



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Sport Management Review

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/smr](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/smr)

# Anti-doping education for coaches: Qualitative insights from national and international sporting and anti-doping organisations

Laurie B. Patterson <sup>\*</sup>, Susan H. Backhouse, Patrick J. Duffy*Institute for Sport, Physical Activity and Leisure, Leeds Beckett University, Fairfax Hall, Headingley Campus, Leeds LS6 3QS, United Kingdom*

## ARTICLE INFO

*Article history:*

Received 1 October 2014

Received in revised form 4 December 2015

Accepted 5 December 2015

Available online 12 January 2016

*Keywords:*

Athlete support personnel

Coaching

Doping

Drugs in sport

Education

Prevention

## ABSTRACT

Within anti-doping efforts, an emphasis has been placed on the importance of providing education programmes to key stakeholder groups, including coaches. Yet, very little is known about current coach education provision in the anti-doping domain across countries and sports. Therefore, this study aimed to: (1) establish the current status of anti-doping education for coaches; (2) gain an understanding of the system through which anti-doping education is provided to coaches; and, (3) explore the opportunities for future education provision. This was done through semi-structured interviews with thirteen individuals responsible for managing anti-doping education within national and international sporting and anti-doping organisations. Most stakeholders acknowledged the importance of providing education programmes for coaches. Some already had provision in place and others were in the process of developing programmes. However, the current focus is on sportspeople and the degree to which sporting and anti-doping organisations are able to devise, implement and evaluate anti-doping education programmes for coaches is hindered by the contextual constraints they face. These include a lack of resources and limited interagency coordination, as well as challenges to overcome negative perceptions of 'anti-doping' efforts. Taken together, the findings indicate that policy expectations regarding anti-doping education for coaches are not being fully operationalised, and this situation is unlikely to change without: (1) greater direction and regulation of the system through which education is provided; (2) frequent and effective communication and cooperation between Code signatories; and, (3) increased fiscal and human capital investment at every level of the sporting hierarchy. Ultimately, until anti-doping education is shown to be a key priority for decision makers within sporting organisations (i.e., chief executives and board members), it is unlikely to become a central priority for coaches.

© 2015 Sport Management Association of Australia and New Zealand. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 113 812 8651.

E-mail addresses: [L.Patterson@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:L.Patterson@leedsbeckett.ac.uk) (L.B. Patterson), [S.Backhouse@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:S.Backhouse@leedsbeckett.ac.uk) (S.H. Backhouse).

## 1. Introduction

Globally, social scientists are striving to understand doping behaviours with a view to inform and improve anti-doping policy and practice. At present, doping is primarily managed through detection and deterrence, and this assertion is evidenced by the heavy spending on drug testing and intelligence-led investigations (WADA, 2012, 2014). However, the importance of prevention through education has been emphasised (Backhouse, Patterson, & McKenna, 2012) and reinforced in the revised World Anti-Doping Code ([WADC], WADA, 2015). Furthermore, amendments to the 2015 Code acknowledge – and attempt to defend against – the role of athlete support personnel (ASP) in doping in sport. Specifically, ASP should (1) be knowledgeable of anti-doping rules; (2) comply with testing; (3) use their influence to encourage anti-doping attitudes in their sportspeople; (4) cooperate with doping-related investigations; (5) declare any prior involvement in doping to relevant authorities; and, (6) refrain from personal use of substances or methods that are prohibited in sport (WADA, 2015, p. 70). ASP are subject to sanction if they fall foul of the anti-doping rules and this gives rise to a need to ensure that these individuals make informed decisions (WADA, 2015). Consequently, in a bid to foster Clean Sport and Code compliance, national and international sporting organisations are duty-bound to ensure that anti-doping education reaches a range of populations, including athletes, their parents and their support personnel (WADA, 2015).

### 1.1. The importance of educating coaches in relation to anti-doping

Notwithstanding the array of support personnel within an athlete's entourage, theoretical, empirical and anecdotal evidence highlights the importance of coaches in relation to doping behaviours. Qualitative research by Smith et al. (2010) illuminated the potential power of coaches when they found that elite sportspeople not only viewed coaches as inspirational and knowledgeable, but also identified them as being "obeyed without question" (p. 188). Therefore, it is not surprising that coaches have been found to play a facilitative role in a number of doping incidents (e.g., Ungerleider, 2001; Zaccardi, 2014). For instance, several track and field coaches (e.g., Mark Block, Remi Korchemny) were involved in sourcing and supplying substances within the Bay Area Laboratory Cooperative (BALCO) doping regime of the 2000s (Fainaru-Wada & Williams, 2006). Similarly, speculation about the involvement of coaches in doping behaviours among cyclists (Walsh, 2007) was confirmed via the United States Anti-Doping Agency's (USADA) investigation into the suspected doping of American Cyclist, Lance Armstrong. Investigators uncovered a systematic doping system involving coaches and other support personnel, who were subsequently sanctioned for the part they played in the case (USADA, 2012). Beyond the Armstrong and BALCO cases, several other coaches have been banned from working in sport for their involvement in doping behaviours (e.g., Andre Abut, Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, 2009; Valerio Mascariello, Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, 2010).

In contrast to the coach as a doping facilitator, research with sportspeople has supported the protective influence of coaches in relation to doping due to their 'closeness' or 'importance' (e.g., Goulet, Valois, Buist, & Cote, 2010; Kirby, Moran, & Guerin, 2011). This potential 'anti-doping' power of coaches is corroborated through their self-reported belief that they should use their influence positively to aid doping prevention (Figved, 1992; Fjeldheim, 1992; Fung & Yuan, 2006; Laure, Thouvenin, & Lecerf, 2001). The possible impact of a coach on the doping behaviour of sportspeople is also implicitly recognised in existing theories in the field. For example, the Sport Drug Compliance Model draws attention to the impact of 'reference group opinion', and highlights coaches as a primary contact group (Donovan, Egger, Kapernick, & Mendoza, 2002). Furthermore, theory (e.g., Donahue et al., 2006) and empirical evidence (e.g., Bahrke, 2012; Barkoukis, Lazuras, Tsorbatzoudis, & Rodafinos, 2011) have suggested that 'maladaptive behaviours' such as doping might be triggered by coaches fostering a 'win at all costs' environment. The potential influence of coaches through their coaching climate is further reinforced by research indicating that the 'moral atmosphere' the coach creates and the relationship they have with their sportspeople has the potential to influence morality-related factors among sportspeople (Gonclaves, Coelho e Silva, Cruz, Torregrosa, & Cumming, 2010; Hardman, Jones, & Jones, 2010; Steinfeldt, Rutkowski, Vaughan, & Steinfeldt, 2011). Therefore, coaches are centrally positioned to impact personal morality (Donovan et al., 2002; Stewart & Smith, 2008), moral reasoning (O'Donnell, Mazanov, & Huybers, 2006) or moral disengagement (Lucidi et al., 2008) in relation to doping behaviours.

### 1.2. Existing anti-doping education for coaches

A number of sporting and anti-doping organisations have developed and implemented anti-doping education programmes for coaches. Although there are no central records of the programmes being delivered, an insight into the current landscape of anti-doping education for coaches was gained by searching the websites of WADA, the United Kingdom Anti-Doping agency (UKAD), International Federations (IFs) and UK-based National Governing Bodies (NGBs). At a global level, WADA developed the Coach's Tool Kit in 2007 to "assist stakeholders in the facilitation of a face-to-face [anti-doping education] workshop for coaches" (WADA, 2007, p. 24). In 2010, WADA translated the tool kit into two online services and launched them as CoachTrue Elite and CoachTrue Recreational. Through a series of slide shows and scenario-based exercises, WADA intended to increase coaches' awareness and knowledge of their anti-doping responsibilities, including encouraging coaches to consider their own decision-making process in their daily interactions with sportspeople (WADA, 2010). A number of IFs are advocating, or are at least signposting, the CoachTrue programmes from their website, including the International Gymnastics Federation (FIG) and the International Swimming Federation (FINA). In contrast, a number of IFs

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/140835>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/140835>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)