

This article was downloaded by:[Canadian Research Knowledge Network]
On: 21 July 2008
Access Details: [subscription number 783016864]
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954
Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



European Sport Management Quarterly

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t716100711>

A Deliberative Democratic Approach to Athlete-Centred Sport: The Dynamics of Administrative and Communicative Power

Lisa A. Kihl^a; Lisa M. Kikulis^b; Lucie Thibault^b

^a University of Minnesota, USA

^b Brock University, Canada

Online Publication Date: 01 March 2007

To cite this Article: Kihl, Lisa A., Kikulis, Lisa M. and Thibault, Lucie (2007) 'A Deliberative Democratic Approach to Athlete-Centred Sport: The Dynamics of Administrative and Communicative Power', *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7:1, 1 — 30

To link to this article: DOI: 10.1080/16184740701270287

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16184740701270287>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article maybe used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

ARTICLE

A Deliberative Democratic Approach to Athlete-Centred Sport: The Dynamics of Administrative and Communicative Power

LISA A. KIHl*, LISA M. KIKULIS** & LUCIE THIBAUT**

**University of Minnesota, USA, **Brock University, Canada*

ABSTRACT This article examines the sport policy process in realizing an athlete-centred sport system through the lens of deliberative democracy. We examine the development of an athlete-centred system largely in the context of Canadian high performance sport; however global aspects of this trend are recognized. Athlete-centred initiatives in light of Habermas's (1996) deliberative democracy theory's core concepts of administratively employed power and communicatively generated power are discussed. In particular, we demonstrate instances of communicative power's counter-steering capabilities of the state's use of administrative power. The tensions between administrative and communicative power illustrated through efforts towards establishing an athlete-centred system are also presented. We conclude by discussing the implications for the potential for a deliberative democratic approach in realizing an athlete-centred sport system and raise important issues about its development.

Introduction

Recently there has been increased interest in the importance of sport policy as it relates to discursive practices, ideas and world views that underpin the policy process (Green, 2004a; Green & Houlihan, 2005; Sam, 2003; Sam & Jackson, 2004, 2006); the link between civil society and the state (Harvey, 2002; Sam, 2005; Sam & Scherer, 2006); the influence of power relations and ideologies (Green, 2004a,b; Oakley & Green, 2001); and the contribution that advocacy coalitions make to our understanding of policy change (Green & Houlihan, 2004; Houlihan, 2005). While most of this research has adopted a critical perspective that has acknowledged the role of power, it

Correspondence Address: Lisa A. Kihl, School of Kinesiology, University of Minnesota, 219 Cooke Hall, 1900 University Avenue SE, Minneapolis, MN, 55455, USA. Email: lkihl@umn.edu

has not explicitly addressed the deliberative role of athletes as citizens in the policy process—citizens, we contend, who have largely been excluded.

Over the past 15 years, there has been increasing support for an athlete-centred approach to the delivery of Canadian high performance sport¹ (cf. Athletes CAN, 1994, 2001; Babiak & Thibault, 2001; Canadian Heritage, 2002a, 2002b; Dubin, 1990; Green & Houlihan, 2005; Kidd, 1995a,b; Sport Canada, 2001; Task Force Report, 1992; Thibault & Babiak 2005). Within high performance sport programming, athletes have been recognized as the focal point and, as such, the organizational structure, sport infrastructure and decision-making process have been adapted to support and respond to the needs, values, and objectives of athletes. An athlete-centred high performance sport system is much more than an investment of resources in support programmes to ensure appropriate access to quality training, coaching and facilities; it also includes athlete involvement in discussions about decisions and policies that most affect them.

Realizing athlete-centred high performance sport requires the implementation of various structural mechanisms that provide and support a legitimate space where athletes and their advocates are empowered to exercise their political autonomy. An important contribution in addressing this concern is the discussions, debate and empirical research on deliberative democracy (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006; Bohman, 1996; Fischer, 2006; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Hunold, 2001; Innes & Booher, 2003; Kelly, 2004). In particular, we draw on Jürgen Habermas's (1996) theory of deliberative democracy as explicated in *Between Facts and Norms* in an effort to shed some light on what structural and procedural features of a deliberative democracy would enable athlete-centred high performance sport. Habermas's emphasis on ethical, consultative, communicative and analytical discussions is explained using the concepts of "administratively employed power"—the organizing, sanctioning, and authority of elected officials and civil servants that enforce policy; and "communicatively generated power"—the decisions agreed upon through public discussion and deliberation. It is the relationship between administrative and communicative power that we use as a heuristic device to assess various athlete-centred initiatives and discuss Canadian high performance sport policy and the aim of achieving an athlete-centred sport system where athletes as citizens are perceived as not only active participants on the playing field but also as co-creators of democratic sport governance and legitimate policy.

The purpose of this article, therefore, is to explore the dynamics of the policy process and the significance of a deliberative democratic approach to policy analysis in relation to the issue of achieving an athlete-centred sport system, drawing on Habermas's concepts of administrative power and communicative power. It is important to note that the aim of this article is primarily to initiate discussion and debate about theoretical traditions in policy theory in general and deliberative democracy more specifically and their potential contribution to sport policy. An additional aim is to develop arguments why Habermas's theory provides a strong foundation for understanding the structures and procedures necessary for establishing a

deliberative democratic approach to sport policy. We see this article as an initial step in developing a framework for future empirical investigations. Given our expertise, the examples we draw on are, for the most part, from Canadian sport, however this does not imply that the approach to policy analysis we have adopted is exclusive to this context. For example, athlete involvement in the activities of the International Olympic Committee has recently been underscored by Mason *et al.* (2006). As well, Houlihan (2003), Beamish and Ritchie (2006), Jackson and Ritchie (in press) have all called for an increased role of athletes in decisions and policies involving drugs and doping in sport.

In the following section, we review the context of the policy issue of athlete-centred sport in Canada and outline its relevance in providing a context for understanding a deliberative democratic approach to the policy process. In the second section, an overview of Habermas's theory of deliberative democracy is provided, which serves as the framework for our arguments for the understanding and realization of an athlete-centred high performance sport system. In particular, the explication of his theory focuses on the concepts of communicative and administrative power, where communicative power is argued to be the key normative deliberative resource in offsetting administratively used power where decisions are made based on effectiveness and efficiency. In the third section, we consider the role of athletes in the policy process focusing on representation, the balance of administrative power, communicative power and consultation. This is followed by a section in which we examine selected policy issues in relation to communicative and administrative power. We conclude with a discussion of the importance of employing various communicative approaches and critical aspects of representation in the adoption of a deliberative democratic athlete-centred sport system.

The Policy Issue: Athlete-Centred Sport

In Canada, the principle of athlete-centred underpinning high performance sport was mentioned approximately 30 years ago in a document on the unification of sport (Taylor, 1976, p. 10). It was not until the 1990s, however, that a more concerted effort was made in both actions and policies with explicit athlete-centred goals and initiatives by government and nonprofit associations responsible for the governance and provision of high performance sport (Athletes CAN, 1994; Green & Houlihan, 2005; Mills, 1998; Sport Canada, 2000, 2001; Thibault & Babiak, 2005). As part of larger discussions on a National Planning Framework for Sport on behalf of the Federal-Provincial/Territorial Sport Policy Steering Committee, Athletes CAN² (1994) outlined its position of what constitutes an athlete-centred sport system:

the values, programs, policies, resource allocation and priorities of sport organizations and agencies place primary emphasis on consideration of athletes' needs in a holistic sense and performance goals within that

context. Those responsible for leadership and decision-making in sport must include the athlete in both defining the needs and goals and in determining how to meet them; i.e. the athlete should be the *active subject* in, not the object of, sporting programs. (p. 3)

Athletes CAN (1994; 2001) considers “athlete-centred” as both a concept and a process that acts as a guiding principle in the application of respective standards that serve to function in creating and/or enabling the sport system to symbolize Canadian athletes’ needs, values and goals. Athletes CAN’s documents identified several characteristics such as accountability, respect, empowerment, equity, excellence, responsibility, mutual support and rights that underpin the development of athlete-centred high performance sport. More recently, athlete-centred has been articulated in the *Canadian Sport Policy (CSP)* (Canadian Heritage, 2002a) and *The Canadian Sport Policy Federal-Provincial/Territorial Priorities for Collaborative Action 2002–2005 (CSP-FPTP)* (Canadian Heritage, 2000b)³ as part of a collaborative approach involving all stakeholders in the Canadian sport system:

At the heart of this collaboration is the view that programs must be seen from the perspective of the athlete/participant. This perspective fosters the athlete-centred, coach-led approach to sport that has been shared by governments and the sport community... and which is increasingly reflected in policy and program decisions. (Canadian Heritage, 2002b, p. 10)

Athlete-centred is identified as a characteristic that will ensure a “leading edge” sport environment in Canada where, “the sport system exists for athletes/participants who are the primary focus in the development of policies, programs, and procedures. Athletes/participants are involved throughout the system in decisions that directly relate to them” (Canadian Heritage, 2002a, p. 13).

There are two fundamental aspects to the development of, and calls for, an athlete-centred system. First, athletes’ needs are the focus for determining what structures, systems, and resources are required to ensure their success in competitions. Second, athletes are expected to be involved in ongoing deliberations about policies and decisions that affect them. Thibault and Babiak (2005) considered the first aspect in their examination of structural and financial changes favouring athlete-centred sport. Specifically, they showed how training has been supported through funding and the creation of national training centres; and how structures have changed to ensure athlete representation on boards and in dispute resolutions. Building on this work, we focus on the second aspect of athlete-centred sport, the extent to which athletes are actively engaged in policy deliberations framed through Habermas’s (1996) deliberative democratic theory explained below.

Habermas's Deliberative Democracy

Deliberative approaches to policy analysis emphasize collective, pragmatic, participatory, and local problem solving in recognition that many problems are too complicated, too contested, and too unstable to allow for schematic, centralized regulation (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Hunold, 2001). Deliberative democratic analysis assists in the understanding of the various tensions of governance within a pluralistic society (Bohman, 1996). Based on this claim, Kelly (2004) contends that Habermas's (1996) theory of deliberative democracy can be used as a schema for citizen/administrative collaboration. Deliberations are a necessary activity during problem framing, making practical considerations in understanding policy issues, and seeking solutions (Innes & Booher, 2003). While Habermas's (1996) work frames a deliberative democratic theory for legislation and governments, the governance of many social services involves bureaucratic organizations in both the public and private sectors and as such face challenges of establishing a deliberative democratic approach to establishing policy and making decisions that have an impact on citizens. Deliberative principles, therefore, can be extended to civic society in general because deliberation can lead to greater consensus and mutual respect among citizens and bureaucrats (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004).

Although there is a significant body of literature on deliberative democracy, we have focused on Habermas's (1996) theory as it provides one of the most comprehensive and systematic accounts of the role of public discourse in contemporary democratic societies (Kelly, 2004). His principle of democracy establishes legitimate policy making as it explains how rational political opinion- and will-formation is institutionalized through a system of rights that secures equal participation through a discursive process. Underpinned by Habermas's (1995) theory of discourse, the primary focus is the public justification of administrative and policy decisions to all those affected who are living under a particular policy. Knops (2006) argues that the value of such an approach is its "emancipatory promise of an equal voice in a process of free reasoning" (p. 596), which enables those who have previously been excluded from policy discussions fair and equal footing.

Two elements are fundamental for deliberative democratic governance: i) a system of rights and ii) a procedure for legitimate policy making (theory of discourse) (Habermas, 1996). The starting point for Habermas is a system of rights that function to stabilize behaviour by providing both private and public autonomy of all citizens to engage in policy making and discussions about the resolution of societal issues. In order for a system of rights to be realized, two important elements must be implemented. First, civic autonomy must be institutionalized so that individuals and groups are provided the opportunity to exercise both their private and public liberties in legitimate policy making. Second, in order for the self-referential system of rights to be achieved, it must become permanent and thus necessitates the establishment and employment of state power through the legislative

process. Legal channels must be created and implemented that provide the state sanctioning, organizing and executive powers to ensure that the system of rights is upheld. The function of state authority (political power) is significant as it emphasizes that regulatory power is crucial for enforcing and thus stabilizing the system of rights. Policy consequently functions as the medium through which political power is created and legitimated.

In addition, Habermas's deliberative democratic theory is appropriate for our purpose because he further differentiates political power into administrative power and communicative power making explicit administrative discretionary decision making that accompanies the notion of collaborative government and the importance of accountability. Administrative power is the policy itself—the organizing, sanctioning and executive functions that underpin the system of rights and the process of legitimate policy making. Policy, however, is incapable of defining and applying itself in every situation that arises, rather administrators must interpret and apply policy. In many bureaucratic organizations, policy making may be steered by instrumental reasoning where an administrator (or administrators) determines both the end and the best means to accomplish that end. Administrators are able to use instrumental rationality because of the power associated with their position in the organizational hierarchy and because the system provides them with the discretion to make these decisions (e.g., use of administrative power). Such instrumental use of power means citizens are excluded rather than included in the authority under which the state is ruled (Habermas, 1996; Kelly, 2004). One outcome of such use of discretionary power is that tensions are created within organizations resulting in citizens feeling alienated if policy justifications are based on legality and efficiency rather than on practical reasoning and normative criteria (Habermas, 1996; Hunold, 2001; Kelly, 2004). While citizens may question the legitimacy of these decisions, they withdraw from the deliberative process because of the “democratic deficit” seen to characterize the development, implementation and evaluation of policies that affect their lives. In order to counter-act the instrumental use of power, citizens must make use of the legislative system (institutionally structured opinion- and will-formation) to actively engage in, and guide decision making and policy making. Habermas refers to this as communicatively generated power—the central concept in his deliberative democratic theory.

Communicative power regulates legislation and underpins the government's administrative decision making. In developing his conception of communicative power, Habermas draws from Hannah Arendt's (1958) notion of power where she argues that power can only be generated when individuals act in concert: “Power springs up between men [sic] when they act together” (Arendt, 1958, p. 200). Individuals in concert, therefore, are capable of producing a certain kind of social power that can empower citizens to self-govern. Habermas (1996) argues that legitimate law or policy is developed when communicative power steers administrative power through genuinely enacted policy. That is, in a deliberative democracy, law or policy is prevented from becoming “instrumentalized for the strategic

deployment of power” (Habermas, 1996, p. 168) by bureaucrats and politicians by ensuring procedures are in place such that the power (administrative) to decide or to act is authenticated as the policies enacted have been “legitimated by the laws citizens give themselves in a discursively structured opinion- and will-formation” (Habermas, 1996, p. 170). Administrative power thus cannot reproduce itself on its own terms; it can only be reproduced by means of communicative power through the medium of the law or policy.

In describing the generation of communicative power, Habermas distinguishes between the role of the informal and formal public sphere. For Habermas (1996), the role of the informal public sphere involves the network of groups and organizations, including the media, “that give voice to social problems, make broad demands, articulate public interests or needs, and thus attempt to influence the political process” (p. 355). It is the “sounding board for problems” (Habermas, 1996, p. 359) where citizens act as the sensors to issues and are given protection and encouragement to openly and freely engage in informal communications about problems that occur within society. Characterized as a “network of communicating information and points of view (i.e., opinions expressing affirmative or negative attitudes)” (Habermas, 1996, p. 360), the informal public sphere acts as a problem-solving process where citizens expose problems and publicly discuss them within different forums (i.e., through the media, electronically, citizen juries, roundtable discussions, public debates or informal discussions). Public deliberations require citizens to actively assess reasons and information, and decide what and how issues should be addressed (Bohman, 1996). The informal public sphere also acts as a means to frame or thematize issues so that government officials are influenced to tackle societal concerns.

Habermas maintains that it is necessary for citizens to take on an active role to amplify and influentially thematize problems with possible solutions and dramatize them in such a manner that government officials will put issues on the political agenda. The effectiveness of citizen problematization is observed in the manner in which it drives the political decision-making process. Informal communications are not required to act on problems nor are these discourses under any pressure to make legitimate decisions, which might be perceived as a limitation; however, citizens experience administrative decisions and policies at the grassroots and thus need a space to expose and discuss their issues without having to invest exorbitant amounts of time required in the formal process of political opinion- and will-formation. The informal public sphere, however, is limited in its capacity to act on community issues and is not responsible for resolving issues that fall within the purview of the formal political system.

The formal public sphere refers to the political system where state authority provides legal channels and systems of rights to ensure citizen’s access to policy making. Formal political systems such as the legislature, parliament and judiciary systems, are occupied by elected or appointed officials. Citizen initiatives generated within the informal public sphere are

brought to the attention of the formal public sphere where attempts are made to address their policy concerns through a formal deliberative process of political opinion- and will-formation. It is in this context that communicative power becomes effective as citizen issues are passed into legitimate institutionalized decision making where the force of the better argument guides argumentation and justification of policy decisions. Furthermore, the link between the informal and formal public sphere is illustrated as Habermas states that “institutionalized opinion- and will-formation depends on supplies coming from the informal contexts of communication founding the public sphere . . .” (p. 352). The role of the formal public sphere in the generation of communicative power is therefore the creation of legitimate law through a political process of opinion- and will-formation. The legislative body is the context where formal political discourses and the principle of democracy are realized and state authority is institutionalized through the medium of law.

Habermas’s (1996) directive regarding the nature and scope of communicatively generated power is important to consider when he states, public discourse(s) initiates communicatively generated power and is transformed into legitimate power “only after it [the problem] passes through the filters of the institutionalized procedures of democratic opinion- and will-formation and enters through parliamentary debates into legitimate lawmaking” (p. 371). Consequently, public issues that have been filtered into institutionalized political deliberations are debated and formulated into legitimate policy. The contribution of Habermas’s conceptualization of communicative power is emphasized by Heysse (2006, p. 280) when he states “Habermas’ adaptation of Arendt’s ‘communicative power’ is very useful in expressing the fact that the rules of the struggle for power in a democracy ensure that those in power cannot ignore opinions that gain acceptance in the public sphere”. Communicative power addresses the link between informal deliberations of the ordinary citizens where they are transformed by the formal political system into legitimate policy through institutionalized deliberative discussions.

The transformation of communicative power into administrative power empowers citizens as they use policy to direct decision making and policy making. Habermas’s notion of deliberative democracy suggests, therefore, that the administrative system is steered by means of a power code, is joined by the legislative function of communicative power and remains free of illegitimate uses of social power. The role of the state in such a system is to regulate this transfer of power without disrupting the self-steering mechanism of the democratic system of legitimate law making.

Since it is impossible for all citizens to actively engage in formal political deliberations, Habermas’s parliamentary principle is offered to outline standards for selecting representative bodies to actively participate in these legitimate discussions and decision-making processes. Habermas (1996) suggests that:

The composition and operation of these parliamentary bodies must be regulated according to criteria that are set in accordance with their assigned responsibilities. Questions of fundamental significance arise in regard to the mode of election and status of representatives; in regard to mode of decision making . . . and even in regard to the organization of work. (pp. 170–171)

Representation also entails a “process of anticipation and recollection flowing between representative and constituents’ participation” (Young, 2002, p. 125). Athlete representatives should therefore engage in ongoing back and forth deliberations between their formal legislative groups and with their various constituency groups (sports). The ongoing consultative and deliberative process allows for social agents to reach agreements and influence legitimate policy through their participation in a democratic and discursive process. It is this dynamic between the administratively employed power and the generation of communicative power to ensure a deliberative democratic approach to sport policy and more specifically the development of athlete-centred sport that is the focus of the remainder of this article. A view of sport policy analysis through the lens of deliberative democracy makes explicit the importance of citizen deliberations in creating legitimate policy, how citizens can exercise power through discourse to counter-act administrative instrumental uses of policy in decision making, as well as institutionalizing the necessary infrastructure that supports public discourse in democratic organizational decision making and policy making.

Before discussing the ways in which administrative and communicative power can help us understand athlete-centred sport policy, it is important to consider some of the limitations of this approach that will become important in the development of a research agenda. One concern is that an emphasis on the structural and procedural aspects of deliberative democracy ignores the micropolitics and relations of power (Fischer, 2006; Flyvbjerg, 2001). Fischer argues there is a “need to supplement the structural and procedural design principles with an examination of the underlying social and cultural realities in the political contexts to which they are applied” (p. 24). As such, a consideration of the structural mechanisms that provide and support a legitimate space to exercise political autonomy is a necessary but not sufficient consideration for understanding deliberative democracy. This emphasis on procedure emphasizes a consensus approach to power that ignores conflict and resistance as important dynamics of power relations (Clegg, 1989; Lukes, 2005). We acknowledge this limitation in Habermas’s approach and in our adoption of it as a heuristic device, and consider this paper as a first step in establishing a foundation for procedural design principles for a deliberative democratic approach to sport policy.

Putting the Athlete in “Athlete-Centred”

In the previous section, it was argued that Habermas’s concepts of administrative and communicative power enable us to understand how a

deliberative democratic approach to policy may be possible. The importance of administrative and communicative power to a deliberative democratic approach to athlete-centred sport is its use for the critical analysis of efforts to involve athletes in decision making and the policy process. In this section we explore selected examples where efforts to increase athlete involvement and expand the role of athletes in the sport policy and decision-making process have emerged in the pursuit of an athlete-centred sport system. Across these examples, athlete representation is the approach that has been used to increase involvement of athletes at the policy and decision-making table. It is through the review of these examples that we move beyond the understanding of deliberative democracy as an ideal to understanding the potential of such an approach for achieving deliberative democracy in practice.

Athletes on Decision-Making Boards

Thibault and Babiak (2005) argue that a significant advancement in the representation of athletes occurred in 1998 when, in their quest to adopt an athlete-centred focus to high performance sport, Sport Canada⁴ accepted a recommendation outlined in the report entitled *Sport in Canada: Everybody's Business. Leadership, Partnership, and Accountability* (Mills, 1998)⁵ to increase the level of athlete participation in the decision-making process of national sport federations. This initiative was subsequently referred to as the 20% solution, as the composition of national sport federations' committees dealing with high performance sport or athlete issues needed to include 20% of athletes (Athletes CAN, 2005; Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages Canada, 2000; Sport Canada, 2003; Thibault & Babiak, 2005). Sport Canada operationalized the policy in their next national sport federation funding programme (2001–2005) by linking punitive measures to non-compliance.⁶ Specifically, in order to be eligible for public funding, a national sport federation was required to institute a “formal policy, or demonstrated equivalent, on athlete-centeredness and can demonstrate the direct involvement of high performance athletes in decision-making” (Sport Canada, 2000, p. 4). In a subsequent document, Sport Canada further clarified this requirement for national sport federations applying for federal government funding:

Involvement in decision-making is intended to mean decisions concerning national team athletes. NSOs [national sport organizations/federations] must ensure that opportunities and mechanisms exist for national team athletes to be informed and to provide input on matters affecting them. NSOs must also provide national team athletes with access to due process. (Sport Canada, 2004, p. 8)

In addition, most if not all multi-sport organizations have followed suit. Important for high performance athletes in Canada is the Canadian Olympic Committee's (COC) Athletes' Council that has changed from representatives

from 51 sport organizations to a council of 12 active and recently retired athletes who are nominated and elected by fellow Olympians and Pan Am athletes to represent the views of athletes to the COC through the work of the Athletes' Council and liaising with other COC committees (Peterson, 2005).

Athlete representation on decision-making and policy-making bodies has both increased the engagement of athletes as valued citizens of Canadian high performance sport and has moved the sport system toward realizing the principle of athlete-centred. As part of a deliberative democratic approach, athlete representation acknowledges the necessity of administrative and organizational discretion in sport governance. As part of the formal policy process, athlete representatives are now held accountable to those they represent. Tensions may arise, however, in situations where athletes and their representatives feel alienated in policy discussions after they have been initially involved or consulted to provide feedback about how to address policy issues. Administrators may often filter through athletes' initial input and make final policy decisions without further consultation with athletes or providing justifications that are responsive to their moral or ethical concerns, thus causing feelings of isolation and disconnect from the very organization where they are considered the central stakeholder. Habermas suggests communicative power is one means of relieving this tension. It is this challenge that we explore in the following examples.

Own the Podium—2010

Elite athlete ambitions to finish on the podium at Olympic Games competitions, the disappointments and failure to do so by Canadian athletes at successive Olympic Games, and the continued pressure by athletes to address the flaws in the fragmented and under-funded sport system in Canada, have been continually articulated in the popular press (e.g., *Calgary Herald*, 2004; Christie, 2005; Starkman, 2000, 2004; Stonehouse, 2003), independent reviews (Athletes CAN, 2003; Dubin, 1990; Ekos Research Associates Inc., 2005) and public documents (e.g., Canadian Heritage, 2000, 2004; Mills, 1998). The ongoing discursive consensus in what Habermas called the "informal public sphere" about the problems and need for significant change, however, was not powerful enough to translate into action until the 2010 Olympic Winter Games were awarded to Vancouver. It was at this time that those with the authority to develop fiscal and strategic policy directions, in consultation with athletes and other stakeholders in Canadian high performance sport, were able to build on this momentum and translate it into a specific plan aimed at pressuring government and the corporate sector for the necessary financial contributions that will enable the pursuit of collective goals of podium finishes as supported by those involved in the development of the plan.

Own the Podium—2010 is a plan that rationalizes a proposed 35 medal count⁷ and a top-place finish for Canada at the 2010 Olympic Winter Games. This plan, developed by an independent task force, was grounded

in consultations with a number of representatives from single and multi-sport agencies (e.g., Canadian Olympic Committee, Canadian Paralympic Committee and national winter sport federations) responsible for the development of elite athletes⁸ as well as representatives from VANOC 2010 and LegaciesNow.⁹ Through consultative meetings with each winter sport federation and assessments of their current and expected level of performance, the rationale for the proposed 35 medals was based upon past and potential successes at international competitions such as world championships and the Olympic Games. The plan also addresses the resources required for each sport federation in order to achieve its predicted medal count for 2010 (Priestner Allinger & Allinger, 2004). Recommendations in this report included infusing the high performance sport system with more resources and with a coordinated approach to planning and managing the implementation of the plan.¹⁰ Priority was also given to ensuring technical support and expertise to provide a strong foundation to athlete preparation. These recommendations demonstrated a commitment to an athlete-centred high performance sport system and decisions that place the needs of elite athletes first.

For those who were involved in the development of the strategy, the sense is that not only have they considered “what it takes” in terms of resources and are counting on the sport system, the corporate sector and the federal government to provide these resources, but the foundation is built upon the shared goals of bureaucrats, administrators, coaches and athletes for podium finishes, and a high performance sport system that provides the support and resources to achieve this goal. COC president Michael Chambers was reported as stating, “The COC believes that Canada’s athletes are among the best in the world but they need and deserve additional support to achieve international podium success” (*Edmonton Journal*, 2004). With such importance placed on performance, *Own the Podium—2010* reflects a strategy that will need to be continually scrutinized to ensure decisions made regarding the implementation of the strategy are held accountable to the needs of athletes. Hunold (2001) argues that when cultural or professional values are shared, discussions and criticisms may take place on an informal basis, which may have greater influence in more formal deliberations when decisions are made and policy is developed.

What defines *Own the Podium—2010* as athlete-centred is not only its emphasis on ensuring the training and competition needs of athletes are met in preparation for the 2010 Olympic Winter Games but the involvement of athletes in its development and review. With respect to athlete representation, the independent task force included “. . . experts with over 100 years of combined experience in varying sports and sports systems” (Priestner Allinger & Allinger, 2004, p. 2) including former athletes; the COC also had athlete representatives as part of the consultation process; and “top athletes from across the country were also contacted for input on the program” (*Inside Track*, 2005, p. 7). From this perspective, *Own the Podium—2010* is a plan and a process that has been established based on consultation through deliberations that included athletes. As a result of

these deliberations, an agreement was established where the full disclosure of the interests of administrators and bureaucrats in placing first in the medal count at the 2010 Olympic Winter Games and the desire of athletes for podium finishes was put forth.

Creating a bold plan as a strategy to obtain resource commitment is an interesting and, for some, an admirable instrumental means to an instrumental end as articulated by Chris Rudge, the chief executive officer of the COC:

We're trying to get for the athletes what they need to be successful . . . The message is clear to everyone we will not be successful if we only run a successful Games. . . . The Games will only be successful if we also compete successfully as the host nation, not like in the past. (Starkman, 2004)

Administrative power, steered by instrumental reasoning that is not legitimated through communicative power, where individuals (i.e., athletes) and their representatives are able to fully deliberate (Habermas, 1996) is not representative of an athlete-centred system. It is with this caution in mind that we present the following example.

Canadian Olympic Team Selection

With an aim of improving Canada's standing at the Olympic Games and motivating athletes to perform at higher levels, in April 2002 the COC "raised the bar" for qualifying for the Olympic Games for Athens 2004. Rather than the Top 16 and Top ½ criteria that had been used for the past quarter century, national team selection was now based on objective selection criteria that required athletes to be Top 12 in the world (Canadian Olympic Committee, 2002). These were more restrictive standards than those established by international sport federations (Athletes CAN, 2004; Canadian Olympic Committee, 2002) and only applied to the Canadian Olympic team selection for the summer Athens 2004 Games.¹¹ Although the tougher Canadian standards were criticized by both athletes who made the standards and athletes who did not (Starkman, 2004; Warick, 2004), some athletes were consulted in this COC initiative. Members of national sport federations and a six member COC Athletes' Council voted in favour of adopting the standard.

Athletes CAN formally expressed the concern of athletes and specifically noted their issues about the process of deciding on the Top 12 standard. They stated that:

Athletes have raised major concerns over the way in which feedback was solicited by COC Athletes Council on this issue and the nature of representations on behalf of athletes by this Council to the COC Board and Executive. In addition, the majority of NSOs [national sport organizations/federations] appear to not have been provided with the

opportunity to voice their legitimate concerns over this policy, once the implications were clearer and better understood. These concerns over process again reflect a departure from the Olympic values of fairness and respect. (Athletes CAN, 2004, p. 2)

For Athletes CAN and athletes more generally, the tougher than international standards approach, the lack of quantitative and qualitative evidence to support the arguments for standard changes, and the need for a “review [of] the role of the COC Athletes Council, ensuring the new governance structure fairly and effectively represents the interests of all Canadian Olympic athletes” (Athletes CAN, 2004) highlight a concern that athletes appear to be the object of, rather than the active subject in, the deliberative process about discussions and consultations in revising Olympic qualifying standards. The deliberations included athlete representation in deciding on the Top 12 standard policy for the COC, however some of the athletes and athlete representatives “backlash” indicated their concerns about the need to revisit this standard and the process (Athletes CAN, 2004). The standards and the responsibility for the COC to set and implement them are established in the governing policies and procedures (i.e., administrative power). To ensure Canadian Olympic Team Selection is truly athlete-centred, the discretionary use of administrative power by the COC should consider challenges and objections made by athletes—who are the ones most affected by the policy.

Both *Own the Podium—2010* and the Canadian Olympic Team Selection were developed with the intention of supporting elite athletes in their quest for podium finishes at international competitions. The caution however is that those with discretion to implement and evaluate these initiatives may take the consensus and shared interests for granted. This runs the risk of suppressing reflexive evaluation and repressing the voice of athletes at critical stages within the policy process.

Collaborative governance of sport systems necessitates administrative discretion that is legitimized through the power code that provides officials with sanctioning, executive and organizing powers to perform their work. Tensions arise, however, when administrators employ administrative power through discretionary decision making that is based on instrumental reasoning, which leads to alienating citizens by limiting their ability to question administrative decision making and have their views considered. Habermas argues that communicatively generated power should act to balance the use of administratively employed power in a deliberative democratic policy process. He maintains that communicative power involves:

... mobiliz[ing] reasons and arguments that draw on citizens' interests, values, and identities. Political discourse thus brings in the citizens' actual sources of motivation and volition. It thereby generates a “communicative power” that has a real impact on the formal decision making and action that represent the final institutional expression of political “will”. (Habermas, 1996, p. xxviii)

This dynamic between administrative and communicative power is demonstrated in the following examples.

Beckie Scott and the 2002 Olympic Winter Games

At the 2002 Olympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City, after winning the bronze medal in the women's 5 km combined classical and free-style cross-country ski event on 15 February 2002 (finishing behind Olga Danilova and Larissa Lazutina of Russia), Canadian Beckie Scott expressed her concerns to the media about the level of doping in her sport, cross-country skiing, and in her race, stating "I feel I didn't compete on an entirely clean field" and when asked whether she felt the silver and gold medal winners were "clean" she was quoted as saying "No comment" (cited in Morris, 2002). She further stated that she did not believe her international sport federation for the sport, the *Fédération Internationale de Ski* (FIS), was doing enough to prevent doping in her sport. Scott's use of the media to discuss doping in her sport and in her race, rather than discussing her concerns directly with her sport federation, or with the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), was at the time publicly criticized by Dick Pound, Canadian member of the IOC and chair of WADA. In response, he was quoted as saying:

If she's [Beckie Scott] got specific complaints against people or things that they're using, that's one thing, but to make sort of generalized statements about people cheating without having any facts to back them up is not helpful. . . . She should, instead of doing the 'ready, fire, aim,' think of 'ready, aim, fire.' (Fitz-Gerald, 2002)

For Habermas, the use of administrative power through discretionary and/or instrumental reasoning limits the ability for other individuals to question decisions and have their views considered legitimate. Pound's public criticism of Scott's "inappropriate" use of media channels to question athletes' doping may be seen as an attempt to use his administrative power and authority to limit the use of informal public deliberations and silence the voice, expertise, and knowledge of athletes. Hunold (2001) states:

Deliberative democracy requires that all citizens participate on the basis of equality with administrative officials and technical experts. In practice, this means that all participants of policy deliberations should have the same chance to define issues, dispute evidence, and shape the agenda. (p. 158)

The institutionalization of citizen rights, in our case athletes, affords them the right to exercise their public autonomy without any repercussions (Habermas, 1996).

Nine days following the exchange in the media, the two athletes who had finished ahead of Beckie Scott in the 5 km event, tested positive for doping after completing another event (30 km) and were disqualified from the

Games. At the time, however, they were allowed to keep their medals from the 5 km event. Pressure to strip the silver and gold winners of their medals was maintained by the Canadian Olympic Committee, the Norwegian Olympic Committee, Beckie Scott, Norwegian athletes and the media. It was 18 December 2003 before Beckie Scott was awarded the gold medal by the Court of Arbitration for Sport (Cole, 2003).¹²

In this example, we see two deliberative democratic processes in place. First, communicative power “injected from the bottom” (Shabani, 1998) is used to steer “administrative power”. Second, the influence of communicative power is legitimized through institutional procedures (e.g., the Court of Arbitration for Sport) that enabled the deliberative process to flourish and influence the outcome. A procedural mechanism was also provided that enabled the voice of athletes to be heard and to have the same opportunity to influence the outcome as administrators. Governance by law institutionalizes a system of rights ensuring civic autonomy. The process of official protests involving courts of arbitration, and the capacity to challenge the IOC’s decision to allow the athletes in question to keep their medals was enabled by the IOC’s constitution which provided a medium through which athletes can challenge decisions and/or medals. Communicative power is thus written in the form of law and provides a legal avenue for citizens to challenge administrative decision making.

The Canadian Sport Policy

The involvement of athletes as part of the decision- and policy-making process was also evident in the development of the *Canadian Sport Policy* (Canadian Heritage, 2002a), a result of one of the most consultative and deliberative processes for sport policy development in Canada (Sport Canada, 2001; Thibault & Babiak, 2005). The two-year consultation process involved several opportunities for athlete involvement. First, there were six regional conferences held throughout Canada (Atlantic—Fredericton, Northern—Yellowknife, Prairies—Regina, British Columbia—Vancouver, Ontario—Hamilton, and Québec—Magog). These regional conferences brought together a number of stakeholders including athletes (Sport Canada, 2001).

Second, six roundtables were established around specific issues or interest groups (i.e., athletes, officials, Aboriginals, national and multi-sport organizations, equity and inclusion, and the media) (Sport Canada, 2001). In the athletes’ roundtable held in November 2000 in Calgary, Alberta, 27 athlete representatives participated in dialogue identifying high-priority issues. One of the issues identified was the “need for a system that allows athletes to train and compete full-time and to balance this with family life, education and career” (Canadian Heritage, 2000, p. 9). The recommendation from athletes led to debates about the issue of funding—an important concern for athletes who have seen some progress but still believe that the amount of financial support provided from government sources does not adequately meet their needs (Athletes CAN, 2003; Canadian Heritage, 2004;

Christie, 2005; Ekos Research Associates Inc., 2005). At the roundtable discussions, athletes also provided recommendations. Among the recommendations were that government funding be used to hold their organizations accountable for sustaining athlete representation; that athlete representatives be elected by their peers and have voting rights at the executive or board level in their sport organizations; that consideration be given to having recently retired athletes as representatives; and that Athletes CAN be represented at all major events (Canadian Heritage, 2000). A number of these recommendations have been implemented.¹³

Third, these regional conferences and roundtables culminated in a national summit held in Ottawa, where 400 representatives from across the country met. The National Summit on Sport was televised live on public television (on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on the last day of the Summit, Saturday 28 April 2001). Representatives attending the summit included athletes, coaches, officials, administrators, individuals from the fields of health and education, and politicians from all levels of government. In addition, working drafts of the policy were made publicly available for feedback. The extensive consultative process (regional conferences, roundtables, national summit, draft reports) was the precursor to the development of the *Canadian Sport Policy* (cf. Canadian Heritage, 2002a, 2002b; Sport Canada, 2001).

The policy process that underpinned the *Canadian Sport Policy* demonstrated an athlete-centred approach with the inclusion of athlete representatives in the informal public sphere where forums were provided for public discussion, enabling representatives to engage indirectly in an assessment of the issues and related solutions in public space that has made its way into the formal policy. By contrast, the Beckie Scott case demonstrates that within the high performance sport system, the goal of developing an athlete-centred system has included efforts to develop formal means for communicatively generated power to influence policy and hold discretionary administrative decision making accountable as well as holding administrators responsible in policy interpretation and in its application. Communicative power was legitimized through institutional procedures (e.g., courts of arbitration) that have the deliberative process to influence policy outcomes regarding issues that relate to athletes. Providing the informal and formal public sphere that has enabled the voice of athletes to be heard and to have an opportunity to influence policy outcomes is supported by a commitment to an athlete-centred sport system—not only in Canada, but globally (cf. Beamish & Ritchie, 2006; Houlihan, 2003; Jackson & Ritchie, in press; Mason *et al.*, 2006).

The examples discussed above highlight the ways in which athletes have become active participants in the development of, and deliberations about, issues, programmes and policies that have an impact on their athletic endeavours. We have focused on examples of representation through which involvement of athletes has been fostered in the Canadian high performance sport delivery system. The role of athlete representation as the means by which administrative and communicative power are played out highlights

both the limitations on, and possibilities for, achieving athlete-centred sport. In the next section, we critically examine the impact of representation and its policy implications for developing an athlete-centred system in light of Habermas's deliberative democratic theory.

Understanding Athlete-Centred Policy Dynamics: Administrative and Communicative Power

Habermas's (1996) deliberative democratic theory provides a procedural account of including citizens (in our case athletes) in decision making and the policy process where the notion of communicative power is the key to providing "self-programming" governance such that only outcomes (e.g., decisions, policy, programmes, strategies) are deemed legitimate when they are a product of a discursive process involving those potentially affected individuals/groups or their representatives. Administrators quite often argue that they make decisions based on efficiency which is necessary to carry out the public will. This responsibility often entails using their discretion in the interpretation and application of policies, and ultimately implementing them through their decisions and runs the risk of separating administrative and communicative power, setting a foundation for repressing the voice of athletes rather than speaking for them—suppressing reflexive evaluation of what constitutes the better policy. Habermas states that a tension arises when outcomes are created, interpreted or applied by administrators who use their discretionary decision-making power in such a way that ignores or contradicts those citizens who will be affected by the outcome. For Habermas, this is not legitimate policy because it may be used for political interests and enforced through sanctions that are not agreed upon (i.e., administrative power). Heysse (2006) adds that the value of communicative power is that "imposing a decision is . . . never the end of the matter; the power with which the decision is imposed depends on opinions about which public debate may be reopened at any moment" (p. 282). The important consideration here is the confidence athletes have in the process of deliberative democracy such that athletes and those affected are willing to argue and discuss alternatives and preferences and rally support for changing or overturning policies or decisions imposed through administrative discretion.

We have identified several instances where athletes and athlete advocates have generated communicative power through the informal and formal public sphere to influence sport policy and administrative decisions. The examples reviewed highlight the role of informal communicative power through the use of consultation with athletes and former athletes as part of roundtable discussions during the creation of the *Canadian Sport Policy* and to provide feedback on the development of *Own the Podium—2010*. The informal consultations, regional and national conferences, roundtable discussions, and media coverage provided a space for athletes and their representatives to express their concerns on the various issues that affect their athletic lives and a space for them to capitalize on their social power by

vocally raising issues and convincingly problematizing them such that they became part of formal policy discussions and influenced decisions and policy outcomes. For example, early media coverage and athlete lobbying in the Beckie Scott case and continuous media coverage of the “disappointing” athletic performance of Canadians at recent Olympic Games and the funding plight of these athletes provided exposure to these issues.

The key role of the informal public sphere in the policy process is to thematize athlete concerns, interests, and ideas for addressing concerns in such a manner that influence a wider debate within the public arena—with the end goal of placing political pressure on bureaucrats and politicians with an aim of bringing about policy change that reflects a more pronounced athlete-centered sport system. For Habermas, this aspect of the informal public sphere is critical to providing a forum for public discussions that enable citizens to engage directly in an assessment of the issues and related solutions that will make its way into the “institutionally structured political will-formation” in the formal public sphere (Habermas, 1996, p. 485). However, the informal public sphere in itself does not have the ability to make collective binding decisions—this takes place in the formal public sphere as explained by Habermas (1996, p. 171) “the administration that has to act as part for the whole can be programmed and controlled only through laws [or policies]”.

We have identified a number of circumstances where policy developed from communicative power generated by both the formal and informal public sphere have been developed. For example, the development of what has been informally termed the “20% solution” has institutionalized the practice of athlete representation on formal decision-making bodies in sport organizations and observed in the development of *Own the Podium—2010* and the Canadian Olympic Team Selection (e.g., Top 12 criteria). In these cases, athletes had representation on the decision-making body. In addition, athlete interests were legally represented at the Court of Arbitration for Sport in the Beckie Scott case. From this perspective, it may be argued that the outcomes were legitimate in the sense that they were developed initially through communicative power generated in some cases through both the informal and formal public sphere. We revisit this assumption below.

These examples of discursively structured opinion- and will-formation also expose tensions in attempting to hold administrators accountable for their discretionary decision and policy making. Self-governance requires that citizens in the public sphere hold officials accountable in their decision making. Public deliberation and organizing assist in limiting arbitrary power by exposing it and demanding that persons in administrative positions provide appropriate justification for their decisions (Habermas, 1996; Young, 2002). In the creation of *Own the Podium—2010* and the Canadian Olympic Team Selection, athletes were consulted in the initial deliberations about determining respective standards. However, legitimate opinion- and will-formation requires ongoing consultation with citizens and their representatives. The creation of legitimate decisions and policies involve deliberations about interpretations, applications, and evaluations of these

policies and judgements. Indeed, “thanks to deliberation, the common good can be seen as a cooperative construction of the whole community and as the outcome of ongoing persuasion and compromise that never ends in a permanent verdict” (Urbinati, 2000, p. 772). In making institutionalized binding decisions, therefore, the bureaucrats, administrators and politicians who govern high performance sport in Canada should not only ensure that those most affected by a decision/policy are involved in the interpretation of the policy(ies) during implementation phases but representatives should also be involved in discussions on an ongoing basis.

In addition, athletes were also consulted as part of the development of the *Canadian Sport Policy*, however their involvement was limited to the informal public sphere. As a government document, the formal deliberations about policy content and the making of the written policy were left to the bureaucrats and politicians. Whether the interests of athletes as articulated during informal discursive exercises might be represented in the written document is an empirical issue that requires future investigation. The concern here is that administratively employed power through discretionary decision making and/or instrumental reasoning limits the ability for other individuals to question decisions and have their views considered, thus creating tensions. Such limitations to communicative power require consideration that there is a potential for administrative power being employed to repress any efforts at communicative power for instrumental reasons rather than in the interests of athletes.

Although limited in scope, these examples reveal how the implementation of athlete representation as a means to develop a more athlete-centred sport system has enabled athletes to become involved in informal and formal deliberations about issues that affect them. In applying Habermas’s concepts of administrative and communicative power as a reflexive tool for the critical analysis of efforts to include athletes and athletes’ interests in decision making, we have uncovered the contributions and limitations of a deliberative democratic approach to developing an athlete-centred sport system. Two issues emerge from this critique: (1) the examples show that Habermas’s deliberative democratic theory and in particular administrative and communicative power are not abstract theoretical ideals—the inclusion of athletes and athlete representatives in discussions and decision making about issues that matter to them has resulted in what Habermas would call “legitimate” policy and/or practice where issues are debated and follow a path to the formal public sphere generating communicative power such that decisions and policy are agreed upon; and (2) the tensions and dynamics between administrative and communicative power are highlighted when we observe athlete representation being limited to the informal public sphere, or having a representation in the formal process but not having the opportunity for ongoing deliberations with those athletes whom they represent. In the next section, we take up the issue of representation addressing these constraints so that Habermas’s principle of democratic deliberation may be achieved through communicative and administrative power and ensure an athlete-centred system.

What Ought We to Do?

Habermas's theory of deliberative democracy is based on the principles that all those affected by a decision should have a chance to participate and that decisions are outcomes achieved through rational arguments. His recognition of the informal public sphere where deliberations and debates engage the public and have the potential to be "picked up" by the formal public sphere generating communicative power recognizes the importance of all citizens in the policy process. Habermas also stipulates that representation is critical in the formal public sphere, stating:

Justified and binding decisions about policies and laws demand, on the one hand that deliberation and decision making take place face to face. On the other hand, at the level of direct and simple interactions, not all citizens can join in the shared exercise of such a practice. A solution to this problem is provided by *the parliamentary principle* of establishing representative bodies for deliberation and decision making. (Habermas, 1996, p. 170, emphasis in original)

The argument is not only supported by pragmatic reasons but there are ethical arguments as well—such as the selection (or election) of representatives who have experience, are informed about the issues, and are passionate advocates, so that they can be more effective deliberators (Gutmann & Thompson, 2004).

It is this principle that characterizes much of how the Canadian sport system has addressed the need to include athletes in the decision-making process. Providing athletes with more representation and voting rights has been adopted as the way to ensure an athlete-centred system and provide athletes with the opportunity to be involved in decisions that affect them. In addition, representation is also characterized by the involvement of former athletes who are considered "experts" who are consulted to provide information and feedback on policies and programmes or recruited as part of the formal decision-making bodies. The merits and limitations of direct participation of all citizens and representative democracy have been taken up in the literature (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006; Delli Carpini *et al.*, 2004; Phillips, & Orsini, 2002). Of greater importance for our analysis is whether the existing "athlete representation" is sufficient to contribute to an athlete-centred system that not only places the needs of athletes first but involves athletes throughout the system on issues that pertain to them. Three concerns and suggestions for addressing these issues are provided below.

The first concern with representation is the involvement of "active" athletes who have a focus on training and competition. Consequently, the scheduling of committee meetings may not be a priority and may not be compatible with their schedules. An athlete elected as a representative may not be able to attend all meetings. Thus athletes may not have the time or will to participate in policy or decision making. Athletes on decision-making boards or the implementation of a "representation" policy may be critiqued

in terms of whether it enables the fulfillment of a deliberative democratic approach to achieving an athlete-centred high performance sport. Providing athletes with “voting” rights reflects the notion of democracy. Voting has been adopted and unquestioned as “the way” to ensure athlete-centred high performance sport and to demonstrate a democracy by giving athletes the opportunity to be involved in decisions that affect their lives. A deliberative democratic process, however, requires citizens to actively participate in discussions. For athletes who are focused on full-time training, working to meet financial needs and/or pursuing their education, it may be difficult to be actively engaged in such a deliberative process. What needs to be considered is whether the athlete representation on decision-making boards is one means of manipulating athlete-centred to promote certain interests over others. Even though representation provides a platform for athletes to influence policies, not all athletes have the capacity to deliberate.

Second, the involvement of recently retired athletes to lead and assist in the development of a high performance sport system that focuses on athletes’ needs addresses concerns about commitment and availability of active athletes yet ensures the involvement of those with experience and understanding of “the athletes’ view”. The concern, however, is whether or not the ongoing opportunity exists for these athlete representatives to deliberate with athletes on the decisions or policies and how these decisions and policies are interpreted and applied. As Gutmann and Thompson (2004) state:

Citizens rely on their representatives to do their deliberating for them, but representatives are expected not only to deliberate among themselves but also to listen to and communicate with their constituents, who in turn should have many opportunities to hold them accountable. The advantage is that the deliberation by leaders who have been tested by experience... is likely to be more informed, effective, and relevant. The disadvantage is that most citizens become mere spectators. . . . Moreover, and perhaps most critically, representative democracy places a very high premium on citizens’ holding their representatives accountable. To the extent that they fail to do so, or are prevented from doing so, their representatives may fail to act responsibly, or even honestly. (p. 30)

Deliberations with representatives necessitate a broad understanding of formal discussions where individuals not only sit at the formal decision making “table” involved in opinion- and will-formation but are also included in both initial and ongoing consultations in: (1) determining athletes’ needs and values and (2) interpreting, implementing, and evaluating of policies and judgments. Ongoing consultative deliberations give athletes and their representatives a forum and an opportunity to provide feedback about policy interpretation and final policy decisions. For example, athlete representatives were involved in the development of *Own the Podium—2010* that included collective goals of podium finishes and were also involved in the establishment of criteria for Canadian Olympic Team

Selection in being ranked Top 12 in the world. They should however, be provided with a public space where they are able to ask for moral and ethical justifications of administrative decisions. This is where communicative power acts in “the manner of a siege” (Habermas, 1996, p. 486) as it offers a “normative filter” that restricts the extent of discretionary administrative decision making.

Finally, representation involves the use of bargaining and voting to determine how interests are heard. Bargaining involves compromises, threats, promises, and various uses of power to accept one’s claim. This is particularly problematic when such powers are not equally distributed and when discourse ethics is not used to establish the procedures by which deliberations are fair and that bargaining power is evenly distributed (Habermas, 1996; Knops, 2006). In Habermas’s deliberative democratic theory, the principle of discourse ethics which defines deliberations as “a joint process of ‘ideal role taking’...” in deciding how to address community or organizational issues, citizens are involved in equal participation of a “free” process of exchange of information where rational consensus is sought based on “good” reasoning (1996, p. 117). The focus on citizen discussions follows a process of “thoughtful interaction and opinion-formation” where individuals rely on reasoned argumentation (Habermas, 1996, p. ix). Alternatives are weighed and decisions are rationally justified to become more informed regarding the public’s general interests and policy justifications. If athlete representation (by active or retired athletes) is to hold its promise of considering the interests and views of athletes, primacy must be placed on ensuring legitimate rules for deliberation are founded upon the understanding that participants have different views, that these views are respected, and that everyone should explore the perspective of others and evaluate their own perspective in light of others such that the common values and interests of all the relevant stakeholders are uncovered.

Conclusions

This paper examined specific accounts of how athlete involvement in decisions and policies has played out in a system that is working towards realizing the principle of athlete-centred high performance sport. Two critical aspects of deliberative democracy were featured: administrative and communicative power. These aspects provided the foundation from which to examine specific events and to critique the extent to which changes have really translated into ensuring athletes’ interests are represented in the development, implementation and evaluation of decisions and policies that affect their lives. Instances where athletes and athlete advocates have used communicative power in the informal and formal public sphere to influence policies and decisions contributing to a notable shift towards athlete-centred high performance sport have been presented. Instances where policy development and key decision making that appear to provide limited opportunity for communicative power to steer administrative power were also presented. With the exception of the Beckie Scott case, the examples

presented, although highlighting the ways in which policies and decisions relating to athletes have become more athlete-centred through the adoption of a more deliberative and democratic policy process, have also shown that deliberations involving athletes or athlete representatives is often limited and/or expedited rather than judged as a critical component to enhancing the quality and value of decisions or policies. A similar concern was voiced by Houlihan (2003) who, in reference to the World Anti-Doping Code, noted "... changes that have happened are a result of the good will of the powerful rather than the involvement of the athletes themselves." As such, sport bureaucrats' use of discretion in determining what is in the best interest of the athletes does not always symbolize the principle of athlete-centred sport.

Drawing from Habermas's deliberative democratic theory, it is suggested that when examining changes towards athlete-centred high performance sport, we need to consider the extent to which the voice of athletes is really heard and to what extent deliberations that frame policy are characterized through a process that ensures advocate-representation so that policy development, implementation and evaluation are founded upon deliberative democratic principles. The need for a deliberative democratic approach to policy is a means for strengthening civil society through citizen engagement and giving those previously excluded a voice (Bohman, 1996; Harvey, 2002; Hunold, 2001; Knops, 2006). Deliberative democracy requires the education of all citizens by providing the necessary information so that they are informed on issues and are able to participate in deliberations on key policy issues. As well, the process is characterized by ongoing discussions throughout the policy process (Delli Carpini *et al.*, 2004; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Phillips & Orsini, 2002; Theiss-Morse & Hibbing, 2005). Absent from the literature is an understanding of the various citizen capacities necessary to effectively engage in public deliberations that will allow for a self-programming sport governance.

Finally, this paper has attempted to formulate a rationale that demonstrates the nature and scope of communicative power and its ability to counter-steer the use of administrative power. Critics have argued that the exact nature, scope, and process of generating communicative power are vague (Flynn, 2004; Kelly, 2004). Specifically, Flynn (2004) posits that it is unclear where communicative power is actually situated. He argues that it is difficult to pinpoint the nature and scope of when citizens informally engage in political discourse or engage in discourse as representatives within political institutions—is it produced in the discussions of the informal public sphere or is it generated within the institutional power to make binding decisions in the formal public sphere? These are empirical questions that need to be added to the research agenda. To develop our arguments we have focused on the nature and scope of communicatively generated power and highlighted the importance of the different types of discussions within the informal sphere and the relation to the formal political sphere in legitimate policy and decision making. Further empirical research, however, should examine this link in more depth and specific types of informal and formal discourses, and instances where communicative power has been

unsuccessful in steering administrative power. Using the advocacy coalition framework to analyse policy change in elite sport in Canada and the United Kingdom, Green and Houlihan (2004) highlight the importance of analysing the policy process and the role of actors in this process arguing that over time the values and beliefs of actors involved in the process may change resulting in lesser or more prominent roles in the policy process. The caution, therefore, is whether or not representatives are co-opted and subjected to manipulation to support the existing policy or decision. Future research needs to consider these arguments and delve into power relations among all stakeholders involved in high performance sport.

This paper provides a foundation for future empirical research. A number of key questions is worthy of exploration. For example, what is the capacity of athletes or athlete representatives to participate in the policy process? What is the will of policy makers to change procedures and structures to reflect a deliberative democratic approach to athlete-centred sport? This paper also calls for future research to take a more comprehensive approach to investigating the extent to which the policy and decision-making processes in Canada's high performance sport system is characteristic of a deliberative democracy and has indeed resulted in a truly athlete-centred high performance sport system.

Notes

1. We use an interpretation of high performance sport as articulated by Abby Hoffman (former director of Sport Canada). She defined the "art and science of high performance sport" as getting "the right ingredients together (the coach, the facilities, the training programme, the competitions, etc.) in the right combination at the right time, and applied to the right group of athletes" in order to address the "nature of commitment to excellence in Canada" (*Fitness and Amateur Sport*, 1990, p. 8). The interpretation of elite athlete is also drawn from a federal government document, *Sport: The Way Ahead* (Task Force Report, 1992, p. 31) that states elite athletes are individuals who "have attained the highest levels in their sport through intensive training, skill, technical development and competitive success. Training... is more intensive with regular competition at high-performance national and international levels. The pursuit of excellence is a driving force behind high-performance athletes."
2. Athletes CAN is a nonprofit organization that was created by high performance athletes for high performance athletes to represent their interests and concerns within the Canadian sport system.
3. These documents articulate a vision, goals, and actions aimed at developing sport at all levels in Canada. The documents use the term "athlete/participant" when referring to visions, goals and actions that are aimed at individuals involved in competitive sport or sport for recreation and reserving the use of the term "athlete" when considering individuals involved in competitive sport only. Our focus is on high performance sport and as such we use the term "athlete".
4. Sport Canada is a unit of the federal government located within the Department of Canadian Heritage. Its mission is "to enhance opportunities for Canadians to participate and excel in sport" (Sport Canada, 2005).
5. The report by Mills (1998) was published following the findings of a parliamentary sub-committee charged with the responsibility to study sport in Canada. Members of the

sub-committee consulted with a number of key stakeholders in Canada's sport system. Dennis Mills a Liberal Member of Parliament, was the Chair of this sub-committee. The recommendation in question stated: "The Government of Canada ensure that top-level athletes have more control over the system by encouraging sports organizations to give them significant decision-making strength in those issues that affect them" (Mills, 1998, p. 133).

6. While national sport federations are autonomous independently governed nonprofit sport organizations, the majority of these organizations is highly dependent on financial contributions from Sport Canada. In recent years Sport Canada has linked financial contributions to specific public policy objectives such as, but not limited to, the realization of an athlete-centred sport system.
7. The success of Canada's winter athletes at world championships during the 2004–2005 winter season (28 medals: 10 gold, 10 silver, and 8 bronze) was promoted as a sign that the renewed system and strategy is working (Bell, 2005). The performance of Canadian athletes at the Torino Olympic Winter Games was further evidence that *Own the Podium—2010* is on the right track (Canadian Olympic Committee, 2006a).
8. In the development of *Own the Podium—2010*, various representatives (including athletes) from all 13 winter National Sport federations, the COC, Sport Canada, Calgary Olympic Development Association, Canadian Paralympic Committee, and VANOC 2010, met and established various goals, principles, and a framework for achieving success at the 2010 Olympic Winter Games. A steering committee (Own the Podium Steering Committee) was responsible for implementing the report's recommendations; however, the representatives from the respective winter sports are not athletes, (some may be former athletes, for example Ken Read) but are currently administrators in the system (Canadian Olympic Committee, 2005).
9. VANOC 2010 is the name of the Organizing Committee for the Olympic Winter Games to be held in Vancouver in 2010. LegaciesNow is responsible for ensuring and managing the legacies of these games.
10. *Own the Podium—2010* sparked the federal government to invest \$55 million (CAD) over five years to support the report's initiatives (Canadian Heritage, 2005a). The report specifies the required additional funding each winter sport organization needs to translate into the predicted medal count during the 2010 Games.
11. The Canadian Olympic Committee reset the qualification standard to the lower international sport federation standard in time for the Torino 2006 Olympic Winter Games.
12. Ironically, Beckie Scott was appointed a member of the Athlete Committee of the World Anti-Doping Agency in March 2005 under the chairship of Dick Pound (WADA, 2005). Beckie Scott was subsequently voted to the International Olympic Committee Athletes' Commission in February 2006 for an eight-year term (Canadian Olympic Committee, 2006b) and she was appointed to the Board of Directors of VANOC 2010 in May 2006 (VANOC 2010, 2006).
13. From the recommendations that were implemented, as criteria for receiving public funding, national sport federations must have an athlete-centred policy that indicates the direct involvement of athletes in decision making (Canadian Heritage, 2005b). National sport federations have opened their governance structures to include athlete representatives. In addition, most if not all multi-sport organizations have followed suit. The most relevant for high performance athletes is the Canadian Olympic Committee's Athletes' Council that has changed from representatives from 51 sport organizations to a council of 12 active and retired athletes who are nominated and elected by fellow Olympians and Pan Am athletes to represent the views of athletes to the COC through committee work and liaising with COC committees (Peterson, 2005).

References

- Abelson, J., & Gauvin, F. P. (2006). *Assessing the impacts of public participation: concepts, evidence and policy implications*. CPRN Research Report No. P|06. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Press.
- Athletes CAN (1994). *Athlete-centred sport. Discussion paper*, September. Retrieved 18 November 2003, from www.athletescan.com/e/publications/AthleteCentredDiscussion.doc
- Athletes CAN (2001). *Position paper on the development of national sport policy*, 10 January. Retrieved 2 June 2004, from www.athletescan.com/e/publications/NatSportPolicyPosition.doc
- Athletes CAN (2003). *Effective athlete advocacy*. Presentation made at the Athletes CAN Forum. Retrieved on 19 June 2006, from www.athletescan.com/Images/Publications/Effective_Athlete_Advocacy.ppt
- Athletes CAN (2004). *COC Top 12 criteria. Athletes CAN position paper*, 29 June. Retrieved 19 April 2005, from www.athletescan.com/e/publications/documents/COC_Top12_Criteria_position_June2904.doc
- Athletes CAN (2005). *History of Canadian sport and accomplishments of athletes CAN*. Retrieved 18 February 2005, from www.athletescan.com/Content/About/History.asp?langid=1
- Babiak, K., & Thibault, L. (2001). *Shifting priorities in amateur sport delivery: the case of Canadian national sport*, 4 June. Paper presented at the North American Society for Sport Management Conference. Virginia Beach, Virginia, USA.
- Beamish, R., & Ritchie, I. (2006). *Fastest, highest, strongest: a critique of high-performance sport*. London: Routledge.
- Bell, T. (2005). All the work is aimed at winning Olympic gold in 2010. *The Vancouver Province*, 29 May. Retrieved 18 February 2005, from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Bohman, J. (1996). *Public deliberation: pluralism, complexity, and democracy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Calgary Herald (2004). Olympic disappointment: More federal funding may not be the answer, 30 August. Retrieved 19 June 2006, from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Canadian Heritage (2000). *Report on the Athletes Roundtable, Calgary, AB, November 19–20, 2000*. Retrieved 5 June 2006, from www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/pol/pccs-csp/ncs-rt/4_e.cfm
- Canadian Heritage (2002a). *The Canadian sport policy*. Retrieved 25 May 2003, from www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/pol/pccs-csp/2003/polSPORT_e.pdf
- Canadian Heritage (2002b). *The Canadian sport policy. Federal-provincial/territorial priorities for collaborative action 2002–2005*. Retrieved 25 May 2003, from www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/pol/pccs-csp/action/action_e.pdf
- Canadian Heritage (2004). *National roundtables on future high performance sport funding discussion paper, April 2, 2004*. Retrieved 5 June 2006, from www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/pubs/tablesroundes-roundtables/index_e.cf?wide=1
- Canadian Heritage (2005a). Minister Owen Acts on Budget 2005 Commitment for Own the Podium. *News Release—Communiqué*. Retrieved 12 June 2006, from www.pch.gc.ca/newsroom/index_e.cfm?fuseaction=displayDocument&DocIDCd=4
- Canadian Heritage (2005b). *Sport Funding and Accountability Framework (SFAF III: 2005–2010)*. Retrieved 5 June 2006, from www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/prog/cfrs_sfaf/criteriasfaf3_e.pdf
- Canadian Olympic Committee (2002). *Canadian Olympic Committee Team Selection Policy Athens 2004. Team Selection Committee Recommendations*, 24 November. Retrieved 19 February 2005, from www.olympic.ca/EN/games/olympic/summer/athens/files/TSP_athens2004_Eng.pdf
- Canadian Olympic Committee (2005). *About us> Olympic News> 2005. Own the Podium 2010*. Retrieved 29 June 2005, from www.olympic.ca/EN/organization/news/2005/0121_background.shtmlvjh

- Canadian Olympic Committee (2006a). Canadian Olympic Committee achieves goal of a top-three finish at the 2006 Olympic Winter Games. *Podium*, 4(2). Retrieved 1 October 2006, from www.olympic.ca/EN/newsletters/28e.shtml
- Canadian Olympic Committee (2006b). Beckie Scott elected to IOC Athletes' Commission. *Podium*, 4(2). Retrieved 1 October 2006, from www.olympic.ca/EN/newsletters/28e.shtml
- Christie, J. (2005). Muenzer concerned about support. *The Globe and Mail*, 25 January. Retrieved 25 January 2005, from www.globeandmail.com
- Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of power*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cole, C. (2003). 'A gold and it's deserved': At the finish line, race had just begun for Beckie Scott. *National Post*, 19 December. Retrieved 18 February 2005, from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., Cook, F. L., & Jacobs, L. R. (2004). Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement: a review of the empirical literature. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 315–344.
- Dubin, C. (1990). *Commission of inquiry into the use of drugs and banned practices intended to increase athletic performance*. Ottawa, ON: Supply & Services Canada.
- Edmonton Journal* (2004). COC sets lofty goals. *Edmonton Journal*, 30 November. Retrieved 17 February 2005, from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Ekos Research Associates Inc. (2005). *Status of the high performance athlete in 2004*. Retrieved 14 June 2006, from www.athletescan.com/Images/HP%20Survey/0574-final9.doc
- Fischer, F. (2006). Participatory governance as deliberative empowerment: the cultural politics of discursive space. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), 19–40.
- Fitness and Amateur Sport (1990). *For excellence. A symposium on Canadian high performance sport February 12, 13, 14, 1989. Proceedings*. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- Fitz-Gerald, S. (2002). Pound to Scott: name cheaters or be quiet: anti-doping chief says Canadian skier wrong with her "ready, fire, aim" criticisms. *National Post*, 21 February. Retrieved 18 February 2005, from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Flynn, J. (2004). Communicative power in Habermas's theory of democracy. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 3(4), 433–454.
- Green, M. (2004a). Changing policy priorities for sport in England: the emergence of elite sport development as a key policy concern. *Leisure Studies*, 23(4), 365–385.
- Green, M. (2004b). Power, policy, and political priorities: Elite sport development in Canada and the United Kingdom. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21(4), 376–396.
- Green, M., & Houlihan, B. (2004). Advocacy coalitions and elite sport policy change in Canada and the United Kingdom. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39(4), 387–403.
- Green, M., & Houlihan, B. (2005). *Elite sport development. Policy learning and political priorities*. London: Routledge.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1995). Reconciliation through the public use of reason: Remarks on John Rawls's political liberalism. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 92(3), 109–131.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (W. Rehg, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press (original work published in 1992).
- Harvey, J. (2002). Sport and citizenship policy: a shift toward a new normative framework for evaluating sport policy in Canada? *ISUMA Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 3(1), 160–165.
- Heyse, T. (2006). Consensus and power in deliberative democracy. *Inquiry*, 49(3), 265–289.
- Houlihan, B. (2003). *Athlete's rights, doping control and the world anti-doping code*, 30 October. Presentation made at the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport Conference. Montréal, QC, Canada.

- Houlihan, B. (2005). Public sector sport policy: developing a framework for analysis. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 40(2), 163–185.
- Hunold, C. (2001). Corporatism, pluralism, and democracy: toward a deliberative theory of bureaucratic accountability. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 14(2), 151–167.
- Innes, J., & Booher, D. (2003). Collaborative policy making: governance through dialogue. In M. A. Hajer, & H. Wagenaar (Eds.), *Deliberative policy analysis: understanding governance in the network society* (pp. 33–59). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Inside Track (2005). Own the Podium 2010, a new plan for sport in Canada. *Inside Track*. Retrieved on 6 June 2006, from www.kin.calgary.ca/2002/news/inside-archive/2005JanFeb.pdf
- Jackson, G., & Ritchie, I. (in press). Leave it to the experts: the politics of ‘athlete-centredness’ in the Canadian sport system. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*.
- Kelly, T. (2004). Unlocking the iron cage: public administration in the deliberative democratic theory of Jürgen Habermas. *Administration & Society*, 36(1), 38–61.
- Kidd, B. (1995a). Confronting inequality in sport and physical activity. *Avante*, 1(1), 3–19.
- Kidd, B. (1995b). Inequality in sport, the corporation, and the state: an agenda for social scientists. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 19(3), 232–248.
- Knops, A. (2006). Delivering deliberation’s emancipatory potential. *Political Theory*, 34(5), 594–623.
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A Radical View*. London: Macmillan.
- Mason, D., Thibault, L., & Misener, L. (2006). An agency theory perspective on corruption in sport: the case of the International Olympic Committee. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(1), 52–73.
- Mills, D. (Chair) (1998). *Sport in Canada: everybody’s business. Leadership, partnership, and accountability*, December. Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. Ottawa, ON: Government of Canada.
- Morris, J. (2002). Winter Olympics: Bonus medal for Scott: anti-doping advocate proud of ‘clean’ bronze. *The Windsor Star*, 16 February. Retrieved on 18 February 2005, from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Oakley, B., & Green, M. (2001). Still playing the game at arm’s length? The selective re-investment in British sport, 1995–2000. *Managing Leisure*, 6, 74–94.
- Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (2000). *Official languages in the Canadian sports system. Volume 1*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Peterson, G. (2005). *2004–05 Canadian Olympic Committee Report*. Retrieved 14 June 2006, from www.diving.ca/english/html/agm/COC%20AGM%20Report%202005.doc
- Phillips, S. D., & Orsini, M. (2002). *Mapping the links: citizen involvement in policy processes*. CPRN Discussion Paper No. F|21. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Priestner Allinger, C. P., & Allinger, T. (2004). *Own the Podium—2010. Final report with recommendations of the Independent Task Force for Winter NSOs and funding partners*. Retrieved 18 February 2005, from www.olympic.ca/EN/organization/news/2005/files/otp_final.pdf
- Sam, M. P. (2003). What’s the big idea? Reading the rhetoric of national sport policy process. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 20(3), 189–213.
- Sam, M. P. (2005). The makers of sport policy: a (task) force to be reckoned with. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21(1), 78–99.
- Sam, M. P., & Jackson, S. J. (2004). Sport policy development in New Zealand. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39(2), 205–222.
- Sam, M. P., & Jackson, S. J. (2006). Developing national sport policy through consultation: the rules of engagement. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(3), 366–386.
- Sam, M. P., & Scherer, J. (2006). The steering group as policy advice instrument: a case of “consultocracy” in stadium subsidy deliberations. *Policy Science*, 39, 169–181.
- Shabani, A. P. (1998). *Habermas’ between facts and norms: legitimizing power?* Paper presented at the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy, Boston, MA, 10–19 August 1998. Retrieved 16 June 2005, from www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Poli/PoliShab.htm

- Sport Canada (2000). *Sport Funding and Accountability Framework (SFAF 2001–2005). National sport federations' eligibility criteria*, January. Hull, QC: Author.
- Sport Canada (2001). *Towards a Canadian sport policy. Report on the National Summit on Sport*. Retrieved 7 August 2003, from www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/pol/pcs-csp/Sum-rep/tdm_e.cfm
- Sport Canada (2003). *The Athlete's roundtable*. Retrieved 18 February 2005, from www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/pol/pcs-csp/ncs-rt/2_e.cfm
- Sport Canada (2004). *Sport funding and accountability framework (SFAF III: 2005–2010). National sport organizations' eligibility criteria*, February. Gatineau, QC: Author.
- Sport Canada (2005). *Sport Canada mission*. Retrieved 4 October 2006, from www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/mission/index_e.cfm
- Starkman, R. (2000). Analysis: how we're failing our athletes; there's little funding, support or leadership. *Toronto Star*, 24 September, A1.
- Starkman, R. (2004). COC must put money where its mouth is. Plan for 35 medals in 2010 is costly. *Toronto Star*, 30 November. Retrieved 1 December 2004, from www.thestar.com
- Stonehouse, D. (2003). Chretien reverses funding "oversight". *The Ottawa Citizen*, 22 February. Retrieved 19 June 2006, from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Task Force Report (1992). *Sport: the way ahead. The report of the Minister's Task Force on federal sport policy*. Ottawa, ON: Supply & Services.
- Taylor, B. (Chair) (1976). *Report: unification of sport*, March. Ottawa, ON: Committee for the Unification of Sport.
- Theiss-Morse, E., & Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Citizenship and civic engagement. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 227–249.
- Thibault, L., & Babiak, K. M. (2005). Organizational changes in Canada's sport system: toward an athlete-centred approach. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 5 (2), 105–132.
- Urbinati, N. (2000). Representation as advocacy. A study of democratic deliberation. *Political Theory*, 28 (6), 758–786.
- VANOC 2010 (2006). *News release: Vancouver 2010 welcomes Olympian Beckie Scott to the Board of Directors, thanks Olympian Catriona Le May Doan*, 17 May. Retrieved 1 October 2006, from www.vancouver2010.com/en/OrganizingCommittee/MediaCentre/NewsReleases/2006/05/17/74_0605171221-618
- WADA (2005). WADA appoints members to new athlete committee, 29 March. Retrieved 1 October 2006, from www.wada-ama.org/en/newsarticle.ch2?articleId=3115118
- Warick, J. (2004). Worthy athletes kept home. *The Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, 13 August. Retrieved 18 February 2005, from Canadian Newsstand database.
- Young, I. M. (2002). *Inclusion and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.