

EKSAMEN (Vår – 2019)

INNLEVERING

I

Studieprogram: Sport Management

Emnekode: SPM395

Emnenavn: Fordypningsoppgave

Innleveringsfrist: 24.05.2019

Kandidatnummer: 918

Antall ord: 7968

Antall sider inkludert forside: 34

Table of contents

- 1.0 Introduction 3**
- 2.0 Background 4**
 - 2.1 The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC)..... 4**
 - 2.2 Global Harmonization..... 5**
 - 2.3 Conceptual explanations 5**
- 3.0 Methodology 6**
 - 3.1 Literature review..... 6**
 - 3.2 Data collection 7**
 - 3.3 Role of the researcher..... 8**
- 4.0 Theoretical framework..... 9**
 - 4.1 Legitimacy theories 9**
 - 4.2 Normative and empirical legitimacy 10**
 - 4.3 Value-based legitimacy..... 10**
 - 4.4 Procedural justice..... 10**
- 5.0 Results 12**
 - 5.1 Doping Controls 12**
 - 5.2 Whereabouts System 14**
 - 5.3 TUE – Therapeutic Use Exemption..... 16**
- 6.0 Discussion 18**
 - 6.1 Normative legitimacy 18**
 - 6.2 Value-based legitimacy..... 18**
 - 6.3 Procedural justice..... 19**
- 7.0 Conclusion 22**
- 8.0 Bibliography 23**
- Attachment 1 26**
- Attachment 2..... 27**

1.0 Introduction

The use of drugs to enhance performance has been a well-known phenomenon for as long as winning a sporting competition has involved status, money or other rewards (Yesalis & Bahrke, 2002). The origin of anti-doping efforts is unclear, but the International Olympic Committee (IOC) sharpened their attention towards performance enhancing drugs during the 1960's. In 1999, efforts against doping were strengthened through the creation of the World Anti-Doping Agency, as an independent organization with global authority on anti-doping work (Hunt, Dimeo & Jedlicka, 2012). The development of increasingly advanced doping substances and techniques is a challenge to the anti-doping authorities (Houlihan, 2002). An important part of legitimising anti-doping authorities is through showing that the work is in accordance with the values and expectations of a vast majority of athletes. Gleaves and Christiansen (2019) claim that athletes are the largest stakeholder for anti-doping, and therefore, their opinions matter. However, as Houlihan (2004) points out, athlete involvement in the development of anti-doping policies is minimal, even though they are the core subjects of the work that is developed in these policies. In addition, athletes seldom express detailed opinions about anti-doping in the public. Illustratively, nordic combined athlete, Jan Schmid expressed that it is a mine-field for the athletes to critically comment on anti-doping work in the media because there is a risk of saying something wrong or being misunderstood (Baardsen, 2019).

The lack of athlete involvement in policy development, and the lack of athlete voices in media, makes research on this field even more important, because this is a way the athletes can express their opinions anonymously. Reflecting the lack of athlete involvement and voices, however, there is a limited amount of research that has looked in to athletes' perceptions of and opinions on the policies and practices of anti-doping. Most of the limited amount of research on the subject has been conducted in the Scandinavian countries (Efverström, Ahmadi, Hoff & Bäckström 2016; Elbe & Overbye 2014; Hanstad, Skille & Thurston 2009; Hanstad, Skille & Loland 2009; Overbye 2016; Overbye & Wagner 2014). The global character of sport, and the strong position of fairness in sport, makes legitimacy particularly important for anti-doping authorities. On this background, this thesis seeks to explore how athletes' perceptions of the policies and practices of anti-doping work are connected to the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities. Because of the limited research on the subject, it is interesting to put these findings together in a literature review and look in to how these perceptions can affect the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities.

For this reason, my research question is:

How does athletes' perceptions of the policies and practices of anti-doping influence the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities?

To shed light on this research question, I proceed in the following section to provide the necessary background on the World Anti-Doping Agency, the World Anti-Doping Code and their work on global harmonization. Then, I will present the methodology that has been employed in the research, followed by the theoretical framework of the thesis. Following this, I present the results in three sections. Finally, I discuss the results and conclude with an answer to my research question.

2.0 Background

In this chapter, I provide a background for understanding anti-doping policies and practices in sport. I will describe the establishment of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC), as the WADC is the main policy document guiding the anti-doping work considered in the thesis. This is followed by an explanation of the global harmonization of WADA's work and the regulations from the WADC. Finally, I provide a conceptual explanation of doping controls, the whereabouts system and therapeutic use exemptions (TUE).

2.1 The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC)

WADA was established in 1999, following a doping scandal in cycling in 1998. The first Conference on Doping in Sport was hosted by the IOC in Lausanne, Switzerland in February 1999, and led to the creation of WADA. Composed and funded equally by governments and the Olympic movement, its vision is to create "a world where athletes can compete in a doping-free sporting environment", and they see it as their mission to "lead a collaborative worldwide movement for doping-free sport" (WADA, 2019a). The drafting, acceptance and implementation of the WADC has been important as a part of the fight against doping. The policies, rules and regulations in the Code should be followed by all anti-doping agencies in

the world. The main objective with the WADC is to create harmonization. It provides guidelines for implementation of anti-doping measures, and duties and exemptions for the athletes (WADA, 2018).

2.2 Global Harmonization

Hanstad, Skille and Loland (2009) examined the global harmonization of anti-doping work in a survey among members of the Association of National Anti-Doping Organizations (ANADO). They found that almost one in three national agencies were not in compliance with the Code. This was explained by a lack of resources and practical problems. Great variations were found regarding the athletes' requirements to make themselves available for testing, but the researchers emphasize that it has been specified in the 2009 version of the Code that athletes must make themselves available at least one hour a day. With regards to sanctions, significant differences were found across the National Anti-Doping Organizations. Two agencies had no system for sanctions connected to missed tests and failure to provide whereabouts information. Nineteen agencies only imposed sanctions for missed tests, and twelve agencies were following the Code, and sanctioned both missed tests and failure to provide information on whereabouts. It is emphasized that the differential treatment with regards to sanctions can lead to a feeling of unfairness.

Read, Skinner, Lock and Houlihan (2018) emphasize the importance of global harmonization, and point towards the Russian doping scandal in 2014. After this scandal, WADA's ability to monitor compliance with the WADC was questioned by governments, national anti-doping agencies, athletes and journalists all over the world. In light of scandals like this, the challenge of global harmonization of anti-doping work becomes more visible, which creates doubt about the regulatory performance of WADA. The WADC was revised in 2015 (WADA, 2018), but the research of Read et al. (2018) indicates that compliance with the Code across countries is still an issue for anti-doping authorities.

2.3 Conceptual explanations

Several parts of anti-doping work have a direct effect on the lives of the athletes. Doping controls, the whereabouts system and the therapeutic use exemption have been highlighted as important factors in athletes' evaluation of anti-doping (Elbe & Overbye 2014; Hanstad & Loland 2009; Overbye & Wagner 2013).

Doping controls are among the most important tools to detect the use of doping among athletes. The international standards from WADA explain that athletes are required to provide samples for a doping control at any time and any place. This involves both urine and blood samples (WADA, 2019b).

When athletes reach a certain level in their elite sport career, they may be required to provide their whereabouts to anti-doping authorities. This is a measure that has been put in to place to make out-of-competition testing possible. This gives anti-doping authorities more opportunities to discover doping use. This system requires that athletes report their whereabouts in an online system called ADAMS. Missed tests and the failure to provide whereabouts can lead to a warning, and three warnings within an 18-month period is considered a violation of the rules (WADA, 2019b). Violating the regulations can lead to up to four years' suspension from competing in sports, depending on the substance and the severity of the violation (WADA, 2018)

The therapeutic use exemption was established in 2004, and put in to effect in 2005. This involves that athletes with medical conditions can get permission to use medication that is on the prohibited list. With this system, athletes can compete when using the medicine they need because it is not considered to have a performance enhancing effect, but rather creates equal conditions for all athletes. To get an exemption like this, athletes must apply to their national anti-doping agency or their international federation depending on what level they compete in (WADA, 2019c).

3.0 Methodology

To answer the research question, this thesis employs a qualitative approach, and draws upon a literature review of research on athletes' perceptions on anti-doping policies and practices. In this chapter, I will explain the method that is employed, how data has been collected and analysed, and discuss limitations of the study.

3.1 Literature review

To get an understanding of athletes' perceptions of anti-doping policies and practices and their effects on the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities, I chose to conduct a literature

review. This can be a suitable method when the aim of the research is to get an overview of existing research (Halvorsen, 2008). The literature review is based on data, information and arguments collected from existing studies on athletes' perceptions of anti-doping work. Choosing this method provides an opportunity to create a bigger picture of the topic, and to get a better understanding of the complexity of the issue (Halvorsen, 2008). Through the chosen literature, the aim was to examine athletes' perceptions on different parts of anti-doping work, and how these perceptions can affect the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities.

Halvorsen (2008) explains how this method provides a broad range of information, and allows for a creation of a wider understanding than what might have been the case with empirical research of one topic. On the other hand, the method does not provide opportunities to answer unresolved questions that might appear during the research process. A possible limitation of this method is the evaluation of which articles are relevant to the study or not, which might lead to the exclusion of articles that contain relevant information. To achieve a good result in this type of study, Halvorsen (2008) emphasizes the ability of the researcher to delineate and critically evaluate the results of the literature search.

3.2 Data collection

In order to select the most relevant literature and articles of good academic quality, a list of inclusion and exclusion criteria was established. Articles included in the study had to examine athletes' perceptions on anti-doping work. Only research conducted after 2003 was included because of the release of the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC) in 2003, and the focus on harmonizing anti-doping work in this version of the WADC (WADA, 2019c). Since most of the research on the subject is published in English, the searches were conducted with English terminology. Last, all articles included in the study had to be peer reviewed to ensure that the academic content was trustworthy.

The searches were conducted in three different databases that are recommended by the library at The Norwegian School of Sport Science. Oria, SportDiscuss and Web of Science are databases that provide a broad range of research within the field of sport management. There is limited research on athletes' perceptions of anti-doping work, and many of the articles in this literature review are written by Scandinavian researcher, and investigates the opinions of Scandinavian athletes. Some research from other countries is included, but the uneven distribution might have led to results biased towards the perceptions of Scandinavian athletes. Limiting the search to Scandinavian athletes was considered, but since the research

from other countries provide useful information, they were included in the study. However, the likely Scandinavian bias should be noted, as research indicates that anti-doping values have a particularly strong position in Scandinavian sporting culture (Møller & Tangen, 2019).

The following words were used in the searches: “*Anti-doping*”, “*athlete perceptions*”, “*doping control*”, “*whereabouts system*” and “*strict liability*”. As a result of this search, seven articles were chosen for the literature review. It should be mentioned that many of the searches were overlapping, and some of the same articles were found in different databases and with different combination of words. An overview of this process is presented in *Attachment 1*. In addition to the articles from the literature search, I have made manual searches through the reference lists in these articles, which led to the inclusion of two additional articles. Because of limited access to databases, the manual search provides an opportunity to cover a wider range of research and include relevant findings, which can strengthen the reliability of the study.

The results from the searches were analyzed considering the theoretical framework presented in the following chapter. The results are systematically divided in to categories of doping controls, the whereabouts system and therapeutic use exemption because these are the main anti-doping policies potentially affecting athletes’ perceptions. In the discussion, findings from the results are categorized in relation to three theoretical concepts. The aim of the analysis was to find the most common opinions among athletes regarding anti-doping work, and attempt to explain how their opinions have an impact on the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities.

3.3 Role of the researcher

The author’s ability to remain impartial and unbiased through the research process is also emphasized in Halvorsen (2008). Impartiality and objectivity are important to reach a neutral and comprehensive understanding of the topic. I have sought to remain objective throughout my research, and portray clearly what appears in the literature. Through a clearly defined procedure for data collection and analysis, I have attempted to ensure that personal opinions and views have not influenced the selection and reading of sources, and that interpretation and understanding of the existing literature have not affected the results or affected how they are presented.

4.0 Theoretical framework

In this chapter, I will introduce the theoretical framework that compose the basis for the discussion. First, I present theories of legitimacy and attempt to explain some different approaches to legitimacy that are evident in anti-doping work. Following this, I present theories on procedural justice, which have been found to be important in peoples' evaluation of legitimacy.

4.1 Legitimacy theories

Donovan, Egger, Kapernick and Mendoza (2002) claim that athletes who find the policies and practices of anti-doping to be legitimate will be more likely to comply with the rules and regulations. The two main mechanics that can regulate behavior through the law is deterrence and legitimacy. Legitimacy is important because it builds on the moral values of people, and institutions with high legitimacy require less resources for deterrence (Jackson, Milani & Bradtford, 2018). Legitimacy can create voluntary acceptance and stability in a system (Tyler, 2006). Zelditch (2001) provides a broader definition of legitimacy that introduces the acceptance of a group. He explains that something can be considered legitimate if it is in line with the norms, values, beliefs, practices and procedures that have been accepted by the group. He claims that legitimacy drives behaviour because people want to act according to the norms that make them look right for the group they are acting within. This is also the view presented in Donovan et al. (2002). They consider how the legitimacy of an authority affects compliance with the law, and they also consider how the perception of justice and fairness affects the legitimacy of an authority.

An important part of the justification of anti-doping is fairness. This is highlighted in the description of WADA's logo, which explains that the "equal sign" is a symbol of equity and fairness (WADA, 2019a). This is an important factor for the theories used in this study. For WADA to achieve their goals, it is important that they are perceived as fair and just. Anti-doping authorities work every day to make athletes comply with the rules and regulations of anti-doping, and their legitimacy is important to achieve this goal. Loland (2009) develops the concepts of fairness and fair play in sport, and builds on general ideas of fairness. He focuses on equal treatment, and claims that equality of opportunity to perform is the minimum requirement for achieving fairness in sport. Since fairness is an important part of the justification of anti-doping work, this shows that it is important to consider these

factors when assessing legitimacy. Perceptions of the legitimacy will likely reflect, to some extent, the common perceptions of fairness and justice among athletes.

4.2 Normative and empirical legitimacy

Jackson et al. (2018) separates the concepts of normative and empirical legitimacy. Normative legitimacy is explained as a value-based set of criteria regarding the right to exercise power. These are set by external observers who dictate the terms of legitimacy. Empirical legitimacy is a matter of public opinion. The legitimacy of an authority is measured according to their right to rule and their authority to govern. This means that when people assess the legitimacy of an institution, they consider whether it is moral, just and proper, and whether it is entitled to dictate what is considered appropriate behavior. Those who are the subjects of power are the ones that specify how institutions need to act. Thus, it becomes clear that athletes' opinions will be important for the empirical legitimacy of anti-doping work.

4.3 Value-based legitimacy

Legitimacy is a concept meant to measure the beliefs that bolster willing obedience. Value – based legitimacy creates a sense of obligation or willingness to obey rules and regulations. This sense of obligation builds on the trustworthiness of governments and their procedural justice, which again turns in to empirical legitimacy and the actual compliance with rules and regulations (Levi, Sacks & Tyler, 2009). Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) claim that the value system of an organization can help them accomplish legitimacy. The norms and values within the organization must be in line with the larger social system. For example, anti-doping policies must be developed in line with the values of fairness and respect that is accepted in sport, because this is the social system they operate within. This can impact the process of legitimising anti-doping as a principle. Procedural justice has an independent effect on legitimacy, and can undermine the effects of trustworthy governments. Therefore, it is important to consider the procedural justice that is perceived by athletes to understand how this affects the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities (Levi et al., 2009).

4.4 Procedural justice

Procedural justice is the conception of how fair or just the decision-making processes are. When people feel that authorities exercise their power through fair procedures, this also

influence the authority's legitimacy. People's opportunity to influence policies is one factor that can influence their perception of fairness in procedures (Levi et al., 2009).

According to Efverström et al. (2016), it is important to consider procedural justice when legitimacy is assessed. To be perceived as legitimate, it is important for authorities to consider how the decisions are made and whether they follow rules, regulations and laws (Levi et al., 2009). Tyler (as cited in Levi et al., 2009) explains that procedural justice is dependent on how authorities exercise their power. The sense of fairness among people is strengthened if they believe that the authorities are applying laws evenly, and procedures are predictable and trustworthy. Efverström et al. (2016) suggests that fair procedures are more important than the distribution of advantages and disadvantages, and that athletes' evaluation of legitimacy is more dependent on fair actions and procedures rather than the outcome of the regulations and the fear of punishment. Tyler (2000) provides four factors that are important for people's judgement about the fairness of procedures. The first is opportunities to participate, which has also been mentioned in the work of Levi et al. (2009). Athletes opportunity to express how they experience anti-doping is an example of a factor that can strengthen the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities. The second is neutral authorities and forums. Trustworthiness of authorities and their motives is the third factor. This is important in anti-doping because athletes need to trust the functioning of the system, and believe that the right measures are put in practice to catch the ones that cheat. Equal treatment of athletes is important to create trust in the system. Last is the degree to which people believe they are treated with dignity and respect. An example is athletes' privacy, which need to be considered both in relation to doping controls and the whereabouts system.

How athletes experience procedural justice related to anti-doping work is important for their perceived legitimacy of anti-doping as a whole (Efverström et al, 2016). For procedural justice in sport, it is important to have just and equitably imposed procedures across athletes, as well as scientifically accurate and effective systems (Donovan et al., 2002). This means that athletes' opinions on the procedural justice in anti-doping work will influence the perceived legitimacy of anti-doping authorities and all the work that is done within the anti-doping field (Efverström et al, 2016).

5.0 Results

Athletes are probably some of the most important stakeholders in anti-doping work. Therefore, the aim of this chapter is to take a closer look at the different opinions of athletes in relation to different parts of the anti-doping work, and examine if there are any common traits across the research. The main findings of all articles used are presented systematically in *Attachment 2*.

This chapter is divided into three parts that include the main elements of anti-doping work that have been researched with regards to athletes' opinions. I present findings from research on doping controls, the whereabouts system and therapeutic use exemptions.

5.1 Doping Controls

Doping controls are important tools in the efforts to create a fair sports arena without doping (Overbye, 2016). Doping controls are not only important to reveal the ones who cheat, but also as a deterrent. As Overbye (2016) presents in her article, this aspect makes athletes' perceptions important. Athletes' perceptions do not affect enforcement of the rules, but for doping controls to work as a deterrent, athletes must believe in the system.

Several studies have investigated athletes' perceptions on doping controls (Efvenström et al. 2016; Elbe & Overbye 2014; Overbye 2016; Sas-Nowosielski & Świątkowska 2007). An important finding in these articles is the broad support for doping control in principle among athletes, and that most athletes are in favour of testing.

Overbye (2016) conducted a study of 645 Danish elite athletes through a web-based questionnaire. The aim of the study was to investigate their trust towards the doping testing system in their sport. She found that two out of three athletes were satisfied with the national testing regime within their sport. One major finding was a distrust towards the testing systems in other countries. 85% of athletes reported that they believed there was a downgrade of doping controls in certain countries in order for athletes to win medals for the country. The survey included athletes with and without previous experience with doping controls. Experience with testing showed a positive influence on athletes trust in doping control measures, but a lower degree of trust in implementation of these measures in other countries. Other factors that contributed to lower trust was experiences with flaws in the system and good knowledge about the science. Athletes that depend more on an effective system, in for example speed and power and endurance sports, were found to have a greater distrust in doping controls. Overbye (2016) concludes that this study confirms what has been found in

previous studies. The current anti-doping policy has led to a different kind of inconsistency and new forms of experienced inequality because athletes note how compliance with the Code is varying across countries and sports. The rationale behind doping testing in sport had a broad support among athletes. The distrust is related to the implementation process, not to the rules or the measures themselves (Overbye, 2016).

Another study on doping controls was conducted by Elbe and Overbye (2014). They examined the perspectives of four hundred Danish elite athletes through an online survey. This study presents a different view on doping controls, and the questions are more focused on the effects doping controls have on athletes' daily lives. They found that athletes are concerned about their privacy and the stress related to the system. As many as 98% of athletes reported that they think it is fine to be tested for doping. 23,9% claim that they feel an infringement of their privacy when doping controls are conducted in their private homes. The stress is related to the fear of testing positive and urination problems. Close to half of the athletes reported a fear of false positive results, and over a third of the athletes said they experience stress related to urination problems. The feeling of being under suspicion by the control officers and having their personal integrity infringed have also been reported as sources of stress. 13% reported that they felt under suspicion, and 15,3% felt their integrity was infringed during doping controls. Elbe and Overbye (2014) suggest that the major concerns among athletes are not related to the doping test in particular, but rather to the whereabouts system.

Sas-Nowosielski & Świątkowska (2007) claim that there is a low knowledge about anti-doping efforts among Polish athletes. They found a general positive attitude towards doping controls in their study of 830 athletes. Most athletes were found to be in favour of doping tests, and almost half of them expressed strong support for doping controls. On the other hand, they found that attitudes toward sanctions for violation of the rules were less positive. The conclusion suggests that Polish athletes should be further educated on anti-doping efforts in relation to their knowledge and attitudes.

Efvenström et al. (2016) carried out a study that investigated 261 international athletes. This study examined more aspects of anti-doping work than the doping controls, but presents some relevant perspectives on the control system. It is emphasized that attitudes towards the principle and policies in general are positive. 80% agreed that different anti-doping activities, among these doping controls, are essential to prevent doping in sport. Unlike the other studies, Efvenström et al. (2016) found that most athletes think doping controls at home are fine, they feel respected by the doping control officers and do not

experience a feeling of being under suspicion during controls. On the other side, they emphasize that four out of ten athletes reported feeling somewhat or very uncomfortable regarding their privacy when providing urine samples. The feeling of unjust enforcement of doping controls is pointed out, and there is a perception among athletes that the extent and type of doping controls have big variations across countries. Like other studies, this study also found that a part of the concern is related to the whereabouts system. Athletes also call for more power in the decision-making processes, but their limited knowledge limits their possibility to impact policies. There is a wish among athletes to be heard in relation to how they experience the system.

5.2 Whereabouts System

The reporting of whereabouts is a controversial and debated part of the World Anti-Doping Code, and researchers in the field have differing opinions on the system (Gleaves & Christiansen 2019; Hanstad & Loland 2009; Møller 2011). Hanstad and Loland (2009) argue that the system is a justifiable and necessary addition to the anti-doping work. In contrast, Møller (2011) completely disagrees with Hanstad and Loland's justifying of the system. He argues that the system is both dehumanizing and counter-productive in nature. This shows that there is a need to understand how the athletes perceive the system, because they are the ones subjected to it.

In a study involving 645 Danish elite athletes, Overbye and Wagner (2014) examine experiences, attitudes and trust towards the whereabouts system. Their findings report a great variety among athletes, and an ambivalent perception of the system among elite athletes. A majority of athletes considered the whereabouts system to be a necessity in anti-doping work, and therefore did not see it as a problem to be a part of the testing pool. On the contrary, a minority of athletes reported having no negative experiences when reporting their whereabouts. The system was considered too time consuming by most of the athletes, and more than half of them reported being afraid of getting a warning. About 40% of athletes reported that the system decreased the joy of being an elite athlete, and the same amount reported a feeling of being under surveillance. Overall, the study found a low level of trust in the functioning of the system in all countries.

Bourdon, Schoch, Broers & Kayser (2014) made similar findings in their study of the whereabouts system among French-speaking athletes. Among the 69 athletes that were included in the study, there was a broad perception that doping controls are a necessity. 94%

considered the whereabouts system to be a necessary part of anti-doping work. At the same time, 71% of the athletes agreed that reporting whereabouts is a part of being an elite athlete, but many of these athletes reported that they felt their everyday life was negatively impacted by the system, and that their joy of being an elite athlete was decreased. 74% felt under surveillance and 54% found the system too time-consuming, while 54% reported that the system reduced their pleasure of being an athlete. 57% of athletes also reported that they had some technical hurdles with the system. 58% of athletes perceived the system to be unfair because of different implementation across the world. Athletes in this study even reported a feeling of unfair implementation within their own country. Bourdon et al. (2014) conclude that French-speaking athletes are clearly dissatisfied with the current whereabouts system.

Hanstad, Skille and Thurston (2009) performed a study on all athletes in the Norwegian testing pool. 70% of athletes in this study agreed that doping was a problem in elite sport in general, but only 17% thought doping was a problem in their own sport. More than four out of ten athletes believed that the whereabouts system could contribute to less doping in sport. They found three main points of concern: technical challenges, unfair sanctions and uneven implementation. More than half of the athletes saw the system as unfair because of uneven implementation across nations and sports. Most athletes trusted the functioning of technical aspect of the systems, but one in five reported that they did not have confidence in this aspect, and more than one third had problems reporting whereabouts because of technical problems. Hanstad et al. (2009) present the idea that the risk of warnings because of technical problems can lead to athletes developing negative views of the system. The discrepancy between infringements and sanctions is also reflected in the athletes' opinions. Most athletes disagreed that three warnings in 18 months should be regarded as a doping offence. There is a perception among athletes that sanctions are not proportionate to the severity of the violation.

Valkenburg, de Hon and van Hilvoorde (2014) conducted a study of 129 Dutch athletes. Similar to the findings in other studies, the athletes generally agreed that doping is a problem in sports. 63% of athletes reported that the whereabouts system is an important part of the anti-doping system. On the other hand, athletes feel that the system has a negative effect on their everyday life. Reporting whereabouts was considered time consuming by athletes, and 30 % reported a feeling of infringed privacy as a consequence of the system. 28% of athletes also reported that the whereabouts system decreased their joy of being an elite athlete. The results show a great dissatisfaction about the whereabouts system among Dutch athletes, especially regarding violations of privacy.

Efverström et al. (2016) contributes to the idea that global harmonization is an issue regarding the whereabouts system. They found that 44% of all athletes in their survey has doubts about the functioning of the whereabouts system in other countries than their own. They also found that one third thinks it is problematic to file whereabouts, and three of four are worried about failing to be available in line with information they have provided. Efverström et al. (2016) point out that these findings can indicate that the whereabouts system affects athletes' daily lives. They emphasize that practical issues related to the system seem to be a great concern to many athletes. Over half of the athletes reported that their friends and family think the whereabouts system restricts their social life. In addition, almost half of the athletes feel monitored knowing that the doping control personnel know where they are, which can be a threat to athletes' feelings of privacy.

5.3 TUE – Therapeutic Use Exemption

Current research on athletes' perceptions of the TUE regulation is limited, which makes it a challenge to look at the legitimacy of the system. At the same time, the research that is available shows diverging opinions among athletes.

Overbye and Wagner (2013) examined Danish athletes' experiences and perceptions regarding the TUE. Both athletes with and without previous experience with TUEs were included in the study. This survey found three factors that are concerns to the athletes regarding this system: how it is administered, the risk of misuse, and the lack of global harmonization. This leads to a feeling of unfairness and a perception that some athletes get unfair advantages. An interesting difference between athletes with and without experience with the system was also found in this research. There seems to be a stronger distrust among athletes with previous experience. 66% of these athletes believed that some athletes get a TUE without needing it, while only 46% of the athletes with no experience thought the same. This difference was also seen when athletes were asked about the use of medicines beyond what is needed to treat the medical condition. On the other hand, almost all athletes in the survey agreed that neither of these exploitations of the system are acceptable. It is pointed out that there is a general support for the exemption, but athletes lack trust in the efficacy of the system and the regulations.

Bourdon et al. (2014) examined perceptions of French-speaking athletes in relation to the TUE. 49% of these athletes reported that they believe some of their opponents are using banned drugs with the excuse of a TUE. Almost half of the athletes said that they refrained

from using medicines they needed because they did not want to apply for a TUE. The reason for their reluctance came from a feeling of doubt about the way the system is regulated and used. Finding it hard to obtain the exemption they need and feeling that the system is misused by other athletes was reported in the study. Bourdon et al. (2014) claim that this points towards a distrust in the administration and management of the TUE system.

Efverstöm et al. (2016) found in their research that the TUE is an exception from the general acceptance and support for anti-doping regulations. 53% of the respondents in their research found the rules to be unfair, and this implicates that this is a part of the policy that athletes find problematic. The researchers claim that the TUE regulation is a part of the anti-doping policy that is questioned because of its fairness. Comments from their research illustrate that some athletes perceive these regulations as unfair and advantageous for athletes that are granted an exemption. Another aspect that is considered unfair is the treatment of applications for a TUE. 70% of respondents reported that they believe there is unequal treatment of athletes in this process. Efverström et al. emphasize that the TUE regulation is the only part of the anti-doping work that is questioned both on the policy and practice level.

6.0 Discussion

The results of the literature review have provided some possible aspects of anti-doping practices that can influence the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities. This chapter will systematically analyze the findings in relation to the theories that have been presented in chapter 4. It will address how the normative legitimacy of the anti-doping authorities is influenced by diverging opinions among researchers. The broad acceptance of anti-doping as a principle and its policies is discussed considering the theory of value-based legitimacy. Last, it looks in to the theories on procedural justice, and how athletes' evaluation of the fairness and justice has an influence on the legitimacy.

6.1 Normative legitimacy

Before looking at how athletes' perceptions influence the empirical legitimacy of anti-doping authorities, it is interesting to look at the normative legitimacy. Especially regarding the whereabouts system, there are diverging arguments about legitimacy. Normative legitimacy builds on the opinions of experts (Jackson et al., 2018), and one could believe that it is clear whether an organization is legitimate or not. The discussion about anti-doping legitimacy is however pulling in different directions. Different researchers present different values that are important to their evaluation of anti-doping work. If anti-doping authorities are to be legitimate, their work must be justified (Donovan et al., 2002). Therefore, discussion about the normative legitimacy of anti-doping authorities builds on the justification of their work, and what values are emphasized by researchers when they assess legitimacy. Some researchers consider the fairness of sport to be most important for the justification (Hanstad et al., 2009), while others believe that the respect towards athletes and their rights outweighs this justification, and argues on this basis, that the present system cannot be justified (Møller, 2011). Thus, is the normative legitimacy of the anti-doping authorities somewhat unclear, which could make the empirical legitimacy, perceived by athletes, even more important.

6.2 Value-based legitimacy

The broad acceptance and support for anti-doping principles found in this research can be related to the norms and values that are internalized in athletes. Especially, Scandinavian countries have been very committed to anti-doping policies from the start, which shows that anti-doping norms are strongly rooted in these countries (Tangen & Møller, 2019). Since the results are mostly from Scandinavian countries, their culture could explain why the findings

show so much support for anti-doping as a principle. As presented in Zelditch (2001), the accepted norms and values within a group are important for legitimacy, which could explain to some degree why athletes express support for the principle of anti-doping. The norms and values related to Scandinavian culture can contribute to a strong value-based legitimacy for the anti-doping authorities in these countries. Going against these norms and values and not accepting the principle could affect one's place and acceptance within this social order. Athletes agree that there needs to be a system in place to overcome the problem of performance enhancing drugs. The anti-doping regulations are perceived as fair and just by the athletes because they are in line with the values they have in relation to a fair sport. Clean athletes' desires to compete in a clean sport could be a possible explanation to why they seem to accept measures that are intrusive, and that would not have been accepted as a requirement in other jobs. The value of competing in a clean sport outweighs athletes' feelings about how these measures affect their everyday life. These factors contribute to what seems to be a strong legitimacy for the principle of anti-doping, which in turn leads to compliance. Even when measures do not have a direct positive effect on athletes' lives, they willingly comply with the regulations because they value the principle of competing in a fair and clean sport (Zelditch, 2001). These arguments have an underlying assumption that the athletes in the research are clean athletes, which implies that their values corroborate disapproval of doping in sport.

6.3 Procedural justice

Athletes' assessment of legitimacy is defined as empirical legitimacy, since they are the ones that are subjected to the system (Jackson et al., 2018). How athletes experience procedural justice will influence their perceptions of the legitimacy of anti-doping agencies. This factor could be the reason there is such a clear distinction between athletes' perceptions of the principle and the practice of anti-doping. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, the way an authority exercises its power is essential to the evaluation of procedural justice (Levi et al. 2009). Tyler's (2000) factors for judgement of fair procedures provide a good foundation for the discussion of procedural justice. Lack of athlete involvement in policy making can be a threat to legitimacy because it weakens athletes' feeling of fair procedures. Athletes have expressed a feeling of not being heard when it comes to anti-doping work. Efverström et al. (2016) emphasize that athletes call for more power in decision-making processes, but that their lack of knowledge could restrain their possibility to impact the policies. Educating the

athletes and including them in policy-making could have a positive effect on anti-doping authorities' legitimacy, because it could make it easier for athletes to express their opinions on the system. This could be connected to their feeling of respect from anti-doping authorities.

Dignity and respect in the treatment of people is important for their perception of fairness in procedures (Tyler, 2000). The results show that both the whereabouts system and doping controls can be an issue when it comes to athletes' privacy and their joy of being an elite athlete. Doping controls are something that can be a problem for procedural justice. Their impact on athletes' daily lives can lead to a feeling of infringement on their privacy. The control itself seems to cause a feeling of being under suspicion, which could impact the feeling of respect from control officers. The intrusive nature of the control is reported to cause stress and can decrease athletes' feelings of dignity. The biggest problem however, seems to be related to the whereabouts system, and not to the controls. The problem with the whereabouts system is that several of the studies show that athletes feel under surveillance when they must report where they are at all times. The system could decrease athletes' feelings of autonomy, because it restricts their opportunity to be spontaneous and make last minute changes in their schedules. The effect of decreased privacy and autonomy could lead to decreased feelings of dignity and respect, and in that way, have a negative effect on anti-doping authorities' legitimacy.

Tyler (2000) emphasize that trustworthiness of governments is an important factor in the evaluation of procedural justice. The results point towards two disparities in anti-doping work that can influence the legitimacy negatively. Athletes assessment of authorities' motives has an influence on their evaluation of the fairness of procedures.

The first disparity that the results illuminate is a disproportion between the severity of a violation and its sanctions. There is a discontent among athletes regarding sanctions, especially in relation to the whereabouts system. Sanctions that are not in line with the motives of the work can be destructive for legitimacy. This might lead to a decrease in athletes trust in the authorities and the fairness of the system. This could reflect a discrepancy between the motives of anti-doping authorities and the motives of athletes, regarding what they think the aim of anti-doping work is. Athletes, perhaps, seek protection in the form of a safe working environment and fair competition. On the other hand, certain features of anti-doping policy probably signal that the anti-doping authorities' main motive is to expose and sanction the ones that dope, with less concern for the wellbeing of "clean" athletes.

The second disparity becomes visible when looking at the connection between the methods of anti-doping work, like doping controls and the whereabouts system, and the aim

of the work. If the methods that are used in the work do not help to reach the aim of the work, this can create distrust in the system. One of the main concerns that is pointed out in several of the studies is that the methods are not implemented equally in all sports and all countries. When rules and regulations are implemented differently, this can lead to other inequalities. Both because it becomes easier for some athletes to use performance enhancing drugs without being discovered, but also because the regulations will have a bigger impact on the lives of athletes in countries where they are implemented correctly. This can decrease the trustworthiness of anti-doping authorities because their methods are not in line with the aim of their work: to decrease unfairness and inequalities between athletes. Each part of anti-doping work needs to be perceived as legitimate in order to legitimise the whole system (Donovan et al., 2002). When the methods create new forms of inequalities, this could decrease athletes trust in the methods and therefore their trust in the anti-doping authorities.

The global harmonization is not only a problem when it comes to disparities. It is important that procedures are imposed equally across athletes, because fair actions and procedures are important to procedural justice (Donovan et al., 2002). Equal opportunities to perform is important when considering the fairness of sport (Loland, 2009). When the common perception among athletes is that the system is unfair, it becomes a threat to procedural justice, and therefore a threat to legitimacy. Since one of the main objectives of WADA is to harmonize policy implementation across countries, this is something that can pose a threat to their legitimacy. When athletes experience an unequal implementation of the system, this can lead to a perception of unequal opportunities to perform, which in turn will decrease the legitimacy of the anti-doping work.

There is a high demand for fairness in sport, and this discussion shows that there are some very ambitious goals to harmonize implementation of anti-doping policies across all sports and countries. These expectations of fairness and harmonization raise some demands to the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities that are unique compared to other fields. The ideal of fairness is strongly rooted in sports, and makes it especially important for the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities that their actions are perceived as fair.

7.0 Conclusion

Before concluding the thesis, I would like to make a reminder about the research question: *How does athletes' perceptions of the policies and practices of anti-doping influence the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities?*

Drawing on theories of legitimacy, this thesis has explored how athletes' perceptions influence the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities. The broad support for anti-doping as a principle can be related to athletes' moral values about the use of performance enhancing drugs. More critical concerns become visible when athletes are asked about anti-doping policy in practice. Athletes experience a lack of harmonization, which leads to a feeling of unfairness and inequality. At the same time, athletes' feelings of dignity and respect are threatened by low involvement in policy making, decreased privacy and decreased feelings of autonomy and joy of being an athlete. These factors can lead to a weaker legitimacy for anti-doping authorities.

Anti-doping legitimacy is strongly influenced by athlete perceptions through their experience of the implementation of rules, which influences their perception of procedural justice. The uneven application of regulations across countries leads to a negative perception of procedural justice, which in turn can lead to a lower legitimacy for anti-doping authorities. If they want to keep their position as the leader of a collaborative worldwide movement for doping-free sport, they must consider how procedures are implemented, and in turn whether this implementation contributes to a perception of fairness among athletes. However, pointing to a possible Scandinavian bias, the thesis has discussed this finding in the light of the strong position of anti-doping norms and values in some sporting cultures. The legitimacy of anti-doping work in practice is, on the other hand, strongly impacted by athlete perceptions because their opinions about the fairness influences the procedural justice, which in turn is an important factor for building an organizations legitimacy. The strong position of fairness in sport, as well as the global character of sport, means that there are very high demands for the anti-doping authorities to achieve legitimacy. Athletes' perceptions of anti-doping will, in the end, influence the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities, and WADA must continue to consider how they can create equal conditions for all athletes to strengthen their legitimacy.

For further research, it could be interesting to look deeper into athletes' perceptions on policy making, and investigate how they can contribute to a policy that can strengthen the legitimacy of anti-doping authorities, and how this would affect the work in practice.

8.0 Bibliography

- Baardsen, J. (2019). Norsk VM-helt går ut mot antidopingsystemet: -Det fungerer ikke. *Verdens Gang*. Retrieved May 15th 2019 from <https://www.vg.no/sport/i/zLdlJ4/norsk-vm-helt-gaar-ut-mot-antidopingsystemet-det-fungerer-ikke>
- Bourdon, Schoch, Broers, & Kayser. (2014). French speaking athletes' experience and perception regarding the whereabouts reporting system and therapeutic use exemptions. *Performance Enhancement & Health*, 3 (3-4), 153-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.peh.2015.10.002>
- Donovan, R. J., Egger, G., Kapernick, V. & Mendoza, J. (2002). A Conceptual Framework for Achieving Performance Enhancing Drug Compliance in Sport. *Sports Medicine*, 32 (4), 269-284. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200232040-00005>
- Elbe, A. & Overbye, M. (2014). Urine doping controls: the athletes' perspective. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 6 (2), 227-240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2013.801361>
- Efverström, A., Ahmadi, N., Hoff, D. & Bäckström, Å. (2016). Anti-doping and legitimacy: an international survey of elite athletes' perceptions. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 8 (3), 491-514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2016.1170716>
- Gleaves, J. & Christiansen, A. V. (2019). Athletes' perspectives on WADA and the code: a review and analysis. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2019.1577901>
- Halvorsen, K. (2008). *Å forske på samfunnet: En innføring i samfunnsvitenskapelig metode*. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Hanstad, D. V. & Loland, S. (2009). Elite level athletes' duty to provide information on their whereabouts: Justifiable anti-doping work or an indefensible surveillance regime? *European Journal of Sport Science*, 9 (1) 3-10.
- Hanstad, D. V., Skille, E. Å., & Thurston, M., (2009). Elite Athletes' Perspectives on Providing Whereabouts Information: A Survey of Athletes in the Norwegian Registered Testing Pool. *Sport and Society*, 6 (1), 30-46.
- Hanstad, D. V., Skille, E. Å. & Loland, S. (2009). Harmonization of anti-doping work: myth or reality?. *Sport in Society*, 13 (3), 418-430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430431003588036>

- Houlihan, B. (2002). *Dying to win: Doping in sport and the development of anti-doping policy* (2nd ed.). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Houlihan, B. (2004). Civil Rights, Doping Control and the World Anti-doping Code. *Sport in Society*, 7(3), 420-437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743042000291712>
- 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 (2012) 55–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.peh.2012.05.001>
- Jackson, J., Millani, J. & Bradford, B. (2018). Empirical Legitimacy and Normative Compliance with the Law. In: A. Farazmand. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1914-1
- Levi, M., Sacks, A., & Tyler, T. (2009). Conceptualizing legitimacy, measuring legitimating beliefs. *American behavioral scientist*, 53 (3), 354–375. <http://doi:10.1177/0002764209338797>
- Loland, S. (2010). Fairness in sport: An ideal and its consequences. In: McNamee, M. *The Ethics of Sports*. (pp. 116-124). London: Routledge.
- Møller, V. (2011). One step too far – about WADA's whereabouts rule. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 3(2), 177-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2011.579145>
- Overbye, M. (2016). Doping control in sport: An investigation of how elite athletes perceive and trust the functioning of the doping testing system in their sport. *Sport Management Review*, 19(1), 6-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.10.002>
- Overbye, M. & Wagner, U. (2013). Between medical treatment and performance enhancement: An investigation of how elite athletes experience Therapeutic Use Exemptions. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 24(6), 579-588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2013.03.007>
- Overbye, M. & Wagner, U. (2014). Experiences, attitudes and trust: an inquiry into elite athletes' perception of the whereabouts reporting system. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 6(3), 407-428, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2013.791712>
- Pfeffer, J. & Salanick, G. R. (2003). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. California: Stanford University Press.

- Read, D., Skinner, J., Lock, D. & Houlihan, B. (2018). Legitimacy driven change at the World Anti-Doping Agency. *International Journal of Sport and Politics*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2018.1544580>
- Sas-Nowosielski, K & Świątkowska, L. (2007). The Knowledge of The World Anti-Doping Code among Polish athletes and their attitudes toward doping and anti-doping policy. *Human Movement*, 8 (1). 57-64.
- Tangen, J. O. & Møller, V. (2019). Scandinavian exceptionalism in anti-doping within sport: rooted in ideologies of social welfare and paternalism?. *Sport in Society*, 22 (4), 639-653. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2017.1389067>
- Tyler, T. (2000). Social Justice: Outcome and Procedure. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35 (2), 117-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/002075900399411>
- Tyler, T.R., 2006. *Why people obey the law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Valkenburg, D., de Hon, O. & van Hilvoorde, I. (2014). Doping control, providing whereabouts and the importance of privacy for elite athletes. *International journal of drug policy*, 25 (2), 212–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2013.12.013>
- WADA. (2018). *World Anti-Doping Code*. Retrieved April 10th 2019 from https://www.wada-ama.org/sites/default/files/resources/files/wada_anti-doping_code_2018_english_final.pdf
- WADA. (2019a). *Who We Are*. Retrieved March 19th 2019 from <https://www.wada-ama.org/en/who-we-are>
- WADA. (2019b). *International Standard: Testing and Investigations*. Retrieved May 5th 2019 from https://www.wada-ama.org/sites/default/files/resources/files/isti_2019_en_new.pdf
- WADA. (2019c). *International Standard: Therapeutic Use Exemptions*. Retrieved May 6th from https://www.wada-ama.org/sites/default/files/resources/files/istue_2019_en_new.pdf
- Yesalis, C. E. & Bahrke, M. S. (2002). History of Doping in Sport. *International Sports Studies*, 24 (1), 42-76.
- Zelditch, M. J. (2001). Theories of Legitimacy. In: J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations* (p. 33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Attachment 1

Search word	Database	Combinations	Results
1. Anti-doping/antidoping/doping 2. Athlete perceptions 3. Doping control 4. Whereabouts system 5. Strict liability	Oria	(1) AND (2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5)	7 relevant results
		(1) AND (2)	7 relevant results
		(1) AND (3)	3 relevant results
		(1) AND (4)	7 relevant results
		(1) AND (5)	2 relevant results
1. Anti-doping/antidoping/doping 2. Athlete perceptions 3. Doping control 4. Whereabouts system 5. Strict liability	SPORTDiscus	(1) AND (2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5)	7 relevant results
		(1) AND (2)	5 relevant results
		(1) AND (3)	1 relevant result
		(1) AND (4)	3 relevant results
		(1) AND (5)	1 relevant result
1. Anti-doping/antidoping/doping 2. Athlete perceptions 3. Doping control 4. Whereabouts system 5. Strict liability	Web of Science	(1) AND (2 OR 3 OR 4 OR 5)	7 relevant results
		(1) AND (2)	5 relevant results
		(1) AND (3)	2 relevant results
		(1) AND (4)	1 relevant result
		(1) AND (5)	0 relevant results

Attachment 2

Article	Theme	Findings
<p>Overbye, M. (2016). Doping control in sport: An investigation of how elite athletes perceive and trust the functioning of the doping testing system in their sport. <i>Sport Management Review</i>, 19(1), 6-22.</p>	<p>Doping controls</p>	<p>645 Danish athletes answered the survey</p> <p>The number of tests and athletes selected for control are appropriate: 67% agreed – 33% disagreed</p> <p>Doping control in other countries is not extensive enough: 73% agreed – 28% disagreed</p> <p>Doping control is downgraded in certain countries because medals have higher priority: 85% agreed – 15% disagreed</p> <p>Doping control in DK is sometimes so unprofessional that it is possible to cheat: 15% agreed – 85% disagreed</p> <p>Doping control in other countries is sometimes so unprofessional that it is possible to cheat: 46% agreed – 54% disagreed</p> <p>Some athletes are tested positive without being doped: 30% agreed – 70% disagreed</p>
<p>Elbe, A. & Overbye, M. (2014). Urine doping controls: the athletes' perspective. <i>International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics</i>, 6:2, 227-240.</p>	<p>Doping controls</p>	<p>400 Danish athletes answered the survey</p> <p>Doping testing is fine: 98% agreed</p> <p>Careful to declare all information: 90,2% agreed</p> <p>Sometimes afraid of being tested positive: 49,5% agreed</p> <p>Stressful because of difficulty to urinate: 35,4% agreed</p> <p>Offends privacy when doping control at the house: 23,9% agreed</p>

		<p>Personal integrity is violated when someone is watching them provide urine 15,3% agreed</p> <p>Sometimes feel under suspicion: 13% agreed</p>
<p>Sas-Nowosielski, K & Świątkowska, L. (2007). The Knowledge of The World Anti-Doping Code among Polish athletes and their attitudes toward doping and anti-doping policy. <i>Human Movement</i>, 8(1). 57-64.</p>	<p>Doping controls</p>	<p>830 athletes answered the survey</p> <p>Low knowledge about anti-doping efforts among Polish athletes</p> <p>44,23% expressed strong support for doing controls</p>
<p>Efverström, A., Ahmadi, N., Hoff, D. & Bäckström, Å. (2016). Anti-doping and legitimacy: an international survey of elite athletes' perceptions. <i>International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics</i>, 8:3, 491-514</p>	<p>Doping controls Whereabouts system TUE</p>	<p>261 international athletes answered the survey</p> <p>Anti-doping as a principle</p> <p>Doping in sport should remain prohibited: 77% agreed</p> <p>Have not thought about withdrawing from elite sports due to anti-doping work: 75% agreed</p> <p>Different anti-doping activities – from doping controls and the whereabouts system to storing test samples and biological passports – are essential part of the work: 80% agreed</p> <p>TUE – considered unfair that some athletes are allowed to use otherwise banned substances: 53% agreed</p> <p>Anti-doping in practice</p> <p>Acceptable to have doping test at home: 82% agreed</p> <p>Feel they are treated with respect by the control officers: 80% agreed</p>

		<p>Selection for doping controls gives a feeling of being under suspicion: 84% disagreed</p> <p>Selection for doping controls during competition is fair: 82% agreed</p> <p>Selection for out-of-competition doping controls is fair: 74% agreed</p> <p>Filing whereabouts is problematic: 1 in 3 agreed</p> <p>Whereabouts system decreases joy of being an elite athlete: 1 in 3 agreed</p> <p>Afraid of failing to be available for testing during the time they have provided in the system: 3 in 4 agreed</p> <p>Positive attitudes towards doing whatever is necessary to prevent doping in their sport: 70% agreed</p> <p>Feeling somewhat or very uncomfortable regarding their privacy when providing urine sample: 4 in 10 agreed - Women to a greater extent than men (W: 54% vs M: 37%)</p> <p>Feel monitored knowing that doping control personnel know where they are: 47% agreed</p> <p>Family and friends think the system restricts athlete's social life: Over ½ agreed</p> <p>Individuals that use prohibited substances escape detection: 58% agreed</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Whereabouts system does not work properly in all countries: 44% agreed</p> <p>Same extent of doping controls in all countries: 4 in 10 disagreed Equal treatment of all athletes applying for a TUE: 70% disagreed</p> <p>Athletes should be more involved in policy work: 85% agreed</p> <p>Difficult to follow changes and keep up to date on the list: 46% agreed</p> <p>Afraid unauthorised persons will access their test samples: 47% agreed</p> <p>Don't know if they have a biological passport: 41% agreed</p>
<p>Overbye, M. & Wagner, U. (2014). Experiences, attitudes and trust: an inquiry into elite athletes' perception of the whereabouts reporting system. <i>International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics</i>, 6:3, 407-428</p>	<p>Whereabouts system</p>	<p>645 Danish athletes answered the survey</p> <p>The system is too time consuming: 47% agreed completely – 28% agreed partially</p> <p>Afraid of warnings: 29% agreed completely – 29% agreed partially</p> <p>Reduces the joy of being an elite athlete: 10% agreed completely – 31% agreed partially</p> <p>Feel under surveillance: 20% agreed completely – 20% agreed partially</p> <p>Feel under suspicion: 8% agreed completely – 14% agreed partially</p>

		<p>Experienced flaws in the system: 5% agreed completely – 37% agreed partially</p> <p>See it as a compliment to be part of the system: 24% agreed completely – 53% agreed partially</p> <p>Unfair unless every elite athlete in my sport reports whereabouts: 4% agreed completely – 16% agreed partially</p> <p>Just one of many other duties an elite athlete must accept: 37% agreed completely – 46% agreed partially</p> <p>Necessary and therefore no problem to be a part of the system: 49% agreed completely – 35% agreed partially</p>
<p>Bourdon, Schoch, Broers, & Kayser. (2014). French speaking athletes' experience and perception regarding the whereabouts reporting system and therapeutic use exemptions. <i>Performance Enhancement & Health</i>, 3(3-4), 153-158</p>	<p>Whereabouts system TUE</p>	<p>69 French speaking athletes answered the survey</p> <p>Spend too much time filling out whereabouts: 54% agreed</p> <p>Felt under surveillance when reporting whereabouts: 74% agreed</p> <p>System decreases joy of being an elite athlete: 54% agreed</p> <p>Afraid to receive a warning for not being at the declared location: 91% agreed</p> <p>Technical problems or hard time understanding the reporting system: 57% agreed</p> <p>Unequal implementation of the whereabouts system: 57% agreed</p>

		<p>Whereabouts system is necessary to ensure clean sport: 83% agreed</p> <p>There is a lack of information on the anti-doping system: 57% agreed</p> <p>Previously refrained from using necessary medicine in order to not have to apply for a TUE: 46% agreed</p> <p>Believe other athletes in their sport are granted TUEs without medical justification: 49% agreed</p> <p>Believe athletes in their sport might abuse TUEs: 48% agreed</p> <p>Think it is unacceptable to get a TUE without medical justification: 70% agreed</p> <p>Think excessive use of treatment in relation to justified medical prescriptions is wrong: 72% agreed</p>
<p>Hanstad, D. V., Skille, E. Å., & Thurston, M., (2009). Elite Athletes' Perspectives on Providing Whereabouts Information: A Survey of Athletes in the Norwegian Registered Testing Pool. <i>Sport and Society</i>, 6 (1), 30–46.</p>	<p>Whereabouts system</p>	<p><i>236 Norwegian athletes answered the survey</i></p> <p>Three warnings in 18 months should be regarded a doping offence: 62,2% disagreed</p> <p>Confidence in the technical aspect of the system: 68,5% agreed</p> <p>Not able to update whereabouts because of technical problems: 34,7% agreed</p> <p>System is unfair because of unequal establishment in all countries: 56,6% agreed</p>

<p>Valkenburg, D., de Hon, O. & van Hilvoorde, I. (2014). Doping control, providing whereabouts and the importance of privacy for elite athletes. <i>International journal of drug policy</i>, 25 (2), 212–218</p>	<p>Whereabouts system</p>	<p><i>129 Dutch athletes answered the survey</i></p> <p>The use of doping is a big problem in sport in general: 80% agreed – 12% disagreed</p> <p>The use of doping is a big problem in my sport: 28% agreed – 59% disagreed</p> <p>The use of doping is a big problem in Dutch elite sport: 11% agreed – 45% disagreed</p> <p>I think it is important that elite sport in general is free of doping: 93% agreed – 5% disagreed</p> <p>I think the whereabouts system is important in detecting users of doping: 63% agreed – 19% disagreed</p> <p>I think the whereabouts system is important in preventing the use of doping: 59% agreed – 22% disagreed</p> <p>A whereabouts system is necessary to carry out unnoticed out-of-competition tests: 63% agreed – 22% disagreed</p> <p>An anti-doping program can function well without whereabouts regulation: 35% agreed – 38% disagreed</p> <p>I attach much importance to my privacy: 72% agreed – 14% disagreed</p> <p>I think my privacy is violated due to the requirement of providing whereabouts: 30% agreed – 46% disagreed</p> <p>I think anti-doping organizations interfere too much in my private life: 26% agreed – 53% disagreed</p> <p>The current whereabouts system has a negative influence on the pleasure I experience in being an elite athlete: 28% agreed – 58% disagreed</p>
--	---------------------------	---

<p>Overbye, M. & Wagner, U. (2013). Between medical treatment and performance enhancement: An investigation of how elite athletes experience Therapeutic Use Exemptions. <i>International Journal of Drug Policy</i>, 24(6), 579-588.</p>	<p>TUE</p>	<p><i>645 Danish athletes answered the survey</i></p> <p>Athletes granted a TUE in their sport used larger doses of medicine than required by their therapeutic need: 49% agreed</p> <p>Athletes gets TUE without a therapeutic need: Never granted TUE - 46% agreed Granted TUE - 66% agreed</p> <p>Athletes with TUE uses higher doses of medicine than their therapeutic need: Never granted TUE – 47% agreed Granted TUE – 68% agreed</p> <p>Athletes granted TUE</p> <p>I must use the medicine/method to compete “on equal terms”: 64% agreed completely – 21% agreed partially</p> <p>I dislike to take medicine requiring the use of TUE: 33% agreed completely – 23% agreed partially</p> <p>Other athletes have commenting on my use of TUE as if it was cheating: 4% agreed completely – 21% agreed partially</p> <p>I feel that it is cheating a bit: 2% agreed partially</p>
---	------------	--