

<11>

PRODUCING THE CANADIAN FEMALE ATHLETE

*Negotiating the Popular Logics
of Sport and Citizenship*

Michelle Helstein

Sport Canada's institutional home, as a branch of the Federal Department of Canadian Heritage, is representative of sports' long-standing celebration within Canadian culture as a phenomenon that values, strengthens, and unites the Canadian experience. Sport in this context is part of a larger Canadian cultural policy that assumes a broadly representative, homogenous, "Canadian" audience. However, this celebration of nationalism within the context of Canadian sport exists alongside a substantial body of academic literature that argues and illustrates that sport is a masculine domain. Thus, the topic of Canadian popular sporting culture necessarily highlights a link between citizenship and masculinity that initiates questions about the production and positioning of the Canadian female sport participant. As the editors of this volume

suggest in the introduction, addressing the popular cultural production of the Canadian female athlete requires an exploration of the contexts in which she is produced, circulated, consumed, and preserved. That is, how do the various social, economic, and political institutions that govern popular sporting culture produce particular understandings of Canadian sporting females? In response to this question, this paper will examine the contemporary intersections of masculine sport culture, public sport policy, changing federal funding regimes, increased private sector sponsorship, evolving media ownership, and commodification as contexts for a specific production, circulation, consumption, and preservation of the female athlete in Canadian popular culture. At the intersections of these contexts, there is an attempt to celebrate a unified notion of Canadian sporting culture, even as the Canadian female athlete necessarily complicates that process. Through an exploration of contexts, this paper illustrates that popular sporting culture in Canada is not an end point, but rather an ongoing site of cultural labour that showcases the constitution and negotiation of a popular logic of female athletes and citizenship.

The Department of Canadian Heritage “is responsible for national policies and programs that promote Canadian content, foster cultural participation, active citizenship, and participation in Canada’s civic life, and strengthen connections among Canadians.”¹ It is not surprising then that Sport Canada, the federal government agency responsible for the development and functioning of the Canadian sport system, is housed administratively within the Department of Canadian Heritage. Federal government discourses position sport as a powerful “tool for social development,” with the “ability to engage citizens and communities,” build a “more cohesive society” and “pride in our nation,” while enriching “Canada’s cultural life by promoting Canadian values, including diversity.”² Sport is situated as a resource for the work of nation and citizenship.

Canada is certainly not alone in its contemporary attempts to forge links between sport and national culture. As Silk, Andrews, and Cole suggest,

The twentieth century witnessed a strengthening of the bond between the discursive (re)production of specific national cultures and select sporting practices, such that sport has become arguably the most emotive—peacetime—vehicle for harnessing and expressing bonds of national cultural affiliation.³

Similarly, Rowe, McKay, and Miller suggest "...national mythmaking through sport is common across continents."⁴

In the Canadian context, this link between sport and national culture is most evident in the nationalism that has long been associated with hockey in Canada.⁵ Indeed, it is common within the Canadian context to assert that ice hockey signifies something about Canadian people and their culture. As Gruneau and Whitson point out in their book, *Hockey Night in Canada: Sport, Identities, and Cultural Politics*, hockey has been celebrated as "Canadian specific," "our common passion," "the language that pervades Canada," and "the game of our lives."⁶ Given this rhetoric, it is not exceptional to hear statements such as those made by Brown that, "hockey is far more than a puck and a stick to a youngster living in Canada. It is a ceremony, a ritual, an almost mystical rite... the playing of the game credentials a boy and makes him an authentic Canadian."⁷ These popular imaginations are commonplace and within the wider Canadian cultural context; many people are noticeably invested in protecting them as true.⁸

Associations between hockey and Canadian identity are taken up, in both popular and official discourses, in ways that highlight unified constructions of Canadian culture and identity. Adams states "hockey is about part of the obfuscating construction of the so-called 'ordinary Canadian', a creature whose evocation in popular political commentary helps to homogenize discourses about an increasingly heterogeneous population."⁹ While this heterogeneity takes many forms (ability, age, class, gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, among others), the focus of this paper is on locating gender within these homogenizing discourses. Doing so raises questions about the production of the Canadian female athlete within a national sporting culture that is necessarily, even if not always explicitly, premised on masculinity. Popular and official links then between sport, nationalism, and citizenship are necessarily deeply gendered.¹⁰ While sport has certainly been a major site of contestation for increased opportunities and acceptance of women, it is still regarded and understood as a male preserve.¹¹ While women are participating in increasing numbers, their positioning within sport is still subject to normative discourses of gender that are celebrated and protected within sporting culture.

Dominant sport discourse, for example, most often requires strong, aggressive, forceful, space-occupying movements. Adherence to these embodied practices enables an athlete to be successful at sport. Dominant gender discourses function

in similar ways. Dominant notions of femininity require a petite frame, cooperation, and passivity, while dominant notions of masculinity require strength, aggression, the occupation of space, and domination. Therefore, to practice dominant sport discourse and a dominant discourse of masculinity is to engage in the same movements, gestures, and attitudes.¹² This argument holds most true in sports including hockey, lacrosse, football, basketball, rugby, and soccer that happen, not coincidentally, to be some of the most celebrated sports around the world. On the other hand, the embodied practice of conventional femininity and sport is at odds. As Shogan suggests, “while there is nothing normal about an athletic body for either men or women, male athletic embodiment is an ideal of masculinity, and female athletic embodiment is a contradiction.”¹³

So, while women can and do excel at sport, their embodied participation is still seen to be at odds with their position as women. As Young argues, “if there is a particular female person participating in sport, then, either she is not ‘really’ a woman, or the sport she engages in is not ‘really’ a sport.”¹⁴ There is clearly a hierarchy within sporting cultures, and those sports seen as most worthy of links to national identity are those that celebrate strength, aggression, the occupation of space, and domination, that is, those that celebrate normative masculinity. A female successfully practising such sport, and thereby embodying the movements of conventional masculinity, has been resisted. This is most obvious, in the historical refusal or discouragement of access to sport for women¹⁵ and more contemporarily and implicitly in the rendering of women who practice sport successfully as abnormal or unnatural.¹⁶ As more women participate in sports traditionally coded as masculine, it is a common conception that such females must be reclaimed or recovered. Popular cultural engagements with successful female athletes often reinforce that women can only transgress gender boundaries if they can somehow over-correct, that is, show their normative femininity, and therefore assumed heterosexuality in very explicit ways to ensure their status as real women.¹⁷

In the context of Canadian hockey for example, Whitson and Gruneau argue “...it was hockey’s attachment to a hypermasculine vision of ‘Canadianness’ that became the core element in Canada’s emerging hockey mythology.”¹⁸ Women who take up the game, even at the national level, receive less praise and attention within national sporting culture for equal

accomplishments.¹⁹ It is often argued that Canadian women who take up the game are not playing “real” hockey in that they play a less aggressive and physical version of the game. That is, they play a less masculine version of the game. However, there is no denying that hockey, whether played by men or women, requires strong, forceful, aggressive, space-occupying movements; movements normatively associated with masculinity.

It is therefore not surprising that we see attempts within popular representations to reclaim Canadian female hockey players as “real” women. One such attempt occurred at the first women’s world hockey championship tournament held in Ottawa in 1990. Rather than the red/white/black combinations traditionally worn by all Canadian teams, the Canadian National Women’s Hockey team wore hot pink uniforms. It is difficult to imagine any rationalization for that choice on behalf of Hockey Canada beyond an attempt to feminize the women even as they played a strong aggressive game.

More contemporary examples exist with respect to individual players in Canadian hockey. For example, Cassie Campbell, arguably the most conventionally feminine woman on the 2002 and 2006 gold-medal-winning Olympic hockey teams, was also “by far the most prominently featured member” of the team in both promotional campaigns for Canadian hockey and commercial endorsements, was “dubbed by her teammates and others as the ‘poster girl’ for women’s hockey,”²⁰ and is now working as a commentator for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporations’ (CBC) *Hockey Night in Canada*. This is not to say that Campbell is not an exceptionally skilled hockey player (she is), but rather to highlight that none of her exceptionally skilled teammates were deemed to be as marketable to the national sporting culture. As Theberge suggests, in order to be marketable in an era of corporate interest players may celebrate their athleticism on the ice, but must be “pretty and feminine off it.”²¹

Hayley Wickenheiser, often cited as the best female hockey player in the world, provides a different example of how female athletes are reclaimed. Wickenheiser is a physically dominant player who is not normatively feminine. Her success on the ice as both a Canadian national team member (in both hockey and softball) and a member of a European men’s professional hockey team has attracted some media attention (though significantly limited in comparison to Cassie Campbell) but very limited endorsement opportunities. Her adopted son

Noah and/or her boyfriend are almost always present (either visually, literally, or figuratively) within popular representations of Wickenheiser, positioning her as mother and wife. Perhaps most famously, this is evident in her commercial endorsing *Hamburger Helper*, which features her explaining that the product allows her to be an athlete without impeding her ability and obligation to be a good wife and mother by cooking for and attending to the needs of her family.

The place that women are afforded within national sporting cultures is necessarily constrained by the masculine culture of sport. “The nation as a group of readers has routinely been for the taking, but it is taken in distinctly partial ways. For when women are offered up as representatives of the nation, it is usually in a way that sexualizes performance.”²² If we return to the link between sport, nation, and citizen the production of the female athlete occupies a complex space. While in moments the individual successes of female athletes may be celebrated, those same athletes are eventually positioned and reclaimed as “good citizens” through reference to hyperfemininity and/or heterosexuality:

Simply put, so-called national sports afford men—in general, and certain men in particular—an opportunity to represent the nation in a way not open to women. Sport helps construct the different versions of citizenship available to men and women.²³

Given the links between sport, nationalism, and masculinity, the existence of the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women in Sport and Physical Activity (CAAWS) should not be surprising. CAAWS is both the most widely popular advocacy group and the organizational voice for the official federal discourse of female sport participation in Canada.

The history of CAAWS and its institutionalization within the Canadian sport delivery system is a significant context for the production of the Canadian female sporting participant. Formal federal government involvement in Canadian amateur sport began in 1961 with the passing of Bill C-131, *The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act*. Government involvement as instituted by the act was indirect and consisted primarily of federal–provincial cost sharing agreements to promote mass fitness and sports programs.²⁴ There were no provisions to ensure the distribution of monies to both male and female athletes. The Federal government’s 1968 Task Force on Sport similarly made no mention of the distribution of funds to women

on an equal basis with men.²⁵ The 1970 *Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada* made recommendations concerning “the lack of equal opportunity for girls in school sport programs.”²⁶ The federal government responded by hiring a consultant to the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch (FASB) in 1972. Still, FASB personnel did not act on recommendations forthcoming from the first national conference on women and sport (1974) and, consequently, little changed in the administration of sport in Canada.²⁷ It was not until 1980 that FASB officials, “sufficiently concerned about an inadequate response to the 10-year review of the *Royal Commission on the Status of Women* recommendations,” finally agreed to the establishment of an official Women’s Program within FASB.²⁸ The Women’s Program led to the establishment, in 1981, of the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women in Sport and Physical Activity (CAAWS).²⁹

Hall, Lawrence-Harper, and Scott Pawson³⁰ have identified a relationship between the history of CAAWS’ funding and the historically specific mandates of the organization. Initially, CAAWS was funded primarily through project grants from the FASB Women’s Program and the Secretary of State Women’s Program. At that time, CAAWS’ founders stated specifically that their mandate was “to advance the position of women by defining, promoting, and supporting feminist perspective on sport and to improve the status of women in sport.”³¹ In the early years there was debate among the membership about whether the association should be committed to explicitly feminist principles, what feminism meant, and what type (liberal, radical, et cetera) of feminism was being practiced.³² In 1987, CAAWS specifically declared itself a feminist organization and, through a series of five position statements, committed itself to feminist advocacy.³³ In accordance with that commitment, during this period CAAWS relied on funding from the Secretary of State Women’s Program and only accepted specific project funding from Sport Canada so as not to be “co-opted by the sport system it was committed to changing.”³⁴

In 1990, CAAWS lost its operational funding from the Secretary of State Women’s Program. One year later, CAAWS was saved when an agreement with the federal government established CAAWS as a national multi-sport organization with an office in the Canadian Sport, Fitness, and Administration Centre in Ottawa.³⁵ As Lawrence-Harper suggests, CAAWS “reformulated the organization’s ideological strategy, structure, and external relations in order to be an umbrella sport organization.”³⁶ Since 1994, CAAWS, like all multi-sport organizations, has received its core operational and project funding from Sport Canada.³⁷

At the time of that transformation, CAAWS “removed all references to feminism from its mission statement and goals.”³⁸ In 1992, the association’s mandate was “to ensure that girls and women in sport and physical activity have access to a complete range of opportunities and choices and have equity as participants and leaders.”³⁹ Hall suggests, “CAAWS now sees itself more as part of the Canadian sport community and much less a feminist organization linked to the women’s movement.”⁴⁰ McKay argues that this emulation of bureaucracy is the tendency within women’s sporting organizations when volunteers are supplanted by “professional experts skilled in marketing, business administration and management.”⁴¹ This position is exemplified in the words of Marg McGregor, CAAWS executive director from 1992–2000, who stated, “that a not-for-profit organization was no different than a business” that needed to be “cost effective, productive, show value, be supported by clientele, and able to market its product.”⁴²

On its website, CAAWS assures readers that it plans to remain “true to its founding principles” and “accepting of its place in women’s movements” but also suggests that in the future the organization “will wear a different face.”⁴³ In a stance consistent with, and likely motivated by, Canadian sport policy, which states a need to seek “innovative sources of funding... especially through private sector and corporate partnerships and sponsorships,”⁴⁴ CAAWS states:

Recognizing that the time has come to diminish our dependence on government funding, CAAWS is developing a marketing strategy... we are seeking to attract public sector contributions and private sector sponsorship, to encourage individual participation in the organization, and to expand the market for our products.⁴⁵

The effects of this shift are significant given that, as the only national public sector initiative and the only multi-sport organization in Canada charged exclusively with promoting sport/physical activity to girls and women, CAAWS predominates the official federal discourse of female sport participation in the Canadian context. In this privileged position as the predominant public sector voice, we might assume that CAAWS has the potential to offer competing, more diverse, and just representations of active females than might be expected of profit-motivated private companies concerned with marketability framed in reference to hyper-femininity and heterosexuality.

In its most benevolent form, CAAWS attempts to represent the female sport participant through discourses of advocacy, feminism, empowerment, participation, diversity, and inclusion. However, we know through the association's own statements, at least some of the leadership and labour within the organization views discourses of marketing, efficiency, commodification, and corporatization as legitimate. While CAAWS has done and continues to do valuable work in the promotion and inclusion of the female sport participant in Canada, there is a danger that, in looking to marketing and private sector sponsorship, representations produced by CAAWS highlight and conform to the conventionally popular (hyper-feminine and heterosexual) female sport participant, and in that process conform to normative, rather than resistive, narratives.

For example, one of the most notable and publicized corporate partnerships resulting from this new philosophy was the collaboration between CAAWS and Nike. Publicly, Nike claimed that its efforts directed to the women's market were concerned with empowering female athletes, providing opportunities for self-transformation and growth, and providing products "Engineered for women athletes."⁴⁶ Research conducted on Nike found that the company's representational vision of the female sport participant was premised on empowerment and excellence for middle- and upper-middle-class women.⁴⁷ The vision presumed normative white, heterosexual, able-bodied, (hyper)femininity, and a neo-conservative distinction between whatever you are right now (unhealthy, unmotivated, unfit) and what you can, should, and will be if you simply try hard enough.⁴⁸ Analysis of Nike advertising texts demonstrated that under the guise of empowerment and advocacy, the lived realities of many women were silenced within the representational images.⁴⁹ As just one example, Nike is invested in empowering a certain group of girls and women (privileged North American) through the exploitation of another group of girls and women (offshore factory workers).⁵⁰ Furthermore, while it would be unfair to say that Nike has not positively influenced the promotion of female athletes in some ways, various researchers have found that Nike advertising directed to women since the early 1990s clearly illustrates that, as a profit-motivated company, they have not moved beyond the constraints of normative sporting culture in representing women in sport.⁵¹

A second corporate partnership that resulted was the Whirlpool sponsorship of a CAAWS campaign titled Mothers in Motion.⁵² From the Sport Canada homepage, it is only a few links to the Mothers in Motion homepage, "for women who

want to lead healthy lifestyles and mentor their children to do the same.”⁵³ A central feature on the page is a circle with the words “Excuse #26” and an arrow pointing to a laundry basket piled high with clothes. Above the basket are the words, “NO MORE EXCUSES.” One link on the page takes the reader to another Mothers in Motion site that provides “Laundry tips for busy active moms,”⁵⁴ while a second link provides “a few stain-removal tips courtesy of Whirlpool Home Appliances to keep uniforms and other sports-wear shiny and new,”⁵⁵ and a third link offers “tips for storing food and keeping your family safe.”⁵⁶ While there are arguably some helpful resources on the overall site and mothers are encouraged to lead by example, much of the Mothers in Motion campaign is framed in reference to mothers enabling children to achieve and be active. The uniforms that mothers are to keep “shiny and new” are explicitly those of their children (not their own). “Knees and elbows can come home a new shade of green as your little soccer tyke slides and dives across the field.”⁵⁷ Elsewhere “mothers of school-aged children” are encouraged to be “the biggest fan of your child’s sport team (such as soccer, basketball, ice hockey, ringette).”⁵⁸ It is unlikely that had CAAWS been determining content on their site outside of the influence of Whirlpool that the organization would have chosen topics like laundry and refrigeration as significant to keeping mothers active. Again, this corporately sponsored campaign is constrained by the motivations of profit and, as such, does not move beyond normative representations of women.

That these sponsors and sites are linked to Sport Canada⁵⁹ and thus the Department of Heritage Canada, with its commitments to “active citizenship and participation in Canada’s civic life” is telling with respect to how women are positioned in the national sporting culture. While I again reiterate that CAAWS has done some very important work with respect to female sporting participation in Canada, these two examples are representative of normative notions of gender that constrain the female athletes positioning within masculine national sporting culture.

While it is true that there is an increased encouragement and expectation of private sector sponsorship across the Canadian sport delivery system with “government funding... below the level of the late 1980s and early 1990s,”⁶⁰ the move impacts the production of male and female athletes within the national sporting culture differently. For example, in 1999, the Department of Canadian Heritage convened a national conference that brought together key individuals from sport,

government, and the corporate sector with the objective of forging stronger relationships between Canadian sport and the corporate sector.⁶¹ The summary report on the National Conference on Sport and the Corporate Sector highlights a number of barriers to corporate funding of sport in Canada. One of these barriers is that “there is insufficient coverage of amateur and high-performance sport in the Canadian media.”⁶² This barrier is directly linked in the report to the fact that “professional sport events dominate media coverage to the extent that amateur and lower-profile sports cannot make a marketable impact,”⁶³ a key component necessary to draw corporate interest. This point is significant for at least two reasons. First, given that professional sport in Canada (and North America) is almost exclusively male, the fact that professional sports dominate media coverage translates to male sport dominating media coverage. This obviously increases viewer exposure to those sports (hockey, football, basketball, baseball, and so on) and ways of playing the game. Second, it suggests that what is considered marketable, and thus presented to and consumed by the Canadian public, is left in the hands of media ownership and corporate interest.

This introduces another important context in examining how the Canadian female sport participant is produced, circulated, consumed, and preserved. Globally, we are witnessing a trend toward convergence and synergy wherein a small number of major media conglomerates have large holdings of both various distribution platforms and the means of content production (including to a large extent sport!). News Corporation, owned by Rupert Murdoch, is perhaps the most cited example of this corporate integration and the resulting media concentration. Moreover, the rise and success of News Corporation is intricately tied to sport. As David Andrews states, quoting Murdoch himself:

At the heart of Murdoch’s corporate media philosophy is the steadfast belief that “sports programming commands unparalleled viewer loyalty in all markets” (Murdoch 1996), and can therefore be used as a “battering ram” to penetrate media markets more effectively, and indeed rapidly, than any other entertainment genre.⁶⁴

Given Murdoch’s appropriation of sport as a “battering ram” it is not surprising that in 2006 News Corporation had complete or partial holdings in Fox Sports Networks, FoxSports.com, ESPN, CTV Sportsnet, Rogers Sportsnet,

Madison Square Garden, the New York Knicks, the New York Rangers, the Staples Center, the National Rugby League (Australia)).⁶⁵ Additionally, News Corporations' many holdings across a number of distribution platforms (TV, Internet, film, magazine, newspapers, and book publishing) means the media conglomerate has a great deal of control over what is both produced and distributed with respect to sport content.

Harvey and Law provide a highly detailed, complex, and informative description that demonstrates how Canada's largest media conglomerates, including BCE, CanWest, Rogers, and Quebecor, have in the recent past developed a "Canadian oligopoly" that has led "to a high degree of concentration of media ownership"⁶⁶ in the Canadian context. They too highlight the positioning of sport within that concentration and speak to the effects on mediated sport culture in Canada. While the space of this paper does not allow for an extensive discussion of their argument, I draw here on their claim that

[a] concentrated press means also less diversified sport journalism reporting and an increased focus of the media on commodified sport forms. Moreover, the so-called need for a national entertainment media model meant that less important room has been left for broadcasting non-commodified sport events.⁶⁷

The increasing changes to the Canadian media system mean that cultural sporting values and politics are "subject to corporate strategies driven by global competitive pressures."⁶⁸ In this context, some symbols proliferate while others become extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find because what matters is what sells.

Silk, Andrews, and Cole have termed this process "corporate nationalisms."⁶⁹ In this process, "the locus of control in influencing the manner in which the nation and national identity are represented becomes exteriorized through, and internalized within, the promotional strategies of transnational corporations."⁷⁰ Most often, these "commercially inspired reflections" are "depthless caricatures... and stylized signifiers of (sporting) traditions."⁷¹ Given discussion earlier in the paper regarding the positioning of women within the necessarily masculine sporting culture, it is not difficult to anticipate that women's sport is more adversely affected by a media system driven by a concentrated corporate interest and thus

more concerned with marketability and commodification than the celebration of diversified cultural values and affiliations. The caricatures and stylized signifiers of national sporting culture are not strong, aggressive, forceful women. If women appear at all within concentrated media forms they are more likely to be framed within discourses of femininity and (hetero)sexuality as exemplified earlier in this paper through reference to Cassie Campbell, Hayley Wickenheiser, Nike, and Whirlpool. Jenkins puts it most succinctly, “[media] concentration is bad because it lowers diversity.”⁷² Once again, the context in which the Canadian female athlete is produced and circulated will arguably lead to less representation, or at the very least less diversity of representation for the Canadian female athlete.

Before concluding, it is necessary to draw out an important distinction central to this paper. The arguments presented throughout are not meant to diminish the very real lives and accomplishments of female sport participants in Canada. Of course, many women exemplify not only sporting excellence (in all its strong, forceful, and aggressive embodiments) but also the heterogeneity necessarily implicit in that identity. The distinction that must be made is between the actual women who pursue sport and their existence (production, circulation, consumption) as a popular cultural form.

For example, as individuals, both Cassie Campbell and Hayley Wickenheiser have challenged gender norms and masculine sporting culture in very real ways. That said, the production, circulation, and consumption of Cassie Campbell and Hayley Wickenheiser as popular cultural forms has been framed within national and masculine sporting cultures, Canadian sport policy, changing federal funding regimes, increased private sector sponsorship, evolving media ownership, and commodification. Within those contexts, Campbell and Wickenheiser (alongside all Canadian female sport participants) as popular cultural forms are actively supporting the institutions (social, political, and economic) that produce them as texts. The work of the female sport participant thus becomes the work of the nation and markets. Regardless of the diversity present, the female athlete as popular cultural form works to produce, circulate, and preserve the homogenous “Canadian” sporting audience that can be sold for both government and corporate interest.

Locating the production of the Canadian female athlete at the intersections of masculine sporting culture, Canadian sport policy, changing federal funding regimes, increased private sector sponsorship, evolving media ownership, and

commodification, have highlighted the ways in which national sporting citizenship is differently displayed and available across difference. While I have focused this paper on gendered differences there are clearly many contexts within national sporting culture that attempt to “reify the term ‘sport’, denying the fissures—of gender, class, ethnicity...—that it sometimes tries to reconcile.”⁷³ The Department of Canadian Heritage offers us a unifying discourse of national sporting culture, but highlighting the production of the Canadian female athlete speaks to the heterogeneity of that culture. This disruption illustrates that popular sporting culture in Canada is not an end point, but rather an ongoing site for the production, circulation, and negotiation of a popular logics of citizenship that is necessarily gendered. Acknowledging the ongoing production of national sporting culture, rather than asserting it as something already there to be proud of and engage in, may allow for a recasting of the “regimented images of sporting citizens” such that they are represented “in all their chaotic, hybridic diversity.”⁷⁴

Notes

1. Canadian Heritage, “Welcome!” http://pch.gc.ca/index_e.cfm (accessed 8 September 2007).
2. Sport Canada, *The Canadian Sport Policy* (Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage, Government of Canada, 2002): 3.
3. Michael Silk, David Andrews, and C. L. Cole, *Sport and Corporate Nationalisms* (New York: Berg, 2005): 6.
4. David Rowe, Jim McKay, and Toby Miller, “Come Together: Sport, Nationalism, and the Media Image,” in *MediaSport*, ed. Lawrence Wenner (New York: Routledge, 1998): 121. See also Andrew Tudor, “Them and Us: Story and Stereotype in TV World Cup Coverage,” *European Journal of Communication* 7 (1992): 391–413; Hugh O’Donnell, “Mapping the Mythical: A Geopolitics of National Sporting Stereotypes,” *Discourse and Society* 5 (1994): 345–380.
5. See for example Gamal Abdel-Shehid, “Writing Hockey Thru Race: Rethinking Black Hockey in Canada,” in *Rude: Contemporary Black Canadian Cultural Criticism*, ed. Rinaldo Wolcott (Toronto: Insomniac Press, 2000): 69–86; Ken Dryden and Roy MacGregor, *Home Game: Hockey and Life in Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1989); Neil Earle, “Hockey as Canadian Popular Culture,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30 (1995): 107–123; Rick Gruneau and David Whitson, *Hockey Night in Canada: Sport, Identities and Cultural Politics* (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1993); Peter Gzowski, *The Game of Our Lives* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1981); Steve Jackson, “Gretzky, Crisis, and Canadian Identity in 1988:

- Rarticulating the Americanization of Culture Debate,” *Sociology of Sport Journal* 11 (1994): 428–446; Bruce Kidd and John MacFarlane, *The Death of Hockey* (Toronto: New Press, 1972); John Nauright and Philip White, “Nostalgia, Community, and Nation: Professional Hockey and Football in Canada,” *AVANTE* 2 (1996): 24–41; David Whitson and Rick Gruneau, *Artificial Ice: Hockey, Commerce and Cultural Identity* (Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2006).
6. Gruneau and Whitson 1993, 3.
 7. Neil Earle, “Hockey as Canadian Popular Culture: Team Canada 1972, Television and the Canadian Identity,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30 (1995): 107–123.
 8. Mary Louise Adams, “The Game of Whose Lives? Gender, Race, and Entitlement in Canada’s ‘National’ Game,” in Whitson and Gruneau 2006: 71–84.
 9. *Ibid.*, 71.
 10. Rowe, McKay, and Miller, 1998.
 11. Susan Cahn, *Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Women’s Sport* (New York: Free Press, 1994); Eric Dunning, “Sport as a Male Preserve: Notes on the Social Sources of Masculine Identity and its Transformations,” *Theory, Culture, & Society* 3 (1986): 79–90; Michael Messner, “Sports and Male Domination: The Female Athlete as Contested Ideological Terrain,” *Sociology of Sport Journal* 5 (1988): 197–211; Mariah Burton Nelson, *Are We Winning Yet? How Women are Changing Sports and Sports are Changing Women* (New York: Random House, 1991); Nancy Theberge, “Toward a Feminist Alternative to Sport as a Male Preserve,” *Quest* 37 (1985): 193–202; David Whitson, “Sport in the Social Construction of Masculinity,” in *Critical Feminist Perspectives*, eds. Michael Messner and Donald Sabo (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1990): 19–29.
 12. Whitson 1990; Debra Shogan, *The Making of High Performance Athletes: Discipline, Diversity and Ethics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).
 13. Shogan 1999, 55.
 14. Iris Young, “Throwing Like a Girl: A Phenomenology of Feminine Body Comportment, Motility and Spatiality,” *Human Studies* 3 (1980): 147.
 15. Helen Lenskyj, *Out of Bounds: Women, Sport and Sexuality* (Toronto: The Women’s Press, 1986); Hall 2002.
 16. Susan Cahn, *Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Women’s Sport* (New York: Free Press, 1994); Burton Nelson, 1991; Shogan 1999.
 17. Cahn, 1994; Toby Miller, Jim McKay, and Randy Martin, “Courting Lesbianism,” in *Sportsex*, ed. Toby Miller (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001): 103–125.
 18. David Whitson and Rick Gruneau, *Artificial Ice: Hockey, Commerce and Cultural Identity* (Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2006): 3.
 19. See Adams 2006, 71–84, for a discussion of the 2002 gold medal wins of both the Canadian Men’s and Women’s hockey teams at the Salt Lake City Olympics.
 20. Nancy Theberge, “Challenging the Gendered Space of Sport as a Male Preserve,” *Quest* 37 (2002): 298.

21. Ibid.
22. David Rowe, Jim MacKay, and Toby Miller, "Courting Lesbianism," in *Sportsex*, ed. Lawrence Wenner (New York: Routledge, 1998): 126.
23. Adams 2006, 74.
24. Don Macintosh and David Whitson, *The Game Planners: Transforming Canada's Sport System* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990).
25. Hall 2002.
26. Ibid, 166. See also Sheila Robertson, "The Life and Times of CAAWS," *Canadian Woman Studies* 15 (1995): 16–21.
27. Hall 2002; Don Macintosh and David Whitson, *The Game Planners: Transforming Canada's Sport System* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990).
28. Hall 2002, 168.
29. Nancy Theberge, "Feminism and Sport: Linking the Two Through a New Organization," *Canadian Woman Studies* 4 (1983): 79–81.
30. Ann Hall, *Feminism and Sporting Bodies: Essays on Theory and Practice* (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1996); Hall 2002; Janis Lawrence-Harper, "Change in Feminist Organization: The Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport and Physical Activity 1981–1991" (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Alberta, 1993); Samantha Scott-Pawson, "The Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women in Sport: An Organizational Case Analysis of a Feminist Organization, 1981–1990" (Unpublished MA thesis, Queen's University, 1991).
31. Hall 2002; CAAWS, *CAAWS Annual General Meeting Kit* (Ottawa: CAAWS, 1982).
32. Hall 2002.
33. Ibid; Robertson 1995, 16–21.
34. Robertson 1995, 19.
35. Hall 2002; Lawrence-Harper 1993.
36. Lawrence-Harper 1993.
37. Hall 2002.
38. Ibid, 204.
39. CAAWS, "CAAWS Activities in 1992–93," *Action* 21 (1999): 2–4.
40. Hall 1996, 98.
41. Jim McKay, "Gender and Organizational Power in Canadian Sport," in *Sport and Gender in Canada*, eds. Philip White and Kevin Young (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1999): 209.
42. Hall 2002, 204.
43. CAAWS, "History of CAAWS," <http://www.caaws.ca/e/about/caaws.cfm> (accessed 29 September 2006).
44. The Canadian Sport Policy lists as one of its "Realities, Trends, and Challenges" the necessity for "seeking innovative sources of funding... especially through private

- sector and corporate partnerships and sponsorships”: Sport Canada, *The Canadian Sport Policy* (Ottawa: Department of Canadian Heritage, Government of Canada, 2002).
45. CAAWS, “History of CAAWS,” <http://www.caaws.ca/e/about/caaws.cfm>, under CAAWS in the Year 2000 and Beyond.
 46. Nike, “Engineered for Women,” <http://www.nike.com/womens/> (accessed 8 May 1998).
 47. Michelle Helstein, “That’s Who I Want to Be: The Politics and Production of Desire Within Nike Advertising to Women,” *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 27 (2003): 276–292.
 48. Debra Capon and Michelle Helstein, “Knowing the Hero: The Female Athlete and Myth at Work in Nike Advertising, in *Sport, Culture and Advertising: Identities, Commodities and the Politics of Representation*, eds. Steven Jackson and David Andrews (New York: Routledge, 2005): 39–58.
 49. Melisse Lafrance, “Colonizing the Feminine: Nike’s Intersections of Postfeminism and Hyperconsumption,” in *Sport and Postmodern Times*, ed. Genevieve Rail (New York: State University of New York Press, 1998): 117–139.
 50. C. L. Cole and Amy Hribar, “Celebrity Feminism: Nike Style: Post Fordism, Transcendence, and Consumer Power,” *Sociology of Sport Journal* 12 (1995): 347–369; Helstein 2003, 276–292.
 51. Cole and Hribar 1995, 347–369; Capon and Helstein 2005, 39–58.; Helstein 2003, 276–292; Michelle Helstein, “Rethinking Community: Introducing the Whatever Female Athlete,” *Sociology of Sport Journal* (2005): 1–18; Lafrance 1998, 117–139; Shelly Lucas, “Nike’s Commercial Solution: Girls, Sneakers, and Salvation,” *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 35 (2000): 149–164.
 52. Much of the work of CAAWS happens within initiative-based programs or projects. These initiatives currently include ACTive, Active and Free, Girls@Play, Mothers In Motion, On The Move, Views, and Women 55–70.
 53. CAAWS, “Mothers in Motion,” http://www.caaws.ca.mothersinmotion/home_e.html (accessed 9 September 2007).
 54. CAAWS, “Mothers in Motion: Laundry Tips,” http://www.caaws.ca/mothersinmotion/sponsor/laundry_e.html (accessed 9 September 2007).
 55. CAAWS, “Mothers in Motion: Stain Removal Tips,” http://caaws.ca/mothersinmotion/school/index_e.html (accessed 9 September 2007).
 56. CAAWS, “Mothers in Motion: Food Storage Tips,” http://caaws.ca/mothersinmotion/sponsors/tips_e.html (accessed 9 September 2007).
 57. *Ibid.*
 58. CAAWS, “Mothers in Motion: Mothers of School-Age Children,” http://caaws.ca/mothersinmotion/school/index_e.html (accessed 9 September 2007).
 59. While the Sport Canada website provides a link to all multisport organizations, in all

cases the viewer is met with the following message before being able to proceed to the new website: “You are now leaving the Canadian Heritage Website. Please be advised that the legislation and policy governing Government of Canada Websites, including official language requirements do not apply beyond this point.”

60. John Nieuwenhuis, *National Conference on Sport and the Corporate Sector: Summary Report*. Prepared for the Department of Canadian Heritage (Sport Canada) (Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada, 1999): 1.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid, 6.
63. Ibid, 6.
64. David Andrews, “Speaking the ‘Universal Language of Entertainment’: News Corporation, Culture, and the Global Sport Media Economy,” in *Critical Readings: Sport, Culture and the Media*, ed. David Rowe (London: Open University, 2004): 105.
65. Jean Harvey and Alan Law, “‘Resisting’ the Global Media Oligopoly? The Canada Inc. Response,” in *Sport and Corporate Nationalisms*, eds. Silk, Andrews, and Cole, 2005, 192.
66. Ibid, 216.
67. Ibid, 220.
68. Ibid, 202.
69. Silk, Andrews, and Cole, 2005, 7.
70. Ibid.
71. David Andrews, *Sport-Commerce-Culture: Essays on Sport in Late Capitalist America* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006): 118.
72. Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006): 248.
73. Rowe, McKay, and Miller, 1998, 121.
74. Ibid, 133.