Linking Coach Interpersonal Style With Athlete Doping Intentions and Doping Use: A Prospective Study

Nikos Ntoumanis,[1] Vassilis Barkoukis,[2] Daniel F. Gucciardi,[1] and Derwin King Chung Chan[3]

[1]Curtin University; [2]Aristotle University of Thessaloniki; [3]University of Hong Kong

We brought together various lines of work on motivation, morality, and doping by testing a theory-based model prospectively linking contextual and personal motivational variables, moral attitudes, moral disengagement in doping, doping intentions, and doping use. Participants were 257 Greek athletes who completed a questionnaire pack at the beginning of a sport season. In the case of doping use, we also obtained data close to the end of the same season. The model showed that perceptions of controlling coach behaviors predicted athlete need frustration, which in turn predicted low moral functioning and doping intentions/doping use. The findings highlight pathways (direct and indirect) by which the social environment may impact on athletes' intentions and decisions to engage in doping and could pave the way for future antidoping interventions aimed at improving coaching interpersonal style.

Keywords: coach behaviors, cross-cultural, doping behavior, moral attitudes, moral disengagement, psychological needs, self-determination theory

A recent meta-analysis of the psychological literature on doping (Ntoumanis, Ng, Barkoukis, & Backhouse, 2014) showed that researchers have focused primarily on the role of personal variables (e.g., attitudes, beliefs, and perfectionism) in predicting doping intentions and doping use. The research evidence on sociocontextual factors is comparatively less extensive and has focused primarily on the role of prevailing social norms (cf., theory of planned behavior; Ajzen, 1991) in condoning or sanctioning doping behavior (e.g., Lazuras, Barkoukis, Rodafinos, & Tzorbatzoudis, 2010; Lucidi et al., 2008). However, this work, although important in identifying the influence of the social environment in condoning or disapproving doping, has somewhat limited applied use. This is because such research does not highlight the behaviors and processes (direct and indirect) by which the social environment impacts on athletes' intentions and decisions to engage or not in doping. The aim of this study is to propose and test a model prospectively linking different types of coach motivational style with doping intentions

and doping behavior via a number of motivation and morality-related variables.

Coach Interpersonal Styles

Although there are various influential social factors in sport, undoubtedly coaches play the most important role in shaping the psychological experiences and behaviors of their athletes (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2009; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). In fact, conceptual models of doping behavior (e.g., Johnson, 2012; Petróczi & Aidman, 2008) acknowledge the important role of the motivational atmosphere created by coaches. Coaches instruct and try to motivate their athletes in ways in which they see as most appropriate and effective, or perceive as culturally sanctioned (e.g., being distant and assertive, demanding obedience) and indicative of competent and authoritative instruction (Reeve, 2009). However, research has shown that not all coach behaviors are adaptive. Many researchers have utilized self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2002), one of the most widely applied theories of motivation in sport settings (for a review, see Ntoumanis, 2012), to differentiate between adaptive and maladaptive coach interpersonal styles and to investigate the effects of these styles on athlete motivation, psychological well-being, and behavior.

In SDT research, a broad distinction has been made between autonomy-/need-supportive interpersonal style and controlling interpersonal style. An autonomy-supportive style supports self-initiated strivings and

Nikos Ntoumanis is with the School of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia. Vassilis Barkoukis is with the Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece. Daniel F. Gucciardi is with the School of Physiotherapy and Exercise Science, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia. Derwin King Chung Chan is with the Institute of Human Performance, The University of Hong Kong, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong. Address author correspondence to Nikos Ntoumanis at nikos.ntoumanis@curtin.edu.au.

creates conditions for athletes to experience a sense of volition, choice, and self-endorsement. Examples include provision of choice, rationale, and opportunities for initiative and independent work; taking others' perspective into account; and acknowledging their feelings (Reeve, 2009). Such behaviors result in increased athlete motivation, psychological well-being, and prosocial behavior (Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Ntoumanis & Standage, 2009). Despite the label, an autonomy-supportive style is theorized and has been empirically shown (cf., Ntoumanis, 2012) to predict the satisfaction of not just the basic need for autonomy (feeling control over one's behavior) but also the basic needs for competence (feeling effective in producing desired outcomes) and relatedness (feeling connected with and accepted by others).

In contrast, a controlling interpersonal style is in operation when coaches behave in a coercive, pressuring, and authoritarian way to impose a specific and preconceived way of thinking and behaving upon their athletes. As a consequence, athletes often comply but do not endorse the requested behaviors. Sometimes, coach control can be more subtle, for example, by showing affection and support only when athletes behave in ways in which conform to coaches' expectations and by showing indifference or being cold when athletes do not behave in such ways. Bartholomew et al. (2009) were the first to systematically review the various facets of a controlling interpersonal style and its potential applications in sport in terms of explaining certain types of coach behavior. Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, and Thøgersen-Ntoumani (2010) and Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, Ryan, Bosch, and Thøgersen-Ntoumani (2011) subsequently showed that controlling coaching environments can frustrate athletes' psychological needs and predict in negative emotions, feelings of burnout, and disordered eating. The link between coach autonomy-supportive and controlling interpersonal styles with athletes' perceptions of need satisfaction and frustration is important because according to basic needs theory, a mini-theory of SDT, psychological well-being and optimal functioning are dependent on the satisfaction of the three aforementioned needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Hence, contexts that support versus frustrate these needs should invariantly affect psychological and physical wellness. For example, self-destructive behaviors are evident when individuals experience hostile social environments that frustrate their needs (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Although there is limited evidence (e.g., Barkoukis, Lazuras, Tsorbatzoudis, & Rodafinos, 2011) to suggest that self-endorsed types of personal motivation are negatively related to doping intention and use, there is no research that has examined the role of coach interpersonal styles (adaptive and maladaptive) that predict, directly or indirectly via personal motivational factors, substance abuse such as doping.

Moral Attitudes to Decision Making

Motivation variables can also predict doping-related variables via the promotion of prosocial or antisocial moral attitudes and behaviors. Ntoumanis et al.'s (2014) meta-analysis found moderate effect sizes linking moral attitudes and beliefs with doping intention and use. Ntoumanis and Standage (2009) tested a SDT-based model of morality, which showed that autonomy-supportive coaching and satisfaction of athletes' psychological needs were positively related to self-determined motivation and prosocial moral attitudes (e.g., sportspersonship) and were negatively related to the endorsement of cheating as well as the violation of unwritten rules and ethical codes (i.e., endorsement of gamesmanship). "Endorsement of cheating" (i.e., breaking the written rules of the game) and "endorsement of gamesmanship" (i.e., breaking unwritten rules of the game or common etiquette) are two of the three moral attitudes to decision making proposed by Lee, Whitehead, and Ntoumanis (2007). The third variable is "keeping winning in proportion." This variable represents the attitude that winning should not be achieved by any means and that losing and winning are part of life. Lee et al. (2007) showed that higher scores on this variable were positively associated with more sportspersonship behaviors (e.g., respect for conventions and rules).

Moral Disengagement and Doping

Moral disengagement in doping has been recently investigated in the doping literature. This variable refers to cognitively restructuring and discounting doping and its consequences. Using a longitudinal design, Lucidi et al. (2008) demonstrated that high school students' moral disengagement in doping moderately and positively predicted both intention to dope at Time 1 and self-reported doping use at Time 2. Similar findings were also reported by Kavussanu, Hatzigeorgiadis, Elbe, and Ring (2016). However, the motivational predictors of moral disengagement in doping were not examined in these studies. In contrast, Hodge, Hargreaves, Gerrard, and Lonsdale (2013) examined such motivational predictors but of general moral disengagement in sport (not specific to doping). Hodge et al. reported that this variable was correlated with more prodoping attitudes and susceptibility to doping, as well as with controlling coach and teammate behaviors. We believe that a more specific mediator (i.e., moral disengagement with respect to doping) should be a better alternative to a more generic measure of moral disengagement in sport when assessing doping-related outcomes. Attitudes to moral decision making (i.e., endorsement of cheating, gamesmanship, and keeping winning in proportion) and moral disengagement in doping are expected to covary, although such association has not been previously tested. Including both sets of variables in the same study can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the different belief systems and morality discounting decisions underpinning intentions to engage in doping.

In sum, research has provided pieces of evidence (albeit largely cross-sectional) and theoretical support for the relations between coach interpersonal styles,

psychological needs, morality-related variables, and doping intention. However, such relations have not been previously examined in an integrative fashion in the context of doping in sport. Further, no research has tested how motivation and moral variables prospectively predict doping use. In this study, we were interested in examining predictors of continued and new doping use in competitive sport by obtaining self-reports of doping use at the beginning (Time 1) and end (Time 2) of the competitive season.

Study Aims and Hypotheses

The aim of this study was to bring together various lines of work on motivation, morality, and doping and examine a model (Figure 1) prospectively linking contextual and personal motivational variables, moral attitudes, moral disengagement, doping intentions (all measured at Time 1), and doping use (measured at Times 1 and 2). We proposed that perceptions of a coach autonomy-supportive style would positively predict athletes' psychological need satisfaction (Hypothesis 1 [H1]) and negatively predict psychological need frustration (H2). In contrast, it was expected that a coach controlling style would negatively predict psychological need satisfaction (H3) and positively predict need frustration (H4). These predictions are based on theoretical tenets (see Introduction section) and prior empirical evidence in sport (e.g., Bartholomew et al., 2011).

Endorsement of cheating and gamesmanship as well as moral disengagement in doping were expected to be positively predicted by need frustration (H5–H7) and negatively predicted by need satisfaction (H7–H9). The moral attitude of keeping winning in proportion was hypothesized to be positively predicted by need satisfaction (H10) and negatively by need frustration (H11). These predictions are partly based on Ntoumanis and Standage's (2009) study in which autonomy support and need satisfaction were positive predictors of sportspersonship and negative predictors of antisocial moral attitudes. Endorsement of antisocial attitudes and behaviors in sport are more likely to occur when athletes feel that their psychological needs are frustrated by pressuring coaching environments. In such situations, athletes often think and act in nonagentic ways that reflect compensatory mechanisms and goals to provide "collateral satisfaction" (Deci & Ryan, 2002), such as approval from others, even at the expense of one's health.

We also expected that cheating, gamesmanship, and moral disengagement in doping would be positive predictors of doping intention (H12–H14). In contrast, keeping winning in proportion was expected to negatively predict doping intentions (H15). These predictions were based on past work in the doping literature linking sportspersonship and general moral disengagement (not specific to doping) to doping intentions (e.g., Hodge et al., 2013; Lazuras, Barkoukis, & Tsorbatzoudis, 2015). Doping intentions are more likely to be salient when athletes endorse cheating and gamesmanship, believe that winning is all that matters in sport, and disregard or trivialize any moral codes associated with


Figure 1 — Visual display of hypothesized theoretical sequence for Times 1 and 2 data. Rectangles encompass latent variables that are correlated with each other. Parcels and item indicators are excluded for visual clarity. MDE = moral disengagement.

doping behavior. Given that intentions predict behavior (albeit not always strongly; Sheeran, 2002), we predicted that doping intentions would negatively predict new users (i.e., doping users at Time 2 but not at Time 1; H16) and positively predict continued users (doping users at both time points; H17).[1]

Methods

Participants

The sample ($n = 257$) comprised 159 male and 98 female Greek athletes aged between 15 and 36 years ($M = 21.79$, $SD = 3.84$). The primary sports represented in this sample included football/soccer (32.3%), rowing (19.5%), handball (13.2%), volleyball (10.9%), and swimming (9.3%). Demographic information captured athletes' time in their sport ($M = 9.33$ years, $SD = 4.18$), on their current team or squad ($M = 4.32$ years, $SD = 3.35$), and with their current coach ($M = 2.76$, $SD = 2.32$). At the time of completing the survey, athletes reported spending between 0.5 and 35 hr/week training for their sport ($M = 14.74$, $SD = 6.12$) and were primarily engaged in competitions at national (79%) or international (18.3%) levels.

Measures

With the exception of doping intentions, for all 7-point scales listed below, the following anchors were used: 1 (*strongly disagree*), 2 (*disagree*), 3 (*slightly disagree*), 4 (*neutral*), 5 (*slightly agree*), 6 (*agree*), and 7 (*strongly agree*).

Autonomy-supportive style. Athletes' perceptions of autonomy support provided by their coach were assessed using the six-item Health Care Climate Questionnaire (Williams, Grow, Freedman, Ryan, & Deci, 1996); the original items were adapted to capture the coach as the key social agent (e.g., "I feel that my coach provides me choices and options"). Despite its label, the questionnaire includes items that also capture competence and relatedness support.

Controlling style. Athletes' perceptions of their coach's controlling use of rewards (e.g., "My coach tries to motivate me by promising to reward me if I do well"), negative conditional regard (e.g., "My coach is less supportive of me when I am not training and competing well"), intimidation (e.g., "My coach threatens to punish me to keep me in line during training"), and excessive personal control (e.g., "My coach expects my whole life to center on my sport participation") were captured using the 15-item Controlling Coach Behaviors Scale (Bartholomew et al., 2010).

Psychological needs satisfaction. Items were collated from three surveys to assess athletes' perceptions of the degree to which they experienced satisfaction of the three psychological needs of autonomy (five items; e.g., "I have some choice in what I want to do in my sport";

Standage, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2003), competence (five items; e.g., "I think I am pretty good at my sport"; McAuley, Duncan, & Tammen, 1989), and relatedness (five items; e.g., "When participating in my sport I feel supported"; Richer & Vallerand, 1998) within their sport.

Psychological needs thwarting. The 12-item Psychological Need Thwarting Scale (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, Ryan, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2011) was used to assess athletes' perceptions of the degree to which they experienced frustration of the three psychological needs of autonomy (e.g., "I feel forced to follow training decisions made for me"), competence (e.g., "There are times when I am told things that make me feel incompetent"), and relatedness (e.g., "I feel I am rejected by those around me") within their sport.

Attitudes to moral decision making. Athletes' attitudes toward the acceptance of cheating (e.g., "I would cheat if I thought it would help me win"), keeping winning in proportion (e.g., "Winning and losing are a part of life"), and acceptance of gamesmanship (e.g., "I sometimes try to wind up the opposition") were tapped using a nine-item scale of attitudes to moral decision making (Lee et al., 2007). Responses were rated on a 5-point scale with the following anchors: 1 (*strongly disagree*), 2 (*disagree*), 3 (*neutral*), 4 (*agree*), and 5 (*strongly agree*).

Moral disengagement in doping. The degree to which athletes' endorse psychological mechanisms designed to disengage from moral self-sanctions associated with doping behavior was captured using a six-item scale (e.g., "Doping is alright because it helps your team"; Mallia et al., 2016).

Doping intentions. Athletes' intentions to use prohibited substances during the upcoming season were captured using a three-item scale (e.g., "I intend to use prohibited substances to enhance my performance during this season"; Barkoukis, Lazuras, Tsorbatzoudis, & Rodafinos, 2013). Responses were recorded using a 7-point scale with the following anchors: 1 (*extremely unlikely*), 2 (*very unlikely*), 3 (*unlikely*), 4 (*neutral*), 5 (*likely*), 6 (*very likely*), and 7 (*extremely likely*).

Doping behavior. Following the procedure by Lucidi et al. (2008), we presented athletes with a list of substances, including five of the most common legal nutritional supplements (i.e., protein and amino acids; vitamins and minerals; glutamine; creatine; and Tribulus, ZMA, HMB, or other testosterone boosters) and five of the most common doping substances (i.e., testosterone and by-products, growth hormone and IGF-1, β-blockers, erythropoietin, and anabolic steroids). Participants responded in a yes–no format as to whether or not they had used each of these substances in the past 6 months with the intention of improving their performance. We asked athletes to report on the use of both legal and illegal substances in an effort to minimize social desirability in reporting. However, for the purposes of this study, we included only the

data regarding illegal substances. In Table 1, we present two binary doping behavior variables, one for each time point, to classify athletes who reported using at least one illegal substance at each time point (0 = nonuser, 1 = user). In the same table, we also report two new variables based on athletes' responses to their use of illegal substances at Times 1 and 2: (a) "new user" represented athletes who had reported using illegal doping substances at Time 2 but not at Time 1 (0 = no, 1 = yes) and (b) "continued user" encompassed athletes who reported using illegal doping substances at both Times 1 and 2 (0 = no, 1 = yes). Alternative operationalizations of doping behavior are detailed in the Supplementary Material [available online].

Procedures

The recruitment of athletes occurred after permission was obtained from team managers and coaches. Athletes were informed about the aim and procedures of the study. They were reassured about the anonymity of their responses and that the surveys will be used solely for research purposes. Participation in the study was voluntary, and athletes were informed that they could withdraw any time they wish. The order of the survey scales was counterbalanced and administrated to the athletes at the training courts immediately before or immediately after a training session by trained personnel. Completion of surveys lasted approximately 25 min. All questionnaires were completed at the beginning of the competitive season. Doping behavior was assessed at the beginning and close to the end of the competitive season.

Data Analyses

Due to a disproportionate ratio of sample size to the number of multi-item latent factors, item parcels were used as manifest indicators of several latent variables to reduce the number of parameters estimated and, therefore, model complexity. When compared with individual items, item parcels produce more reliable latent variables and greater communality, and minimize distributional violations, sources of sampling error, and likelihood of correlated residuals (Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002; Little, Rhemtulla, Gibson, & Schoemann, 2013). Parcels were created using two different methods so that each latent factor was defined by at least three parcels (Little, 2013); readers are referred elsewhere for reviews of alternative strategies for constructing item parcels (e.g., random sampling, item-to-construct balance based on factor analyses), including discussions on their strengths and weaknesses (Little et al., 2002, 2013). For the unidimensional constructs of autonomy-supportive style and doping moral disengagement, we considered shared item content to maximize conceptual coherence and ordering within the questionnaire package so that items adjacent to each other were not parceled together, thereby minimizing methodological artifacts. Factor analyses of the controlling style, psychological needs satisfaction, and psychological needs frustration scales indicated that the subcomponents of each construct were highly correlated and that a general factor provided an adequate representation of the data. Akin to the internal consistency approach proposed by Kishton and Widaman (1994), we created a single parcel to represent each facet of these latent variables whereby the controlling style latent factor was defined by four

Table 1   Descriptive Statistics, Internal Reliability Estimates, and Bivariate Correlations Among Study Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Autonomy-supportive style	(.88)												
2. Controlling style	−.23**	(.87)											
3. Needs satisfaction	.43**	−.12	(.83)										
4. Needs frustration	−.23**	.58**	−.10	(.87)									
5. Doping moral disengagement	−.04	.43**	−.03	.42**	(.90)								
6. Cheating	.037	.18**	−.01	.20*	.54**	(.84)							
7. Winning	.06	−.34**	.23**	−.18**	−.11	−.08	(.92)						
8. Gamesmanship	.04	.07	.02	.15*	.36**	.47**	.23**	(.79)					
9. Doping intentions	−.06	.38**	−.07	.39**	.69**	.51**	−.27**	.25**	(.97)				
10. Doping behavior (Time 1)	−.06	.19*	−.06	.08	.42**	.30**	−.08	.23**	.47**	—			
11. Doping behavior (Time 2)	.00	−.01	−.05	−.10	.05	.17*	.00	.17*	.14	.31**	—		
12. New user	.19	−.14	−.08	−.31*	−.38*	−.04	.17	.04	−.41	−51**	.72**	—	
13. Continued user	−.20	.13	−.04	.08	.42*	.45*	−.19	.44*	.56*	.67**	.67**	−.22	—
M	5.05	3.33	4.86	3.61	2.31	2.08	3.93	2.57	1.96	—	—	—	—
SD	1.02	1.08	0.78	1.04	1.24	0.94	1.20	0.90	1.44	—	—	—	—

Note. Doping behavior: 0 = nonuser, 1 = user; new user (*n* = 16) and continued user (*n* = 12): 0 = no, 1 = yes. Internal reliability coefficients are presented in brackets.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .001$.

parcels, and both needs satisfaction and frustration were each represented by three parcels. Attitudes to moral decision making and doping intentions were modeled using their original items to preserve the recommendation of at least three indicators per latent factor.

We performed the analyses with Mplus 7.4 (Statmodel, Los Angeles, CA; Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2015) using a maximum likelihood estimator with bootstrapping, which is a nonparametric resampling procedure that does not rely on a normal distribution (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).[2] Bias-corrected bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of the indirect effects were constructed from 5,000 resamples (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). An indirect effect differs significantly from zero when its 95% CI does not encompass zero. Latent factor reliability estimates were computed using McDonald's (1970) omega (ω), which takes into account the magnitude of the association between constructs and their indicators as well as measurement error of items.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

From the 257 participants who completed the questionnaire at Time 1, only 166 completed the measure of doping behavior at Time 2 (i.e., 64.59% retention).[3] In total, 16 athletes (10%) were classified as a new user, whereas 12 athletes (7.23%) were classified as a continued user. Descriptive statistics, internal reliability estimates, and bivariate correlations for all study variables at Times 1 and 2 are provided in Table 1.

Longitudinal Analysis of the Theoretical Sequence

Model fit indices are unavailable when the logit link function is used alongside maximum likelihood estimation. The logit link function was applied due to the binary scale (categorical nature) of the dependent variables of "continued users" and "new users." However, when tested separately, the cross-sectional part of the model (which included all other variables apart from the two categorical ones) showed a good fit: $\chi^2(349) = 694.58$, $p < .001$, comparative fit index = .935, Tucker–Lewis index = .924, root mean square error of approximation = .062, and 90% CI [.055, .069].

An overview of standardized parameter estimates of direct paths is provided in Table 2. An autonomy-supportive coaching style positively predicted athlete psychological need satisfaction, whereas a controlling style positively predicted psychological need frustration. Need frustration was a positive predictor of moral disengagement in doping, endorsement of cheating, and gamesmanship. Need satisfaction positively predicted the attitude of keeping winning in proportion, and unexpectedly, gamesmanship (the latter effect was probably due to net suppression as the correlation between need satisfaction and gamesmanship was almost zero).

Doping intentions were positively predicted by moral disengagement in doping and endorsement for cheating, but not by endorsement for gamesmanship. Keeping winning in proportion was a negative predictor of doping intentions. Doping intentions were a predictor of new users ($\beta = -.45$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [−.76, −.20], odds ratio [OR] = .60) and continued users ($\beta = .55$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.40, .70], OR = 1.95). The amounts of variance explained in the latent variables were as follows: needs satisfaction ($r^2 = .16$), needs frustration ($r^2 = .46$), doping moral disengagement ($r^2 = .23$), acceptance of cheating ($r^2 = .11$), keeping winning in proportion ($r^2 = .12$), acceptance of gamesmanship ($r^2 = .2$), and doping intentions ($r^2 = .68$).

There was a specific indirect effect of autonomy support to new users via needs satisfaction, keeping winning in proportion, and doping intentions ($\beta = .011$, 95% CI [.003, .032]). This effect was positive because it was partly composed of two negative indirect effects: winning → intentions ($\beta = -.18$) × intentions → new users ($\beta = -.45$). The total effect of controlling coaching on new users ($\beta = -.115$, 95% CI [−.246, −.038]) encompassed two specific indirect effects: controlling coaching → needs frustration → moral disengagement → doping intentions → new user ($\beta = -.093$, 95% CI [−.204, −.026]) and controlling coaching → needs frustration → acceptance of cheating → doping intentions → new users ($\beta = -.025$, 95% CI [−.077, −.005]). With regard to continued users, there was a specific indirect effect of autonomy support via needs satisfaction, keeping winning in proportion, and doping intentions ($\beta = -.013$, 95% CI [−.039, −.005]). The total effect of controlling coaching was significant ($\beta = .138$, 95% CI [.059, .224]) and included two specific indirect effects: controlling coaching → needs frustration → moral disengagement → doping intentions → continued user ($\beta = .113$, 95% CI [.045, .196]) and controlling coaching → needs frustration → acceptance of cheating → doping intentions → continued user ($\beta = .030$, 95% CI [.008, .084]).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to test a model linking contextual and personal motivational variables, moral attitudes, moral disengagement in doping, and doping intentions with doping behavior over a sports season. Such relations have not been previously examined in an integrative fashion using a prospective design.

Predicting Doping Behavior

We were interested in identifying athletes who would report at the beginning and close to the end of the sport season that they had recently taken banned substances (continued users); we were also interested in identifying athletes who reported taking a banned substance only at the latter time point (new users). Such longitudinal effects have not been tested previously and can provide insight into the uptake and maintenance of doping

Table 2 Standardized Parameter Estimates of the Hypothesized Model

Structural Paths	β	95% CI	p
Autonomy-supportive style → Needs satisfaction	.40	[.20, .58]	<.001
Controlling style → Needs satisfaction	−.03	[−.25, .21]	.81
Autonomy-supportive style → Needs frustration	.01	[−.12, .15]	.85
Controlling style → Needs frustration	.69	[.48, .80]	<.001
Needs satisfaction → Doping moral disengagement	.09	[−.06, .25]	.29
Needs frustration → Doping moral disengagement	.48	[.27, .62]	<.001
Needs satisfaction → Cheating	.10	[−.07, .32]	.35
Needs frustration → Cheating	.33	[.12, .49]	.001
Needs satisfaction → Winning	.34	[.16, .51]	<.001
Needs frustration → Winning	−.05	[−.19, .10]	.56
Needs satisfaction → Gamesmanship	.21	[.05, .40]	.02
Needs frustration → Gamesmanship	.29	[.02, .48]	.01
Doping moral disengagement → Doping intentions	.62	[.40, .82]	<.001
Cheating → Doping intentions	.25	[.10, .50]	.02
Winning → Doping intentions	−.18	[−.32, −.08]	.004
Gamesmanship → Doping intentions	−.07	[−.22, .10]	.46
Doping intentions → New user	−.45	[−.76, −.20]	.002
Doping intentions → Continued user	.55	[.40, .70]	<.001
Autonomy-supportive style ↔ Controlling style	−.30	[−.53, −.14]	.002
Needs satisfaction ↔ Needs frustration	−.04	[−.26, .18]	.75
Doping moral disengagement ↔ Cheating	.69	[.55, .80]	<.001
Doping moral disengagement ↔ Winning	−.09	[−.24, .06]	.25
Doping moral disengagement ↔ Gamesmanship	.36	[.12, .52]	<.001
Cheating ↔ Winning	−.10	[−.29, .06]	.27
Cheating ↔ Gamesmanship	.48	[.31, .63]	<.001
Winning ↔ Gamesmanship	.23	[.01, .46]	.04

Note. CI = confidence interval.

behavior. The findings showed doping intentions to directly predict the continued use of doping in a positive fashion. Continued use was also predicted indirectly and in a negative fashion by perceptions of autonomy support via the moral attitude of "keeping winning in proportion." In contrast, perceptions of controlling coaching were positive indirect predictors of continued doping use via psychological need frustration, moral disengagement in doping, and endorsement of cheating. These results indicate that controlling coaching environments that frustrate athletes' psychological needs have the potential to foster low moral functioning and positive intentions toward doping, which in turn can result in sustained doping behavior.

A number of interesting indirect effects also emerged. Perceptions of autonomy support were negative predictors of continued users via psychological need satisfaction, keeping winning in proportion, and doping intentions. In contrast, perceptions of controlling coaching were positive predictors of continued users via psychological need frustration, acceptance of cheating, and moral disengagement in doping. Taken together, these findings are in line with past work linking coaching

behaviors with athletes' moral functioning and doping. Such work has shown that environments characterized by pressure, contingent approval, preoccupation with winning, and low inclusion and caring for athletes can facilitate moral disengagement in sport, low sportspersonship, and willingness to cheat to achieve desired outcome (Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Ommundsen Roberts, Lemyre & Treasure, 2003; Yukhymenko-Lescroart, Brown, & Paskus, 2015). Our findings support and extend this past work by showing that such effects of the social environment are mediated by perceptions of athletes' psychological needs frustration in these environments.

With regard to predicting new doping use, our findings suggest that even athletes who reported at the beginning of the season low doping intentions and no doping use may be involved in doping use later on in the season. This finding was unexpected but can be explained. During a competitive season, there are many situations that could predispose an athlete in favor of doping use, such as injuries or failure to achieve important goals. When these situations are experienced, particularly when athletes are placed in a controlling coaching

environment that motivates by pressure and guilt, athletes might endorse cheating and moral disengagement in doping (see indirect effects in the Results section). Hence, athletes with initially low intentions to dope may eventually engage in this behavior to achieve desired objectives. Alternatively, it is possible that some of the new users might have taken a banned substance by accident for a variety of reasons (cf., the work of Chan et al., 2016, on the psychology of the avoidance of unintentional doping). The latter possibility is also a possible explanation for the unexpected correlations involving the variable of "new user" with need frustration and moral disengagement in doping in Table 1.

Predicting Doping Intentions

Favorable attitudes toward cheating were a positive predictor of doping intentions, whereas the attitude of keeping winning in proportion was a negative predictor. These findings are in line with the Sport Drug Control Model, which postulates personal morality as an antecedent of doping intentions (Donovan, Egger, Kapernick, & Mendoza, 2002). They also corroborate previous evidence linking positive attitudes (moral and nonmoral specific) toward doping and endorsements of scenarios describing doping use (Lucidi et al., 2008; Vargo et al., 2014). Our findings also provide support for Barkoukis et al.'s (2013) argument that interventions for clean athletes should foster attitudes about the unethical nature of doping use. The moral attitude of gamesmanship was not a significant predictor of doping intentions. This finding is probably because gamesmanship refers to situations in which athletes break the spirit of the game (e.g., winding up the opposition) but not the rules; hence, gamesmanship might not be a direct predictor of doping-related cognitions.

Moral disengagement in doping was also a strong positive predictor of doping intentions, much stronger than moral attitudes were. The findings pertaining to moral disengagement are in line with past evidence suggesting that moral disengagement (specific to doping but also more generally with regard to sport participation) is an important antecedent of doping intentions (Kavussanu et al., 2016; Lucidi et al., 2008). Thus, cognitive and affective disengagement from the moral, health, and interpersonal consequences of antisocial behavior in general as well as doping use in particular can be precursors of athletes' intentions to act in a self-serving manner by taking illegal performance-enhancing substances.

Predicting Moral Attitudes and Moral Disengagement in Doping

Athletes' need frustration was a positive predictor of favorable attitudes toward cheating and gamesmanship, as well as higher levels of moral disengagement in doping. Taken together, these findings indicate that when athletes experience frustration of their basic psychological needs, they are more likely to endorse more dysfunctional moral

attitudes and cognitions. There is increasing empirical evidence documenting the maladaptive correlates of need frustration in athletes and other populations (e.g., Ntoumanis, 2012; Vansteenkiste & Ryan, 2013). Our study is the first to show that need frustration might have implications for moral functioning, both in terms of sport participation and specifically with respect to doping. As expected, psychological need satisfaction was a positive predictor of the attitude of keeping winning in proportion, but it did not predict cheating, gamesmanship, or moral disengagement in doping. Similar null findings between need satisfaction and antisocial moral variables have also been reported by Hodge and Gucciardi (2015). Interestingly, Hodge and Lonsdale (2011) and Hodge et al. (2013) also found nonsignificant relations between autonomous motivation (an outcome of need satisfaction) and antisocial moral variables. These findings, viewed in conjunction with our findings for need frustration, provide further support to the arguments made by Bartholomew et al. (2011) and Bartholomew et al. (2011); to understand from an SDT perspective diminished or compromised functioning (moral, in the case of our study) measures of need frustration hold greater explanatory capability than measures of need satisfaction.

Study Limitations, Future Research Directions, and Implications

This study had a number of limitations. For example, the dropout in the Australian sample prevented us from testing the longitudinal aspect of the study across both cultures. The primary obstacle we faced was the refusal of coaches to grant us access again for data collection purposes, which we suspect was because of the emphasis of the survey on the reporting of doping substance use at a time when a high-profile doping case in the Australian Football League captured the media attention for several weeks (Essendon drug scandal). Another limitation of our study was that we had only two time points for measurement, and most variables were measured only once. We could have potentially included more assessments of all variables throughout the competitive season to more accurately capture changes (both linear and nonlinear) in doping intention and behavior; however, this was not deemed pragmatic in terms of obtaining sport clubs' approval. A third limitation of our study was that, although the list of substances and categories of drugs included in the questionnaire covered the most commonly used substances included in the World Anti-Doping Agency's list of prohibited substances, other doping substances or methods (e.g., continuous erythropoietin receptor activator, blood doping) might had been used by our participants. Therefore, in the future, researchers could include a more comprehensive list of substances and methods of doping. In addition, given that peer influence is potentially important in terms of doping-related cognitions (Hodge & Gucciardi, 2015), future research could include measures of peer autonomy support and control.

Finally, our findings could have been affected by social desirability, given that we used self-reports for doping-related variables. With regard to the more "sensitive" variable of doping use, we asked athletes to report on the use of both legal and illegal substances in an effort to somewhat counter social desirability in reporting (i.e., we did not explicitly tell the athletes which substances were illegal and we also did not tell them that we would include in our analyses the illegal ones only). Currently, self-reports are the most realistic means to measure doping use in psychological research. Interestingly, self-reports provide higher prevalence of doping use when compared with doping controls. Only 2% of positive samples are reported according to World Anti-Doping Agency's statistics, whereas doping prevalence exceeds 10% in self-reports (see Lazuras et al., 2010). In addition, self-reports can capture retrospective use and are cost-effective, whereas doping controls can capture current use only and are expensive.

Despite these limitations, the present study offers several unique contributions to the literature by bringing together independent but complementary lines of work on motivation, moral attitudes, and doping in sport in an integrative model. We added to the SDT literature (sport-specific and wider) by showing how controlling styles and need frustration can predict low moral attitudes and moral disengagement in doping. Such links have not been previously tested. We also contributed to the doping literature by longitudinally testing predictors of continued and new doping use, and by examining behaviors and processes (direct and indirect) by which the social environment impacts on athletes' intentions and decisions to engage or not in doping. Such findings are also novel. This project serves as the basis for developing antidoping education programs for coaches (who are often absent from such programs) with the aim of training them in more need-supportive and less controlling behaviors in general, but also specifically training coaches to communicate to athletes information about doping using a more need-supportive style. Our findings suggest that such programs should focus primarily on reducing experiences of psychological need frustration and tackling moral disengagement in doping.

Acknowledgments

Notes

1. We also obtained data from 211 Australian athletes at Time 1. However, only 39 of them provided data on doping behavior at Time 2 (i.e., 18.48% retention). The primary reasons for dropout included refusal by the coach to grant access again to their team and to a far lesser extent athletes being inaccessible to complete the questionnaire at Time 2. Given the substantial attrition rate and also following reviewer feedback, we do not present the Australian longitudinal data here; however, we report the invariance testing of Greek and Australian Time 1 data in the Supplementary Material [available online].

2. Due to a disproportionate ratio of clusters (i.e., teams) to parameters in the model, the TYPE = COMPLEX function in Mplus did not allow us to adjust the standard errors and, therefore, minimize the influence of this nonindependence in the data (i.e., nonpositive-definite matrix).

3. When compared with participants who completed assessments at both time points, athletes who dropped out of the study after Time 1 were more experienced [$M_{dropout} = 10.39$ years, $SD = 4.93$; $M_{retained} = 8.73$ years, $SD = 3.58$; $F(1, 246) = 9.32$, $p = .003$], had been with their current team for a shorter amount of time [$M_{dropout} = 3.42$ years, $SD = 3.30$; $M_{retained} = 4.83$ years, $SD = 3.28$; $F(1, 250) = 10.59$, $p = .001$], spent less time training per week [$M_{dropout} = 12.37$ hr, $SD = 4.46$; $M_{retained} = 16.07$ hr, $SD = 6.52$; $F(1, 249) = 22.94$, $p < .001$], and reported lower doping intentions at Time 1 [$M_{dropout} = 1.60$, $SD = 1.27$; $M_{retained} = 2.16$, $SD = 1.48$; $F(1, 255) = 9.03$, $p = .003$].

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*, 179–211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Barkoukis, V., Lazuras, L., Tsorbatzoudis, H., & Rodafinos, A. (2011). Motivational and sportspersonship profiles of elite athletes in relation to doping behavior. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 12*, 205–212. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.10.003

Barkoukis, V., Lazuras, L., Tsorbatzoudis, H., & Rodafinos, A. (2013). Motivational and social cognitive predictors of doping intentions in elite sports: An integrated approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 23*, e330–e340. PubMed

Bartholomew, K.J., Ntoumanis, N., Ryan, R.M., Bosch, J.A., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2011). Self-determination theory and diminished functioning: The role of interpersonal control and psychological need thwarting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 1459–1473. doi:10.1177/0146167211413125

Bartholomew, K.J., Ntoumanis, N., Ryan, R.M., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2011). Psychological need thwarting in the sport context: Assessing the darker side of athletic experience. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 33*, 75–102. doi:10.1123/jsep.33.1.75

Bartholomew, K.J., Ntoumanis, N., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2009). A review of controlling motivational strategies from a self-determination theory perspective: Implications for sports coaches. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 2*, 215–233. doi:10.1080/17509840903235330

Bartholomew, K.J., Ntoumanis, N., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2010). The controlling interpersonal style in a

coaching context: Development and initial validation of a psychometric scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 32*, 193–216. PubMed doi:10.1123/jsep.32.2.193

Chan, D.K.C., Ntoumanis, N., Gucciardi, D.F., Donovan, R.J., Dimmock, J.A., Hardcastle, S.J., & Hagger, M.S. (2016). What if it really was an accident? The psychology of unintentional doping. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 50*, 898–899. PubMed doi:10.1136/bjsports-2015-094678

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Donovan, R.J., Egger, G., Kapernick, V., & Mendoza, J. (2002). A conceptual framework for achieving performance enhancing drug compliance in sport. *Sports Medicine, 32*, 269–284. PubMed doi:10.2165/00007256-200232040-00005

Hodge, K., & Gucciardi, D.F. (2015). Antisocial and prosocial behavior in sport: The role of motivational climate, basic psychological needs, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 37*, 257–273. PubMed doi:10.1123/jsep.2014-0225

Hodge, K., Hargreaves, E.A., Gerrard, D., & Lonsdale, C. (2013). Psychological mechanisms underlying doping attitudes in sport: Motivation and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 35*, 419–432. PubMed doi:10.1123/jsep.35.4.419

Hodge, K., & Lonsdale, C. (2011). Prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport: The role of coaching style, autonomous vs. controlled motivation, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 33*, 527–547. PubMed doi:10.1123/jsep.33.4.527

Johnson, M.B. (2012). A systemic social-cognitive perspective on doping. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13*, 317–323. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.12.007

Kavussanu, M., Hatzigeorgiadis, A, Elbe, A.M., & Ring, C. (2016). The moral disengagement in doping scale. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 24*, 188–198. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.02.003

Kishton, J.M., & Widaman, K.F. (1994). Unidimensional versus domain representative parceling of questionnaire items: An empirical example. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*, 757–765. doi:10.1177/0013164494054003022

Lazuras, L., Barkoukis, V., Rodafinos, A., & Tzorbatzoudis, H. (2010). Predictors of doping intentions in elite-level athletes: A social cognition approach. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 32*, 694–710 PubMed doi:10.1123/jsep.32.5.694

Lazuras, L., Barkoukis, V., & Tsorbatzoudis, H. (2015). Toward an integrative model of doping use: An empirical study with adolescent athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 37*, 37–50. PubMed doi:10.1123/jsep.2013-0232

Lee, M.J., Whitehead, J., & Ntoumanis, N. (2007). Development of the attitudes to moral decision-making in youth sport questionnaire. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 8*, 369–392. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2006.12.002

Little, T.D. (2013). *Longitudinal structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Little, T.D., Cunningham, W.A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K.F. (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9*, 151–173. doi:10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_1

Little, T.D., Rhemtulla, M., Gibson, K., & Schoemann, A.M. (2013). Why the items versus parcels controversy needn't be one. *Psychological Methods, 18*, 285–300. PubMed doi:10.1037/a0033266

Lucidi, F., Zelli, A., Mallia, L., Grano, C., Russo, P.M., & Violani, V. (2008). The social-cognitive mechanisms regulating adolescents' use of doping substances. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 26*, 447–456. PubMed doi:10.1080/02640410701579370

Mageau, G.A., & Vallerand, R.J. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 21*(11), 883–904. PubMed doi:10.1080/0264041031000140374

Mallia, L., Lazuras, L., Barkoukis, V., Brand, R., Baumgarten, F., Tsorbatzoudis, H., . . . Lucidi, F. (2016). Doping use in sport teams: The development and validation of measures of team-based efficacy beliefs and moral disengagement from a cross-national perspective. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 25*, 78–88. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.04.005

McAuley, E., Duncan, T., & Tammen, V.V. (1989). Psychometric properties of the intrinsic motivation inventory in a competitive sport setting: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 68*, 20–32.

McDonald, R.P. (1970). The theoretical foundations of principal factor analysis, canonical factor analysis, and alpha factor analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 23*, 1–21. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8317.1970.tb00432.x

Muthén, L.K., & Muthén, B.O. (1998–2015). *Mplus user's guide* (7th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

Ntoumanis, N. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on motivation in sport and physical education: Current trends and possible future research directions. In G.C. Roberts & D.C. Treasure (Eds.), *Motivation in sport and exercise* (Vol. 3, pp. 91–128). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Ntoumanis, N., Ng, J.Y.Y., Barkoukis, V., & Backhouse, S. (2014). Personal and situational predictors of doping use in physical activity settings: A meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine, 44*, 1603–1624. PubMed doi:10.1007/s40279-014-0240-4

Ntoumanis, N., & Standage, M. (2009). Morality in sport: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 21*, 365–380. doi:10.1080/10413200903036040

Ommundsen, Y., Roberts, G.C., Lemyre, P.N., & Treasure, D. (2003). Perceived motivational climate in male youth soccer: Relations to social-moral functioning, sportspersonship and team norm perceptions. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 4*, 397–413. doi:10.1016/S1469-0292(02)00038-9

Petróczi, A., & Aidman, E. (2008). Psychological drivers in doping: The life-cycle model of performance

enhancement. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 3*, 1–12. doi:10.1186/1747-597X-3-1

Preacher, K.J., & Hayes, A.F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 879–891. PubMed doi:10.3758/BRM.40.3.879

Reeve, J. (2009). Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how they can become more autonomy supportive. *Educational Psychologist, 44*, 159–175. doi:10.1080/00461520903028990

Richer, S., & Vallerand, R.J. (1998). Construction and validation of the perceived relatedness scale. *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée, 48*, 129–137.

Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention—Behavior relations: A conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology, 12*, 1–36. doi:10.1080/14792772143000003

Standage, M., Duda, J.L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2003). A model of contextual motivation in physical education: Using constructs from self-determination and achievement goal theories to predict physical activity intentions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 97–110. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.97

Vansteenkiste, M., & Ryan, R.M. (2013). On psychological growth and vulnerability: Basic psychological need satisfaction and need frustration as a unifying principle. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 23*, 263–280. doi:10.1037/a0032359

Vargo, E.J., James, R.A., Agyeman, K., MacPhee, T., McIntyre, R., Ronca, F., & Petróczi, A. (2014). Perceptions of assisted cognitive and sport performance enhancement among university students in England. *Performance Enhancement & Health, 3*, 66–77. doi:10.1016/j.peh.2015.02.001

Williams, G.C., Grow, V.M., Freedman, Z.R., Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (1996). Motivational predictors of weight loss and weight loss maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 115–126. PubMed doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.1.115

Yukhymenko-Lescroart, M.A., Brown, M.E., & Paskus, T.S. (2015). The relationship between ethical and abusive coaching behaviors and student-athlete well-being. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 4*, 36–49. doi:10.1037/spy0000023