
This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Doping in sport: Whose problem is it?

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.12.001>

PUBLISHER

© Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of Sport Management Association of Australia and New Zealand

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Engelberg, E. Terry, and James Skinner. 2019. "Doping in Sport: Whose Problem Is It?". figshare.
<https://hdl.handle.net/2134/20328>.

Doping in sport:

Whose problem is it?

Terry Engelberg ^a

James Skinner ^b

^a Department of Psychology/Sport and Exercise Science, College of Healthcare Sciences,
Division of Tropical Health and Medicine, James Cook University, Cairns, QLD, Australia.

^b Institute for Sport Business, Loughborough University, London, UK.

Corresponding author:

Associate Professor Terry Engelberg, Department of Psychology/Sport and Exercise Science,
College of Healthcare Sciences, Division of Tropical Health and Medicine, James Cook
University, Cairns, QLD 4870, Australia

Tel: +61 (0)7 4232 1620

Email: terry.engelbergmoston@jcu.edu.au

Email addresses of other author:

J.L.Skinner@lboro.ac.uk

Doping in Sport: Whose Problem is it?

Abstract

In the last few years there has been a significant increase in the number and scope of social science research into doping in sport. However, despite this apparent progress, the field remains a disparate body of work and lacks both direction and leadership. Whilst sport management is a discipline that is well suited to provide such leadership, scholarly research into this controversial topic has not been published widely in sport management journals.

This special issue aims to redress this gap by bringing together a range of scholarly articles from a variety of perspectives from authors from North America, Europe and Australia. The issues and challenges covered are varied, but each paper brings a common theme: the implications for the management of doping in sport. The six papers in this Special Issue of Sport Management Review are a significant addition to the slowly growing body of sport management scholarly work on doping in sport. It is hoped that future research will be prompted with this Special Issue and the discipline of sport management will recognise and respond to the challenges presented by doping.

Doping in Sport: Whose Problem is it?

1. Introduction

In recent times doping scandals have tarnished a number of sports. These incidents pose threats to the integrity of sport both nationally and on a global scale. In response, sporting organizations and governments have introduced legislation and accompanying punishments to deter the use of both performance enhancing and other illicit (non-performance enhancing) drugs. However, it could be argued that effective strategies for combating doping in sport are hindered by a lack of organizational commitment, varying opinions on how the problem should be managed and a lack of reliable information and empirical data to formulate and implement appropriate doping policy.

According to the World Anti-Doping Code (WADA, 2015), a substance or method to improve performance will be deemed to constitute an anti-doping rule violation if it meets any two of three specified criteria. These are broadly categorized as (1) a potential to enhance performance; (2) a threat to health; and, (3) a violation of the “spirit of sport” (WADA, 2015; p.14)

The issue of whether a substance is performance enhancing or a threat to health clearly places the rationale for anti-doping within a medical framework (for historical accounts of the development of the WADA Code, see Hunt, 2011; Hunt, Dimeo, & Jedlicka, 2012; Rosen, 2008). The spirit of sport component of the Code’s definition of doping (WADA, 2015, p.14) is less easily compartmentalized, taking in philosophy (“ethics, fair play and honesty”), psychology (“dedication and commitment”), sociology (“community and solidarity”), and law (“respect for rules and law”). Not surprisingly, then, the phrase has become the single most controversial aspect of the Code. Many authors (e.g., Henne, Koh, & McDermott, 2013; Smith & Stewart, 2008; Stewart & Smith, 2014; Waddington, Christiansen, Gleaves, Hoberman, & Møller, 2013) have highlighted the lack of clarity,

absence of logic and other severe problems with the spirit of sport as a criterion for defining doping. The ambiguity of the term has perhaps contributed to a difference of opinion about how doping should be managed and the fragmented direction of the social science research into doping.

In the last few years there has been a significant increase in the amount and scope of social science research into anti-doping. However, despite this apparent progress, the field remains a disparate body of work and lacks both direction and leadership. One academic discipline arguably best suited to provide such leadership is sport management. Sport management provides a contextual lens to address the management of sport and its associated practices. Through this lens it can facilitate constructive debate, provide insight into complex phenomena and identify possible solutions to the challenging problems confronting sport. Its ability to apply a range of management theories and its symbiotic relationship with sport suggests the discipline is well positioned to better understand the complex drivers of doping practices and significantly contribute to the debate on appropriate preventative strategies and deterrence mechanisms. However, the discipline of sport management has had a somewhat chequered history with regard to its relationship to what is colloquially referred to as the “dark side” of sport (Wood, McInnes, & Norton, 2011).

2. ‘Dark Side’ Research

As a relatively new discipline, sport management researchers have at various times taken stock of the field, to highlight both shortcomings and opportunities. Some of these stocktakings have been personal (e.g., Boucher, 1998; Zeigler, 2007), whilst others have used bibliometric analysis (e.g., Ciomaga, 2013; Shilbury, 2011). Ciomaga (2013) suggests that the modern discipline of sport management is largely focused on themes that resonate with a commercial logic, rather than the social responsibilities of sport, which reflects the management backgrounds of many researchers. Zeigler (2007) cautions that the special status

of sport as a force that positively impacts both individual development and societal cohesion is challenged by the logic of profit:

.... competitive sport is structured by the nature of the society in which it occurs. This would appear to mean that overcommercialization, taking drugs, cheating, officials taking bribes, violence, and so on at all levels of sport are simply reflections of the culture in which we live. Where does that leave us today as we consider sport's presumed relationship with moral character development? (Zeigler, 2007; p.303)

Thus, one commercial marketing application of sport management becomes developing strategies that increase attendances at sporting events. In such a context, a problem such as doping by athletes represents both a threat and an opportunity: a threat in that doping might deter attendances (Engelberg, Moston, & Skinner, 2012) or threaten sponsorship (Solberg, Hanstad, & Thøring, 2010); an opportunity in that it might encourage even greater attendances through athletes who run ever faster, hit and throw ever further (Cashmore, 2012). In this latter case, the main purpose of athletic sport becomes the bettering of previous performances, with top athletes only truly achieving success if they can establish new records.

3. Taking stock of doping research (in sport management journals)

To set the scene for this special issue, we conducted a systematic search of seven of the leading sport management journals for publications on doping-related topics or themes. The initial selection of journals was based on prior empirical analysis of sport management citation data (e.g., Ciomaga, 2013; Shilbury, 2011; Zeigler, 2007). This delimited the analysis, since some relevant contributions by sport management academics may have been published in journals offered by other disciplines or topic areas (such as 'social issues' or 'sport policy'). Despite this restriction, the resulting data are objectively verifiable and form a

solid basis for commentary on the application of sport management to the ongoing threat of doping.

Each of the seven journals were systematically searched for articles on doping appearing in the last decade (2005 to 2014 publications only). A total of 16 relevant articles on doping were identified. This included seven articles in *Sport Management Review* (Engelberg, Moston, & Skinner, 2015; Houlihan, 2014; Mazanov, Hemphill, Connor, Quirk, & Backhouse, 2015; Petróczi & Haugen, 2012; Smith et al., 2010; Stewart, Adair, & Smith, 2011; Wagner, Pedersen, & Møller, 2014). There were five articles in *European Sport Management Quarterly* (Hanstad, 2008; Probert & Leberman, 2009; Tainsky & Winfree, 2008; Wagner, 2010, 2011). Two articles were in both the *Journal of Sport Management* (Huybers & Mazanov, 2012; Woolf, Rimal, & Sripad, 2014) and the *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing* (Christiansen, 2010; Denham, 2007). No articles were identified in the *International Journal of Sport Management*, *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, nor *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*.

Half (eight) of the articles used primary data; one of these articles (Hanstad, 2008) also employed secondary data, including document and media analysis. Of the eight primary data articles, six featured athletes or athletic populations. There were wide variations in the type of athlete studied (e.g., cyclists only, bodybuilders only, youth male athletes, university athletes, doping athletes only); the other two articles sampled support staff (one article) and former and current administrators, managers, and directors (one article). Primary data-driven articles used both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, although there was only one survey (Woolf et al., 2014) and one experimental study (Huybers & Mazanov, 2012). One article (Petróczi & Haugen, 2012) presented a theoretical game-modelling design to illustrate self-response patterns.

For secondary data articles, the most favoured methodology was document analysis (eight articles). This included case studies that featured analysis of policy documents, media releases, and other documents from governing bodies of sport (such as the World Anti-doping Agency [WADA], the International Ski Federation [FISA], the Federation internationale de Football Associations [FIFA], the International Athletics Federation [IAAF]). Other research methods such as media analysis, and attendance data were only reported once respectively.

Overall, we found no dominant conceptual or theoretical frameworks. Two articles were primarily psychological, or were premised on psychological and social psychological theories (Engelberg et al., 2015; Woolf et al., 2014); other theoretical frameworks included social ecology theory (Smith et al., 2010); Bourdieu's (1993) conceptual framework of social field, capital and habitus (Stewart et al., 2011); figural sociology and game models (Hanstad, 2008); and phenomenology (Probert & Leberman, 2009). While acknowledging the quality and contribution of this work it clearly indicates the limited breadth and depth of sport management research into doping.

One of the most striking aspects of the aforementioned analysis is the limited number of academic articles in leading sport management journals on the topic of doping. Given the apparent threat posed by doping and the special features of sport (Smith & Stewart, 2010) that separate it from other institutionalized practices a greater contribution from sport management might have been expected.

The sport management discipline and sport managers can make significant contributions to the doping debate and how doping should be managed. For example, sport managers can influence and shape the anti-doping policies that regulate the workplace environment of athletes and achieve desirable policy objectives (Skinner, Engelberg, & Moston, in press). Similarly, creating organizational systems and practices that facilitate high levels of trust can assist in facilitating belief in the integrity of the drug testing system. The

corollary is that institutional distrust can fracture the relationship between a governing body and its athletes (Wilson, Gilbert, & Edwards, 2004). This need for greater managerial input is perhaps exacerbated by recent high profile doping scandals involving individuals (e.g., Lance Armstrong), teams (e.g., Essendon Football Club) and organizations (e.g., International Association of Athletics Federations: IAAF). Furthermore, just as able-bodied Olympians have been implicated in doping use, so too have Paralympic athletes (e.g., Pluim, 2008). Dr. Peter Van de Vliet, the IPC Medical and Scientific Director, commented that historically, there has indeed been drug-taking in the Paralympics (Gentleman, 2012). We are also seeing a rise in performance and image enhancing drug use by adolescents (Calfee & Fadale, 2006), and an increase in doping occurring outside of elite sport in non-elite environments (Hutchinson, Moston, & Engelberg, 2015).

4. Papers in the issue

This Special Issue addresses the disciplinary imbalance by providing a range of papers by scholars from Denmark, Greece, Canada, United Kingdom, and Australia. These papers distinctively focus on the implications of doping for the management of sport and sport managers.

Overbye's (2016) research uses the WADA Code to outline the mutual responsibilities of national and international sports federations and national governments for joint efforts against prohibited substances and methods in elite sport worldwide. Identifying that that a major challenge currently undermining anti-doping efforts is a lack of commitment among a number of important governments and international federations she suggests that the perceptions of athletes about the functioning of the testing system in their sport as well as their trust in and support of the anti-doping system as a whole has the potential to create a new kind of inequity, and a feeling of unfairness among athletes who believe they are being subjected to a stricter testing regime than their competitors. Based on a quantitative survey of

645 Danish elite athletes, Overbye found two thirds of the athletes were satisfied with the national testing regime; however, a majority believed that in certain countries, doping control was sometimes downgraded in order to win medals, a finding of particular concern.

Building trust, however, requires sport managers to maintain high levels of personal morality, executive integrity, and professional ethics. Indeed, the use of performance enhancing substances to increase athletic performance and the greater possibility of victory has ethical and moral issues attached to it. Here, Copeland and Potwarka (2016) explore the principle of ethics through a teaching case study of the University of Waterloo Warriors 2010 varsity football team. This was the most significant doping scandal in Canadian university sports history, with a total of nine anti-doping rule violations asserted through a review completed by the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport. This first-hand account, along with the findings of the review, provides important insights into ethical decision making processes and leadership structures in a team sports environment.

Key to preventing future occurrences similar to the Waterloo Warriors varsity case could lay in the investigation of doping attitudes and practices amongst development athletes and young people in general (Moston, Engelberg, & Skinner, 2015). Ultimately, this can inform the development of education programmes for school athletes. This is an area of growing research interest and is the focus of the research completed by Barkoukis, Kartali and Lazuras (2016). This study, included in this special issue, investigated the effectiveness of a school-based intervention in promoting an anti-doping culture in adolescents. Two hundred and eighteen high school students from a Greek secondary school completed a questionnaire looking at attitudes towards nutritional supplements and doping use, social norms and norm salience, and the values of sport. While the intervention was partially successful, it failed to produce a change in attitudes towards doping, and the study highlights the difficulties of establishing whether an anti-doping intervention can ever be said to have

worked. The authors suggest that sport managers can utilize the findings to develop their own initiatives to promote an anti-doping culture among young athletes.

Following the anti-doping education theme, Patterson, Backhouse and Duffy (2016) highlight the practical difficulty of anti-doping education. They suggest that anti-doping education for coaches is minimal and a cause for concern as coaches have an important role to play in deterrence. Patterson and her colleagues (2016) point out that very little is known about current coach education provision in the anti-doping domain across countries and sports. Their findings indicate that policy expectations regarding anti-doping education for coaches are not being fully operationalized and this situation is unlikely to change. They suggest that until anti-doping education is shown to be a key priority for decision makers within sport organizations, it is unlikely to become a key priority for coaches.

Although education programmes have the potential to contribute significantly to managing contemporary problems associated with doping, an understanding of these problems and how they are dealt with in a sporting environment is necessary. Gowthorp, Greenhow and O'Brien (2016) show how existing theory offers insight into contemporary problems through an investigation of the allegations of drug use within the Australian Football League (AFL). Specifically, they examined the alleged use of performance enhancing drugs by a number of players and support personnel of the Essendon Football Club (EFC). Their work questions the legitimacy of the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority's (ASADA) power in its management of the allegations. Using content analysis of legal documents and Bourdieu's (1985, 1990) conceptual framework, their work aimed to determine the legitimate regulatory authority of key actors involved in the EFC investigation. The findings suggest that symbolic capital sometimes emerges as a proxy for legitimate authority and regulation within social fields; the case highlights some of the damaging outcomes for sport from this "misrecognition" of legitimacy.

The final paper by Phat, Birk, Turner and Fenech (2016) also focuses on the EFC, as well as the Cronulla Sharks Rugby League Club. This teaching case study is based on actual events surrounding the 2011-2012 banned performance enhancing drugs scandal involving these two high profile Australian sporting clubs. This case investigates whether drug use is directly related to the moral hazard issue. It questions if internal controls broke down, leading to individuals or a small team of people running ambiguous programs involving the use of performance enhancing drugs? The question provides the opportunity for students to debate if this a breakdown of internal controls is a symptom of poor corporate governance, where the building blocks of corporate governance (leadership, planning, and organizational performance) are not well established and linked.

What the above papers highlight is that when addressing banned performance enhancing drug use, the discipline of sport management has a key role to play. Of central concern to sport managers is their ability to develop and implement sound anti-doping management practices. Sport management academics must continue to contribute to this debate as this contribution may assist in shaping how doping in sport should be managed now and in the future. This Special Issue provides a platform for this contribution.

References

- Boucher, R. L. (1998). Toward achieving a focal point for sport management: A binocular perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12(1), 76.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The social space and the genesis of groups. *Theory and Society*, 14(6), 723-744.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The fields of cultural production: Essays in arts and literature*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Calfee, R., & Fadale, P. (2006). Popular ergogenic drugs and supplements in young athletes. *Pediatrics*, 117(3), e577-e589. doi:10.1542/peds.2005-1429
- Cashmore, E. (2012, October 24). Opinion: It's time to allow doping in sport. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/10/23/opinion/cashmore-time-to-allow-doping-in-sport/index.html>
- Christiansen, A. V. (2010). "We are not sportsmen, we are professionals": professionalism, doping and deviance in elite sport. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 7(1/2), 91-103. doi:10.1504/IJSMM.2010.029714
- Ciomaga, B. (2013). Sport management: a bibliometric study on central themes and trends. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 13(5), 557-578. doi:10.1080/16184742.2013.838283
- Denham, B. E. (2007). Government and the pursuit of rigorous drug testing in Major League Baseball: a study in political negotiation and reciprocity. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 2(4), 379-395. doi:10.1504/IJSMM.2007.013712
- Engelberg, T., Moston, S., & Skinner, J. (2012). Public perception of sport anti-doping policy in Australia. *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*, 19(1), 84-87. doi:10.3109/09687637.2011.590556
- Engelberg, T., Moston, S., & Skinner, J. (2015). The final frontier of anti-doping: a study of athletes who have committed doping violations. *Sport Management Review*, 18(2). doi:10.1016/j.smr.2014.06.005
- Gentleman, A. (2012, September 3). Paralympic doping risk 'could grow' as Games attracts more money *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2012/sep/02/paralympic-doping-risk-games-money>

- Hanstad, D. V. (2008). Drug scandal and organizational change within the International Ski Federation: A figurational approach. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8(4), 379-398. doi:10.1080/16184740802461645
- Henne, K., Koh, B., & McDermott, V. (2013). Coherence of drug policy in sports: Illicit inclusions and illegal inconsistencies. *Performance Enhancement & Health*, 2(2), 48-55. doi:10.1016/j.peh.2013.05.003
- Houlihan, B. (2014). Achieving compliance in international anti-doping policy: An analysis of the 2009 World Anti-Doping Code. *Sport Management Review*, 17(3), 265-276. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2013.10.002
- Hunt, T. M. (2011). *Drug Games: The International Olympic Committee and the Politics of Doping, 1960–2008*. Kindle Edition.: University of Texas Press.
- Hunt, T. M., Dimeo, P., & Jedlicka, S. R. (2012). The historical roots of today's problems: A critical appraisal of the international anti-doping movement. *Performance Enhancement & Health*, 1(2), 55-60. doi:10.1016/j.peh.2012.05.001
- Hutchinson, B., Moston, S., & Engelberg, T. (2015). Social validation: A motivational theory of doping in an online bodybuilding community. *Sport in Society*, in press. doi:10.1080/17430437.2015.1096245
- Huybers, T., & Mazanov, J. (2012). What would Kim do: A choice study of projected athlete doping considerations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(4), 322-334.
- Mazanov, J., Hemphill, D., Connor, J., Quirk, F., & Backhouse, S. H. (2015). Australian athlete support personnel lived experience of anti-doping. *Sport Management Review*, 18(2), 218-230. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2014.05.007
- Moston, S., Engelberg, T., & Skinner, J. (2015). Self-fulfilling prophecy and the future of doping. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 16(2), 201-207. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.02.004

- Petróczi, A., & Haugen, K. K. (2012). The doping self-reporting game: The paradox of a 'false-telling' mechanism and its potential research and policy implications. *Sport Management Review*, 15(4), 513-517. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2012.04.002
- Pluim, B. (2008). A doping sinner is not always a cheat. *British Journal Of Sports Medicine*, 42(7), 549-550.
- Probert, A., & Leberman, S. (2009). The value of the dark side: An insight into the risks and benefits of engaging in health-compromising practices from the perspective of competitive bodybuilders. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 9(4), 353-373. doi:10.1080/16184740903331838
- Rosen, D. M. (2008). *Dope: A history of performance enhancement in sports from the nineteenth century to today*. Westport, Conn: Praeger.
- Shilbury, D. S. (2011). A bibliometric analysis of four sport management journals. *Sport Management Review*, 14, 434-452. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2010.11.005
- Skinner, J., Engelberg, T., & Moston, S. (in press). Doping policy: workplace implications for athletes. In M. Barry, J. Skinner, & T. Engelberg (Eds.), *Research Handbook on Employment Relations in Sport*. London: Edward Elgar Press.
- Smith, A., & Stewart, B. (2008). Drug policy in sport: Hidden assumptions and inherent contradictions. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 27(2), 123-129. doi:10.1080/09595230701829355
- Smith, A., & Stewart, B. (2010). The special features of sport revisited. *Sport Management Review*, 10(1), 1-11.
- Smith, A., Stewart, B., Oliver-Bennetts, S., McDonald, S., Ingerson, L., Anderson, A., . . . Graetz, F. (2010). Contextual influences and athlete attitudes to drugs in sport. *Sport Management Review*, 13(3), 181-197.

- Solberg, H. A., Hanstad, D. V., & Thøring, T. A. (2010). Doping in elite sport — do the fans care? Public opinion on the consequences of doping scandals. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 11(April), 185-199.
- Stewart, B., Adair, D., & Smith, A. (2011). Drivers of illicit drug use regulation in Australian sport. *Sport Management Review*, 14(3), 237-245. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2011.02.001
- Stewart, B., & Smith, A. (2014). *Rethinking Drug Use in Sport: Why the War Will Never be Won*. London: Routledge.
- Tainsky, S., & Winfree, J. A. (2008). Financial incentives and league policy: The example of Major League Baseball's steroid policy. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8(1), 67-81. doi:10.1080/16184740701814423
- WADA. (2015). *World Anti-Doping Code 2015*. Montreal: WADA. Retrieved from <http://www.wada-ama.org/>.
- Waddington, I., Christiansen, A. V., Gleaves, J., Hoberman, J., & Møller, V. (2013). Recreational drug use and sport: Time for a WADA rethink? *Performance Enhancement & Health*, 2(2), 41-47. doi:10.1016/j.peh.2013.04.003
- Wagner, U. (2010). The International Cycling Union under siege - anti-doping and the biological passport as a mission impossible? *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 10(3), 321-342. doi:10.1080/16184741003770206
- Wagner, U. (2011). Towards the construction of the World Anti-Doping Agency: Analyzing the approaches of FIFA and the IAAF to doping in sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(5), 445-470. doi:10.1080/16184742.2011.624107
- Wagner, U., Pedersen, K., & Møller, V. (2014). The IOC and the doping issue—An institutional discursive approach to organizational identity construction. *Sport Management Review*, 17(2), 160-173. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2013.05.001

- Wilson, S., Gilbert, K., & Edwards, A. (2004). The socio-political conservatism associated with doping and high-performance sport: a case study of an athletic squad's perspective. *Journal of exercise science and fitness*, 2(2), 105-114.
- Wood, S., McInnes, M. M., & Norton, D. (2011). The bad thing about good games: The relationship between close sporting events and game-day traffic fatalities. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38(4), 611-621.
- Woolf, J., Rimal, R. N., & Sripad, P. (2014). Understanding the influence of proximal networks on high school athletes' intentions to use androgenic anabolic steroids. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(1), 8-20.
- Zeigler, E. F. (2007). Sport management must show social concern as it develops tenable theory. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21(3), 297-318.