

Making sense of lying to federal agents in the U.S.A: The Marion Jones narrative

Maurice Albert Aronstam

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree:

MA Counselling Psychology

Department of Psychology

Humanities

University of Pretoria

Supervisor: Prof L. H. Human

May 2010

Abstract

This research project investigated how a professional athlete made sense of lying to federal investigators regarding her use of a prohibited substance. More specifically, it investigated how Marion Jones made sense of her experiences through the construction of identity(ies). The constructionism position of narrative was used to determine how Jones gave meaning to significant experiences and constructed a narrative, and how this narrative was constructive of her identity(ies). The three-dimensional space approach of narrative analysis was used as my methodological position. The analysis was done on an interview conducted by Oprah Winfrey on Marion Jones as part of a broadcast of The Oprah Winfrey Show. This was Jones' first public appearance after her release from a six month prison sentence for lying to federal investigators. The analysis revealed the construction of three identities in her narrative. The athlete identity was constructed as one of the past, the felon identity as in the present, and the person identity is constructed as the identity that she will take into the future. Jones makes sense of lying to federal investigators as allowing these identities to develop and leave her with a positive future. This research project contributed to the field of sport psychology by investigating how a professional athlete made sense of her lying to federal investigators regarding her use of a prohibited substance and recommended that the construction of multiple dominant identities may allow for alternative options for professional athletes regarding their doping behaviour.

Key terms: (narrative analysis, identity(ies), three-dimensional space approach, doping, banned substances, sport psychology, Marion Jones, professional athlete)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NO.
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Context	1
1.2 Research Question	6
1.3 Research Goals	6
1.4 Report Structure	7
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE OVERVIEW	9
2.1 Terminology in Doping	9
2.2 Perspectives on Doping	11
2.3 Organisations and Doping	14
2.4 Performance Enhancing Substances in Sport	18
2.5 Doping Methods in Sport	21
2.6 Reasons for Doping in Sport	22
2.7 Effects of Doping in Sport	24
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH INQUIRY	25
3.1 Research Context	25
3.2 Research Participants	27
3.3 Research Position	28
3.4 Research Material	36
3.5 Research Quality	37
3.6 Research Ethics	38
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS	39
4.1 Athlete Identity	40



4.2	Felon Identity	46
4.3	Person Identity	49
4.4	Interplay of Identities	50

CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY 55

5.1	Summary of Research Review	55
5.2	Summary of Research Findings	56
5.3	Integration of Research Review and Findings	58
5.4	Shortcomings and Recommendations	59
5.5	Personal Commentary	61

REFERENCES 63

APPENDIX 1

Chapter 1

Introduction

Introduction

In this chapter I address the research context of my research project from which the research question emerged. Following the research question I state the research goals and address the structure of this research report. Next I will introduce the research context.

1.1

Research Context

For the research context I provide a brief life history of Marion Jones. Jones was an indirect participant in my research and her life history provided the context from which my research question emerged. Unless otherwise referenced, the information in the research context was attained from Jones' autobiography (Jones & Sekules, 2004).

1.1.1 Pre-Sydney Olympic Games (2000)

1.1.1.1 Jones' Family

Jones was born on October 12, 1975 in Los Angeles. After six years of marriage her parents divorced when she was only four years old. During her childhood years Jones retained contact with her biological father, but as time passed her attempts to see her father was not met with the same enthusiasm from his side. By adolescence she saw very little of him. She lived with her mother with whom she has a good relationship. Her mother married Ira who had a positive influence on the children. He passed away when Jones was still in primary school. She had an older brother and it seemed impossible to separate the two. It was his interest in sport that attracted Jones to sport.

In 1995 Jones met and befriended United States of America (USA) shot putter C.J. Hunter. In 1996 they were engaged and married in 1998. He played a big significant role in her life as both companion and training partner. He travelled with her to most athletics meets and guided her in her weights training.

1.1.1.2 Jones as Athlete

Jones was involved in various sports and extramural activities during primary school. In high school she started to make a name for herself as a track athlete. In 1991 at the age of 16 she competed in her first USA Track and Field Championships where she competed against the best sprinters in the USA. From 1991 to 1993 she received the “National High School Athlete of the Year” award for three consecutive years. Jones was also a keen basketball player during her high school years, and in 1993 received the “Player of the Year, Division 1 Amateur Athletic Foundation” award for her basketball performances.

In 1994 she enrolled at the University of North Carolina on a basketball scholarship. She had received scholarship invitations from numerous top universities which attested to her talent as a sportsperson. During her university years she participated in both basketball and track and field athletics. While she was competitive in track and field, it was in basketball where she found most satisfaction and showed the greatest improvement. She gained her national colours for basketball after being selected for the USA National University team. Despite her love for basketball, in 1997, just prior to her graduation, she said goodbye to basketball to focus on her athletics.

In 1997 she started to compete regularly against the top athletes in the world. She won her first race in a major competition at the World Championships in Athens in 1997. This was the first time she had received money for competing and marked the start of her professional athletics career. She started to dominate the sprint events and soon had gained an impressive reputation as “the fastest woman on earth”. She quickly became a high profile athlete with large endorsement deals as well as numerous media and public appearances.

After working together on an informal basis for a few months Jones attained the services of Trevor Graham as her full-time coach in 1999. Their relationship deteriorated progressively after the 2000 Olympic Games. In 2003 Jones finally broke off her ties with Graham as her coach.

1.1.2 Sydney Olympic Games (2000)

1.1.2.1 Jones' Family

C.J. Hunter and Jones both competed at the Sydney Olympic Games. They had hired an apartment in Sydney. Before Jones had competed in any of her races, rumours surfaced of Hunter being involved in a doping scandal. He subsequently tested positive for doping and was disqualified from the Olympic Games and banned from the sport. This came as a great shock to Jones and had placed her under a huge amount of unnecessary pressure.

Also present at the Olympic Games was Jones' brother, mother, uncle and her cousins. They had attended all her races and were a great source of support. After Jones won her first gold medal she spotted them in the crowd and made her way there to celebrate with them.

1.1.2.2 Jones as Athlete

In the run up to the 2000 Olympic Games the media tipped Jones to win five gold medals. She appeared on numerous magazine covers and other print media. While she did not take home five gold medals, she did win five medals. She won three gold medals for the 100m, 200m, and 4x400m relay respectively as well as two bronze medals for the 4x100m relay and the long jump respectively. She was the first woman in history to win five medals at a single Olympic Games. After winning the last medal, reporters at the post race conference made Jones aware that she had in fact made history by winning five medals, something Jones was not aware of.

In 2001 she felt mentally and physically tired and attributed this to burn-out from the Olympic Games the year prior. It was also during this time she lost her first 100m race since 1997, showing her complete domination of the sprint events for the previous four years in a discipline

where athletes usually have a fairly short lifespan. She was regarded by some as the most sought after female sports celebrity in the world at that time.

Until publication of her autobiography, Jones had an exceptional track record. Represented in the following table is her complete track and field record up to the publication date of her autobiography.

Table 1
Summary of Jones' Athletic Performances

Events	Total Events Entered	Placing			
		1 st Place	2 nd Place	3 rd Place	Other
60m	3	2	1	0	0
100m	65	61	4	0	0
200m	32	30	0	0	2
400m	4	4	0	0	0
4 x 100m Relay	7	2	3	1	1
4 x 200m Relay	3	3	0	0	0
4 x 400m Relay	3	3	0	0	0
Long Jump	22	14	5	1	2

1.1.3 Post-Sydney Olympic Games (2000)

1.1.3.1 Jones' Family

After the Sydney Olympic Games her relationship with her husband progressively deteriorated due to pressures following his doping scandal. They finally divorced in 2001. In 2001 Jones also received word that her biological father had passed away. She wanted to be involved with the funeral proceedings, but experienced great difficulty in dealing with her father's side of the family as they did not accommodate her request to be involved.

Jones started seeing the world record holder for the men's 100m, Tim Montgomery. Due to their recent athletic achievements the media had dubbed them the "fastest couple in the world". In 2003 she had her first child with Montgomery. Their son was named Monty. In 2007 they had another son named Damir (Rakieten, 2008).

1.1.3.2 Jones as Athlete

Despite feeling exhausted and losing her first 100m race in four years, she still dominated on the track in 2001. After a period of rest she performed exceptionally well again in 2002. She was unbeaten in the 100m, 200m and 400m for the entire year. She had now proved without doubt that she was the fastest woman in the world. At the height of her dominance Jones got pregnant late in 2002. She did not compete in 2003 due to the pregnancy. She started to compete again in 2004 and lived up to the huge anticipation of her return after her pregnancy. The build-up to the Olympic Games in 2004 had started and she was unbeaten in that year until the publication of her autobiography late in 2004.

In October 2007 Jones released a press statement in which she revealed her plans to plead guilty to two counts of lying to federal agents regarding her use of performance enhancing drugs. In this press statement she revealed that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) had been investigating a case against the Bay Area Laboratories Co-operative (BALCO). They interviewed her in 2001 regarding her association with this company. During the interview with the federal investigators she came to the realisation that she had unknowingly used a banned substance. She had unknowingly been given a banned substance by Graham, her coach at the time. During this interview she decided to lie and try to cover it up ("Marion Jones", 2009; Rakieten, 2008).

The substance that she had taken was a designer steroid called tetrahydrogestrinone (THG); also known as 'the clear'. This is an anabolic androgenic steroid (ASS) (Keun-Youl, 2005). ASS is discussed in more detail in section 2.4.1. After pleading guilty to having used a banned substance she had to return her five medals of the 2000 Olympic Games and her records from 2000 onwards were erased from the record books (Rakieten, 2008).

In January 2008 Jones was sentenced to six months in prison as well as 800 hours of community service for pleading guilty to two counts of lying to the FBI. Her sentence was enforced in April that year. In September 2008 she was released from prison (“Marion Jones”, 2009).

1.1.4 Oprah Winfrey Interview

In October 2008 Jones appeared on the Oprah Winfrey Show. She had not released any public statements or press releases since her release from prison in September 2008. This was the first time that she would address publicly her experience of spending six months in prison and having her medals and records erased. It was expected that approximately 24 million viewers across the world would watch the interview on the Oprah Winfrey Show. This interview constitutes my research material and it is from this context that the research question emerged.

1.2

Research Question

The research question of this research project was: “How did Marion Jones make sense of lying to federal agents of the USA regarding the use of a prohibited substance?”

1.3

Research Goals

1.3.1 General Goal

The general goal of this research project was to determine how Marion Jones made sense of lying to federal agents of the USA regarding the use of a prohibited substance.

1.3.2 Specific Goals

1. To conduct a research overview on doping in sport.
2. To describe the research inquiry of this research project.

3. To conduct the research inquiry of this research project.
4. To portray the research findings of this research project.

1.4

Report Structure

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to my research project and addresses the research context, introduces the research question, provides the research goals and describes the report structure.

Chapter 2 provides a research overview and looks at the terminology in doping, perspectives on doping, organizations involved in doping, performance enhancing substances in doping, doping methods in sport, reasons why athletes dope, and the effects of doping. Existing research on doping in sport is also addressed.

Chapter 3 introduces the research inquiry. The research context, research participants, research position, research material, research quality and research ethics is addressed in this chapter.

Chapter 4 looks at the research findings. The research findings are linked back to the research question and provide the answer to the research question.

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the findings and the limitations of this research project are addressed.

Conclusion

In this chapter I addressed the research context of my research project and introduced the research question. Following the research question I stated the research goals and addressed the structure of this research report. The next chapter will address the research overview.

Chapter 2

Literature Overview

Introduction

In this chapter I address the literature overview of my research project. I address the terminology in doping, perspectives on doping, organizations and doping, performance enhancing substances in sport, doping methods in sport, reasons for doping in sport, and the effects of doping in sport.

Although Jones was sentenced to prison for lying to federal investigators, the lie concerned the topic of doping in track and field athletics. Doping is therefore discussed as this was the topic that she lied about.

Next I will introduce the terminology in doping.

2.1

Terminology in Doping

2.1.1 Drugs

Drugs can be defined as a “chemical substance, which by interaction with biological targets, can alter the biochemical systems of the body” (Mottram, 1996, p. 1). Originally drugs were designed to rectify imbalances in the body caused by disease, but in later years athletes started to use certain drugs for the performance-enhancing effects they create in a healthy body.

The term drugs and performance-enhancing substance is used interchangeably in the literature. For the purposes of this research project, I use the term performance-enhancing substance when referring to the use of a substance by an athlete to enhance performance. I use the term banned substance when referring specifically to a substance that is on the World Anti-Doping Agency’s (WADA) prohibited list. I also use the term doping, which is discussed in section 2.1.2, when

referring to the broader scope of performance-enhancing substances as well as any performance-enhancing methods.

2.1.2 Doping

There are three broad viewpoints regarding doping in sport. The first proposes that doping remains illegal in sport. The second viewpoint argues for a critical review of the current list of banned substances. This viewpoint argues that some substances be made legal as there is not sufficient evidence that points to the adverse effects of these substances on the athlete, nor the substances' performance-enhancing effects on the athlete. Lastly, some people argue for the legalisation of doping which they view as the future of athletic development (Carr, 2008; Dilger, Frick, & Tolsdorf, 2007; Franchini & Lambert, 2007; Hoberman, 2006; Miah, 2005; Mottram, 1996; Noakes, 2006).

Despite disagreement regarding the definition of doping, there are also commonalities included in most definitions. These commonalities include the intention of an athlete to seek an unfair advantage, the use of doping that results in an unfair advantage for the athlete in competition or training, and the use of doping that is damaging to the athlete's health (Houlihan, 2003; Katch, 1986; Mottram, 1996; Payne, 1990; Simon as cited in Morgan, 2007).

With increased monitoring of doping in professional sports in recent years there also followed a rise in the number of court cases instigated by athletes against sports federations. Due to this some sports federations have additionally adopted liability definitions. These definitions serve the purpose of providing protection for sports federations as they are defendable in a court case. Commonalities in these definitions include that an athlete is guilty of doping if [Houlihan, 2003; Mottram, 1996; World Anti-Doping Code, 2009]:

- a prohibited substance or its metabolites or markers is found in an athlete's sample
- the use or attempted use by an athlete of a prohibited substance or prohibited method
- refusing or failing without compelling justification to submit to sample collection
- violation of applicable requirements regarding athlete availability for out of competition testing

- tampering or attempted tampering with any part of doping control
- possession of prohibited substances and prohibited methods
- trafficking or attempted trafficking in any prohibited substance or prohibited method, and administration or attempted administration to any athlete in competition or training of any prohibited substance or prohibited method.

2.2

Perspectives on Doping

2.2.1 Sport Medicine Perspective

The sport medicine perspective on doping mainly relates to the pharmacological aspects of doping. The focus of this perspective is mainly on the classification of various ways of doping as well as the understanding of the physiological response of the body to doping. There are two distinct views, along with their associated practices within the sport medicine perspective. Firstly, the physiological enhancing effects of substances and methods are used to create specific doping practices that enhance certain areas of athletic performance. Conversely, doctors or sport scientists use the adverse side effects of doping for the prevention of doping, and as a way to deter athletes from doping (Bloomfield, Fricker, & Fitch, 1992; Hoberman, 2002; Payne, 1990).

2.2.2 Sport Sociology Perspective

Sociology in sport is concerned with the effects that sociological and cultural phenomenon have on sport. Sport sociology's view on doping is mainly concerned with the interaction of the athletes with their environment and society. Doping is viewed from the perspective that societal trends and the environment have an impact on the use of doping (Horne, Tomlinson, & Whannel, 1999).

2.2.3 Sport Psychology Perspective

The cognitive behavioural perspective is currently the dominant perspective in sport psychology and limited literature exists on sport psychology that incorporates a different perspective on sport. Sport psychology therefore predominantly views doping from the cognitive-behavioural perspective and is concerned with the thoughts and attitudes towards doping and the resulting behaviours of the athletes (Gardner & Moore, 2006; Lamont-Mills & Christensen, 2008).

As limited research on doping in sport psychology exists, the existing research will be discussed here under the heading of the sport psychology perspective. The findings of the research will be depicted in terms of quantitative research and qualitative research. Lamont-Mills and Christensen (2008) conducted an extensive review of the literature on doping in sport and I will base my report of the current trends in research on this article.

2.2.3.1 Quantitative Research on Doping in Sport Psychology ¹

Sport psychologists have conducted limited research on doping in sport compared to other disciplines such as sport economics (Lamont-Mills & Christensen, 2008) and sport medicine (Gregory, 2007; Hoberman, 2002; Saugy et al., 2006).

The existing research on doping in sport psychology has focused mostly on the cognitive or behavioural aspects of doping. This research has typically used questionnaires to gather their material. The focus of these studies is on the behaviour, motives, and attitudes towards doping in sport (Dilger et al., 2007; Lucidi et al., 2008; Tricker, 2000).

Though limited, this research appears throughout the literature over the past 20 years. The majority of the research has been conducted in North America, with more limited contributions

¹ Through the Academic Information Services of the University of Pretoria I searched the following databases; Psychinfo, Business Source Premier, Academic Source Premier, Sportdiscus, Cinahl, and Ebscohost, from 1990 to 2010.

from Europe. A large number of the participants in the existing research are adolescent or university athletes.

The existing research results seem to indicate that the majority of professional athletes have negative attitudes towards doping in sport and that the use of doping is generally not wide spread. The above results highlight that the majority of the existing research has been conducted from the cognitive and behavioural research position and is concerned mainly with doping behaviours as well as thoughts and attitudes towards doping.

As my research project is qualitative in nature I will not elaborate further on the quantitative research and will focus on the qualitative research conducted on doping in sport psychology.

2.2.3.2 Qualitative Research on Doping in Sport Psychology ²

Very limited qualitative research has been conducted from the sport psychology perspective. The article by Lamont-Mills and Christensen (2008) is the only published research article that is similar to my research project in terms of its goals, as well as their research position. For this reason I will discuss it in more detail.

Lamont-Mills and Christensen (2008) conducted a discursive analysis in the context of doping in sport. The aim of their study was to determine how a professional athlete, namely Shane Warne, accounted for his drug taking behaviour when talking to the media. They argue that for researchers to better understand doping in sport, we must have a better understanding of how athletes talk about doping and subsequently give meaning to their doping behaviour.

Their participant is a professional cricketer and they contextualise their analysis on a social, real life experience of this single athlete. The research material used for analysis consisted of three

² Through the Academic Information Services of the University of Pretoria I searched the following databases; Psychinfo, Business Source Premier, Academic Source Premier, Sportdiscus, Cinahl, and Ebscohost, from 1990 to 2010.

media releases from Shane Warne subsequent to a positive drug test during the Cricket World Cup in 2003.

The researchers concluded that Shane Warne constructed his drug taking as not being related to performance enhancement, as being an act of ignorance rather than deliberate deception, and as a once-off event.

The abovementioned article investigated the use of discourse (“language”) as a means for an athlete to understand his doping behaviour. It did not focus on the knowledge of “how” an athlete made sense of the experience of doping in relation to other experiences as the investigation was only textual. It was rather an investigation into how language was used to construct understanding. The context of the athlete’s experience is not taken into account and how the athlete made sense of the experience in relation to history and culture is not considered in this study.

2.3

Organisations and Doping

In this section I will discuss the roles of the various organisations involved in the governing of the Olympic sports, that have a direct effect on Marion Jones’s narrative, and that are involved with athletics, namely:

- International Olympic Committee (IOC)
- World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA)
- United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA)
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

The IOC and WADA are the international agencies involved with Olympic sports and doping in Olympic sports. The above agencies all adhere to the World Anti-Doping Code. The USADA is the only national agency included in my research project as Marion Jones, the indirect participant of my research project was an American Olympic athlete. I do acknowledge that there are

national agencies in other countries that participate at Olympic events, but they will not be included in my research project.

Furthermore, there are governing bodies of various non-Olympic sports that also adhere to anti-doping practices. Amongst these are the International Cricket Council (ICC) and the Federation Internasionale de Football Association (FIFA). These will not be included in my study as they are not involved in Olympic athletics and specifically in the Marion Jones narrative.

2.3.1 International Olympic Committee (IOC)

The IOC was established in 1894 by Pierre de Coubertin and Demetrios Vikelas (International Olympic Committee [IOC], 2009a). Following the death of cyclist Knud Enemark Jensen at the Olympic Games in Rome 1960, the IOC instituted its Medical Commission to set up its first list of prohibited substances in 1967. Drug tests were first introduced by the IOC at the Olympic Winter Games in Grenoble and at the Olympic Games in Mexico in 1968. The IOC was responsible for drug testing until 1999 when they established an independent body in WADA, to take over the responsibility (Mottram, 1996; World Anti-Doping Agency [WADA], n.d.).

The IOC upholds the Olympic values through a wide range of programmes and projects and also aims to protect professional athletes worldwide. The goal of the IOC is to contribute to building a peaceful and better world and tries to achieve this through sport. It achieves this through education as well as setting high sporting standards for all Olympic sports (International Olympic Committee [IOC], 2009b).

The IOC is included as Jones was an Olympic athlete and her narrative was informed by the rules, regulations, and values instilled by the IOC.

2.3.2 World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA)

In 1998 the world was shocked at yet another doping scandal in international sport, this time in the world of cycling. A world conference was subsequently held in February 1999 to address the

issues regarding doping in sport. Following this world conference, all parties involved agreed that an independent international anti-doping agency needed to be established. WADA was subsequently established in November 1999, to promote and coordinate the fight against doping in international sport (WADA, n.d.).

The main aim of WADA is the protection of the athletes' right to participate in doping-free sport and in so doing promote health, fairness, and equality. WADA also ensures the functioning and coordination of effective anti-doping programs at the international and national level with regard to detection, deterrence, and prevention of doping (WADA, n.d.).

The World Anti-Doping Code was established by WADA to harmonise all anti-doping policies for all sports around the world. For WADA to control doping in athletics world wide, they needed to standardise all doping policies. The Code provides WADA with the basic framework on which to base their specific strategic plans to ensure they keep doping under control (WADA, n.d.).

The World Anti-Doping Code contains the list of all banned substances and methods that apply to all Olympic athletes. Included in the World Anti-Doping Code banned list for 2009 are all substances and methods that WADA deems to either (1) enhance sporting performance, (2) has a real or potential health risk to the athlete, or (3) violates the spirit of sport as described in the introduction of the World Anti Doping Code (WADA, 2003).

WADA and the World Anti-Doping Code are included as Jones, as a professional athlete, was subject to the regulations and policies enforced by WADA. Her narrative would therefore be informed by the regulations and policies of WADA.

2.3.3 United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA)

The USADA is the national agency involved with sports doping in the United States of America specifically, and works closely with WADA. It began its operations in 2000, and has been given full authority to execute its national anti-doping program. This agency has adopted the World

Anti-Doping Code and WADA's Prohibited List ("Marion Jones Accepts Sanction", 2007; United States Anti-Doping Agency [USADA], 2008).

The USADA's vision is to eliminate the practice of doping in sport in the USA and to preserve the integrity of sport. It also attempts to ensure the health of athletes through research initiatives and educational programmes (USADA, 2008).

The USADA is included as Jones was an American athlete and therefore subject to the regulations and policies of the USADA. Her narrative was informed by the regulations and policies of the USADA.

2.3.4 Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

The FBI is an intelligence agency and national security organisation in the USA. It was established in 1908 by Attorney General Charles Bonaparte during the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt. Bonaparte appointed a force of special agents within the Department of Justice. While this force of special agents had no official name in 1908, in 1909 the force was named the Bureau of Investigation. In 1936 the official name of the FBI was adopted (Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], 2009b).

The FBI serves the purpose of protecting and defending "the United States against terrorist and foreign intelligence threats, to uphold and enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and to provide leadership and criminal justice services to federal, state, municipal, and international agencies and partners" (FBI, 2009a).

The FBI is included as they were the organisation responsible for the investigation of doping in track and field athletics. Jones was interviewed as part of their investigation and her narrative was informed by the practices of the FBI.

2.4

Performance Enhancing Substances in Sport

The World Anti-Doping Code (2009) includes in its prohibited list the following substances, which can be divided into three broad categories:

2.4.1 Prohibited Substances

This category contains substances that are prohibited during competition, as well as any time during the training period. Random doping tests are conducted on athletes during competitions as well as during their training season.

The substances in this category include:

- Anabolic agents
 - Anabolic androgenic steroids (AAS)³
 - Other anabolic agents
- Hormones and related substances
- Beta-2 antagonists
- Hormone antagonists and modulators
- Diuretics and other masking agents

Anabolic agents include chemicals which are similar in structure and activity to the male hormone testosterone. These chemicals aim to reproduce the anabolic properties of testosterone. Athletes using anabolic agents can recover more quickly from hard training sessions and therefore train at a high intensity more often than others not using anabolic agents (Bloomfield et al., 1992; Mottram, 1996; Payne, 1990; Wright & Cowart, 1990).

Hormones occur naturally in the human body and serve functions such as stimulating muscle growth and strength, or producing red blood cells that carry oxygen to the muscles during

³ Jones used a designer steroid named 'the clear', which was a type of ASS.

exercise. Hormone levels are altered through the use of hormone substances that increase the levels of hormones present in the body or that stimulate the natural production of hormones (Eight Types of Drug, 2009; Mottram, 1996).

Beta-2 antagonists are used in asthmatic medication to provide relief from breathing difficulty. It is currently thought that this may be used by athletes to improve their breathing during endurance sports. It is also reported that certain beta-2 antagonists may also increase muscle strength, though contradictory research evidence exists (Kindermann, 2007; Mottram, 1996).

Hormone antagonists and modulators influence the binding of hormones to receptor sites in the body by either stimulating or inhibiting the binding of certain hormones. This alters the body's reaction to those specific hormones. Hormone antagonists and modulators do not have a direct influence on performance, but is rather used to mask the effects of hormone or anabolic androgenic steroids use (Hormone Antagonists and Modulators, 2009).

Diuretics are used to eliminate fluids from the body. There are three main reasons why athletes may use diuretics. Firstly, in sports where athletes compete in weight classes they seek acute weight reduction through rapid fluid loss to be able to compete in a lower weight class. Secondly, in sports such as body-building diuretics are used to get rid of excess fluid retention caused by anabolic steroids. The aim of this is to achieve the "cut look". Thirdly, athletes look to dilute the concentration levels of their urine to attempt to avoid the detection of other banned substances that they may be present in their urine. Other masking agents are included in this category as their function is also to avoid the detection of banned substances (Bloomfield et al., 1992; Mottram, 1996; Payne, 1990).

2.4.2 Competition Prohibited Substances

In addition to the above substances, this category includes substances that are prohibited during competition. These are tested for randomly during competition.

The substances in this category include:

- Stimulants
- Narcotics
- Cannabinoids
- Glucocorticosteroids

Stimulants' main effect is the stimulation of the central nervous system and the indirect release of adrenaline and noradrenaline. They may have the effect of reducing tiredness through increasing alertness, competitiveness and even aggression (Bloomfield et al., 1992; Mottram, 1996; Payne, 1990).

Narcotics are mainly associated with substances that produce pain relief. The narcotics act on the brain and subjectively reduce the amount of pain that is experienced. The result is that athletes are able to compete beyond their normal pain threshold (Bloomfield et al., 1992; Mottram, 1996; Payne, 1990).

Cannabinoids are chemicals that are derived from the cannabis plant, the most well known being marijuana. They induce a state of relaxation and are not generally seen as performance-enhancing. It is however included in the list of banned substances as it is considered to be detrimental to the image of sport and may be dangerous to athletes during competition as their judgement may be affected (Eight Types of Drug, 2009; Mottram, 1996).

Glucocorticosteroids has an anti-inflammatory effect and acts as a pain reliever. It is useful to mask pain and allows athletes to compete while injured or ill. It induces a state of euphoria which can lead to impaired decision making and judgement. It is also a component for the treatment of respiratory tract diseases such as asthma. Athletes seeking to open up their airways to inhale more oxygen can use Glucocorticosteroids for this use (Eight Types of Drug, 2009; Bloomfield et al., 1992; Mottram, 1996; Payne, 1990).

2.4.3 Sport Specific Prohibited Substances

This category contains substances that are prohibited in specific sports, as the effects can only be beneficial in those sports.

The substances in this category include:

- Alcohol
- Beta-blockers

Alcohol in general is detrimental to performance and can reduce concentration, coordination, reaction time, and can even cause mental confusion. However, in small dosages alcohol can reduce tremor or nervousness and can be beneficial in sports where taking aim is paramount. Such sports include archery and shooting (Mottram, 1996).

Beta blockers have an effect on the body's nervous system response by moderating the cardiac output and muscle blood flow during times of stress or arousal. This effect will be detrimental in sports that require strenuous exercise, but can improve performance in aiming sports such as archery and shooting by reducing tremor and slowing movements (Mottram, 1996).

2.5

Doping Methods in Sport

The World Anti-Doping Code (2009) includes in its prohibited list the following doping methods which are prohibited in and out of competition times:

2.5.1 Gene Doping

The use of genetic modification in the athlete's body to enhance the athletic ability is referred to as gene doping. The gene cells which are targeted for modification in the field of sport mostly include gene cells responsible for the growth and strengthening of muscles and those responsible for the production of red blood cells (WADA, 2005).

2.5.2 Enhanced Oxygen Transfer

Enhancing of oxygen transfer through any method is regarded as an attempt to gain an unfair advantage over competitors. The most common form of enhancing oxygen carrying capacity is through blood doping. The athlete increases the red blood cell count in the body by being injected with more blood prior to the competition or training. The red blood cells are responsible for carrying oxygen to the muscles. If there are more red blood cells present then more oxygen is available to the muscles, increasing the endurance of the muscles (Bloomfield et al., 1992; Mottram, 1996; Payne, 1990).

2.5.3 Chemical and Physical Manipulation

Chemical and physical manipulation refers to any methods used by an athlete to invalidate the testing results. Most often this is in the form of altering the validity or integrity of the urine sample. It has been recorded that athletes substitute another person's clean urine into their bladder through the use of a catheter (Bloomfield et al., 1992; Mottram, 1996; Payne, 1990).

2.6

Reasons for Doping in Sport

Athletes might dope for a variety of reasons. These reasons can be separated into physical, psychological and social reasons (Hanson, Venturelli, & Fleckenstein, 2005; Mottram, 1996).

2.6.1 Physical Reasons

Physical reasons why athletes might dope include performance enhancement through the need to be competitive, increasing their strength, controlling their weight, finding relief from pain, and managing injuries or illness (Anshel, 1991a; Anshel 1991b; Laure & Reinsberger, 1995; McDuff, 2005; Mottram, 1996).

2.6.2 Psychological Reasons

Psychological reasons why athletes dope includes overcoming boredom, to produce pleasure, and to find relieve from stress. There are also psychological rewards such as an increase in self-worth and self-value through admiration from peers, school officials, family, and community. Substances have a beneficial effect on confidence levels and this may also lead to better socialisation with peers through the increase in confidence (Anshel, 1991a; Anshel 1991b; Hanson et al., 2005; Laure & Reinsberger, 1995; McDuff, 2005).

2.6.3 Social Seasons

For young athletes there is an increase in attention from various sources including colleges, universities, and schools. These institutions gain from having top-level athletes at their institutions and they will often offer financial rewards for athletic performance. This results in pressure on the athlete to excel, which mostly comes from coaches, parents, peers, teachers, school administrators, media, as well as the community (Hanson et al., 2005).

Society currently places great emphasis on winning and this places athletes under extreme pressure. There is even more pressure on the athlete when the athlete is not winning. This pressure may lead to serious risk-taking behaviour in order to ensure victory (Hanson et al., 2005).

2.7

Effects of Doping in Sport

Doping can lead to health risks, some of which are known and some that remain unknown at present. Engaging in doping behaviour can result in mild to serious and even permanent physical effects, behavioural effects, as well as psychological effects (Bloomfield et al., 1992; Maravelias, Dona, Stefanidou, & Spiliopoulou, 2005; Payne, 1990; Wright & Cowart, 1990).

As there are numerous side effects for each of the banned substances and doping methods prohibited by WADA, examples will not be given here. For a comprehensive list of the effects see Keun – Youl (2005).

Conclusion

In this chapter I addressed the literature overview of my research project. I addressed the terminology associated with doping, perspectives on doping, organizations and doping, performance enhancing substances in sport, doping methods in sport, reasons for doping in sport, and the effects of doping in sport. Next I will introduce the research inquiry of my research project.

Chapter 3

Research Inquiry

Introduction

In this chapter I address the research inquiry of my research project. I address the context of my research project, the research participants, research position, research material, research quality, and the research ethics of my research project. Next I will introduce the context of my research project.

3.1

Research Context

3.1.1 Athletic Context

‘I let it all out: joy, relief, excitement, passion, and pride, especially pride in being an American.

It’s like that at the Olympic Games’.

(Michael Phelps – Team USA swimmer)

(Phelps & Abrahamson, 2008)

USA athletics have a proud history and is currently ranked the top track and field team in the world. The USA Olympic Team has also won the highest number of medals at every Olympic Games since the 1996 Olympic Games held in Atlanta. The privilege to compete for the USA at the Olympic Games is one that is sought by many athletes. Selection into Team USA for American track and field athletes is based wholly on performance at the Olympic trails. These trails are considered to be more competitive than the actual Olympic Games. This is because only the top ranked athletes at the trails qualify for the Olympic team. For example any athlete who ends fourth at the trails does not make the team, but may have been consistently running better times than some Olympic athletes from other nations. It is a rare privilege to be able to compete

at the Olympic Games, even more so for such a dominating nation such as the USA (United States of America Track and Field [USATF], 2008, 2010; “A map of,” 2008).

The athletic context informed Jones’ narrative as she was one of the top female athletes in this context of track and field athletics between 1997 and 2006. The athletic context played an important role in forming her identity as an athlete. It is within this context from where she had to make sense of her experience of lying to federal agents.

3.1.2 Television Context

The television context will play a role in the research material I used because the interview formed part of an interview by Winfrey on The Oprah Winfrey Show. The Oprah Winfrey Show has been nationally televised in the USA for 24 years. On average it is reported that 24 million viewers watch the show every week in the USA, and is broadcast in 145 countries worldwide (“Oprah Ending Talk Show”, 2009; “The Oprah Winfrey Show”; 2009).

This was Jones’ first public appearance after her release from prison, and she had a certain agenda for doing the interview. It created the opportunity for her to address topics which she might have liked the public to understand. At the same time Winfrey also had her agenda for the interview. The television context will influence how Jones approached the interview and what messages about herself she would have liked to portray to the viewers of the show. This context is relevant as this interview constitutes my research material.

3.1.3 Academic Context

This research project was conducted at the University of Pretoria within the Faculty of Humanities. The department of Psychology offer three Masters level training courses, namely: Clinical Psychology, Counselling Psychology, and Research Psychology. This research project forms part of the Counselling Psychology course, which is based upon the researcher-practitioner training model (Human, 2008).

This research project is influenced by this context in that it was informed by the guidelines as set out by the Postgraduate Research Committee and by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Pretoria (UP).

3.2

Research Participants

3.2.1 Marion Jones

Jones was an indirect participant in my research project. She is an American athlete who competed in the 60m, 100m, 200m, 400m and long jump. At the height of her career she was regarded as the fastest woman on earth. At the Sydney Olympic Games in 2000 she became the first woman to win five medals at a single Olympic Games (Jones & Sekules, 2004).

This research project used natural material in the form of an interview conducted with Jones by Winfrey in 2008 (Potter, 2004). Jones can therefore be seen as an indirect participant as no contact was made with her during this research project.

The benefits of using natural material include: 1) the researcher's own categories or assumptions are not imposed on the material during collection; 2) the research material is not separated from the social interaction of daily life; 3) it studies people's practices in the situation where it occurs; 4) it allows issues that may not be anticipated by the researcher to guide the research; 5) it includes all the complexities that the natural setting offers (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2008).

3.2.2 Oprah Winfrey

Winfrey started her career in television as a news anchor at the age of 19. She became the co-host of "People Are Talking". She then moved to Chicago and was the host of "AM Chicago". This show was later renamed "The Oprah Winfrey Show" and has remained the number one talk show for 23 consecutive seasons in the USA. She also started her own production company named Harpo, which also produces her own show ("Oprah Winfrey's Official Biography", 2008).

Talk show host Winfrey conducted an interview with Jones soon after her release from prison. She probably had a specific agenda in mind while conducting the interview which would have informed her choice of questions. She influenced my research project through leading the interview in a specific direction through her questioning.

3.2.3 Researcher

In my education in the field of psychology I completed various research modules. At a pre-graduate level I completed a module in research in the social sciences and a module in psychological research at the University of South Africa (UNISA).

At honours level at the UP I completed modules in qualitative data analysis, statistics for the social sciences, research psychology, as well as a research essay. This research project is part of the research section of my Master Degree in Counselling Psychology.

3.3

Research Position

Research in the Human Sciences can be divided into quantitative and qualitative research approaches.

3.3.1 Quantitative Research

Quantitative approaches are concerned with “the reduction of phenomena to numerical values in order to carry out statistical analyses” (Smith, 2003, p. 1). This is achieved using observation, manipulation, and the control of variables. The goal of quantitative research is to be able to replicate results, generalise results, and in so doing predict human behaviour (Henning, Van Rensburg, & Smit, 2004; Singleton, Straits, & Straits, 1993; Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2008).

3.3.2 Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is concerned with “collecting data in the form of naturalistic verbal reports... and the analysis conducted on these is textual” (Smith, 2003, p. 2). Willig (as cited in Lyons & Coyle, 2007) considers the goal of qualitative research to be concerned with meaning, sense making, and subjective experience. The qualitative approach attempts to understand how people come to attach meaning to experiences and how they make sense of these experiences (Shaw, 2002; Young & Collin, 2004).

Within qualitative research in psychology some of the main approaches include descriptive phenomenology, interpretative phenomenology, grounded theory, narrative analysis, conversation analysis, discourse analysis (Smith, 2003), action research, and ethnography (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2008).

My research study was done from a qualitative approach; within which I chose the narrative approach as my research position and methodology. I chose narrative analysis as my research position because its focus on identity helped me answer my research question. The narrative approach is explained more fully in 3.3.3.

3.3.3 Narrative Research

*Three umpires are sitting around over a beer and one says,
“There’s balls and there’s strikes and I call `em the way they are”.
Another says, “There’s balls and there’s strikes and I call `em the way I see them”.
The third says, “There’s balls and there’s strikes and they ain’t nothin’ until I call `em”.
(Anderson, 1990, p. 75)*

The above metaphor will be used to explain the main theoretical positions in narrative research.

3.3.3.1 Narrative and Reality

“There’s balls and there’s strikes and I call `em the way they are” (Anderson, 1990, p. 75).

In this metaphor the “balls” and “strikes” are reality. Reality exists external to the person in the “balls” and “strikes” that occur in the cricket match. Knowledge of this reality lies in the accurate description of the “balls” and “strikes”. Knowledge is equal to reality. The role of the umpire in this cricket match is to make the “call”, using language to give a reflection of reality. The umpire refers to himself as “I” and this “I” is the narrator, and the “call” is the narrative. The umpire is considered knowledgeable when his “call” gives an accurate reflection of the “balls” and “strikes” as they happened (Durrheim, 1997; Shaw, 2002; Smith, 2008).

From a positivist position reality exists ‘out there’, outside of human influence, and knowledge about it is there to be discovered by anyone. Narrative research from this position aims to give an accurate reflection of this reality. Due to the external nature of reality it is there to be measured, labelled, and described. The narrative contains a unitary truth in its objective reflection of reality. Language from this position reflects reality. Language is the way in which knowledge is communicated to other people. Language therefore can be considered as neutral with regards its role in gaining knowledge. Language has a communicative function and only serves the purpose of communicating this reality (Durrheim, 1997; Shaw, 2002; Smith, 2008).

Another metaphor that can be used to describe this position is that of a mirror. A mirror offers an exact reflection of that which is in front of it. Reality exists out there in the external world and a narrative is an exact reflection of reality. Accurately observing reality, and then accurately describing it through a narrative, is considered knowledge. Language is just the tool a person can use with which to describe the reflection (Durrheim, 1997; Shaw, 2002; Smith, 2008).

3.3.3.2 Narrative and Perception

“There’s balls and there’s strikes and I call `em the way I see them” (Anderson, 1990, p. 75).

In this metaphor the focus now shifts to the inner world of the umpire. The “balls” and “strikes” occur in the cricket match and the role of the umpire in this cricket match is to make the “call”, using language to give a description of his perception of the “balls” and “strikes”. The “balls” and “strikes” are considered reality, the umpire or the “I” is the narrator and the “call” is the narrative, but the narrative now describes the inner world of the umpire. Knowledge is the perception of reality of the umpire. Knowledge is equal to the inner world of the umpire (Raskin, 2002; Shaw, 2002; Young & Collin, 2004).

From this position knowledge is seen as being ‘in there’ and is equal to a person’s perceptions of reality. People actively engage in constructing their perception of reality and the narrative carries this perception. Narrative research from this position aims to reflect the perception of the individual or the differences in perceptions of people. From this position language reflects the subjective experience of the individual. Language is used to create a conceptual representation or insight into the experience of a person. Language therefore can be considered as neutral with regards its role in gaining knowledge. Language has a communicative function and only serves the purpose of communicating subjective experience to others (Durrheim, 1997; Kotzé & Kotzé, 1997; Raskin, 2002; Shaw, 2002; Young & Collin, 2004).

Another metaphor that can be used to describe this position is to look at a piece of art. The artwork remains exactly the same for all observers, yet each will create different perceptions of the artwork. Knowledge can be discovered through attaining an accurate description of each person’s perception. Here language is a tool to be used in order to communicate the different perceptions to others.

3.3.3.3 Narrative and Identity(ies)

I have chosen the constructionism position of narrative for my research project and will therefore elaborate more on this position. I have chosen this position as it will help me answer my research question.

“There’s balls and there’s strikes and they ain’t nothin’ until I call them”

(Anderson, 1990, p. 75)

The focus now shifts to how the umpire constructs reality through the interplay of his inner and outer world. The umpire experiences seeing the “balls” and “strikes” while he is standing in the cricket match. The “balls” and “strikes” represent the physical reality, but this reality does not yet carry meaning. The umpire, represented by the “I” is the narrator of the “call”, which is the narrative. As soon as the umpire makes the “call” he constructs meaning of seeing the “balls” and “strikes”. It is only then that the “balls” and “strikes” come to carry any meaning. Language became the means for the umpire to make the “call”, constructing meaning of the “balls” and “strikes”. The “call” is constructed by the umpire but the “call” also constructs the umpire. By constructing the “call” the umpire communicates something about the meaning of the “balls” and “strikes”, but at the same time the “call” tells us something about the umpire. Firstly it tells us something about the identity of the “I”. The identity of the “I” is that of an umpire. Further it can tell us something about the umpire. For example, if the umpire’s “call” follows the laws of the game of cricket and he makes the correct decision according to these laws, he then tells us something about his competency as an umpire. Andrews remarks that “stories are not only the way in which we come to ascribe significance to experiences... they are one of the primary means through which we constitute our very selves...” (2000, pp. 77-78). Jones told the narrative of how she made sense of her experiences but she also constituted herself through the narrative she told. This research project is specifically interested in how she constituted herself through her narrative (Crossely, 2000; Kotzé & Kotzé, 1997; Sclater, 2003; Sparkes, 1999).

The constructionism position views narratives as being constructed and constructive. Narrative research from this position aims to determine how a person gives meaning to significant experiences and constructs a narrative, as well as how the narrative is constructive of the identity(ies) of the person. This is achieved through the analysis of the interplay between experience, construction of meaning and the role language plays in constructing meaning of experience. From this position people exist in language, not with language. Therefore, meaning and understanding is not just communicated using language, but is created through language. Language now shifts from being neutral to being performative and constructive, therefore having

a “doing” function. Reality is performed and constructed between individuals using language (Durrheim, 1997; Jenkins, 2001; Kotzé & Kotzé, 1997; Raskin, 2002; Smith, 2008).

The construction of narratives gives meaning to experiences and identities are constructed by the narratives. History and culture are the building blocks of a narrative. Each of these characteristics of narrative will be discussed below.

3.3.3.3.1 Narrative and Experience

People are narrators by nature. We tell narratives, we listen to narratives, narratives inform us about other people, and narratives affect us. People turn their experiences into narratives so that they may be shared with other people and also to provide us with a means to create an understanding of our lived experiences and allows for experiences to continue through narratives (Kotzé & Kotzé, 1997; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002; Sparkes, 1999; Young & Collin, 2004).

The experiences or events that make up these narratives are connected in a lineal sequence through time and “the success of this storying of experience provides persons with a sense of continuity and meaning in their lives...” (White & Epston, 1990, p. 10). Jones storied her experiences in the interview with Winfrey and this narrative allowed her to make sense of her experiences. She was able to gain a sense of continuity in her life through the construction of this narrative.

3.3.3.3.2 Narrative and Identity

As people attach meaning to their experiences in their personal narratives they are actively engaged in creating their identities, in constructing meaning in their lives. The self is retained through narrative in that people story themselves. People do not just narrate their experiences, they narrate their very existence. These identities create continuity in their lives (Crossley, 2000; Human 2008; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Riessman, in press; Sclater, 2003; Smith, 2003; Sparkes, 1999; White & Epston, 1990).

Identities are constructive in that they influence the interpretation of new experiences. Identities are also reflective in that identities are reflected in the narrative. The investigation of a narrative allows for the interpretation of the identities of the narrator. Multiple identities can inform our interpretations of experience. Three identities were constructed in Jones' narrative and will be addressed in chapter four (Crossley, 2000; Human 2008; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Riessman, in press; Sclater, 2003; Smith, 2003; Sparkes, 1999; White & Epston, 1990).

3.3.3.3 Narrative and History

This continuity in people's lives can leave them with a sense of permanence or predictability in their lives, in that they are left with something that they can trace throughout time. Ricoeur (as cited in Pellauer, 2007) gives an explanation of how narrative can be used to construct this permanence throughout time. People use narratives to understand themselves through time, to see their lives as having a past, present, and a future. When people's interpretations of these experiences are arranged throughout time, they form an understanding of their lives (Crossley, 2000; Sparkes, 1999).

A narrative not only allows us to make sense of lived experiences, but it also allows us to interpret new experiences in such a way that the continuity of our interpreted lives persists. Because narrative has a past, present, and a future, it can be expected that the lived past and the expected future will play a role in our interpretation of experience in the present. Our past or lived history therefore determines how we interpret new experiences in the present. Our future or expected outcomes would also play a role in our interpretation of current experiences. Therefore, experiences in the present are interpreted taking into account the past (lived experience) as well as the future (expected outcomes). This allows people to trace their identities through time and allows for those identities to continue into the future (White & Epston, 1990).

Lived experience and future expectations are also influenced by the social constructs created within a specific culture. The language we grow up and live in within a specific culture, specify

or constitute the experiences we have. Experiences are therefore also culturally bound (Kotzé & Kotzé, 1997; Young & Collin, 2004).

3.3.3.3.4 Narrative and Culture

Culture can be described as social constructs created within a specific culture. They are ways of thinking, acting and communicating. They are constructed and constructive. People construct discourses through the continued use of cultural perspectives and practices, but these discourses also construct how cultural perspectives and practices are implemented. People draw on the symbolic resources available to them from their culture. The various discourses in society have a constitutive or shaping effect on the personal discourses and lives of people. Cultural discourses therefore play a determining role in how people make sense of their lives (Durrheim, 1997; Jenkins, 2001; Kotzé & Kotzé, 1997; Shaw, 2002; Young & Collin, 2004).

People develop or are exposed to certain cultural backgrounds throughout their lives and hence they develop a familiarity for constructing narratives from this cultural background. They become familiar with certain ways of constructing narratives and this contributes to the attempt to create continuity in their narratives. The development of identities is another way in which continuity is achieved. Jones was exposed to a sporting background and hence her culture in American sport informed her narrative (Crossley, 2000; Lock, Epston, & Maisel, 2004; Sparkes, 1999).

3.4

Research Material

Two narrative analysis approaches are discussed by Ollerenshaw & Creswell (2002), namely the problem-solution approach and the three-dimensional space approach. This research project is based on the three-dimensional space approach, which allowed for the investigation of identities in the research material.

3.4.1 Narrating I used natural research material in the form of an interview of Jones

conducted by Winfrey on The Oprah Winfrey Show (Potter, 2004). The interview was conducted in Chicago, Illinois in the USA and aired in the USA on October 27, 2008. The interview was also broadcast in South Africa on SABC3.

3.4.2 Receiving The interview was downloaded from The Oprah Winfrey Show website on October 30, 2008.

3.4.3 Transcribing Transcription is viewed as an important first step in the analysis process. Gaining extensive familiarity with the research material that will be used for analysis is an advantage gained by transcribing your own interview material. I transcribed the interview myself to gain familiarity with the content of the interview and to gain familiarity with the identities portrayed by Jones. I watched and re-watched the interview and typed out the interview transcript over a two week period (Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, & Liamputtong, 2007).

3.4.4 Analysing I conducted the analysis based on the three dimensional space approach suggested by Ollerenshaw and Creswell (2002). This approach suggests the investigation of the interplay of self, social, place, and history within a narrative. I analysed the text using the above approach, which allowed me to identify the identities constructed by Jones in her narrative. I then looked at the interplay of those identities in the narrative.

3.4.5 Reflecting I critically reflected on the influence that this research project had on me, which forms part of chapter five.

2.4.6 Writing The writing up of my research project is in the form of this research report.

3.5

Research Quality

3.5.1 Supervision

To enhance the quality of my research project I was in supervision in which I received feedback on my work on an individual basis (Hames, 2007). Topics covered in supervision to enhance the quality of my work included structural and technical elements of my research project, the application of my research position and methodology, and methods to enhance the reporting my research findings.

3.5.2 Peer-Supervision

To enhance the quality of my research project I was involved with a peer supervision group in which all my work was critically evaluated by fellow MA I and MA II students (Hames, 2007). The elements that were critically evaluated to enhance the quality of my work included the structure and layout of my research project, the application of my research position and methodology, as well as the linguistic quality of the writing up of my research project.

3.6

Research Ethics

3.6.1 Postgraduate Committee

I sent a research proposal to the Post-Graduate Committee in the Faculty of Humanities at UP. They approved my research proposal and I received feedback from the committee regarding theoretical as well as ethical considerations in my research project.

3.6.2 Ethics Committee

My research proposal was approved by the Ethics Committee of UP. From an ethical point of view I addressed the issues concerning consent and the material storage of my research project.

Conclusion

In this chapter I addressed the research inquiry of my research project. I addressed the research context, research participants, research position, research material, research quality, and the research ethics of my research project. Next I will discuss the research results.

Chapter 4

Analysis

Introduction

Andrews remarks that “stories are not only the way in which we come to ascribe significance to experiences... they are one of the primary means through which we constitute our very selves...” (2000, pp. 77-78). Jones constructed her narrative in the interview conducted by Winfrey, and through her use of language came to ascribe significance to her experiences. Not only did she ascribe significance to her experiences, but she constituted herself in the narrative. The metaphor described in 3.3.3.3 stated:

“There’s balls and there’s strikes and they ain’t nothin’ until I call them”

(Anderson, 1990, p. 75)

Jones “calls” her past experiences to ascribe significance to these experiences, and in doing so constitutes her athlete identity. Jones then “calls” her recent past (prison) and present experiences to ascribe significance to these experiences, and so constitutes her felon identity. Jones also “calls” her expected future, and in doing so she constitutes the development of her person identity.

In the analysis of Jones’ narrative the abovementioned three identities came to the fore (refer to 3.3.3.3.2). Jones’s narrative is presented in terms of the development of these three identities separately, and looked at through the interplay of the context, personal, social, and her history. After presenting Jones’ narrative in terms of the three identities the interplay of these identities are discussed.

4.1

Athlete Identity

Jones introduced her identity as an athlete as originating from as early as childhood. As a young child she realised she ‘had something that everybody else didn’t’ (L113). She realised that when she was running she was always ‘further ahead’ (L114), ‘stronger’ (L115) and ‘faster’ (L116) than everyone else. She recalls that from ‘an early age I was winning races’ (L111). She added that this realisation came from an early age and did not just develop as a college or professional athlete. As a college athlete and as a professional athlete she was ‘still beating people’ (L116). She was ‘just continuing’ (L116) her winning ways. Her experiences of beating other people at running from an early age continually informed her athlete identity. She shared her personal realisations, and indirectly introduced all her competitors as the role players that led to these realisations. Coming to the conclusion that she had something that others did not have came about in relation to where she finished in races compared to her competitors. Jones used her performance history to dispel any thoughts of ever thinking she needed to dope to be able to beat her competitors. She added that she ‘never thought that’ (L110) she needed to use performance enhancing substances to be competitive. She used her experience of continually beating others to make it clear that she never thought that she had to gain an advantage provided by doping because she had been beating people without it for so long.

Jones then introduced her as an adult athlete, and specifically to the role that supplements played in her training. She knew she had to take ‘a number of supplements and vitamins’ (L67) to optimise her ‘energy’ (L67) levels and keep her ‘on an even playing field’ (L67) with the other athletes. She introduced her competition with her competitors as informing her behaviour to take supplements so that she ‘can be on an even playing field with everybody else’ (L67). Jones made sense of her usage of supplements as one of the areas where she needed to stay on par with her competitors. She named ‘vitamin C, vitamin E ... creatine’ (L81) as things she was taking to supplement her training program. She introduced her coach as the one who was responsible for what she was taking. She did this by saying; ‘I was given it by my coach, Trevor Graham’ (L17), ‘I was told I was being given’ (L59) and ‘he told me’ (L61 & L71). She added that a few times prior to the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games she had been given what she believed to be flaxseed

oil. This was over and above the usual supplements and vitamins she was taking. She had taken it by placing a few drops ‘under her tongue’ (L71) for a few moments and then swallowing. She mentioned that her coach did not at any time say to her to keep their supplement combinations a secret. She added that normally that type of information is not discussed among athletes as they do not want to ‘give anybody else the edge’ (L74). Through her past experiences she therefore did not suspect anything out of the ordinary regarding talking about her supplements because ‘things are very hush-hush in the world of athletics’ (L74). It was expected to keep such information a secret.

Jones then addressed her experiences of how she felt during her training just prior to the 2000 Olympic Games. She recalled she ‘had more energy on the track’ (L76). She ‘felt stronger’ (L95). She ‘felt powerful’ (L96). She felt ‘a little bit faster’ (L97) just prior to the Olympic Games. She felt better at the end of training sessions and she reports she ‘felt really good, when typically you probably would not really feel good at the end of a workout’ (L76). She did not attribute this to the flaxseed oil but to her entire training program. She reported that her training regime is such that she is ‘suppose to be better’ (L100) in the Olympic year. She viewed her ‘hard training’ (L79) and getting the correct supplements combination ‘working in conjunction with what I’m doing in the weights room’ (L79) as the cause of her increased performance. For this reason she again did not suspect anything out of the ordinary with her supplements. Her training was meant to make her feel stronger and faster in the build-up to the Olympic Games, therefore not making her suspicious.

Victor Conte was introduced as a role player after he had remarked in another television interview in 2004 that he had personally given and seen Marion Jones inject herself with the clear (a designer steroid) before the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games. Jones’ former husband and coach had a working relationship with Conte and had approached him asking for supplement advice for Jones as well as the whole training group. She mentioned that she had ‘met him a few times in the past’ (L140) but does not regard herself as having any form of ‘relationship or friendship’ (L141) with him. Marion Jones denied the allegations made by Victor Conte and says ‘I do not particularly know why he would lie’ (L136).

After the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games Jones was invited to meet with prosecutors regarding a case they were investigating concerning the use of performance enhancing drugs in track and field athletics. They interviewed her in 2000 and again in 2001. In the first interview she had her attorneys present and there were also three federal prosecutors present in a conference room. They presented a substance named the clear. She reported that when ‘I saw the substance I knew that I had taken the substance’ (L14). She recognised it as the substance ‘that had been given to’ (L25) her by her coach but under the name of flaxseed oil.

She then introduced her personal experiences at the moment when she realised she had used that banned substance. She said she: ‘thought about my family’ (L43) and ‘how proud they were’ (L44) of her. She thought about ‘how disappointed they would be’ (L44). She thought about her ‘kid at the time’ (L45). She thought about the implications on her ‘finances’ (L46) and her ‘sponsors’ (L47). She said she was ‘saddened’ (L41) because she knew she had ‘worked hard’ (L41) and that she possessed ‘a great amount of talent’ (L41), but now she questioned that. She questioned ‘how much that assisted me at the Sydney Games’ (L41). She ‘had worked so hard’ (L26) to get where she was at that point and she knew ‘that all of that was going to be questioned’ (L26). When she realised that’s what she had been taking; ‘I made the decision that I was going to lie and I was going to try and cover it up’ (L32). She realised that all of her ‘performances would be questioned’ (L36). The interplay of her personal experience, the context of being interviewed by federal prosecutors, and the possible expected future implications on her identity as an athlete informed her decision to lie and attempt to cover it up (refer to 3.3.3.3.3).

She then introduced her thoughts regarding the person that had given her the substance. She reported that she was ‘very disappointed’ (L153 & L156), ‘mad’ (L156), and ‘upset’ (L156) at the discovery that she had been given a performance enhancing substance by her coach. ‘I question my decision to hire him as a coach’ (L154) and ‘question not questioning him’ (L155), especially regarding the supplements he was giving her. After the interview with the federal prosecutors and finding out that she had been given a banned substance by her coach, Jones mentioned that she did not confront him. ‘I didn’t say anything to him’ (L158). She decided that she had already made ‘the ultimate decision’ (L158) to lie and that she ‘just continued the lie’ (L163). She was ‘concerned’ (L162) that if she now confronted the situation that ‘people would

start to question um, to question me’ (L162). She made the decision that she ‘would never take anything that he gave me again’ (L162).

After she learned about her doping she mentioned that to be able to live with herself for lying she would often say that she has ‘never knowingly taken performance enhancing drugs’ (L165). She mentioned that by adding the ‘knowingly’ (L165) she was technically ‘telling the truth’ (L165). She also kept her knowledge of having been given performance enhancing substances to herself until she told her now husband, who at that stage was a very good friend.

Jones then offered insight into her reflections on her behaviour during the interview with the federal prosecutors. In hind sight and looking back at her decisions while being interviewed, she added that ‘things would have been different’ (L54) had she ‘taken that five minute break’ (L54) to seek the advice of her attorneys. She said she would probably have made a different decision had she consulted them.

In 2006/2007 Jones ‘was approached by federal prosecutors’ (L176) again with information that she had indeed lied to them back in 2000 and 2001. They presented her with the options of ‘either we were going to trail or I was going to have to plead’ (L176).

She called a press conference to explain what had transpired and give her planned actions for the immediate future. She wanted to apologise to all those that she has hurt as a result of her choices, and mentions that ‘my family’ is at the top of that list (L216). She added that her team mates, who have had to give up their medals, fell in the ‘whomever I have hurt’ (L216). She made it clear that her wrong doing was ‘to lie to federal prosecutors’ (L231). She did not intend to cheat by taking banned substances; she unknowingly was given it. She had the same intentions as her team mates that day in Sydney and that was to win the gold medal, knowing they were all drug free. She reported that for them to have to give up their medals must be ‘horrible’ (L221). She made it clear that she apologised to all that her mistake affected, and that was the mistake of lying. She mentioned that she is ‘trying to move on’ (L233) and that she hopes her team mates ‘can move on to’ (L233).

Jones then takes us to the experience of giving back the medals that she had won at the 2000 Olympic Games. She had given them to representatives of the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and United States Track and Field (USTF). She did not attach great sentiment to the medals themselves by saying ‘it’s not about the hardware’ (L187), but reports that ‘it is the memory that will be tarnished’ (L188). She remembered her family and seeing ‘the pride in their faces’ (L189) when she won. Those memories are the ones that are now tarnished.

Jones then offered her current views regarding her athletics career and identity as an athlete. She mentioned that ‘I would go through the races in my head’ (L194) and she still struggles with not knowing whether she would have won had she not been given a banned substance. She added that ‘just the fact that there is a question mark, um, is not fair’ (L200). She also said that it is not fair for “anybody that I ran against’ (L198) or ‘the woman who ran with me on the relay’ (L199). She still believed that she ‘would have won’ (L198) those races. Her performance history still informed her belief that she would have won those races, but it is the uncertainty that she felt was not fair.

She mentioned that all of her medals, performances and records from 2000 onwards have been erased from the records. She acknowledged Oprah Winfrey’s statement: ‘erased from the record books as though you never ever existed’ (L205), showing that she recognised that her athlete identity has been taken away, as though she never existed. This experience led her to thoughts about her kids. She thought of the day when she has to explain to them why she suddenly disappeared from the record books. She mentioned she has to explain to them that ‘all of a sudden, you know there is no mommy’ (L209).

She still maintained that she never knowingly took performance enhancing substances and that her mistake was that she lied to the federal prosecutors. She added that she paid the ultimate price, and states that ‘the ultimate price is having your name and your reputation and everything that you stood for, just ripped away’ (L235).

Narrative Commentary

The context in which this narrative was told was in the interview with Winfrey in 2008 (refer to 3.3.3.3.1). This was soon after her release from prison. The identity from which Jones conducted the interview was that of a convicted felon. Jones's felon identity is discussed in more detail in 4.2. When Jones presented her past experiences she constructed her athletic identity in the narrative (refer to 3.3.3.3.2 and 3.3.3.3.3). When referring to her past it became clear that Jones' athlete identity was dominant from a very young age. She addressed her development as an athlete, her attributes as an athlete, her use of supplements, the experience of being interviewed by federal investigators, and her experiences regarding, and the consequences of, her use of a prohibited substance.

She viewed herself as talented and hard working. She regarded herself as a very competitive athlete with very high standards of performance and achievement. As an athlete she also viewed her self as having to use supplements as a way to keep on an even playing field with the other athletes (refer to 3.3.3.3.4). She viewed her supplement use in a secretive light, but did not present it as being secretive due to an attempt to hide the unlawful nature of the activity. She rather viewed it as being the norm of the athletic context. Her athlete identity was the dominant identity that she constructed that informed her making sense of her experiences from early childhood until early in 2008.

In the interview with federal investigators she was then presented with the realisation that she had unknowingly doped. This proved to be a major challenge to her athlete identity. This challenge potentially threatened the only identity in her narrative up to that point. She proceeded to lie about her doping. While the act of lying can be seen from a moral standpoint, here the psychological function of that lie is considered. The lie was her attempt to allow her identity as an athlete to continue (refer to 3.3.3.3.3). Due to the dominant nature of this identity she had no choice but to allow it to continue as she did not construct another identity from which to interpret her experiences. She succeeded in allowing her identity as an athlete to continue by keeping this lie a secret until 2007 when she made a press statement in which she admitted to her doping and having lied to federal investigators.

Jones was banned from athletics and her Olympic medals and all her records from 2000 onwards were removed. From a legal position her athlete identity was taken from her and not allowed to continue. She accentuated this by saying ‘the ultimate price is having your name and your reputation and everything that you stood for, just ripped away’ (L235).

4.2

Felon Identity

In 2000 and 2001 Jones was interviewed by federal prosecutors regarding doping in track and field athletics. She lied to the prosecutors and added that this was the ‘bad decision’ (L13) that led to her going to prison. This bad decision was the cause of her prison experience in 2008, an experience that contributed to her construction of her identity as a convicted felon.

After introducing the cause of her prison experience Jones returns to her views of prison prior to being incarcerated. Jones reflected on her preconceived idea about prison and adds that she also had the preconceived idea created by the media that prison was a life or death struggle where you can easily lose your life. She added that she probably had the same idea that ‘most people have’ of prison (L251). She shared that her experience of prison ‘was not like that at all’ (L259). She highlighted this by saying that in prison ‘you don’t have to be watching your back every second’ (L260). On the contrary, she added by saying that she met ‘very interesting people’ (L244) in prison and through her interaction with them she actually gained rather than lost.

Jones shared her experience of meeting these very interesting people and she could associate with them in that they, as she did, made a bad choice in life. She added that ‘some of these women made one bad choice’ (L248) and are now spending up to ‘20 years’ (L248) in prison. She compared her six months to their sentences and said that ‘it starts giving me strength’ (L248). Seeing them ‘wake up every morning and smile and have the energy to get through the day’ (L249) knowing that they have many years left in prison gave her strength to also get through the day. She also remarked that it placed what she considers as ‘the ultimate price, six months’ (L247) into perspective. She thought ‘I can do this’ (L250). She gained strength not only to get

through each day, but also to be able to see the end of this experience and get through her sentence.

In prison Jones also regained an appreciation for the smaller things in life that are often taken for granted. In her response: "...to do the little things... I appreciate so much more now the little things" (L267) she referred to gains that she currently experiences as a result of some of her experiences as a felon.

From gaining strength and appreciation through her prison experience Jones also added that she suffered consequences due to her prison experience. Jones listed the consequence of being away from her family as the most difficult she faced. She accentuated the difficulty of being away from her family by adding: "...being away from my kids on their birthday..." (L238) and "...not experiencing those milestones, you can't ever get those back" (L241). Her prison experience allowed her to gain through the interaction with other prisoners, but also led to her losing time with her family.

She also added that while being away from her family was the 'hardest part' (L263), 'the second hardest part was being told what to do' (L263). She accentuated her difficulty with this by adding that they would tell her what to do regardless 'if you are Marion Jones or not' (L263). She had gone from a world famous athlete; the proverbial top of the food chain, to being a prisoner and being told what to do; considered the proverbial bottom of the food chain. She acknowledged this by saying that you can be 'up here at one point and down here the next' (L349).

Jones also offered a review of her prison sentence and while saying that 'the sentence was fair' (L271), she made her disappointment in the sentence clear. This 'disappointment' (L270) was based on the consequences of having to be away from her family. She added that she would have liked 'confinement or probation' (L274) and would have worn the ankle bracelet 'all day and all night, to be with my family' (L276). This not being the case, she had 'to live with' (L279) the consequences of her sentence. She added that 'I made the bad choice that put my future and my freedom in somebody else's hands and make that choice for me' (L278).

After her release from prison Jones still had consequences that she was faced with. Some of the consequences that resulted due to her prison sentence include that she was on probation for a period of ‘two years’ (L2). In the USA each state has different laws regarding the voting rights of citizens. In Texas, where Marion is a resident, you only regain your right to vote two years after your probation (State by State Info, 2009). Therefore another consequence she had to face was that she will not be able to vote in the next election. In addition to her probation she also added that she has ‘800 hours of community service’ (L3) that she needed to complete. While she was experiencing these consequences, she made sense of these by viewing them as ‘part of the consequences that I have to face’ (L10) due to her previous bad decisions.

Narrative Commentary

The context of this narrative is the interview by Winfrey, which took place soon after Jones’ release from prison (refer to 3.3.3.3.1). Her felon identity is the one she constructed as her present identity at the time of the interview. She addressed her prison experiences (recent past) as well as the current consequences that she was experiencing as a result of her prison experience (refer to 3.3.3.3.3).

She regarded herself as responsible for making the bad decision and having given someone else the power to give her the felon identity. She constructed the felon identity not as one of choice, but one that was given to her. From a legal position this identity was bestowed upon her. She viewed her felon identity as one where she lost as well as gained while being in prison. She viewed herself as having lost time with her family that she can never get back, while she gained strength and appreciation for the small things again.

While it was her felon identity that was dominant in the context of the interview, she constructed a third identity, which she implied will be more dominant in her future.

4.3

Person Identity

Jones reported that she has ‘learnt a lot about’ (L282) herself. For her this does not only include her experience of spending six months in prison but also all that led up to that experience. She stated that it was ‘not just my prison experience, but everything before that’ (L287) which ‘has got me to where I am now’ (L287). She felt she is ‘older’ (L285), ‘wiser’ (L286), and ‘finally at a point’ (L284) where ‘it’s me’ (L288).

She said she doesn’t ‘have athletics anymore to hide behind’ (L287). She reported that it used to be ‘Marion Jones the athlete, but when you take that away it almost felt like, a bit ashamed, not as confident in myself’ (L290). She was concerned that she was ‘not living up to Marion Jones the athlete’ (L292). Her concern stretched to her belief ‘that everything beyond being athletic wasn’t really good enough’ (L293). She added that without the successful and great athletic side she did not feel that she was good enough.

This has resulted in her being ‘happy in the skin’ (L341) that she is in. She felt that for the first time people were speaking to her with truth, speaking to her and seeing her for the person that she really is. She added that she felt in the past people were speaking to her as Marion Jones the athlete. Now that part is gone, and people are speaking to her because of her. She hopes that people might be inspired to see how she has managed to go from ‘up here’ (L349) to ‘down here’ (L349) and walk away at the end being ‘ok with herself’ (L349). She hopes ‘that in itself will inspire people and help people’ (L350).

She mentioned that she has retired from the sport and will never run again. She experienced sadness because she loves to compete. The nature of professional sport is competitiveness and Jones remarked that she ‘loves to compete’ (L304). With the end of her identity as an athlete she was saddened because she could no longer engage in what that level of sport is ultimately about. She said that she is now ‘energised by this next chapter’ (L305) and driven by it being ‘bigger and better than that last chapter’ (L305). She is now driven by the goal of connecting ‘with people at a much bigger level’ (L306). She wanted to ‘help young people make certain choices

and not make certain bad choices’ (L307) like she made. She wanted her legacy now ‘to be this’ (L308), ‘to connect with people on a much bigger level’ (L306) and to ‘help young people’ (L307) make better choices. She added that she wanted this legacy to be ‘something for my kids to be proud of’ (L309).

Narrative Commentary

In the interview with Winfrey, Jones’ dominant identity was that of the felon, but she also introduced certain changes regarding this identity. There was development from her felon identity to one which would leave her with a positive future. She gave an insight into her expected future and was in the process of constructing a new identity with which she could continue into the future (refer to 3.3.3.3.3). She constructed her identity as a person as her identity of the future. She addressed the development of this identity thus far and also gave an insight into what this identity would have in store for her in the future.

This identity resulted from her prison experience as well as all the experiences that led up to her prison sentence. As a person she viewed herself as older, wiser, and finally being at a point where she feels like herself. Previously as an athlete she viewed herself as having poor confidence and not being good enough without the athletic side. Her identity as a person leaves her feeling happy in her own skin and allowed for confidence without having to be an outstanding athlete. This identity also allowed her to interpret her communication with others as being more sincere and truthful. This identity left her feeling energised for what was to come.

4.4

Interplay of Identities

A narrative not only allows us to make sense of past and present experiences, but it also allows us to interpret new experiences in such a way that the continuity of our interpreted lives persists (White & Epston, 1990). Her past experiences was constructive of her athlete identity, her present experiences was constructive of her felon identity, and though the interplay of these, allowed her

to construct the person identity, one which leaves her with continuity in her life (refer to 3.3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.3.2, & 3.3.3.3.3).

Athlete Identity as Past

Jones' past was constructive of her athlete identity. As an athlete Jones considered herself as 'up here' (L349). She possessed something that everybody else didn't' (L113), considered herself as having 'a great amount of talent' (L41) and having 'worked so hard' (L26). She also added that she used to hide behind her athletics. She added that she doesn't 'have athletics anymore to hide behind' (L287). She reported that it used to be 'Marion Jones the athlete, but when you take that away it almost felt like, a bit ashamed, not as confident in myself' (L290). She believed 'that everything beyond being athletic wasn't really good enough' (L293). She therefore associated strongly with her dominant identity as an athlete and through her reflection on her life while an athlete, states that there was not really anything else other than the athlete.

She was then confronted with the experience of being interviewed by federal investigators in her capacity as an athlete and learned that she had been given a performance enhancing substance. This knowledge posed a great threat to her athlete identity. Potentially this could have spelled the end of her identity and hence her sense of continuity in her life (refer to 3.3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.3.2, & 3.3.3.3.3). Her thoughts went immediately to all the aspects of her life that would be affected by this knowledge. She thought about her 'family' (L43), her 'finances' (L46), and her 'sponsors' (L47). It made her question her identity as an athlete and would result in others questioning her as an athlete. 'I made the decision that I was going to lie and I was going to try and cover it up' (L32). The psychological function of her lying to the federal investigators was an attempt to cover up the threat to her identity as an athlete. This would allow her identity as an athlete to continue.

In 2007 the ban from competition and having her records and medals removed meant that the authorities had halted the continuation of her athlete identity. From a legal position her athlete identity was not allowed to continue. The end of this identity left her with no continuity into the future.

Felon Identity as Present

Jones was then sent to prison and this marks the start of her felon identity. The legal position gave her a new identity when she was sentenced to prison, one of convicted felon. While this was not a voluntary construction of an identity she accepted this identity in her narrative. Her experiences in prison were now interpreted from this identity. When Jones was released from prison her felon identity was legally halted, even though there were still consequences such as community service and a criminal record present after her release from prison. Legally Jones was not regarded as a felon anymore and again she was not left with continuity going into the future. While Jones's dominant identity in the present context of the interview with Winfrey was that of a felon, she already presented the development of her identity as a person. She presented this identity as one which left her with continuity and a positive future.

In addition to allowing a positive expected future for herself, she also reinterpreted her athletic and prison experiences as allowing her identity as a person to be constructed. She mentioned that she has managed to go from 'up here' (L349) to 'down here' (L349) and walk away at the end being 'ok with herself' (L349) She also felt that she has reached a point where she is 'happy in the skin that' (L341) she is in. She felt that 'it's me' (L288) and felt comfortable with who is. It appeared as if she needed to experience the extremes of being 'up here' (L349) to 'down here' (L349) to be able to find the middle ground of being a person. She discovered her person identity through the interplay of her athlete identity and felon identity.

Person Identity as Future

In her narrative Jones mentioned certain goals and future expectations, especially with regards her children. She mentioned wanting to leave a legacy that her children could be proud of. Her identity as a person opened up the option for her to leave a legacy for her 'kids to be proud of' (L309). This identity also allowed her to 'help' (L307) and 'inspire' (L350) others. This identity is presented as the one with which she is going to go into the future.

Furthermore, she added that she had hidden behind her athletics for fear that her true view of herself will emerge. She says:

‘I truly believe that the reason I made that awful mistake and a few thereafter was because I didn’t love myself enough to tell the truth and hidden behind my obvious talents for much of my life for fear that the weak, sad, hurt and vulnerable Marion would emerge and ruin the plan for my life’ (L327).

Jones added that ‘a lot of that has to do with, you know, trauma in my childhood, and kind of repressing feelings and things like that and I think’ (L298). Another consequence of the interplay of these three identities allowed Jones to be freed from her emotional prison. Before the prison experience it appears as if Jones’ athlete identity came with the price of acting as a shield for internal conflicts and unresolved emotions she was experiencing. The superstar context of being a world class athlete and constantly being in the public eye did not allow Jones to resolve this internal conflict and emotions. Emotionally she was a prisoner in that context. She made sense of her prison experience as allowing her to resolve her internal conflicts and emotions and then be ‘happy in the skin’ (L341) she’s in. She had to experience going to prison and becoming a felon for her to be freed from her emotional prison as an athlete.

It is important to note that while from a legal perspective her athlete and felon identity was not allowed to continue, these identities will always remain part of Jones life narrative. While they may not be dominant identities anymore, these multiple identities continue to inform her (refer to 3.3.3.3.2). This was evident in Jones’s narrative where she spoke of her prison experiences. She mentioned that in prison the guards would tell her what to do and when to do it, regardless ‘if you are Marion Jones or not’ (L263). Her dominant identity at that time was that of a felon, yet how others treated her was still informed by her past identity of an athlete. She also commented on her experience of sadness because she would no longer run. She remarked that this was because she ‘loves to compete’ (L304). Her competitiveness was also still informed by her athlete identity.



Conclusion

I presented Jones's narrative in terms of the development of these three identities, namely: the athlete, the felon, and the person. I looked at the interplay of the context, the personal, the social, and her history. I then looked at the interplay of Jones' constructed identities.

Chapter 5

Summary

Introduction

This chapter will provide a summary of the research on doping in sport psychology as well a summary of my research findings. Then an integration of the research review and research findings is provided. Shortcomings and recommendations are made and a personal commentary will address the impact of this study on the researcher. Next a short summary of the research review will be presented.

5.1

Summary of Research Review

The cognitive behavioural perspective is currently the dominant perspective in sport psychology. Sport psychology therefore predominantly views doping from the cognitive-behavioural perspective and is concerned with the thoughts and attitudes towards doping and the resulting behaviours of the athletes (Gardner & Moore, 2006; Lamont-Mills & Christensen, 2008).

Limited research with a specific focus on doping in sport psychology exists. Lamont-Mills and Christensen (2008) conducted an extensive review of the existing literature on doping in sport psychology and this review of the research is based on the trends identified in this article. Quantitative research will be presented first, followed by qualitative research.

5.1.1 Quantitative Research on Doping in Sport Psychology

The existing research conducted from the discipline of sport psychology on doping in sport has mostly been informed by the positivist theoretical position within the field of psychology. The cognitive or behavioural aspects of doping have been the focus of the existing research. This research has typically used questionnaires to gather their material and the analysis have used

quantitative methods of analysis. The focus is on the behaviour, motives and attitudes towards doping in sport (Dilger et al., 2007; Lucidi et al., 2008; Tricker, 2000). The majority of the research has been conducted in North America, with Europe also contributing. A large number of the participants in the current research are adolescent or university athletes. The current results seem to indicate that the majority of athletes have negative attitudes towards doping in sport and that the use of doping is generally not wide spread.

5.1.2 Qualitative Research on Doping in Sport Psychology

The only qualitative research study that specifically addresses doping in sport psychology was that of Lamont-Mills and Christensen (2008). They conducted a discursive analysis and the aim of their study was to determine how a professional athlete, namely Shane Warne, accounted for his drug taking behaviour when talking to the media. They argue that for researchers to better understand doping in sport, we must have a better understanding of how athletes talk about doping and subsequently give meaning to their doping behaviour. Their participant was a professional cricketer and they contextualise their analysis on a social, real life experience of this single athlete. The research material used for analysis consisted of three media releases from Shane Warne subsequent to a positive drug test during the Cricket World Cup in 2003. The researchers concluded that Shane Warne constructed his drug taking as not being related to performance enhancement, as being an act of ignorance rather than deliberate deception, and as a once-off event. This article investigated the use of discourse (“language”) as a means for an athlete to understand his doping behaviour.

5.2

Summary of Research Findings

In this study a narrative approach is used to determine how Jones made sense of her experiences of lying to federal agents. Narrative is one of the primary ways in which people make sense of their experiences (Smith, 2003). Andrews remarks that “stories are not only the way in which we come to ascribe significance to experiences... they are one of the primary means through which we constitute our very selves...” (2000, pp. 77-78). In the construction of a narrative to ascribe

meaning to our experiences, we constitute our very selves in the narrative through identities. Narratives are constructive of these identities. Jones' narrative presented with three identities, namely the *athlete*, the *felon*, and the *person*. The context of the narrative is the interview conducted by Winfrey.

Jones spoke of her athletic experiences from early childhood to her experiences as an Olympic champion. She presented her past and in doing so constructed her athletic identity. As an athlete she viewed herself as talented, hard working, competitive, and as having very high standards of performance and achievement. She added that her supplement use was a way to keep on an even playing field with the other athletes. She viewed her supplement use in a secretive light, but does not present it as being secretive due to an attempt to hide the unlawful nature of the activity. Supplement use was one way in which she remains on par with the other athletes, and keeping details about supplement use a secret was the norm in the athletic context. Her athlete identity was the dominant identity from which she interpreted her past experiences.

Jones' athlete identity was then challenged in the interview with federal investigators where she realises that she had unknowingly used a prohibited substance. This challenge potentially threatened the dominant identity in her narrative up to that point. She proceeded to lie about her realisation that she had used a prohibited substance. Lying is often seen by society from a moral standpoint where it is considered "wrong". The psychological function of that lie is important in Jones' narrative. The lie was her attempt to allow the only identity she had constructed at the time to continue. From the psychological standpoint she had no other option but to lie to allow her identity as athlete to continue. In 2007 the above events led to Jones' ban from athletics and removal of her performances and medals from 2000 onwards. From a legal perspective the athlete identity was not allowed to continue. Jones was left with no continuity going into the future.

Jones then reported on her prison experience. From a legal perspective Jones was involuntarily given a new identity. She was a convicted felon. In her narrative Jones accepted this identity, which became the dominant identity from which she interpreted her experiences in prison. A person is only regarded as a felon while they are spending time in prison. They are removed from society and do not take part in "normal" societal activities. When they are released they regain

most of your rights and you are reintroduced into society. When Jones was released from prison her felon identity was legally halted. Again Jones was left without continuity going into the future. She was placed in a position where she had to construct a new identity in which she could leave herself with a positive future. In the present context of this narrative, Jones' dominant identity was still her felon identity. Though she did the interview from that identity, she did present the development of a new identity with which she expected to have continuity and a positive future. She presented the development of her identity as a person.

Jones now reinterpreted her past and current experiences, keeping in mind her expected future outcomes. She constructed her identity as a person as resulting from her prison experience as well as all the experiences before her prison sentence. She represented her athlete identity as being 'up here' (L349) and her felon identity to being 'down here' (L349), and represented her new constructed identity as finally finding the middle ground where she can be a person. As a person she viewed herself as older, wiser, and finally being at a point where she felt like herself. Her identity as a person leaves her feeling happy in her own skin. The construction of this new identity left her with the option of a positive future. Her identity as a person opened up the option for her to leave a legacy for her 'kids to be proud of' (L309). This identity also allowed her to 'help' (L307) and 'inspire' (L350) others. She presents her person identity as the one with which she is going to go into the future.

Though her athlete and felon identity was legally taken away, these identities will continually inform Jones life narrative. She presents her dominant identity for the future to be her person identity, but her athlete and felon identity will always be present in her life narrative.

5.3

Integration of Research Review and Findings

This research project contributes to research in sport psychology by addressing a gap in the field concerning doping in sport. The cognitive behavioural perspective is currently the dominant perspective in sport psychology (Gardner & Moore, 2006; Lamont-Mills & Christensen, 2008). The majority of research on doping in sport psychology is also done from this perspective and is

quantitative in nature. Quantitative research have mostly addressed the prevalence of doping, reasons why athletes dope, and the effects of doping. The study by Lamont-Mills & Christensen (2008) was the only qualitative research study found. These authors used discursive psychology in an attempt to understand how athletes talk about their doping behaviour. They argue that for a better understanding of the doping behaviour of athletes we need to determine how athletes talk about doping.

This research project contributes to the qualitative research on doping in sport psychology as it addresses an area not yet explored through research. It investigates the way in which an individual athlete made sense of her doping and subsequent behaviour related to the doping.

This research project also contributes to practicing sport psychologists. In practice it can be assumed that had Jones received assistance in developing further identities, ideally, while still being an athlete, or soon after the athlete identity was left with no future, she would have benefited from being able to develop more prominent multiple identities. This could have left her with a choice of identities which might have left her with a sense of continuity in her life. The demands on athletes in competitive sport are great and it can be expected that athletes may develop strong dominant athletic identities. In these cases athletes may benefit from assistance to construct and develop further identities while they are still competitive athletes. This will allow for athletes to have multiple identities from which to interpret experiences, leaving them with alternative outcomes to their experiences. This will create options that can leave them with a greater sense of continuity in their lives when they interpret new experiences in contexts away from competitive sport. It will help them if unforeseeable circumstances cut short their careers or even when they retire from competitive sport.

5.4

Shortcomings and Recommendations

This research project used natural material for analysis (Potter, 2004). It provided the benefits that the researcher is not involved in the collection of the research material and that the material

contains all the complexities offered by the natural environment (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2008). More detailed advantages of natural material were discussed in section 3.2.1.

Natural material also has the shortcoming of not allowing the researcher to gain a more detailed narrative account. A more detailed narrative account would have provided a more accurate account of how Jones made sense of her experiences. Because Oprah Winfrey presumably had a specific agenda in the interview, her questions influenced how Jones constructed her narrative. Her agenda would not have included detailed narrative accounts for analysis. Had I been able to conduct the interview, I would have attempted to attain more detailed accounts of how she made sense of her experiences.

The following are some of the questions that I as the researcher was left with at the conclusion of the analysis:

I am interested to find out what role her Afro-American cultural background had on her identity as an athlete. Culture plays an important role in the construction of narratives (refer to 3.3.3.3.4), and it would have been interesting to find out how this impacted on her as an athlete.

I am interested to find out what roles her family members played in her identity as an athlete, as well as the role they might play in her identity as a person going into the future. I would have liked to ask about the differences in their roles of her brother and mother in the athletics context compared to now going into the future as a person. I would also have liked to ask about the role her father, whom was not very supportive of her, had on her athletic identity.

I am also interested in the influence her athlete identity will have on her expected future. She mentioned that she loves to compete. I would have enjoyed gaining more detail into the influence of her competitiveness on her future identity as a person. I would also be interested if there are any other characteristics that may emerge from her athlete identity that might play a role in her expected future.

Jones included in the narrative her thoughts regarding what would have happened if she took the five minutes to consult with her attorneys. She mentions that she thinks things would have turned out different if she had. I would have liked to find out what she takes from that experience of having lied to the federal investigators. I would have liked to ask her what lessons she takes into her future from that experience.

A recommendation will be made for the inclusion of the participant to offer a more detailed account of the narrative to address the shortcomings of using natural material. This can be achieved with ease if the research material is in the format of an interview conducted by the researcher. At the outset the researcher could schedule a second interview to clarify any shortcomings in the research material after the initial interview. If natural material is used, the researcher could also attempt to contact the participant and inquire about his/her willingness to participate. Consent could be sought for the participant to provide added detail to the narrative and/or to provide feedback after the initial stages of analysis. This will benefit the researcher as he/she will have more detailed narrative to analyse.

5.5

Personal Commentary

I critically reflected on my influence on this research project as well as the influence that this research project had on me. At the beginning of this project I experienced the excitement of the unknown as I was blissfully unaware of what it would entail. Gaining clarity on my research topic meant I could start planning the journey. My history of being a sportsman had an influence on my selection of the topic under investigation. I was drawn to the sporting context when selecting the topic for my research project. For me this meant I could maintain a higher level of motivation and excitement because of my interest in the sporting context of my research project.

The further I progressed through the journey of completing this research project I found my motivation and excitement being challenged. I experienced frustration throughout the process due to the time consuming and passive (with regards physical activity) nature of the research process. My sporting background often informs my desire for physical and mental activity. Having to

spend long hours doing reading or analysis work proved to challenge my desire to be active all the time. Struggling with the passive and time consuming nature of the research project proved to be a very frustrating exercise for me.

During the material analysis I found myself feeling sympathy towards Jones. I have also been subject to doping restrictions and testing in my sport and I found that I was also in very similar situations as her. Due to my lack in knowledge about doping during my sporting career I also at times left my fate in the hands of others. I had to keep this in mind so that this did not influence my analysis of the research material.

At the conclusion of the research project I feel relieved. Though it was a frustrating and challenging experience I do feel I gained much knowledge through the process. I gained appreciation for the research process and feel the knowledge I gained will be able to add to my practice as a psychologist.

Conclusion

This chapter provided a summary of the research on doping in sport psychology as well a summary of my research findings. Then an integration of the research review and research findings was provided. Shortcomings and recommendations were made and a personal commentary addressed the impact of this study on the researcher.

References

- A map of olympic medals. (2008, August 4). *The New York Times*. Retrieved July 02, 2009, from www.nytimes.com
- Anderson, W. T. (1990). *Reality isn't what it used to be: theatrical politics, ready-to-wear-religion, global myths, primitive chic and other wonders of the postmodern world*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Andrews, M. (2000). Introduction to narrative and life history. In M. Andrews, S. D. Sclater, C. Squire, & A. Treacher (Eds.), *Lines of narrative: Psychosocial perspectives* (pp. 77-80). London: Routledge.
- Anshel, M. H. (1991a). A survey of elite athletes on the perceived causes of using banned drugs in sport. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *14*, 283-308.
- Anshel, M. H. (1991b). Cognitive and behavioural strategies for combating drug abuse in sport: Implications for coaches and sport psychology consultants. *The Sport Psychologist*, *5*, 152-166.
- Bloomfield, J., Fricker, P. A., & Fitch, K. D. (Eds.). (1992). *Textbook of science and medicine in sport*. Carlton, Australia: Blackwell.

Canadian Broadcasting Centre [CBC]. (2009). *Eight types of drug*. Retrieved October 14, 2009, from <http://www.cbc.ca/sports/indepth/drugs/glossary/classes.html>

Carr, C. L. (2008). Fairness and performance enhancement in sports. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 35(2), 193-207.

Crossley, M. L. (2000). Narrative psychology, trauma and the study of self/identity. *Theory Psychology*, 10(4), 528-546.

Declare yourself. (2009). *State by state info*. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from www.declareyourself.com/voting_faq/state_by_state_info_2.html

Dickson-Swift, V., James, E. L., Kippen, S., & Liamputtong, P. (2007). Doing sensitive research: What challenges do qualitative researchers face? *Qualitative research*, 7, 327-353.

Dilger, A., Frick, B., & Tolsdorf, F. (2007). Are athletes doped? Some theoretical arguments and empirical evidence. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 25(4), 604-615.

Durrheim, K. (1997). Social constructionism, discourse, and psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(3), 175-182.

Eight types of drug. (2009). Retrieved October 14, 2009, from <http://www.cbc.ca/sports/indepth/drugs/glossary/classes.html>

Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI]. (2009a). *About Us – Quick Facts*. Retrieved February 25, 2010, from www.fbi.gov/quickfacts.htm

Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI]. (2009b). *FBI history*. Retrieved February 25, 2010, from www.fbi.gov/fbihistory.htm

Franchini, E., & Lambert, M. (2007). Drugs in sport: A cure worse than the disease? *International Journal of Sport Science & Coaching*, 2(4), 335-362.

Gardner, F. L., & Moore, Z. E. (2006). *Clinical sport psychology*. Champaign IL: Human Kinetics.

Gregory, A. J. M., & Fitch, R. W. (2007). Sports medicine: Performance-enhancing drugs. *Pediatric Clinics in North America*, 54(4), 797-806.

Hames, I. (2007). *Peer review and manuscript management in scientific journals: Guidelines for good practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hanson, G. R., Venturelli, P. J., & Fleckenstein, A. E. (2005). *Drugs and society* (9th ed.). Princeton, NJ: Jones and Bartlett.

Henning, E., Van Rensburg, W., & Smit, B. (2004). *Finding your way in Qualitative research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Hoberman, J. (2002). Sports physicians and the doping crisis in elite sport. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine*, 12(4), 203-208.

Hoberman, J. (2006). Should we allow performance-enhancing drugs in sport? A commentary on Noakes' critique of Savulescu et al. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 1(4), 317-320.

Hormone antagonists and modulators. (2009). Retrieved January 15, 2010, from www.doping-prevention.de/substances-and-methods/hormone-antagonists-and-modulators

Horne, J., Tomlinson, A., & Whannel, G. (1999). *Understanding sport: An introduction to the Sociological and Cultural Analysis of Sport*. London: Routledge.

Houlihan, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Sport and society: A student introduction*. London: Sage.

Human, L. H. (2008). Unique outcomes in professional psychology training through an adventure experience. *Acta Academia*, 40(3), 151-174.

International Olympic Committee [IOC]. (2009a). *Protection of athletes*. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from www.olympic.org/uk/organisation/missions/athletes_uk.asp

International Olympic Committee [IOC]. (2009b). *The Olympic movement*. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from www.olympic.org/uk/organisation/index_uk.asp

Jenkins, A. H. (2001). Individuality in cultural context. *Theory & Psychology, 11*(3), 347-362.

Jones, M., & Sekules, K. (2004). *Marion Jones: Life in the fast lane*. New York: Time Warner.

Katch, F. I. (Ed.). (1986). *The 1984 olympic scientific congress proceedings: Sport, health, and Nutrition*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Keun – Youl, K. I. M. (2005, October). *Side effects of doping drugs*. Paper presented at the Education Symposium, Macau. Retrieved February 25, 2010, from www.wada-ama.org/rtecontent.../MACAU_Effects_of_Doping.pdf

Kindermann, W. (2007). Do inhaled beta(2)-antagonists have an ergogenic potential in non-asthmatic competitive athletes? *Sports Medicine, 37*(2), 95-102.

Kotzé, E., & Kotzé, D. J. (1997). Social construction as a postmodern discourse: An epistemology for conversational therapeutic practice. *Acta Theologica, 1*, 27-50.

Lamont-Mills, A., & Christensen, S. (2008). “I have never taken performance enhancing drugs and I never will”: Drug discourse in the Shane Warne case. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 18*, 250-258.

Laure, P., & Reinsberger, H. (1995). Doping and high-level endurance walkers – knowledge and representation: A prohibited practice. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Fitness*, 35, 228-231.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative research: Reading, analysis, and interpretation*. California: Sage.

Lock, A., Epston, D., & Maisel, R. (2004). Countering that which is called anorexia. *Narrative Inquiry*, 14(2), 275-301.

Lucidi, F., Zelli, A., Mallia, L., Grano, C., Russo, P. M., & Violani, C. (2008). The socio-cognitive mechanisms regulating adolescents' use of doping substances. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 26(5), 447-456.

Lyons, E., & Coyle, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Analysing qualitative data in psychology*. London: Sage.

Maravelias, C., Dona, A., Stefanidou, M., & Spiliopoulou, C. (2005). Adverse effects of anabolic steroids in athletes: A constant threat. *Toxicology Letters*, 158(3), 167-175.

Marion Jones. (2009, November 30). *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://topics.Nytimes.com>

Marion Jones accepts sanction for doping violation; hands over Olympic medals. (2007,

October 8). [Press Release]. Colorado Springs: United States Anti-Doping Agency.

McDuff, D. R. (2005). Substance use in athletics: A sports psychiatry perspective. *Clinics in Sports medicine*, 24(4), 885-897. Retrieved May 04, 2009, from Science Direct.

Miah, A. (2005). From anti-doping to a 'performance policy' sport technology, being human, and doing ethics. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 5(1), 51-57.

Morgan, W. J. (Ed.). (2007). *Ethics in sport* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Mottram, D. R. (Ed.). (1996). *Drugs in sport* (2nd ed.). London: E & FN Spon.

Noakes, T. D. (2006). Should we allow performance-enhancing drugs in sport? A rebuttal to the article by Savulescu and colleagues. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, 1(4), 289-316.

Ollerenshaw, J. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2002). Narrative research: A comparison of two restorying data analysis approaches. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8, 329-347.

Oprah ending talk show in 2011. (2009). Retrieved March 3, 2010, from www.cnn.com/2009/SHOWBIZ/TV/11/19/oprah.ends.show/index.html

Oprah Winfrey's official biography. (2008). Retrieved March 3, 2010, from

www.oprah.com/oprahdotcom/Oprah-Winfreys-Official-Biography/2

Payne, S. D. W. (Ed.). (1990). *Medicine, sport, and the law*. London: Blackwell.

Pellauer, D. (2007). *Ricoeur: A guide for the perplexed*. London: Continuum International.

Phelps, M., & Abrahamson, A. (2008). *No limits: The will to succeed*. London: Simon & Schuster.

Potter, J. (2004). Discourse analysis. In M. Hardy & A. Bryman. (Eds.). *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 607-624). London: Sage.

Rakieten, A. (2008, October). The Oprah Winfrey Show. New York: Harpo.

Raskin, J. D. (2002). Constructivism in psychology: Personal construct psychology, radical constructivism, and social constructionism. *American Communication Journal*, 5(3). Retrieved January 06, 2010, from digilander.libero.it

Riessman, C. K. (2001). Analysis of personal narratives. In Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (Eds.). *Handbook of Interviewing* (pp. 695-710). London: Sage.

Saugy, M., Robinson, N., Saudan, C., Baume, N., Avois, L., & Mangin, P. (2006). Human growth hormone doping in sport. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 40(1), 35-39.

Sclater, S. D. (2003). What is the subject? *Narrative Inquiry*, 13(2), 317-330.

Shaw, A. (2002). Social constructionism Chapter 1: Social constructionism and the inner city.

Retrieved from <http://xenia.media.mit.edu/~acs/chapter1.html>

Singleton, R. A., Straits, B. C., & Straits, M. M. (1993). *Approaches to social research* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, J. A. (2003). Introduction. In Smith J. A. (Ed.). *Qualitative Psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (pp. 1-3). London: Sage.

Smith, J. A. (Ed.). (2008). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Sparkes, A. C. (1999). Exploring body narratives. *Sport, Education and Society*, 4(1), 17-30.

Technische Universität München [TUM]. (2009). *Hormone antagonists and modulators*.

Retrieved January 15, 2010, from www.doping-prevention.de/substances-and-methods/hormone-antagonists-and-modulators

Tricker, R. (2000). Painkilling drugs in collegiate athletics: Knowledge, attitudes and use of student athletes. *Journal of Drug Education*, 30(3), 313-324.

The Oprah Winfrey Show to end September 2011. (2009). Retrieved March 3, 2010, from

www.oprah.com/oprahdotcom/Oprah-Anounces-Plans-to-End-The-Oprah-Winfrey-Show-in-September-2011

United States Anti-Doping Agency [USADA]. (2008). *USADA history*. Retrieved November 20, 2008, from www.usantidoping.org/who/history.html

United States of America Track and Field [USATF]. (2008). *Annual report*. Retrieved March 4, 2010, from www.usatf.org

United States of America Track and Field [USATF]. (2010). *Track and Field*. Retrieved March 4, 2010, from www.usatf.org/TrackAndField/;

White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Willig, C., & Stainton-Rogers, W. (Eds.). (2008). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research in psychology*. London: Sage.

World Anti-Doping Agency [WADA]. (n.d.). *WADA history*. Retrieved April 14, 2008, from <http://www.wada-ama.org>

World Anti-Doping Agency [WADA]. (2003). *World Anti-Doping Code*. Retrieved April 14, 2008, from http://www.wada-ama.org/rtecontent/document/code_v3.pdf

World Anti-Doping Agency [WADA]. (2005). *Media invitation – gene doping symposium press conference*. Retrieved October 14, 2009, from <http://www.wada-ama.org>

World Anti-Doping Code. (2009). Retrieved April 19, 2009, from http://www.wada-ama.org/rtecontent/document/code_v3.pdf

Wright, J. E., & Cowart, V. S. (1990). *Anabolic steroids: Altered states*. Carmel: Benchmark Press.

Young, R. A., & Collin, A. (2004). Introduction: Constructivism and social constructionism in the career field. *Journal of Vocational behaviour*, *64*, 373-388.

Appendix 1

Oprah Winfrey Interview With Marion Jones

Key To Contexts

c = current

l = legal

t = training

p = prison

pc = press conference

f = action leading to felon identity

Line	Transcription	Identities and contexts		
		Felon Identity (F)	Athlete Identity (A)	Person Identity (P)
	Oprah Winfrey is in bold text. Marion Jones is in standard text.			
1	And you are on probation for how long?			
2	For two years.	F(c)		
3	Um, as part of the sentence in addition to the six months imprisonment, um, part of the sentence was also that I have 800 hours of community service.	F(c)		
4	But you are now an official convicted felon.			
5	That's correct.	F(c)		
6	Which means you will not be able to vote...			
7	That is correct.	F(c)		
8	...In this year's election.			
9	Out of all of the elections you know, it is unfortunate, um, and I tell people that you either have consequences to your choices that you make.	F(c)		
10	There are consequences for the actions that you take and these are just part of the consequences that I have to face.	F(c)		
11	So, how did this happen?			
12	You say that's one of the questions that you wanted to deal with while you were spending your 6 months, how did this happen?			
13	What it came down to is; that I made a bad decision in the year 2000, um, and 2001 and the reason that I ended up in prison was because I lied to federal investigators about a case they had been investigating and of course the case involved track and field or athletics and the use of performance enhancing drugs.	f	A(l)	



14	I was invited um, to meet with prosecutors that were investigating the case and I went in and they showed me a substance um and when I saw the substance I knew that I had taken the substance.		A(1)	
15	I had been given the substance the year prior and immediately when I saw the substance...		A(1)	
16	Given by whom?			
17	I was given it by my coach, Trevor Graham, and when I saw the substance, I mean it is one of those moments that you wish you can go back and you wish you can have again.		A(1)	
18	So, So set up the scene for us, you're in a room...			
19	You're in like a conference room and I have my attorneys on each side and I'm sitting across the table, I think there was three prosecutors um and they're asking me different questions		A(1)	
20	Had they asked you the question had you ever taken uh...?			
21	They hadn't.		A(1)	
22	They hadn't?			
23	They then pulled out the little vile, I can say, and pushed it across the table...		A(1)	
24	Of the substance called the clear?			
25	Of the substance called the clear, um and immediately when they took it out of their bag, or I don't know the particulars and they pushed it across the table, I mean it perhaps was a span of three four seconds Oprah, and immediately when they put it out there I knew that that was the substance that had been given to me.		A(1)	
26	But in that brief moments I made the decision that I had worked so hard in my career and that I knew that by telling them that I had been given the substance and had taken the substance that all of that um was going to be questioned, and...		A(1)	
27	At that moment did you know what the substance was?			
28	When they showed it to me I knew what the substance was.		A(1)	
29	...and did you know that it was a performance enhancing drug?			
30	I knew when they showed it to me and they told me that the clear, see I had heard all about the clear before coming there, but before they showed it to me, I never knew what it looked like because it wasn't introduced to me as the clear.		A(1)	
31	Yes.			
32	Right, and so when they showed it to me and they said this is the substance and I knew that I had taken that substance, um I made the decision that I was going to lie and I was going to try and cover it up, and...	f	A(1)	



33	Why did you make the decision in that moment because that was the split second moment that you are saying...?			
34	Yeah that was the split second moment...	f	A(1)	
35	That put you in jail...?			
36	I knew that all of my performances would be questioned.		A(1)	
37	Ok, can take us back to that moment in your mind, you see the clear, he pushes it across the table, you realise in that moment that this is the stuff I had been taking and you think what?			
38	Oh my god, that's what I've been taking.			
39	In a manner of words...		A(1)	
40	Yes.			
41	Yeah that's what I had been given and I was saddened because I didn't know, I know I worked hard and I know that I have been blessed with a great amount of talent Oprah, but I didn't know in my heart of hearts how much that aided me? How much that assisted me at the Sydney Games?		A(1)	
42	Were you thinking about that, in that moment?			
43	Yeah, I mean it was just all these things running through my mind. Um, I thought about my family.		A(1)	
44	I thought about how proud they were, you know, when I won the medals, when I achieved success, and how disappointed they would be.		A(1)	
45	Um, I thought about my kids and my kid at the time, I only had Monty at the time.		A(1)	
46	Um, I thought about you know my finances.		A(1)	
47	I thought about my sponsors.		A(1)	
48	If I had just taken a break, if I had you know stopped the interview that I was having with the prosecutors, walked out of the room spoken with my attorneys, just taken five minutes, I think things would be different.		A(1)	
49	Because you think that you would have come back and said yes, I had seen these drugs before?			
50	Yes, if I would have taken that moment to go out of the room with my attorneys and shared this information with them.		A(1)	
51	They tell me: "you know what Marion, if you go back in there and you lie and it comes back out, you might have to go to prison.	f	A(1)	
52	You might have to be away from your family.		A(1)	
53	Your reputation will be tarnished.		A(1)	



54	Yeah, if you go back in there and you tell them the truth right now, things will be difficult, you know, immediately, but you'll be able to rebound and do certain things, but if you go back in there and lie Marion, you know things can really get bad". If I had taken that five minute break, I think things would have been different.		A(l)	
55	And that's one of the lessons that you have learnt.			
	Advertisement break (1)			
56	Now you said that you didn't know you were taking a performance-enhancing drug, what did you think you were taking?			
57	I thought what I was taking was supplements, um...		A(t)	
58	What kind of supplements?			
59	I was told that I was um, I was being given uh, what did he say that it was?		A(t)	
60	It's been so long that I have had to discuss it Oprah.		A(t)	
61	Um, I don't remember what he told me at this moment that he was giving me but he gave me a number of different supplements.		A(t)	
62	Yeah, I'd read you were told that it was flaxseed oil.			
63	Flaxseed oil, that's exactly what it was, and...		A(t)	
64	Now I take flaxseed oil. Sometimes I grind up the flaxseeds.			
65	Or sometimes it comes in a pill form that looks kind of clear and that's what actually this vile that they pushed across the table, in the vile it looked like this clear liquid, um, so I was in an environment where I was trusting the people around me, never thought in a million years that anybody would do anything...		A(t)	
66	But what did you think that flaxseed oil would do for you?			
67	Well I knew that there were a number of um supplements and vitamins that I needed to just balance my system out, so I can be on an even playing field with everybody else, um and that was just one of the things that I needed to boost my energy or whatnot.		A(t)	
68	So how often had you taken what you say you believed was flaxseed oil?			
69	Um, if I can remember correctly it was several times prior to the Sydney Games in 2000.		A(t)	
70	And how would you take it?			
71	He told me to put in under my tongue and leave it there for a little while, and then swallow.		A(t)	



72	Did he tell you that this was a secret or not to share it with anyone or...?			
73	Well he didn't really have to tell me that Oprah.		A(t)	
74	Um, you know, things are very hush-hush in the world of athletics particularly, when it comes to supplements and vitamins cause nobody wants to give anybody else the edge, you know so what you take in this camp you don't want to let anybody know in another camp.		A(t)	
75	Ok. So you're told that it is flaxseed oil and you just assume that it is, did you notice a difference after taking it, after a while?			
76	Yes and No, I know looking in hindsight, um there were moments that I felt I had more energy on the track, I had that second wind, you know, that some people talk about, um, and you know there were times in training in particular where I just, I felt really good, when typically you probably would not really feel good at the end of a workout, um, so.		A(t)	
77	So did you attribute the difference to the flaxseed oil?			
78	No, no certainly not.		A(t)	
79	I mean I just, I attributed the difference to hard training, finally getting you know, the supplements, you know working in conjunction with what I'm doing in the weight room...		A(t)	
80	But were you taking other things?			
81	Yeah, I was taking the typical stuff, Vitamin C, Vitamin E, you know, Creatine, things like that, and so I had just thought that we had put the system together you know in preparation for the games, and so the result were being shown on the track, you know everything put together was...		A(t)	
82	Was working for you.			
83	...Was working.		A(t)	
84	Is what you thought, yeah.			
85	So there was never even a question uh, in your mind that what you were taking would be considered illegal or performance enhancing?			
86	Never a question.		A(t)	
87	Never a question?			
88	Never a question, and people might be surprised...		A(t)	
89	And you know that is hard to believe?			
90	Right.		A(t)	
91	That is really hard to believe.			
92	But... I think an athlete at the highest level Oprah, you know you know your body, you know that nothing you felt...		A(t)	
93	That's why it is so hard to believe.			
94	But nothing felt different.		A(t)	
95	I felt strong.		A(t)	



96	I felt powerful, I do all the time, but this is the Olympic year.		A(t)	
97	I know I'm supposed to feel a little bit stronger, a little bit faster.		A(t)	
98	I'm preparing on the track. I'm preparing in the weight room.		A(t)	
99	The supplements are together.		A(t)	
100	Everything is coming together, I'm suppose to better this year, so that's the difference I felt and I attributed that to everything, putting everything together.		A(t)	
101	You know you win a gold medal you break world records because everything worked that year.		A(t)	
102	Ok, did you know other people who had used performance-enhancing drugs?			
103	No.		A(t)	
104	You didn't know?			
105	No.		A(t)	
106	Do you, was it ever talked about, you know, among athletes, among, you know...?			
107	Yes, I mean, it's just like anything you have the rumour mill, you always...		A(t)	
108	People talk about oh such and such, they're doing something when you really don't know, you assume...		A(t)	
109	One of the things that I've read or heard is that, uh, there are some athletes who feel that they have to do it because everybody else is doing it and in order to even be competitive you have to do it. You never thought that or felt that?			
110	No, I never thought that.		A(t)	
111	I mean, from an early age, um, I was winning races.		A(t)	
112	I mean early on, this has not just started in college or after college professionally.		A(t)	
113	From a very early on I realised that I had something that everybody else didn't.		A(t)	
114	You know, I'm further ahead.		A(t)	
115	I'm stronger.		A(t)	
116	I'm faster, and so by the time I graduated from college and I turned professional and I'm still beating people it was just continuing the same thing.		A(t)	
117	I never thought that I needed to use performance enhancing drugs to make me better.		A(t)	



118	Ok, so I'm going to leave the story here where you say you believe that that was flaxseed oil, and not until you're sitting in the room with the federal investigators, they show you the clear and you say, you make the decision, the choice in that moment to lie, when you know that you have taken whatever that is that they showing you...			
119	That's correct.	f	A(l)	
120	...on the table, and that is what you're saying was your mistake.			
121	Yes.	f	A(l)	
122	Yeah, to this day you're still saying you never took performance-enhancing drugs and knew that you were taking it?			
123	Never knowingly did I take performance-enhancing drugs.		A(c)	
124	And so you went to jail because you lied.			
125	That's correct, that's correct.	f	A(l)	
	Advertisement break (2)			
126	Well in 2004, Victor Conte, I'm going to bring him up now, did a 20/20 interview. You are aware of that right?			
127	Yes.		A(t)	
128	And in that 20/20 interview he, he says that he gave a steroid named the clear, and watched you not put under your tongue, he said, he said he watched you inject yourself with it.			
129	Was he lying?			
130	He was lying.		A(t)	
131	Why would he...?			
132	I am aware of the interview Oprah, um...		A(t)	
133	Why would he lie?			
134	Um, there are lots of reasons why people lie.		A(t)	
135	I've shared with you some of the reasons why I lied.		A(t)	
136	I do not particularly know why he would lie Oprah.		A(t)	
137	I know that what I admitted to federal prosecutors was the truth and paid obviously a huge consequence because of that, um, and that's really what I can focus on.		A(t)	
138	I don't know his reasons or his motives.		A(t)	
139	Did you know him?			
140	Um, I'd met him a few times in the past.		A(t)	
141	We did not have a relationship or a friendship or any of like that...		A(t)	
142	Had you gone to his company...?			
143	No, I'd never.		A(t)	



144	...seeking some kind of you know, supplements?			
145	No, my coach at the time Trevor Graham, and my former husband had a relationship with him, and went to him asking for supplement advice for the group and for myself, and so that is how the whole connection started.		A(t)	
146	So you're saying that you never knew you were taking performance-enhancing drugs. Do you think your coach knew?			
147	In hindsight, yes, yes, yeah.		A(t)	
148	So do you hold those people responsible?			
149	No, I mean, ultimately I hold myself responsible, for, um, well fist of all for lying to federal prosecutors, but for not being more, um, careful with the people that I associated with, and not questioned people more.	f	A(t)	
150	Very trusting, um, so for that I blame myself.		A(t)	
151	So in that moment when the prosecutors are putting the clear on the table, and you say in that moment is when you first realise, oh that's what I've been taking. Did your thought not go to the person who had been giving it to you?			
152	Absolutely.		A(l)	
153	I'm very disappointed.		A(l)	
154	I question my decision to hire him as a coach.		A(l)	
155	I question not questioning him, when he would give me certain supplements, just trusting that everything would be on the up and up.		A(l)	
156	So yeah, I was disappointed, mad, upset.		A(l)	
157	What did you say to him afterwards?			
158	I didn't say anything to him. I was, at that point I decided I had made the ultimate decision to lie.		A(t)	
159	So you didn't say anything about it after that moment with the prosecutors, and you realise now that you lied to the prosecutors.			
160	You realise that, as you say, that I've been taking this performance-enhancing drug, and you don't say anything to the person that's been giving it to you?			
161	No.		A(t)	
162	I knew at that point that I would never take anything that he gave me again, um, but I was concerned that if I made rash decisions, if I did anything of that people would start to question um, to question me.		A(t)	
163	And so, I simply continued the lie.		A(t)	
164	Continued saying I never, I know that I've never taken performance-enhancing drugs.		A(t)	



165	Or a lot of times I would say Oprah is that I have never knowingly taken performance-enhancing drugs Oprah, so then I was able to kind of live with myself, because technically, I was telling the truth.		A(t)	
166	But you knew you were lying?			
167	I knew that technically I had taken a performance enhancing drugs, but never knowingly...		A(t)	
168	The knowingly part.			
169	Yes.		A(t)	
170	Yeah, cleared you.			
171	Yeah.		A(t)	
172	And did you keep the lie to yourself			
173	Yes.		A(t)	
174	Never share with anyone else that you were holding this lie?			
175	No, not until I met my now husband, but good friend and shared with him.		A(t)	
176	Um, and then of course in 2006/2007 we were approached by federal prosecutors that it was time, that they had information that they knew that I lied and that either we were going to trail or I was going to have to plead.	f	A(l)	
177	And what were you thinking then?			
178	Saddened.	f	A(l)	
179	Saddened, yes.			
	Advertisement break (3)			
	(Played a part of the Marion Jones press conference announcing her lying to the FBI)			
180	How hard is that to watch?			
181	It's very hard, um		A(pc)	
182	I'm thinking, um, you know, standing before the world literally and saying to the world "I lied", that is one face of it, and then you had to actually give back the medals.			
183	What was that like?			
184	Did you pack up the medals and send them back, or did somebody come get the medals?			
185	How does that work?			
186	Representatives of the USOC and um, USA track and field came to my home and we gave them the medals.		A(t)	
187	Um, it wasn't as difficult to give back the medals because it's not about the hardware.		A(t)	
188	It's just hardware, but it is the memory that will be tarnished knowing that crossing the finish line and celebrating, um.		A(t)	



189	I remember crossing the line and looking up and seeing my mother, seeing my family, just the pride in their face, and you can't take that back, so.		A(t)	
190	You mentioned earlier that one of the things you questioned was what the drug, how much of the drug, uh, actually did enhanced you and how much was really you.			
191	Do you think about that still?			
192	Yes.		A(c)	
193	Really, what the drug did and what was you?			
194	There are moments when I would go through the races in my head, quietly, privately, and I'll ask myself well if you hadn't been given um, the clear, you know, do you think you would have won?		A(c)	
195	Um, do you think you would have, you know ran fast.		A(c)	
196	Do you think you would have beat everybody.		A(c)	
197	Um, and I usually answer yes.		A(c)	
198	I still think I would have won, but just the fact that there is a question mark to me it's not fair, It's not fair for anybody that I ran against.		A(c)	
199	It's not fair for the women who ran with me on the relay.		A(c)	
200	Just the fact that there is a question mark, um, is not fair.		A(c)	
201	And that's why the medals are gone?			
202	Yes, the medals, um, the records, the times, um, all of the performances.		A(c)	
203	Yes, everything that you ran from 2000 on...			
204	That's correct.		A(c)	
205	...erased from the record books as though you never even existed			
206	Correct.		A(c)	
207	Yeah.			
208	You know when I think about it, um, I think about my kids.		A(c)	
209	I think about when the moment comes and I have to explain to them, you know, when they see my name and when they see my times from '97, '98, and '99, then all of a sudden, you know there is no mommy, or no Marion Jones in the record books, what then?		A(c)	
	Advertisement break (4)			
210	In that press conference you named your family and several others, you didn't talk about your team-mates...			
211	Um		A(pc)	
212	...who have also had to give up their medals?			
213	Was there some reason or, what was going on in that moment?			



214	It wasn't, um.		A(pc)	
215	I didn't make the omission for a reason.		A(pc)	
216	I just, you have to understand at that moment, trying to apologise to everybody whom I affected, and most importantly my family, and it wasn't. I didn't make the choice not to, it just got blended in with everything else, that whomever I have hurt, whomever has hurt because of this, I apologise.		A(pc)	
217	But you didn't feel a need to apologise to them specifically, after all of this?			
218	I would...		A(pc)	
219	Because they would be the most affected.			
220	Yes and no.		A(pc)	
221	I mean to have to give up your gold medals is horrible, but it comes down to I made a choice to lie.		A(pc)	
222	My intent was never to harm them.		A(pc)	
223	When I stepped on the track with them in Sydney, I thought we were going for the gold medal, and everybody on that track was drug free, including myself, right.		A(pc)	
224	I never step on that track with the intent to try and cover anything up and help them to win by doing something illegally, right.		A(pc)	
225	So I apologise to everybody that my choice to lie has affected, including them, but at that moment in Sydney I never meant to harm anybody.		A(pc)	
226	Is there something, I'm sure they are going to be watching this, Elaine, girl Marion is on.			
227	Yeah, tune in.		A(c)	
228	Tune in, Marion's on. So is there something you would want to say to them today, that you haven't said?			
229	Yeah, certainly.		A(c)	
230	Um, I would hope that the woman who were on the team with me and there are several of you all, um, you know who you are.		A(c)	
231	I apologise for my actions to lie to federal prosecutors.		A(c)	
232	I apologise for having to put everybody through all of this, um, and beyond that, it's like, ok, I've said it.		A(c)	
233	I'm trying to move on. I hope that everybody else can move on to.		A(c)	
234	You said you paid the ultimate price, what is the ultimate price?			
235	The ultimate price is having your name and your reputation and everything that you stood for, just ripped away.		A(c)	
	Advertisement break (5)			



236	What was your lowest moment?			
237	There's so many to count.	F(p)		
238	Um, I would have to think that being away from my kids on their birthday, um, our, my oldest son turned five while I was in prison, and our baby turned one.	F(p)		
239	Yes.	F(p)		
240	Cutie pies.			
241	And so having to be away from them and not experience those milestones, you cant ever get those back.	F(p)		
242	Being away form my family, that, that's definitely the hardest.	F(p)		
243	Did you meet any interesting people in prison?			
244	Very interesting people.	F(p)		
245	Who also made bad choices?			
246	Yes, a lot of them one bad choice.	F(p)		
247	And you know, I sit here and I say the ultimate price, six months.	F(p)		
248	Some of these woman made one bad choice Oprah and they're there for 18, 19, 20 years and when I start hearing their stories it starts giving me strength.	F(p)		
249	That, you know what, if that lady down the hall can get through it and wake up every morning and smile and have the energy to get through the day, I certainly can.	F(p)		
250	I have three more months here; I can do this.	F(p)		
251	When I first went there I'll be honest I had the same idea of prison that probably most people have, you know you see the stories on... or the prison stories about...	F(p)		
252	NSMBC does prison stories all the time, I get mesmerised by the prison shows.			
253	Lock up!			
254	Right.	F(p)		
255	Its lock up!			
256	Was it like lock up?			
257	No, it wasn't.	F(p)		
258	I was not.	F(p)		
259	It was not like that at all.	F(p)		
260	You don't have to be watching your back every second.	F(p)		
261	You don't think that you will be stabbed in your sleep?			
262	No.	F(p)		
263	The hardest part like I said was being away from the family, and the second hardest part was being told what to do, all day and every day, and so it's like the biggest slap in the face where they tell you when to stand up, tell you when to lay down, um, doesn't matter if you are Marion Jones or not.	F(p)		



264	Well yeah, one of my most powerful definitions of what freedom means comes from the movie Beloved, actually the book Beloved, where the character Setha says after being free for 28 days and taken back into slavery on the 29th day, that waking up every morning and deciding for yourself what to do with the day, that's what freedom is.			
265	Yeah, but people underestimate it, and...	F(c)		
266	Yeah, waking up every morning, and you get to decide.			
267	...and to do the little things, you appreciate... I appreciate so	F(c)		
268	Was going to prison the right... for six months... the right sentence for you?			
269	Is that what you deserved for lying?			
270	I'll be honest with you I was disappointed with the sentence.	F(c)		
271	Anybody who has to be away from their family or go to prison, you never want that, um, but I, I believe that the sentence was fair.	F(c)		
272	I believe in the legal system Oprah. Um, and, I didn't want to go.	F(c)		
273	I was disappointed.	F(c)		
274	I wanted home confinement or probation.	F(c)		
275	You wanted to wear the little ankle bracelet?			
276	I would have worn it all day and all night, to be with my family, um, but it didn't turn out that way and, sure I can compare my story to recent stories about other athletes or other people who were involved in certain situations and didn't get much time.	F(c)		
277	It would be easy to do that. It would be easy to point the finger and say, it's the judge, or it's that, but you know what, it's me I made the bad choice.	F(c)		
278	I made the bad choice that put my future and my freedom in somebody else's hands and make that choice for me.	F(c)		
279	I did that, um, and because of that I have to live with it.	F(c)		
280	How do you think that experience of putting your future in somebody else's hands and allowing them to make the choice for you and you not questioning is what you are saying was part of your issue, is that you didn't question so, you were so trusting.			
281	How has that affected or changed you as a person?			
282	I've learnt a lot about myself in terms of, um, questioning people a lot more, their motives.			P(c)
283	I'm questioning everything now.			P(c)
284	But what is important I think is that I'm finally at a point.			P(c)
285	I'm older.			P(c)
286	I'm wiser.			P(c)



287	But because of my experiences and not just my prison experience, but everything before that um... has got me to where I am now... and if I'm not comfortable in my own skin... you know I don't have athletics anymore to hide behind.			P(c)
288	Now its, it's me.			P(c)
289	What you get, you like it or you don't.			P(c)
290	In the past it was Marion Jones the athlete, but when you take that away it almost felt like, a bit ashamed, not as confident in myself.			P(c)
291	Ashamed of what?			P(c)
292	That I'm not living up to Marion Jones the athlete.			P(c)
293	That everything beyond being athletic wasn't really good enough.			P(c)
294	Um, and so I always use that as a cover, and now of course I don't have that cover anymore and I have really had to, um, find out who I am.			P(c)
295	You know and why I make certain choices?			P(c)
296	So the label of athlete that the world used to define you, you then were trying to live up to all that that label meant to the world.			
297	And you're saying behind, inside yourself, I don't know if I could measure up to that?			
298	That's correct, and a lot of that has to do with, you know, trauma in my childhood, and kind of repressing feelings and things like that and I think...			P(c)
299	Well the truth is that nobody can live up to that.			
300	Nobody can live up to Vogue magazine, the five medals, the endorsements; you know all that comes with that, that image.			
301	Will you ever run again?			
302	No, I will never run again, um, I've retired from the sport, um, but...			P(c)
303	Is there sadness with that?			
304	There is a bit of sadness because I love to compete.			P(c)
305	Um, but on the same token I am energised by this next chapter, and I think really it's going to be bigger and better than that last chapter.			P(c)
306	And so my goal now is to find out how to connect with people at a much bigger level.			P(c)
307	How can I help young people make certain choices and not make certain bad choices like I did.			P(c)
308	I do not want for the legacy of Marion Jones-Thompson now, to be this.			P(c)



309	I want it to be bigger and better and something for my kids to be proud of, that's really now what it's all about.			P(c)
Advertisement break (6)				
310	Is it true that you wrote hundreds of pages of letters while you were in prison?			
311	Yeah.	F(p)		
312	And will you read one of the letters?			
313	I will.	F(p)		
314	It won't be easy but.	F(p)		
315	Um, so this one is titled "letter to the boys".	F(p)		
316	To my precious and beloved Monty and Damir.	F(p)		
317	I'm sitting on my top bunk at the place in Texas called camp Carswell.	F(p)		
318	I am at a place for women who have committed crimes or broken the law.	F(p)		
319	Mommy is far away from both of you because I made a mistake in life and because of it I have to pay a horrible price, which is being temporarily separated from you and your daddy.	F(p)		
320	This place that your mommy has to live at for six months is called prison.	F(p)		
321	I'm here because I made a decision several years ago to hide the truth for fear that all of our lives would be changed.	F(p)		
322	What I didn't realise at that time was that this lie would forever impact all of our lives.	F(p)		
323	This lie has caused all of our friends and family a good amount of shame, disappointment and heartache.	F(p)		
324	It was wrong in hindsight.	F(p)		
325	If I had it to do over again it would be different.	F(p)		
326	Perhaps the not so obvious reasons for lying are a lot more personal than any magazine or news station could ever report.	F(p)		
327	I truly believe that the reason I made that awful mistake and a few thereafter was because I didn't love myself enough to tell the truth and hidden behind my obvious talents for much of my life for fear that the weak, sad, hurt and vulnerable Marion would emerge and ruin the plan for my life.	F(p)		
328	Babies, what it comes down to is this; mommy made a terrible mistake.	F(p)		
329	One that cost me something more valuable and priceless than money can buy.	F(p)		
330	My mistake cost me Monty and Damir for six months of our lives.	F(p)		
331	These are six months that I can never get back, ever.	F(p)		



332	I love you both more than the breath I take, God please put your arms over them and protect them.	F(p)		
333	Mommy	F(p)		
	Advertisement break (7)			
334	So you say in that letter that you to your boys that the real reason you lied is because you didn't think you were good enough?			
335	I didn't think that I was good enough without that side of Marion that everybody knew to be a success, to be great, to make a life for them.			P(c)
336	And now that that Marion is gone, she's not running anymore and her medals have been returned to the Olympic committee...			
337	Yes.			P(c)
338	... they've come and taken them away. You're now left with you. And what is that like?			
339	Finally for the first time that I can remember in a long time Oprah, people are seeing me for me and I'm ok with it.			P(c)
340	If that makes any sense?			P(c)
341	I'm happy in the skin that I'm in.			P(c)
342	You know people are not seeing me anymore and smiling and praising me for how fast I ran on the track.			P(c)
343	They are speaking to me with truth, and talking to me.			P(c)
344	I felt for so long that when people were talking to me they were talking to "me", but...			P(c)
345	The athlete.			
346	The athlete.			P(c)
347	The image.			
348	And now that part is gone and I feel now that people will be able to understand, because they have seen the real Marion.			P(c)
349	That because of that they will see themselves and say; you know what, if she can go through all of this, she can be down, up here at one point and down here the next and you know what, she's still ok with herself and now she wants to help people.			P(c)
350	I think that in itself will inspire people and help people, and that's my hope.			P(c)
351	I think you succeeded, thank you Marion Jones-Thompson.			
352	Thanks very much.			P(c)
353	I think you have succeeded.			
354	Thank you.			P(c)