in participating or have any questions about the project, please email me, Olivia Durst, at [umdurst@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:umdurst@cc.umanitoba.ca).

Feel free to pass along this notice to anyone else who fits the criteria and would be interested in participating.