



EXPLORING OF TABLE TENNIS TRAINERS 'ATTITUDES TOWARDS ATHLETES' USE OF DOPING

Masa Tenisi Antrenörlerinin Sporcuların Doping Kullanımına Yönelik Tutumlarının İncelenmesi

Assistant Prof.Dr. Kübra ÖZDEMİR

Physical Education and Sports, Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1576-2131

Associate Prof.Dr. Ahmet Gökhan YAZICI

Physical Education and Sports, Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7069-304X

Associate Prof.Dr. Mehmet Ertuğrul ÖZTÜRK

Physical Education and Sports, Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4801-7632

Lecturer Muharrem OĞAN

Physical Education and Sports, Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5848-7291

Cite As: Özdemir, K.; Yazıcı, A.G.; Öztürk, M.E. & Oğan, M. (2021). "Exploring Of Table Tennis Trainers 'Attitudes Towards Athletes' Use Of Doping", International Social Mentality and Researcher Thinkers Journal, (Issn:2630-631X) 7(40): 42-47.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is; Table Tennis Championship in Turkey who work in the age of the coach, gender, and level of coaching and investigate their attitudes towards the use of doping according to the operating status of the national team.

Research held in Adana in Turkey Table Tennis Championships in the 2017-2018 season involved 83 coaches selected by random method from a total of 46 coaches attended. The personal information form developed by the researchers and the "Attitude Inventory for Doping" developed by Şapçı (2010) have been used as data collection tools.

The distribution and percentage values of the trainers have been determined by descriptive statistics. The Kruskal Wallis H test, which is a non-parametric test at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level, has been used in order to compare the attitude scores towards doping use of the trainers participating in the study according to age (5 groups) and coaching levels (3 groups). The Mann Whitney-U test, which is a non-parametric test at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level, has been applied according to gender and serving in national teams. When the findings obtained from the study has been analysed, it is observed that there is a significant difference between the attitude scores towards doping use according to age (X² (4), n = 46, 17.95 p <0.05), the difference is not significant between attitude scores towards doping use regarding the coaching level (X² (2), n = 46, 5.24 p > 0.05), gender (Z0.05; -0,715; p >0.05) and serving in national teams (Z0.05; -0,658; p >0.05).

Consequently, it has been understood that doping attitude scores of coaches who served in Turkish Table Tennis Championship differs according to age groups but the attitude scores towards doping use does not differ regarding their gender, coaching level and serving in national team.

Key words: Sports Ethics, Performance, Sport

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı; Masa Tenisi Türkiye Şampiyonası'nda görev yapan antrenörlerin yaş, cinsiyet, antrenörlük kademesi ve milli takımda çalışma durumlarına göre doping kullanımına karşı tutumlarını araştırmaktır.

Araştırmaya 2017-2018 sezonunda Adana'da düzenlenen Türkiye Masa Tenisi Şampiyonasında görev alan 83 antrenörden tesadüfi yöntemle seçilmiş toplam 46 antrenör katıldı. Veri toplama aracı olarak araştırmacılar tarafından geliştirilen kişisel bilgi formu ve Şapçı (2010) tarafından geliştirilen "Doping Kullanımına Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği" kullanıldı.

Verilerin dağılımlarıyla ilgili öncelikli olarak normallik testi (Kolmogorov-Smirnov ve Shapiro-Wilk) yapıldı. Antrenörlerin dağılım ve yüzdeleri tanımlayıcı istatistik (Descriptive Statistics) ile belirlendi. Araştırmaya katılan antrenörlerin yaş (5 grup) ve antrenörlük kademelerine (3 grup) göre doping kullanımına yönelik tutum puanlarının karşılaştırılmasında $\alpha=0.05$ anlamlılık düzeyinde non-parametrik test olan Kruskal Wallis H testi uygulandı. Anlamlı bulunan grupların belirlenmesi için ise non-parametrik test olan ikinci seviye testi olan Tamhane uygulandı. Cinsiyet ve milli takımlarda çalışma durumuna göre $\alpha=0.05$ anlamlılık düzeyinde non-parametrik test olan Mann Whitney-U testi uygulandı. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgular incelendiğinde yaşa göre (X² (4), n=46, 17,95 p<0,05) doping kullanımına yönelik tutum puanları arasındaki farkın anlamlı olduğunu görülürken, antrenörlük kademesine göre (X² (2), n=46, 5,24 p>0,05), cinsiyete göre (Z0.05; -0,715; p>0.05) ve milli takımlarda çalışma durumuna göre (Z0.05; -0,658; p>0.05) doping kullanımına yönelik tutum puanları arasındaki farkın anlamlı olmadığını görüldü.

Sonuç olarak; Masa tenisi Türkiye Şampiyonası'na katılan antrenörlerin doping kullanımına yönelik tutum puanlarının yaş gruplarına göre farklılaştığı görülürken, cinsiyet, antrenörlük kademesi ve milli takımlarda çalışma durumuna göre farklılaşmadığı görüldü.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Spor Ahlakı, Performans, Spor

1. INTRODUCTION

Sport is a ubiquitous human social activity that forms an unique intersection of recreation, health, industry and entertainment worldwide (Handelsman and Gooren, 2008). It is both a major economic activity and a profound influence on individuals' social behavior at play, home and work. One concise and practical definition of sport is the organized playing of competitive games according to rules. In that context, rule breaking is cheating to gain an unfair competitive advantage whether it involves using banned drugs or any other prohibited means, illegal equipment and match fixing (Handelsman, 2020).

Doping occurs at most levels of competition and in all sports. Athletic life may give rise to drug abuse for many reasons, including to deal with stressors, such as retirement from sport, pressure to perform, physical pain and injuries, to self-treat otherwise untreated mental illness and performance enhancement (Fernandez, 2009). There are many reasons why athletes may resort to the use of such substances, despite lucrative endorsements, risking their careers and reputation. In the modern era of competitive sport, winning is often everything (Creado and Reardon, 2016). Performance-enhancing drugs have continued to evolve, with 'advances' in doping strategies driven by improved detection methods and advances in scientific research that can give rise to the use and discovery of substances that may later be banned. When it comes to positive drug tests for elite athletes across sports, 2% have tested positive for any substances banned by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) (Uvacsek, 2011).

Doping is the use of substances or other possible methods that will artificially increase performances of the athletes or players and harm the physical and psychological health of them during the competition or while preparing for the game (Gündoğdu et al, 2017).

Since the earliest times of history, the idea of influencing sporting success by way of external intervention has always been a matter of concern. Additionally, the existence of sportsmanship and gentlemanly behaviour cannot be denied. Doping practices, which cause the physical and psychological structure of the athlete to deteriorate, to enter an unhealthy structure and even to die, corrupt not only the material-based disorders but also the understanding of the champion and record holder, the ideal human type, by destroying the moral values (Dinçer, 2010; Karacabey et al, 2017)

Why is doping prohibited in sport? Doping is against sports morality since it creates an unfair competition environment. It prevents athletes from competing under equal conditions. In addition, it can harm the health of athletes in the short and long term. Some substances can even cause sudden death during sports. Therefore, it is against sports ethics (Url 1, 2020). The desire of athletes to increase their performance is a strong desire, and both the economic and social returns of sporting success cause this desire to be successful to break the moral rules as well as the health rules (Çınar *et al*, 2007).

Doping, which eliminates the possibility of a fair competition, threatens the lives of athletes and keeps the audience away from sports, still maintains its place as the biggest problem of world sports. It is claimed that doping has been used since the beginning of elite sport (Prokop, 1970; Donohoe and Johnson, 1986; Tarakçioğlu, 2020). What is valuable at the basis of sports is the "sport spirit" and it requires athletes to compete on fair and equal terms. However, doping is against both the spirit of sports and sports ethics since it will provide an unfair advantage to the user. Moreover, it is inevitable that doping will cause harmful effects on human health (Dost, 2006; Egesoy et al, 2014).

Studies on struggling doping in the world and in our country are carried out and regulatory institutions are established. There is an absence of any legal provisions and regulations about doping in Turkey, but Turkey Anti-Doping Instructions dated 1 January 2015 regulating these provisions and regulations is the basic and binding regulations for doping in Turkey. The application instructions are carried out by Turkish Anti-Doping Commission. Legislation in all countries has been harmonized with the rules of the World Anti-Doping Agency. If there is a doping dispute in terms of international competitions, the objection can only be made to the International Court of Arbitration for Sport. As stated in the instructions of the World Anti-Doping Agency, it is the athlete's responsibility to enter the active substance that may cause doping rule violations into the athlete's body. For this reason, absolute liability has been accepted for doping rule violations. In case the doping rule violation is detected and proven, sanctions can be applied to individual athletes as well as to the teams. In case of detection of doping rule violations, there are consequences such as ineligibility penalties, cancellation of the degrees achieved, cancellation of the competition, return of the awards won, financial sanctions and cessation of financial aid received from the state (Url 2, 2020).

2. METHOD

The method has been designed and planned using the general survey model. General survey models is the survey arrangements made on the whole of the universe or a group of samples or samples taken from it in order to reach a general judgment about the universe (Karasar, 2006).

3. POPULATION AND SAMPLE

In the research, it is aimed at reaching the entire 83 people who are Table Tennis Championships held in Adana, in 2017-2018 season. The research did not choose the way of sampling because of the highest possible level of reliability and the accessibility all of the units constituting the main body.

4. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

In this study, the survey technique has been preferred as the data collection tool. The personal information form developed by the researchers and the "Attitude Inventory for Doping", which was developed and validity of reliability done by Şapçı (2010) have been used as data collection tools. The questionnaire form consists of two parts. The first part includes the demographic characteristics of the participants. In the second part, there are 10 statements on a single factor regarding the doping perceptions of the participants. The scale is 5-point Likert type. The options of positive attitude expressions are listed as "Completely agree", "Agree", "Neutral", "Disagree", "Never agree"; they are scored as 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1. The options of negative expressions have been scored as 5 and listed as 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 in reverse, The highest score in the scale is 50 and the lowest score is 10.

Coaching level variable;

In Turkey, Coaching Education is administered by Sports General Directorate of Sports Training Department, the Independent Federations, Sports General Directorate of Sports Federations and Physical Education and Sports School and Faculties of Sport Sciences.

Coach training courses are held at (V) level for all sports branches.

- ✓ First Level (Assistant Coach): It covers the training program for this level.
- ✓ II. Level (Trainer): This includes the training program that can be attended by coaches who have a first level basic trainer (monitor) license and can document that they have worked with the upper level trainer for at least 1 year.
- ✓ III. Level (Senior Coach): It covers the training program that can be attended by coaches who have a II. level trainer license and have documented that they have worked at II. level for at least 2 years and who have participated at least 2 sports-related seminars during this period (Url 3, 2020).

5. DATA ANALYSIS METHOD

SPSS 22.0 for Windows program has been used for the analysis of the data obtained from the survey. With this program, Kruskal Wallis H Test measuring whether two or more unrelated means differ significantly from each other and the t test being applied to nonparametric variable have been used. Due to the low number of participants, the non-parametric tests Kruskal Wallis H test and Mann-Whitney U tests have been used

6. FINDINGS

Information on the demographic characteristics (gender, age, coaching level, employment status in the national team) of the trainers participating in the study are explained in Table 1 as frequency and percentage distribution.

Table 1. Demographic data of the coaches

Demographic features		N	%
Coaching Level	Level 1	12	26
	Level 2	18	38,3
	Level 3	16	34,7
Age	20-25 Years old	10	21,7
	26-30 Years old	8	17,3
	31-35 Years old	7	15,2
	36-40 Years old	9	19,5

Gender	Female	16	34,7
	Male	30	65,2
Serving in the National Team	Yes	9	19,5
	No	37	80,4
	Total	46	100

When table 1 was examined, 26% of the coaches participating in the research are in Level 1, 38.3% are in Level 2 and 34.7% are in Level 3. 21.7% are in the 20-25 years old, 17.3% are 26-30 years old, 15.2% are 31-35 years old and 19.5% are 36-40 years old. 34.7% are female and 65.2% are male. 19.5% of them worked in the national team and 80.4% of them did not serve.

Table 2. Doping Attitudes of Participants According to Their Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	z	Sig
Doping Attitude Scores	Female	16	46,31	4,922	-0,715	0.475
	Male	30	46,50	4,911		

When table 2 was examined, The doping attitudes of the female and male participants have been found to be close to each other. For this reason, no significant difference has found between them in terms of doping attitudes in the test results made by gender at the 0.05% significance level. Accordingly, there is no difference between male and female coaches' doping attitudes.

Table 3. Doping Attitudes of Participants According to Their Age

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Chi square	df	Sig
Doping Attitude Scores	20-25 Years old	10	45,60	6,204	34	50	17.957	4	0.001
	26-30 Years old	8	41,00	5,071	35	47			
	31-35 Years old	7	49,71	0,488	49	50			
	36-40 Years old	9	46,89	3,100	41	50			
	41 Years old and above	12	48,50	2,812	41	50			
	Total	46	46,43	4,861	34	50			

In the test results done considering the age variable, a significant difference has been found between age groups. The highest difference was between the age groups 26-30 and 31-35. While the doping attitudes of the 26-30 age group are the lowest, the doping attitudes of the 31-35 age group have the highest value.

Table 4. Doping Attitudes According to the Levels of the Participants

	Coaching Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Chi square	df	Sig
Doping Attitude Scores	Level 1	12	46,17	5,441	35	50	5.246	2	0.073
	Level 2	18	44,78	5,652	34	50			
	Level 3 and above	16	48,50	2,251	44	50			
	Total	46	46,43	4,861	34	50			

In the analysis done regarding the level of the coaches, a significant difference has been found between the second and third levels. While the attitudes of coaches in Level 2 have the lowest value, the values of the coaches in Level 3 have the highest value. Accordingly, a relationship (difference) has been found between the coaching level and doping attitudes.

Table 5. Doping attitudes of the participants according to their serving status in the national team

	Serving in the National Team	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z	Sig
Doping Attitude Scores	National Coach	9	48,11	2,205	-0,658	0.510
	Coach	37	46,03	5,252		

No significant difference has found in the test results done according to their presence in the national team. The values of both groups are close to each other.

6. DISCUSSION

There are studies that measure the knowledge levels of athletes competing in individual and team sports, Elite Athletes, Managers, Coaches, students studying in Physical Education and Sports School and individuals who do fitness exercise about doping and food supplements and investigate their attitudes towards doping in the literature.

In this study, attitudes towards doping use of the coaches served in Turkish Table Tennis Championships held in Adana in the years 2017-2018 have been analysed by taking different variables into consideration

Looking at the analysis results,

According to gender variable: It has been observed that the difference between the athletes' doping use attitude scores is not significant ($p > 0.05$). Mermertaş (2019), Yıldız (2017) and Şapçı (2010) stated that doping use attitudes do not differ regarding the gender variable. Karakoç (2007) revealed that there is a significant difference in doping use attitudes ($p < 0.05$).

According to age variable: It has been observed that the difference between the athletes' doping use attitude scores is significant depending on the age ($p < 0.05$). The highest difference is between the age groups 26-30 and 31-35. According to the age groups, the age group with the highest total score levels of the athletes is 31-35 years. In a study on the volleyball players in different leagues conducted by Şensoy (2018), there is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$). This situation can be explained by the fact that the 31-35 age group is not inexperienced compared to the beginner coaches and they have knowledge in order not to disturb their future processes with the thought that the penalties given to the coaches will hurt their professional development.

According to the test results, it has been proven that the difference between the doping use attitude scores of the coaches depending on their sportsmanship levels is not significant ($p > 0.05$). It can be said that the doping use attitude scores of National Trainers and non-National trainers are very close to each other. Similar to our study, Şapçı (2010) stated in his study that there was no difference between national athletes and normal athletes.

In our study, it has been concluded that the attitude scores of the third-level coaches have the highest value. Accordingly, a relationship (difference) has been found between the coaching level and doping attitudes ($p < 0.05$). This situation can be explained by the experience of the coaches as they participate in the competitions and the increase in their professional experience and knowledge level. Tarakçıoğlu S (2020) also argued in his study that sports ethics make good sports possible for all athletes, coaches, sports physicians and sports managers.

7. RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

When the findings obtained from the study has been analysed, it is observed that there is a significant difference between the attitude scores towards doping use according to age ($X^2 (4), n = 46, 17.95 p < 0.05$), the difference is not significant between attitude scores towards doping use regarding the coaching level ($X^2 (2), n = 46, 5.24 p > 0.05$), gender ($Z_{0.05}; -0,715; p > 0.05$) and serving in national teams ($Z_{0.05}; -0,658; p > 0.05$).

Consequently, it has been understood that doping attitude scores of coaches who served in Turkish Table Tennis Championship differs according to age groups but the attitude scores towards doping use does not differ regarding their gender, coaching level and serving in national team.

In our age, doping is now very common in the international platform and it is noteworthy that lack of knowledge about the harms of doping use by athletes and coaches and their desire to win easily are among the reasons of doping use. In this context, coaches have a great responsibility to ensure that future generations can learn about the dangers of doping. In this respect, the result we obtained can be explained by the inference that seminars have not been organized in the National team camps to raise awareness about doping, and that normal trainers have almost the same knowledge about doping.

REFERENCES

- Creado, S., Reardon, C. (2016). The sports psychiatrist and performance-enhancing drugs. *International review of psychiatry* (Abingdon, England), 28(6), 564–571.
- Çınar, V., Öztürk, M., Şebin, K., Yazıcı, AG. (2007). Doping ve Sporcularda Kullanımı. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi* , 9 (3)
- Diñer, N. (2010). *Elit sporcuların doping hakkındaki bilgi düzeylerinin belirlenmesi*. Yüksek lisans tezi. Selçuk üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Donohoe, T., Johnson, N. (1986). *Foul play: Drug Abuse in Sport*. Blackwell: Oxford, 1986.
- Dost, T. (2006). Doping Türkiye klinikleri. *Türkiye Klinikleri Cerrahi Tıp Bilimleri* 46, No. 2, ss. 145-151
- Egesoy, H., Gümüşdağ, H., Kartal, A. (2014). GEN dopingi ve sportif performans . *Hitit Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* , 6 (1), 71-85.

- Fernandez, M. (2009). Performance-enhancing drugs snare nonathletes, too. *The Journal of Family Practice*, 58(1), 16–23.
- Gündoğdu, C., Çelebi, E., Beyazçiçek, Ö., Beyazçiçek, E., Tüfekçi, Ş., Özmerdivenli, R. (2017). Triatlon atletlerinin doping ve anti-doping konusundaki görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. *Konuralp Tıp Dergisi*. 9:63–9.
- Handelsman DJ, Gooren LJ. (2008). Hormones and sport: physiology, pharmacology and forensic science. *Asian J Androl.* ;10:348–350.
- Handelsman, DJ. (2020). Performance enhancing hormone doping in sport. Endotext, edited by Kenneth R Feingold et. al., *MDText.com*, Inc.
- Karacabey, K., Seyhan, S., Öntürk, Y., Apur, U., Akyel, Y. (2017). Genç sporcuların dopinge yönelimine etken olarak doping hakkındaki bilgi düzeyleri ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi . *Batman Üniversitesi Yaşam Bilimleri Dergisi* , 7 (2/2) , 168-179 .
- Karakoç, E. (2007). *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin doping içerikli ilaç kullanma sıklığının araştırılması*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sivas.
- Karasar, N. (2006). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel yayın Dağıtım.
- Mermertaş, A. (2019). *Spor merkezlerinde fitness egzersizi yapan bireylerin doping ve gıda takviyeleri hakkındaki bilgi düzeylerinin belirlenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Hitit Üniversitesi Sağlık bilimleri enstitüsü. Çorum.
- Prokop, L. (1970). The struggle against doping and its history. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness*. 10(1):45-8. 2.
- Şapcı, HA. (2010). *Üniversiteler arası spor müsabakalarına katılan öğrencilerin doping kullanımına yönelik tutumlarının incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.
- Şensoy, C. (2018). *Türkiye voleybol 1.ve 2. Liglerinde oynayan voleybolcuların doping bilgi seviye ve eğilimlerinin değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi .Aksaray Üniversitesi. Sosyal bilimler enstitüsü.
- Tarakçıoğlu, S. (2020). Türkiye’de Sporda dopingin nedenleri ve çözüm yollarına dair uzman görüşleri. *Spor Hekimliği Dergisi*, 55(2):156-164.
- Url 1. (2020). <https://www.doktortakvimi.com/blog/sporun-vebasi-doping>. Date of access: 04.10.2020.
- Url 2. (2020). <https://www.doganturan.av.tr/sporda-doping/>. Date of access: 04.10.2020.
- Url 3. (2020). <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/sirasayi/donem24/yil01/ss674.pdf>. TBMM *Son Yıllarda Türk sporunda yaşanan doping sorununun araştırılarak alınması gereken önlemlerin belirlenmesi amacıyla kurulan meclis araştırması komisyonu raporu* s. 178. Erişim tarihi: 10.10.2020.
- Uvacek, M., Nepusz, T., Naughton, DP., Mazanov, J., Ranky, MZ and Petroczi, A. (2011). Self-admitted behavior and perceived use of performance-enhancing vs psychoactive drugs among competitive athletes. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 21(2), 224–234.
- Yıldız, R. (2017). *Performans artırma tutum ölçeği'nin Türk sporcularına uyarlama çalışması ve sporcuların dopinge yönelik tutumlarının incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Mersin Üniversitesi.